

XXXII. Catullus 18-20

JOHN W. ZARKER

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

I

This paper presents a case for Catullan authorship of *Catalepton* 3* and 2* in the following manner: first, the evidence of the manuscripts concerning the poems is examined; secondly, reasons are adduced for their previous inclusion among the poems of Catullus; thirdly, the poems themselves, Catullus, Fr. 1, *Catalepton* 3* and 2*, are studied as works of literature; finally, new evidence for their authorship is given based upon the presence of mathematical symmetry and the Golden Section in the short poems of Catullus (1-60) and the lack thereof in the other poems of the *Catalepton*.¹

II

The Catullan manuscript evidence is quite clear on this problem; *Carmen* 17 of Catullus is followed directly by 21. Mynors states (page 15):²

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.

¹ My interest in these poems was aroused during the course of an oral examination for the M.A. at the University of North Carolina in 1952; J. A. Notopoulos, Visiting Professor at Princeton University in 1957, encouraged further study; I am grateful to G. E. Duckworth for inspiration and encouragement in the latter portion of this paper. The following texts will be cited by author: R. Ellis and C. Hardie, *Appendix Vergiliana et vitae Vergilianae antiquae* (Oxford 1957); R. A. B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford 1958); M. Schuster, *Catulli Veronensis liber*², ed. W. Eisenhut (Leipzig 1958). For the sake of variety the poems will at times be called Catullus 18-20 and at times, *Catalepton* 3*, 2*; however, I agree with P. Sommer (*De P. Vergilii Maronis Catalepton carminibus quaestionum capita tria* [Halis 1910]) 25: "... non recte faciunt editores, si tria priapea a ceteris poematis secernunt atque separatis numeris (1* II* III*) notant. Attamen ne legentes confundamus, numeros eos, qui sunt usitati, retineamus."

² Cf. Schuster 14: "18-20 In editionibus, quae ante Lachmanni recensionem prodierunt, inter carm. 17 et 21 tria Priapea inserta leguntur, quae codicibus Catullianis non continentur:..." E. T. Merrill, *Catullus* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1893) 40:

If the manuscript evidence is so explicit, why did Muretus and other editors up to the time of Lachmann continue to include these extraneous poems among the genuine poems of Catullus? Other ancient evidence, namely the grammarians, has been employed to prove or at least suggest Catullan authorship for the three poems traditionally included as Catullus 18–20. The material derived from the ancient grammarians is of two types: first, Catullus, Fr. 1 (“Hunc lucum”), cited by the grammarians as Catullan, is believed by modern editors to be Catullan and is consequently included among the fragments; secondly, one ancient grammarian states that Catullus wrote other Priapean verses in greater number.

The four line fragment beginning “Hunc lucum tibi dedico” (or some part thereof), is cited by ancient grammarians ten times; four of these times it is attributed to Catullus, while six times it is given without any indication of authorship.³ It should be noted also that four of these six citations are by grammarians (Marius Victorinus and Caesius Bassus) who elsewhere attribute the poem to Catullus. This evidence is accepted by modern editors as conclusive, and thus “Hunc lucum tibi dedico” is included as Catullus, Fr. 1 in texts of Catullus.

The second type of evidence given by Terentianus Maurus (*De metris*, Keil 6.406.2752–60) is of great interest and worthy of quotation:

- 2752 ipse enim sonus indicat esse hoc lusibus aptum,
et ferme modus hic datur a plerisque Priapo.
inter quos cecinit quoque carmen tale Catullus,
2755 ‘hunc lucum tibi dedico consecroque, Priape,
qua domus tua Lampsaci est quaque . . . Priape,
nam te praecipue in suis urbibus colit ora

“In the MSS., 17 is immediately followed by 21; but the early editors, influenced by the identity of metre, inserted as 18 the fragmentary address to Priapus beginning *hunc lucum tibi dedico*, and followed it, as 19 and 20, with two poems of similar character, . . . But the numbering of the genuine poems as disturbed by these interpolations has become traditional, and is here followed.” W. Kroll, *G. Valerius Catullus* (Leipzig 1929) makes no comment.

³ Marius Victorinus, *Ars gramm.* (Keil 6.151.9): “. . . ut apud Catullum . . .”; *ibid.* (Keil 6.151.22,23): “. . . ut est apud Catullum . . .”; Caesius Bassus, *De metris* (Keil 6.260.13): “. . . cuius exemplum apud Catullum . . .”; Terentianus Maurus, *De metris* (Keil 6.406.2754–58). Without author cited: Marius Victorinus, *Ars gramm.* (Keil 6.119.6 and 152.11,25); Caesius Bassus, *De metris* (Keil 6.260.31,32,35 and 268.4); Atilius Fortunatius, *Ars* (Keil 6.292.14); [Censorini] *Fragm., De metris* (Keil 6.615.12).

2760 Hellespontia ceteris ostriosior oris.⁷
et plures similes sic conscripsisse Catullum
scimus.

The crux of the problem is *plures similes*. Do the 26 verses of Poem 17 accurately describe *plures*? Why not describe Catullus' efforts as *paucos similes* or perhaps *multos similes*? It would seem to this author (as it must have seemed to Muretus and others) that *plures* implies more than the 26 verses of Priapean meter presently contained in the Catullan corpus.⁴

The manuscript evidence for the poems which were Catullus 19 and 20 and which are now included as *Catalepton (Priapea)* 3* and 2* (Ellis), *Priapea* 86 and 85 (F. Bücheler, *Petronii Satirae et Liber Priapeorum*³ [Berlin 1895]) is infinitely more complicated because of the attribution to the great Vergil. Pliny the Younger in a letter dated 105 A.D. (*Ep.* 5.3.2–6) although not ascribing *Priapea* to Vergil does state that Vergil wrote light verse:

Facio nonnumquam versiculos severos parum... Nec vero moleste fero hanc esse de moribus meis existimationem, ut, qui nesciunt talia doctissimos, gravissimos, sanctissimos homines scriptitasse, me scribere mirentur. ... sed ego verear, ne me non satis deceat, quod decuit M. Tullium, C. Calvum ... inter quos vel praecipue numerandus est P. Vergilius ...

Further, Diomedes (*Artis grammaticae libri* 3, Keil 1.512.27) states: "Priapeum, quo Vergilius in prolusionibus suis usus fuit,..."⁵ In addition, the final verses of the *Catalepton* (14a.3–4) relate:

illius haec quoque sunt divini elementa poetae
et rudis in vario carmine Calliope.

The primary literary evidence for the attribution of *Priapea* to Vergil is, to be sure, the pertinent passages in the *Vita Donati* (17.58–59 Hardie) and the *Vita Servii* (14–15 Hardie). The former says: "deinde Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem, cum esset annorum xxvi." The latter states: "scripsit etiam septem sive octo libros hos: Cirin Aetnam Culicem Priapeia Catalepton Epigrammata Copam Diras." In addition a catalogue of the Murbach

⁴ E. Galletier, *Epigrammata et Priapea* (Paris 1920) 136–37.

⁵ See below, note 14, where this passage is cited in full.

Library, dated about 850, lists the following works: “279 Vergilius Bucolicon; 280 Georgicon; 281 Liber Eneydos; 282 Eiusdem Dire Culicis Ethne Copa Mecenas Ciris Catalepton (*sic*) Priapeya Moretum.” The *Epigrammata* are already gone from this catalogue.⁶ Although the claim for Ovidian authorship of the *Catalepton* by what might be called the Radford school (Radford, Fairclough, Thomason)⁷ was effectively answered by the arguments of R. B. Steele,⁸ nevertheless, Radford’s acerbic history of the *Priapea* (repeated in briefer compass by Thomason) has neither been surpassed nor received the attention it deserved. Radford states in essence that, from the time of the Renaissance until the present (he quotes [above, note 6, pages 174–75] from Giovanni Andrea, editor of the *princeps*, 1469), editors of Vergil were adverse to attribute the great *Priapea* to Vergil although it was known in antiquity that Vergil did write *Priapea*. Little by little the title of the great *Priapea* was changed: *Lusus poetarum in Priapum* or *Diversorum veterum poetarum in Priapum lusus*. However, “. . . since the *Catalepton* happens to begin with three poems—of forty-six lines in all—relating to Priapus, which form of course a part of the *Catalepton* roll and are included under the *Catalepton* title,⁹ the proposal is made to remove the three poems in question from the *Catalepton*, to introduce a new and special title of ‘*Priapea*,’ and so to obviate all need of recognizing the disreputable member of the collection, the great *Priapea*.”¹⁰ To sum up the manuscript evidence for *Catalepton* 3* and 2*, they are part of the *Catalepton* proper and are attributed to Vergil by the manuscripts.

⁶ Cf. R. S. Radford, “The *Priapea* and the Vergilian *Appendix*,” *TAPA* 52 (1921) 166–67; R.E.H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis libellum qui inscribitur Catalepton* (Assen [Holland] 1949) pars prior xxi.

⁷ R. S. Radford, “The Language of the Pseudo-Vergilian *Catalepton* with Especial Reference to its Ovidian Character,” *TAPA* 54 (1923) 168–86; H. R. Fairclough, “The Poems of the *Appendix Vergiliana*,” *TAPA* 53 (1922) 5–34; R. F. Thomason, *The Priapea and Ovid: A Study of the Language of the Poems* (Nashville 1931).

⁸ R. B. Steele, *The Date of the Vergilian Appendix* (Nashville 1936) and “Non-Recurrence in Vocabulary as a Test of Authorship,” *PQ* 4 (1925) 267–80. Both articles were cited by Westendorp Boerma (above, note 6) xxxv and xlv–xlvi.

⁹ Cf. Ellis (above, note 1) under the title *Catalepton (Priapea)*: “Nullus titulus in *B* Catalepton Virgilii incipit *M* P. Virgilii Catalepton *Ar* P.V. Maronis Cathalepton Priapus loquitur *u*.”

¹⁰ Radford (above, note 6) 172; Radford’s tale of the circumlocutions and maneuverings of editors in reference to the title of the first three poems of the *Catalepton* (172–73) is a study in editorial ingenuity. Even Westendorp Boerma (above, note 6) begins his excellent commentary with “De qua saepe tibi, venit . . .,” not with the *Priapea*.

III

What do modern editors believe about the claim of Vergilian authorship for the three *Priapea* at the beginning of the *Catalepton*? There are two schools, the believers and the skeptics. The believers hold that the manuscript attribution is correct, that the *Priapea* are youthful poems of Vergil and part of his Catullan apprenticeship, and that they are part of his preparation for the *Georgics*.¹¹ The skeptics, however, believe that these *Priapea* are non-Vergilian, that they were composed after Vergil, and that they were published sometime between Ovid's long defense for light poetry (*Tristia* 2, 10 A.D.) and the quotation of Pliny the Younger about Vergil's composition of light verse (105 A.D.; quoted above, page 504).¹²

The problem of date of publication of the youthful poetry of Vergil is thorny. Vergil gave certain instructions to his executors, and Augustus countermanded his orders in regard to the *Aeneid*. The *Vita Donati* (39.153–60, 37.143–45 Hardie) gives the following information:

egerat cum Vario, priusquam Italia decederet, ut siquid sibi accidisset, Aeneida combureret; at is facturum se pernegarat; igitur in extrema valetudine assidue scrinia desideravit, crematurus ipse; verum nemine offerente nihil quidem nominatim de ea cavuit. ceterum eidem Vario ac simul Tuccae scripta sua sub ea condicione legavit, ne quid ederent, quod non a se editum

¹¹ T. Birt, *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton* (Leipzig und Berlin 1910) 4, 16; E. K. Rand, "Young Virgil's Poetry," *HSCP* 30 (1919) 128–32; T. Frank, *Vergil, A Biography* (New York 1922) 157–58; N. W. DeWitt, *Virgil's Biographia Litteraria* (Toronto 1923) 78–84; H. W. Prescott, *The Development of Virgil's Art* (Chicago 1927) 36–38; cf. Prescott, "The Present Status of the Vergilian Appendix," *CJ* 26 (1930–31) 53: "... none of the Priapean poems can lay any claim to validity as Vergil's work. It would be interesting, if true, that Vergil initiated the composition of Priapean epigrams in Latin." Cf. *The Development* 36: "Virgil, indeed, may have introduced the type into Latin poetry"; A. Rostagni, *Virgilio Minore* (Torino 1933) 345–50.

¹² E. Galletier (above, note 4) 20–32 and "À propos du *Catalepton* et des œuvres attribuées à la jeunesse de Virgile" *Rev. Phil.* 50, n.s., (1926) 154–58; J. Carcopino, "Vergiliana" *Rev. Phil.* 46, n.s., (1922) 156–84; Radford, Fairclough, and Thomason cited above, notes 6 and 7; H. Herter, *De Priapo* (Giessen 1932) 28, 54; Steele cited above, note 8; F. Klingner, "Über zwei Priapea der Appendix Vergiliana," *Hermes* 71 (1936) 258, 262; E. Paratore, *Una nuova ricostruzione del 'de Poetis' di Suetonio* (Roma 1946) 38–44, 218–220; K. Büchner, "P. Vergilius Maro," *RE* 8A (1955) 1068–70; E. Bickel, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 2 (Heidelberg 1961) 519: "Die Priapea im *Catalepton* der *App. Verg.* sind von Vergil abhängig, aber nicht sein Werk..." Cf. V. Bucheit, "Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum," *Zetemata* 28 (Munich 1962) 65–66.

esset. edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius... ex reliqua L. Varium et Plotium Tuccam [heredes fecit], qui eius Aeneida post obitum iussu Caesaris emendaverunt.

The *Vita Servii* is more concise (27–30 Hardie):

Postea ab Augusto Aeneidem propositam scripsit annis undecim, sed nec emendavit nec edidit: unde eam moriens praecepit incendi. Augustus vero, ne tantum opus periret, Tuccam et Varium hac lege iussit emendare...

Pliny the Elder (*HN* 7.14) adds: “divus Augustus carmina Vergili cremari contra testamenti verecundiam vetuit.” Suetonius (*Iulius* 56.7) relates that Augustus forbade the publishing of the juvenile or minor works of Caesar: “quos omnis libellos vetuit Augustus publicari in epistula quam brevem admodum ac simplicem ad Pompeium Macrum, cui ordinandas bibliothecas delegaverat, misit.” Further, Suetonius (*Augustus* 55) commenting upon Augustus’ actions in dealing with *famosi libelli* states: “... ac ne requisitis quidem auctoribus id modo censuit, cognoscendum posthac de iis, qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cuiuspiam sub alieno nomine edant.” Paratore (above, note 12) argues convincingly that the only work which Augustus had published was the *Aeneid* and that Vergil’s wishes concerning his unpublished works (which would include the *Priapea*) were followed. Paratore also asserts (page 219): “Suetonio ci attesta esplicitamente (*Caes.* 55) [*sic*] che *vetuit Augustus publicari* i versi giovanili de Cesare: avrebbe allora permesso la pubblicazione dei *Catalepton*, ove sono gli sboccati cc. 6 e 13?”

The primary reason given for non-Vergilian authorship is that of meter. *Catalepton* 3* is in Priapean meter and 2* in iambic trimeters.¹³ Klingner (above, note 12, 258) in discussing *Catalepton* 3* speaks of the lack of *rhythmische Gebärdenfolge* found in them. The number of Latin poems extant in Priapean meter is very small: there are only Catullus 17; Catullus, Fr. 1; *Catalepton* 3*; and Maecenas, Fr. 3.¹⁴ However, since the Priapean meter

¹³ Cf. Galletier (above, note 4) 66–68; Büchner (above, note 12) cites Klingner.

¹⁴ E. Bachrens, *Fragmenta poetarum Romanorum* (Leipzig 1893) 338–39 (Seneca *Epist.* 101.10–11: inde illud Maecenatis turpissimum votum...):

debilem facito manu, debilem pede, coxa
tuber adstrue gibberum, lubricos quate dentes:
vita dum superest, bene est! sustine hanc mihi: acuta
nil est si sedeam cruce!

is formed from a glyconic and a pherecratic element, the practices of Horace at least can be compared.¹⁵ In Catullus 17 there are three metrical variations: first, there are 17 trochees beginning the glyconic where one should find, according to Horace, spondees (except *Ode* 1.15.36); secondly, there are four occurrences of elision at the diaeresis (lines 4, 11, 24, 26); thirdly, in two lines (19, 20) the first foot of the pherecratic element is spondaic. There are also eleven occurrences of elision in the 26 verses of poem 17. In the four lines of Catullus, Fr. 1, there are one trochee at the beginning of the glyconic, no elisions at the diaeresis, one syllable anceps in the first foot of the pherecratic, and two elisions.¹⁶ *Catalepton* 3* in 21 verses reveals 12 trochaic glyconics, no elisions at diaeresis, one spondaic pherecratic, and 13 elisions. The table of Sommer (above, note 1, 97) might be enlarged to show the other Priapean fragments:

	Catullus		<i>Catalepton</i> 3*		Maecenas Vergil		Unknown	
	17 Fr. 1	Fr. 2						
trochaic								
glyconic	17	1	0	12	3	0	0	
spondaic								
glyconic	9	3	0	9	1	1	2	

There are four single Priapean verses cited by the grammarians:

1. Hellespontiacos tuum nomen protegit hortos.
Marius Servius Honoratus, *De centum metris* (Keil 4.465.30).
2. libens hoc tibi dedico, libens, sancte Priape.
Caesius Bassus, *De metris* (Keil 6.260.31; omitted from some MSS.).
3. incidi patulum in specum procumbente Priapo.
Diomedes, *Artis grammaticae libri* 3 (Keil 1.512.27 [Priapeum, quo Vergilius in prolu-
sionibus suis usus fuit, tale est]).
4. (-u / -u u) de meo ligurrire libido est.

Nonius Marcellus 134 M ("Ligurrire" degustare: unde abligurrire, multa avide consumere . . . Catullus Priapo) Catullus, Fr. 2 (below, pages 513-14).

¹⁵ In addition to the numerous citations of the ancient grammarians in Keil, s.v. "Priapeum metrum," see also: W. von Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 1897) 526-27; W. J. Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine* (Leyde 1936) 198-200, 284; F. Crusius, *Römische Metrik; eine Einführung*, ed. H. Rubenbauer (Munich 1955) 101. Cf. L. Müller, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii carmina* (Leipzig 1892) lxvii-lxviii: "Glyconio metro si iunxeris pherecratium, oritur versus mollis ac delicatus aptusque deo cuius honori dicatus est, Priapeus."

¹⁶ The use of the dative case singular of the first and second person pronouns as two short syllables occurs in Catullus 17.5, 7 and also in line 1 of Fr. 1. In *Catalepton* 3*, line 10 contains "mihi" as two short syllables, but in lines 12 and 15 it is iambic. F. Vollmer, *Römische Metrik* Band I, Heft 8 of A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (Leipzig 1923) 20, cites a 1920 Bonn dissertation of R. Hartenberger, in which the appearance of *nescio* and *volo* with final "o" short commences with Catullus.

Catullus *Catalepton* 3* Maecenas Vergil Unknown
17 Fr. 1 Fr. 2

trochaic							
pherecratic	24	4?	1	20	3	0	0
spondaic							
pherecratic	2	1?	0	1	0	1	2
elisions	11	2	1	13	3	1	0
elision at							
diaeresis	4	0	0	0	0	0	0

The author or authors of the Priapean poems definitely did not follow the practice of Horace in accepting trochees in the first foot of the glyconic element and also in the pherecratic.¹⁷

The influence of Catullus is present not only in the metrical practices but in similarities in diction and has been noted by almost everyone who has studied the poems.¹⁸ The Catullan techniques and use of diminutives, anaphora, and repetition for emphasis appear throughout *Catalepton* 3* and 2*.

The content of Fr. 1 of Catullus needs little comment. It commemorates the dedication and consecrations of a grove to Priapus, who is much honored in his cities and the Hellespontine shore, wherever his home happens to be. There is a metrical and textual problem in line two where the last portion lacks a trochaic word.¹⁹ There has been brief note taken of the oysters along the Hellespont. The repetitions of the final words of lines 1 and 2, *Priape*, and of 3 and 4, *ora*, *oris* is of interest. The homoeoteuton of "is" at the diaeresis of both lines 3 and 4 as well as at the end of line 4 is not uncommon in Catullus. The four-word final line of the poem, bristling with syllables, recalls line 16 of the Colonia poem; this is a common Catullan technique in the phalaecean poems (e.g. 1.7; 2.1,7; 3.18; etc.).

In view of the similar subject matter and despite the dissimilarity in meter, it is best to view *Catalepton* 3* and 2* (Catullus 19 and 20) together. These poems appear to be an exercise upon a single

¹⁷ Cf. Galletier (above, note 4) 66-67.

¹⁸ E.g. Galletier (above, note 4) 68; Birt (above, note 11) 14; Büchner (above, note 12) 1070; Rand (above, note 11) 132 speaking of *Catalepton* 3* 10-14 comments: "These verses have the lusciousness of Catullus's [17.14-15] . . ."

¹⁹ I am much attracted to the emendation of Scaliger recorded in Keil 6.406 *ad* 2756 of Terentianus Maurus. Bücheler suggested, "qua lege Priapi," whereas Scaliger (1595 A.D.) suggested, "quaque silva Priape," the vocative agreeing with the manuscripts. The parallelism of *domus* and *silva* and the dedication of the grove in line 1 make Scaliger's emendation seem to this writer the most logical.

theme from two slightly different points of view. In both poems Priapus, the garden god, is speaking; in 19 to *iuvenes*, in 20 to the *viator*. Both poems commence with the statement of Priapus that he guards the place or farm. The following sections in both poems (lines 5–9 and 6–9) describe the devotion to the god either by the *domini*, *pater filiusque* (19) or the *pauper erus*.²⁰ Both poems list the gifts to the god in accordance with the seasons; lines 11–14 of Catullus 19 list the offerings of the *pater filiusque* as lines 6 to 9 in Catullus 20; the latter is particularly striking because of the anaphora, *mihi* in the four lines, continued in the *meis*, lines 10 and 12.²¹ Lines 10–15 of Catullus 20 refer to the goats and sheep which thrive in the god's pastures. In both poems the culmination—the point of emphasis—involves animal sacrifice; Priapus would seem to appreciate the expensive offering. The following sections in both poems (lines 17–18, Catullus 19; “Pro quis . . . honoribus . . .”; lines 16–17, Catullus 20, “proin, viator, hunc deum vereberis . . .”) deal with Priapus' duties in return for his gifts, especially the gifts of blood.²² In Catullus 19 Priapus warns the *pueri* (cf. line 1, *iuvenes*) to remove their thefts from this place and approach a rich neighbor whose Priapus is negligent;²³ Priapus further gives the boys an indication of direction. In poem 20, after a warning to respect the god Priapus and to hold

²⁰ Rostagni (above, note 11) 346–47 identifies the *villula* and *pauper agellus* of Siro in *Catalepton* 8 with the *agellum*, *villula*, and *hortulum pauperis* of *Catalepton* 2*. Cf. *ibid.* 349: “I *Priapea* ci annunziano la materia rusticana delle Bucoliche . . .”

²¹ Cf. *Catalepton* 1*.1–2:

Vere rosa, autumno pomis, aestate frequentor
spicis: una mihi est horrida pestis hiemps.

Lucretius 1.174–75 is somewhat similar:

praeterea cur vere rosam, frumenta calore,
vitis autumno fundi suadente videmus . . .

Birt (above, note 11) cites in his commentary on *Catalepton* 1* the Latin verse inscription No. 439 of Bücheler, *Carmina Latina epigraphica* (Leipzig 1895) 206, which gives acrostically the name of the deceased wife, Vera: “Ver tibi contribuat sua munera florea grata . . .” For other verse inscriptions in honor of Priapus see Bücheler, Nos. 193, 861 (*Priapea* 82 Bücheler *Petronii* . . .), 862, 1504.

²² Although Catullus 20 (*Catalepton* 2*) does not specifically mention animal sacrifice to Priapus as does Catullus 19 (*Catalepton* 3*), nevertheless the repetition of *deum*, in the genitive in line 15 and accusative (referring to himself) in line 16, implies that Priapus considers himself among the gods to whom sacrifice is given.

²³ One is to assume from *neglegens Priapus* (line 20) that the god of the *dives vicinus* was negligent because the *dives vicinus* was himself negligent.

up the hands, Priapus points out that a *trux mentula* is at hand.²⁴ The approaching *vilicus* will find it a club fitted to his hand.²⁵ Not only is Priapus protecting the garden by his deity; he is also providing the weapon for its defense.

The similarity in method of composition of the two poems may be illustrated in this manner:

No. of lines	<i>Catalepton 3*</i> (Catullus 19)	No. of lines	<i>Catalepton 2*</i> (Catullus 20)
4	I nourish this place (<i>iuvenes</i>)	5	I protect this farm (<i>viator</i>)
5	The masters worship me (<i>pater filiusque, alter, alter</i>) ⁴	4	Offerings (<i>corolla picta, arista rubens, uva dulcis, oliva</i>)
5	Offerings (<i>corolla picta, spica mollis arista, luteae violae, lacteum papaver, pallentes cucurbitae, mala, uva rubens</i>)	4	Wealth or return for offerings (<i>capella delicata, agnus pinguis</i>)
2	Blood offerings (<i>hirculus, capella</i>)	2	Blood offerings (<i>vaccula</i>)
2	Duties of god (<i>pro quis honoribus</i>)	3	God must be revered (<i>prion, viator</i>)
3	Go to rich neighbor, indication of direction (<i>pueri</i>)	3	Overseer comes, providing of weapon

²⁴ K. Prinz, "Zum zweiten Priapeum des Catalepton," *BPhW* 34 (1914) 1020–22, explains the difficult phrase "velim pol" by the statement, "Pathicus est."

²⁵ The hand image in Catullus 20 is carried through the whole poem. Line 3 has *sinistra* with *manu* understood; perhaps Priapus is to be imagined as gesturing to the left as he points out the path in the other poem. In line five Priapus states that he wards off the evil hand of the thief. How are all the gifts offered to the god? With the hands with which all farm labor is done. The fat lamb brings home a hand heavy with money. Lines 16–17 warn the *viator* to revere the god and remove his hand. With his strong arm (*valente brachio*) the approaching *vilicus* will tear away the *mentula* and it will become a club fitted to his right hand.

The similarities and contrasts are evident. One poem is addressed to *iuvenes* (*pueri*) the other to the *viator*. *Domini* (*pater filiusque*) manage one, a *vilicus* (*pauper erus*) the other. Both poems list the gifts given to the god, but one (Catullus 20) states in addition the animal wealth of the farms, somewhat giving the lie to line four, "erique villulam hortulumque pauperis." In both poems the climax seems to be the blood offering: in one case to Priapus himself, in the other before the temples of the gods. In both instances the word *sanguis* is emphasized by placing it first or last in the line: both poems include the victim or victims of sacrifice in one line and the altar or temple, and blood in the other line. In both poems the *mentula*, the outstanding portion of the god's anatomy, plays a significant role. In one poem it is a means to point out the path to the rich neighbor's place; in the other, as a ready weapon to defend the garden.

The verbal similarities and repetitions in these poems are numerous:²⁶

- | | | |
|----|-------|---|
| 1. | 19.1 | <u>Hunc</u> <u>ego</u> , o <u>i</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>n</u> <u>e</u> <u>s</u> , <u>l</u> <u>o</u> <u>c</u> <u>u</u> <u>m</u> |
| | 20.1 | <u>Ego</u> <u>haec</u> |
| | 20.2 | <u>ego</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>d</u> <u>a</u> , o <u>v</u> <u>i</u> <u>a</u> <u>t</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> , |
| 2. | 19.1 | <u>l</u> <u>o</u> <u>c</u> <u>u</u> <u>m</u> , <u>v</u> <u>i</u> <u>l</u> <u>l</u> <u>u</u> <u>l</u> <u>a</u> <u>m</u> <u>q</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>p</u> <u>a</u> <u>l</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>t</u> <u>r</u> <u>e</u> <u>m</u> |
| | 20.4 | <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>q</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>v</u> <u>i</u> <u>l</u> <u>l</u> <u>u</u> <u>l</u> <u>a</u> <u>m</u> <u>h</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>l</u> <u>u</u> <u>m</u> <u>q</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>p</u> <u>a</u> <u>u</u> <u>p</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>s</u> |
| | 19.6 | <u>p</u> <u>a</u> <u>u</u> <u>p</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>s</u> <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>g</u> <u>u</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> |
| | 19.18 | <u>d</u> <u>o</u> <u>m</u> <u>i</u> <u>n</u> <u>i</u> <u>h</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>l</u> <u>u</u> <u>m</u> <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> |
| 3. | 19.3 | <u>q</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>c</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>d</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>t</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>a</u> |
| | 20.1 | <u>f</u> <u>a</u> <u>b</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>a</u> <u>t</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>t</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>a</u> |
| | 20.2 | <u>e</u> <u>g</u> <u>o</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>d</u> <u>a</u> , |
| 4. | 19.4 | <u>n</u> <u>u</u> <u>t</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> |
| | 20.5 | <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> |
| 5. | 19.10 | <u>f</u> <u>l</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>d</u> <u>o</u> <u>m</u> <u>i</u> <u>h</u> <u>i</u> <u>p</u> <u>o</u> <u>n</u> <u>i</u> <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>r</u> <u>p</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>t</u> <u>a</u> <u>v</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>e</u> <u>c</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> <u>o</u> <u>l</u> <u>l</u> <u>a</u> |
| | 20.6 | <u>m</u> <u>i</u> <u>h</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> <u>o</u> <u>l</u> <u>l</u> <u>a</u> <u>p</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>t</u> <u>a</u> <u>v</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>e</u> <u>p</u> <u>o</u> <u>n</u> <u>i</u> <u>t</u> <u>u</u> <u>r</u> |

²⁶ Cf. Klingner (above, note 12) 259. There would be another similarity worthy of note if the emendation of E. J. Barnes ("*Priapea* 3.3 [*App. Verg.*]," CP 57 [1962] 33-34) is correct:

20.3	<u>q</u> <u>u</u> <u>e</u> <u>r</u> <u>c</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>d</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>t</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>a</u> <u>f</u> <u>o</u> <u>r</u> <u>m</u> <u>a</u> <u>t</u> <u>a</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>t</u> <u>e</u> <u>s</u> <u>e</u> <u>c</u> <u>u</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u>
19.1	<u>E</u> <u>g</u> <u>o</u> <u>h</u> <u>a</u> <u>e</u> <u>c</u> , <u>e</u> <u>g</u> <u>o</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>t</u> <u>e</u> <u>f</u> <u>a</u> <u>b</u> <u>r</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>a</u> <u>t</u> <u>a</u> <u>r</u> <u>u</u> <u>s</u> <u>t</u> <u>i</u> <u>c</u> <u>a</u>

6. 19.11–12 primitus tenera virens spica mollis arista/... mihi
20.7 mihi rubens arista sole fervido
7. 19.14 uva pampinea rubens educata sub umbra
20.8 mihi virente dulcis uva pampino
8. 19.16 cornispesque capella
20.10 capella delicata
9. 19.15 sanguine hanc etiam mihi—sed tacebitis—aram
19.16 barbatus lin̄it hirculus cornispesque capella
20.14 teneraque matre mugiente vaccula
20.15 deum profundit ante templ̄a sanguinem
10. 19.18 praestare et domini hortulum vineamque tueri
19.19 quare hinc, o pueri, malas abstinete rapinas
20.5 tuor malaque furis arceo manu
20.16 proin, viator, hunc deum vereberis

There are some verbal similarities between *Catalepton* 3* and 2* and Vergilian works; they are usually limited to two words, e.g. *mollis arista*, *Ecl.* 5.28; *pauperis tuguri*, *Ecl.* 1.68; *papineas*... *umbras*, *Ecl.* 7.58.²⁷ J. Hubaux, “Les thèmes bucoliques dans la poesie latine” (*Mémoires de l’Acad. roy. de Belgique* 29, sér. 2, [1930]) 129, points out the following formula:

(agnus) gravem domum remittit aere dexteram (*Catalepton* II*).

Non unquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat (*Ecl.* 1.35).

inde domum cervice levis, gravis aere redibat (*Moretum* 82).

The most complete study of verbal reminiscences and borrowings, both verbal and in poetic technique, can be found in Sommer (above, note 1) 99–116; he includes echoes in diction and technique from both Catullus and Vergil, with reference to the minor poems attributed to Vergil as well as to other Latin poets.

One Priapean fragment should be noted at this time. Catullus, Fr. 2 appears to be in Priapean meter:²⁸

²⁷ Cf. Birt (above, note 11) 41–42, 35–36; also Klingner (above, note 12) 257–58. Both point out Catullan reminiscences such as *luteumve papaver* (61.195) and *vitis*... *educat uvam* (62.49–50). The borrowings in F. J. Gladow, *De Vergilio ipsius imitatore* (Diss. Gryphiae 1921), being based on Birt, are incomplete.

²⁸ See the fragments of Priapean poems (above, note 14.) Cf. Bucheit (above, note 12) 62.

“Ligurrire” degustare: unde abligurrire, multa avide consumere
 ... Catullus Priapo (-u/-u u de meo ligurrire libido est).
 (Nonius Marcellus 134 M)

The elision of the final syllable, *est*, is paralleled in *Catalepton* 3* 17. Of great significance is the theory that Catullus must have written more than a few poems in Priapean meter which are not included in the manuscripts.

Modern scholarship agrees that the *Priapea* are not by the hand of Vergil and that they are written early in Vergil's lifetime under Catullan influence. Why does no scholar take the fateful step and suggest Catullan authorship as did our predecessors down to the time of Lachmann. The poetic qualities have been judged by some to be worthy of a young Vergil; are they not deemed worthy of Catullus, who is known to have written at least two other *Priapea*?²⁹ Metrically, if in no other way, the poems seem most nearly akin to Catullus. Yet we have the shred of evidence from Terentianus Maurus, who is believed when he says that *Hunc lucum* is Catullan but is disregarded when he states that Catullus wrote *plures similes*. If scholars are so bound by manuscript evidence that on the one hand they refuse to admit *Catalepton* 3* and 2* into the Catullan corpus and, on the other, they refuse to ascribe them to Vergil despite some manuscript evidence, why not at least print the poems in question at the end of the text of Catullus with a forthright statement about their history?

IV

The final portion of this article will deal with a more controversial type of evidence for Catullan authorship. In his epoch-making article on “Mathematical Symmetry in Vergil's *Aeneid*” (*TAPA* 91 [1960] 184–220) and in his recently published volume, *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid: A Study in Mathematical Composition*, Professor Duckworth has truly set out on “a journey into new and uncharted territory.” In examining the structure of the *Aeneid*, Professor Duckworth found that the books were commonly divided into tripartite sections and then that the sections themselves were always in the same approximate proportions to each other; finally that even in the smaller and

²⁹ Cf. Birt (above, note 11) 47: “... kleine Meisterstücke...”; Büchner (above, note 11) 1070.

smaller subdivisions of the sections the same exact or approximate Golden Section or Golden Mean ratio occurred. "In other words, each book of the *Aeneid* is constructed on the basis of mathematical symmetry, with the proportions in the short passages combining into larger units until we reach the ratios in the subdivisions and main divisions of each book." (Duckworth, "Mathematical Symmetry," 192.) Further research and exciting discoveries in the use of the Golden Section and mathematical symmetry have been made by a former student of Professor Duckworth, Edwin L. Brown, in his 1961 Princeton doctoral dissertation, *Studies in the Eclogues and Georgics of Vergil*, soon to be published in *Latomus*. On page 210 of "Mathematical Symmetry" this statement appears: "... But I do not believe that his [Vergil's] use of the Golden Section proves his Pythagoreanism, for a very simple reason: *he was not the only Roman poet to compose by Golden Mean ratios*. Catullus 64, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis enclosing the story of Ariadne, contains 31 examples of the Golden Section" (italics Duckworth's). In his volume, *Structural Patterns*, Professor Duckworth affirms (104): "My preliminary work on Catullus and Lucretius should be expanded . . ."³⁰

An examination of the short iambic poems of Catullus (1-60) has revealed that 27 are composed in accordance with the Golden Section, while 34 are not. The reason for the total of 61 in spite of the exclusion of Catullus 18-20 is that alternate plans of composition exist for some (17.1, 17.2, 55.1, 55.2) while some poems have two parts (a, b). Because of the small number of lines in these short poems, the Golden Section or ratio is not always .618 but it varies from .600 to .636.³¹ Of the *Catalepton*, however, excluding the *Priapea*, only two are possibly composed in accordance with the Golden Section, while 17 are not so constructed.

In determining ratios I have relied upon basic thought patterns

³⁰ The quotation continues: "... particularly in the case of Lucretius, where the mathematical structure of the poem may help to solve disputed matters of the text." See *ibid.*, Appendix A, page 107, for Catullus 64; the table of proportions is on page 226-27; the outline and chart, 228-29. Preliminary research in the other long poems of Catullus (especially poems 63 and 67) indicates results which should be, I believe, as convincing as those in Vergil; perhaps mathematical symmetry with its use of the Golden Section will be found to be one of the primary contributions of Alexandrianism to Latin poetry.

³¹ See Appendix A for the detailed analysis of both Catullus 1-60 and the *Catalepton*. Catullus 18-20 are *not* included in the Catullus statistics.

in the poems of Catullus and those in the *Catalepton* as well as upon recent scholarship concerning the poems themselves. For Catullus I have used the texts of Schuster and Mynors (see note 1) and H. Bardon, *L'Art de la composition chez Catulle* (Paris 1943) together with other articles on individual poems. I have nowhere changed the traditional punctuation in Catullus or the *Catalepton*. For the *Catalepton* I have relied on the text of Ellis (note 1) and Birt (note 11).

With reference to the problem at hand, i.e. Catullus and the *Priapea* attributed to Vergil, the following data are of interest:

Author	No. of poem	Meter	No. of lines	Com- position	Pro- portions
Catullus	17.1	Priapean	26	$\overline{7-6-9-4}$	16/26 .615
	17.2			$\overline{11-11-4}^\dagger$	15/26 .577
Catullus (Catullus 18)	Fr. 1	Priapean	4	2-2	2/4 .500
<i>Catalepton</i> 3* (Catullus 19)		Priapean	21	$\overline{9-5-4-3}$	13/21 .619
				$\overline{9-9-3}^\dagger^\dagger$	12/21 .571
<i>Catalepton</i> 2* (Catullus 20)		Iambic trimeter	21	$\overline{5-8-8}$	13/21 .619
				$\overline{9-9-3}$	12/21 .571

† Cf. N. Rudd, "Colonia and her Bridge," *TAPA* 90 (1959) 238-42.

†† Cf. Birt (above, note 11) 37.

Because of the importance of the lines about animal sacrifice in *Catalepton* 3* and 2*, I have included those lines with the following one about the duty of the god or *viator*. In this analysis as in the long analysis in Appendix A, I have not broken a poem into parts except where the texts (Mynors or Schuster) have indicated a strong break, i.e. a period or colon. In the preceding analysis, according to my divisions the poems *Catalepton* 3* and 2* fall exceedingly close to the Golden Mean .618 (cf. *Mathematical Symmetry* 192-94 for the mathematical basis and explanation of the use of the Golden Mean.) However, following the divisions of other scholars, *Catalepton* 3* and 2* fall close to the divisions of Catullus 17.

To sum up the results of this research: a significant number of short iambic poems of Catullus are constructed according to the Golden Mean while a significant number of poems in the *Catalepton* are not so constructed. *Catalepton* 3* and 2* appear to this author to be composed in accordance with the Catullan technique of construction and in accord with the Golden Section. Alone this is of little moment. Taken with the evidence of the ancient grammarian Terentianus who states that Catullus wrote *plures similes* in Priapean meter, one may be led to believe that *Catalepton* 3* and 2*, attributed to Vergil but not believed to be written by him—poems which are packed with Catullan reminiscences and verse techniques—should perhaps be included in the Catullan corpus as was done by Muretus and later scholars; at least they should be printed in an appropriate part of the Catullus text with suitable notes and editorial comment.

APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF CATULLUS 1-60 AND THE CATALEPTON

No. of poem	No. of lines	Composition	Proportions	
1	10	7-3	7/10	.700
2	13	8-5	8/13	.615
3	18	$\overline{5-7-6}$	11/18	.611
4	27	$\overline{5-7-12-3}$	17/27	.630
5	13	$\overline{6-7}$	7/13	.538
6	17	$\overline{5-7-5}$	10/17	.588
7	12	$\overline{2-6-4}$	6/12	.500
8	19	11-8	11/19	.578
9	11	4-7	7/11	.636
10	34	13-21	21/34	.618
		(8-5)-(13-8)	(5/8)(8/13)	(.625)(.615)
11	24	16-8	16/24	.666
12	17	$\overline{3-6-8}$	11/17	.647
13	14	5-9	9/14	.643
14	23	$\overline{7-9-7}$	14/23	.609
14b	3	3	—	—
15	19	12-7	12/19	.632

No. of poem	No. of lines	Composition	Proportions	
16	14	$\overline{4-9-1}$	9/14	.643
17.1	26	$\overline{7-6-9-4}$	16/26	.615
				(see above, page 516)
17.2		$\overline{11-11-4}$	15/26	.577
18	(Fr. 1; see above, page 516)			.500
19.1	(Catalepton 3*; see above, page 516)			.619
19.2				.571
20.1	(Catalepton 2*; see above, page 516)			.619
20.2				.571
21	13	8-5	8/13	.615
22	21	8-13	13/21	.619
		(3-5)(9-4)	(5/8)(9/13)	(.625)(.696)
23	27	17-10	17/27	.630
24	10	6-4	6/10	.600
25	13	8-5	8/13	.615
26	5	4-1	4/5	.800
27	7	4-3	4/7	.571
28	15	$\overline{5-5-5}$	10/15	.666
29	24	$\overline{5-15-4}$	15/24	.625
30	12	5-7	7/12	.583
31	14	$\overline{6-5-3}$	9/14	.643
32	11	$\overline{3-5-3}$	6/11	.545
33	8	5-3	5/8	.625
34	24	$\overline{4-16-4}$	16/24	.666
35	18	6-12	12/18	.666
36	20	$\overline{2-8-10}$	12/20	.600
37	20	8-12	12/20	.600
38	8	5-3	5/8	.625
39	21	8-13	13/21	.619
		$\overline{(1.5-5-1.5)}(8-5)$	(5/8)(8/13)	(.625)(.615)
40	8	5-3	5/8	.625
41	8	4-4	4/8	.500
42	24	$\overline{5-15-4}$	15/24	.625
43	8	5-3	5/8	.625
44	21	$\overline{9-8-4}$	13/21	.619

No. of poem	No. of lines	Composition	Proportions
45	26	$\overline{9-9-8}$	18/26 .692
46	11	$\overline{3-3-2-3}$	6/11 .545
47	7	$\overline{4-3}$	4/7 .571
48	6	6	— —
49	7	3-4	4/7 .571
50	21	13-8	13/21 .619
51	16	12-4	12/16 .750
52	4	$\overline{1-2-1}$	2/4 .500
53	5	5	— —
54	7	5-2	5/7 .714
55.1	22	14-8	14/22 .636
55.2	(With 58b <i>Non custos</i> inserted following line 12)		
	32	$\overline{12-10-10}$	20/32 .625
56	7	$\overline{4-3}$	4/7 .571
57	10	$\overline{2-7-1}$	7/10 .700
58	5	3-2	3/5 .600
58a	10	7-3	7/10 .700
59	5	5	— —
60	5	5	— —

Catalepton

1	6	4-2	4/6 .666
2	5	4-1	4/5 .800
3.1	10	8-2	8/10 .800
3.2		6-4	6/10 .600
4.1	12	3-9	9/12 .850
4.2		$\overline{3-7-2}$	7/12 .583
5	14	$\overline{5-5-4}$	9/14 .643
6	6	5-1	5/6 .833
7	4	2-2	2/4 .500
8	6	4.5-1.5	4.5/6 .750
9.1	64	$\overline{2-10-26-16-10}$	38/64 .593
9.2	(Cf. Duckworth, <i>Structural Patterns</i> 215)		
		$\overline{12-28-24}$	40/64 .625
10	26	$\overline{5-6-12-3}$	17/26 .654

(Cf. Catullus
4 above)

No. of poem	No. of lines	Composition	Proportions	
11	8	4-4	4/8	.500
12	9	3-6	6/9	.666
13	40	$\overline{6-12-14}-8$	26/40	.650
13a	4	3-1	3/4	.750
14	12	$\overline{4-6-2}$	6/12	.500
14a	4	4	-	-

SUMMARY

Proportion	Catullus 1-60 (Excluding 18-20)	<i>Catalepton</i> 1-14a
.715	54	
.710		
.705		
.700	1, 57, 58a	
.695		
.690	45	
.685		
.680		
.675		
.670		
.665	11, 34, 35	1, 12
.660		
.655	28	10
.650		13
.645	12, 13, 16, 31	5
.640		
.		
.635	9, 55.1	
.630	4, 15, 23	
.625	29, 33, 38, 40, 42, 43, 55.2	9.2
.620	10, 22, 39, 44, 50	
(Golden Mean .618)		
.615	2, 17.1, 21, 25	
.610	3, 14	
.605		
.600	24, 36, 37, 58	3.2
.		

Proportion	Catullus 1-60 (Excluding 18-20)	<i>Catalepton</i> 1-14a
.595		9.1
.590	6	
.585	30	4.2
.580	8, 17.2	
.575		
.570	27, 47, 49, 56	
	Not appearing on this chart	
	5, 7, 14b, 26, 32, 41, 46	2, 3.1, 4.1, 6, 7, 8
	48, 51, 52, 53, 59, 60	11, 13a, 14, 14a

APPENDIX B

P. VIRGILI MARONIS PRIAPEA

The *Vitae* of Donatus and Servius as well as the ninth century Murbach *Catalogue* (above, page 504) state that Vergil wrote *Priapea*. The earliest manuscript of the *Catalepton* (Bruxellensis 10676 of the twelfth century) includes the three *Priapea* (*Catalepton* 1*, 2*, 3*) without title. The two fifteenth century manuscripts, Monacensis 18895 and Arundelianus 133, both include these three *Priapea* under the title *Catalepton* (above, note 9). If the three Priapean poems beginning the *Catalepton* are an integral part of the *Catalepton* and are not to be separated by a separate title, or if *Catalepton* 3* and 2* are the work of Catullus, what *Priapea* did Vergil write?

If one does not wish to accept the great *Priapea* (565 verses) of Radford as the work of Vergil, there is one other possibility. The 45 line iambic Priapean poem, "Quid hoc novi," could well be the *Priapea* referred to by the *Vitae* and the *Catalogue* of the Murbach Library. Many years ago E. Hiller ("Die Tibullische Elegien-sammlung," *Hermes* 18 [1883] 343-61 questioned the validity of the attribution of Tibullan authorship for "Quid hoc novi" (Bücheler [above, page 504] No. 83). The manuscript evidence is of greatest interest (F. Vollmer, *Poetae Latini minores* 2.2 [Leipzig 1923] 41-42). The Bruxellensis contains the poem following *Catalepton* 14a without interlineation and preceding the *Elegiae in Maecenatem*; in the three Monacenses (eleventh and twelfth centuries) it appears between the *Dirae* and *Copa*; in the Harleianus (thirteenth century) between the *Moretum* and *Culex*. One of the Monacenses has the title, *Incipit Priapea Maronis*. The Rehdigeranus (fifteenth century) states *Virgilii minor priapea*.

New evidence has come to light recently in the form of a fragment of a Vergil codex of the ninth or tenth century found at Graz. The

parchment manuscript was found used as backing for the volume *Meisterbuch der Bäcker und Müller zu Schladming, 1654 bis 1750*. The parchment contains eight columns of 40 lines each, totaling 320 lines. It includes (J. Krassler, "Das Grazer Fragment eines Vergil-Codex des 9. Jahrhunderts," *Anzeiger der öst. Acad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 90 [1953] 186-88) the *Ciris* 338-497, *Catalepton* 14.7 to 14a.4, the *Priapea* "Quid hoc novi," traces of *Copa* 1-38, and *Moretum* 1-51.³² The superscription for the poem "Quid hoc novi" in this ninth or tenth century manuscript reads *P. Virgili Maronis Priapea* as does the subscript.³³ Further, the pages with the columns containing the poem bear the title *Priapea*.

To sum up the old and new manuscript evidence: perhaps by the title *Priapea* in the *Vitae* of Donatus and Servius and the Murbach *Catalogue* (to which library the new Graz fragment is attributed) is meant the Priapean poem "Quid hoc novi" usually attributed to Tibullus.

³² Cf. A. Haury, "Du nouveau sur l'*Appendix Vergiliana*," *REA* 55 (1953) 404-5; *idem*, "Nouveau manuscrit de l'*Appendix Vergiliana*, le fragment de Graz," *REL* 32 (1954) 45-46; F. Gaar, "Text und kritische Bewertung des Grazer 'Vergil'-Fragments," *Anzeiger der öst. . .* 90 (1953) 188-231; R. Meister, "Zum Grazer Fragment eines Vergilcodex (Nachtrag) *ibid.* 91 (1954) 142-43. I have not seen as yet J. Krassler, "Das Grazer Fragment aus einem Vergil-Kodex des 10. Jahrhunderts," *Mitteilungen des steiermärkischen Landesarchivs*, Folge 3, 20-27 (Graz 1953).

³³ Gaar (above, note 32) 226-27 believes that the title *Priapea* must be plural and that it refers not only to "Quid hoc novi" but also to the three Priapean poems at the beginning of the *Catalepton*, despite the fact that these poems are separated by the 14 poems of the *Catalepton*. From the titles in the manuscripts, *Incipit Priapea Maronis* (three different manuscripts) and *Virgilii minor priapea*, one wonders if the term *Priapea* had come to mean a single poem to Priapus.