CRITICAL NOTES ON CATULLUS 29

JOHN-DOUGLAS MINYARD

I

eone nomine urbis opulentissime [Cat. 29. 23].

THE unanimous reading of the witnesses to V is matched by the unanimity of judgment among scholars that the line is corrupt. Estimation of the extent of the corruption varies: *opulentissime* alone, or *urbis* with it.

There are three grounds on which a passage of verse may be judged corrupt: meter, syntax, and sense. The second does not apply here since syntax is not violated. Critics claim that the line is unmetrical and makes no sense in the context of the poem. If this is not true, then there is no reason to consider the line corrupt.

Many attempts to heal the passage have been made, for example: *urbis o piissime* (K. Lachmann, 1829); *orbis o piissimei* (M. Haupt, 1837); *urbis o pudet meae* (R. Ellis, 1867); *urbis ob luem ipsimae* (H. A. J. Munro, 1869); *urbis o potissimei* (L. Mueller, 1880); *urbis o putissimi* (B. Schmidt, 1887); *urbis ob luem meae* (R. Ellis, 1889); *urbis o probissimei* (C. Pascal, 1916); *urbis editissimi* (W. S. Watt, 1962). Munro[1] proved that Haupt's *orbis* dependent upon *omnia* cannot stand. Watt has shown that *putissimi* is unacceptable. I suggest, however, that the line is not corrupt, because the two reasons for suspecting it are false.

It is asserted that the poem is written entirely in pure iambic trimeter (like Poem 4) and not (like Poem 52) in regular iambic trimeter. The MSS fail to confirm this assertion at four places: (1) *Mamurram* in line 3, where the first syllable is long (Hor. *Sat.* 1. 5. 37; Mart. 9. 59. 1 and 10. 4. 11; in Catullus 57. 2, the quantity cannot be determined); (2) *primum* in line 17, where all critics since Avantius (*ca.* 1535) have read *prima*; (3) the corrupt line 20; and (4) line 23. Let us consider them in order. The editors make *Mamurram* fit pure iambics by citing parallels for variation in the quantities of names. The parallels are invalid for three reasons: (1) variation in quantity may not apply to all names but only to some (where the quantity of the syllable in question was not stable), as in various ordinary words (see Lachmann on Lucretius 1. 360); (2) this is the only appearance of the name which would lead one to postulate quantitative instability, which in turn is made necessary only by the requirement of a pure iambic trimeter; (3) no parallels for this license are cited from Catullus.[2] These objections give reason to believe that the first syllable of the name is long and thus violates the pure iambic scheme.

The only reason for changing *primum* (l. 17) is to make a line of pure iambic trimeter.[3] If the line need not be pure iambic trimeter, the need to emend disappears. The appearance of an adverbial *primum* amid a group of words ending in *a* (some neuter plural, some feminine singular) is not unusual in Latin. It is easy to see how an original *primum* would,

1. *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus* (Cambridge, 1878), pp. 102–3. For Watt's conjecture and comments, see *CQ*, LVI (1962), 256 and n. 1.

2. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*[2] (Oxford, 1889), admits that "Catullus indeed does not allow himself the Lucretian licence of alternately lengthening and shortening the same syllable . . . ." ("Excursus on xxix. 20 and 23," p. 102). At *c.* 1. 5 (*Ītalorum*), where Catullus seems to lengthen the initial vowel of the substantive, he actually has the use of the long initial vowel of the adjective and the similar initial quantity of closely related words, e.g., *Ītalia*.

3. As Postgate, *CR*, XXXIX (1925), 162–63, confesses, conceding that *primum* is defensible.

owing to its context, have been corrupted to *prima*. How an original *prima* here became *primum* (even though abbreviated) is more difficult to understand.[4] It is helpful at this point to remember Conington's admonition that the requirement of textual criticism is not the substitution of a good word for a good, or even of a good word for a bad, but "the substitution of a true word for a false."[5] If the poem is not pure iambic trimeter, we ought to assume that *primum* is true and *prima*, while good, is false.

Line 20 is difficult. Conjectures have been proposed to make it pure iambic trimeter, for example: "timete Galliae, hunc time Britannia" (M. Haupt, 1837); "et huicne Gallia et metet Britannia" (H. A. J. Munro, 1869); "neque una Gallia aut timent Britanniae" (R. Ellis, 1867). All depart from the MSS more or less widely, without being convincing either in themselves or in explaining how such corruption might have happened. The witnesses to V present: "hunc Gallie timet et Britannie." In 1452 *hunc* was altered to *nunc*, and Froelich saw (1849) that *timet* concealed an original *timetur*. The first change involves but one letter, and the confusion of *h* and *n* is easy; the second undertakes an alteration no more radical than that of *e* at the end of *Gallie*, *Britannie* to *ae*. The abbreviated form of *timetur* was misread by an easy error;[6] *nunc* scarcely departs from the MSS and would never have been doubted except on the assumption of a pure iambic scheme for the poem. It is nevertheless so superior to its rivals that Mynors (OCT, 1958) prints it (albeit with the cautionary *repugnantibus tamen numeris*). The reading makes sense,[7] conforms to the rules of regular iambics, and fits nicely the linguistic pattern of the poem, climaxing the rhetorical development *primum, secunda, tertia, nunc*,[8] and forming the next to last step in the imitation of an accounting list in this part of the poem, which is signaled by the repeated *eone nomine. primum, secunda, tertia, nunc*—each of the actions adds up to their sum or total effect in line 24, *perdidistis omnia.*

As line 23 stands, it is a normal example of regular iambic trimeter: ⏑ — ⏑ — | ⏑ — ⏑ ‖ ⏑⏑ | — — ⏑ — is unexceptionable. Many parallels could be quoted from Greek (e.g., the similar line from Callimachus [Pfeiffer, I, Frag. 191. 27]). In Latin, note, for example, Horace *Epod.* 17. 63 and 74.[9]

It may be objected that even if all this is true, deviations have been established in a mere five metra out of seventy-two, four lines out of twenty-four. Surely this would be such highly unusual poetic practice as to be suspect on this ground alone. Look at Poem 25: pure iambic tetrameter catalectic throughout, except for *cōnserībīllēnt* at line 11, one line out of thirteen, one metron out of fifty-two.[10] Consider Horace

4. In fact, at *c.* 113. 4, an original *singula* was corrupted to *singulum* in V, the corruption going with the context and not against it: ". . . sed creverunt milia in un*um* / singula fecund*um* semen adulterio." At *c.* 66. 43, an original *maximum* was altered to *maxima* in V. Here there is no context of like endings, but a literate scribe could have associated *maximū* with *progenies . . . clara* rather than *quem*. The confusion of *a* and *ū*, in a free context, could go either way, but the preservation of *primum* here, entirely against its environment, argues in its favor.

5. J. A. Symonds (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings of John Conington* (London, 1872), I, 231.

6. See E. Harrison, *PCPS*, XCIX (1914), 15, and E. M. Thompson, *AJP*, XXI (1900), 79.

7. See C. J. Fordyce, *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford 1961), *ad loc.*: "now fears are felt for G. and B."; not Merrill, *Catullus* (Boston, 1893), *ad loc.*

8. Note also the chiastic balance of adv., adj., adj., adv., which would be entirely in line with the intricate nature of the composition of the poem. This adds to the argument for *primum*.

9. See also Postgate (n. 3 above), p. 162. He notes that in the regular iambic trimeter of Catullus, Horace, and others ". . . these feet of 2 units are not admitted into the even places, where a foot of [one and a half] units (3 morae), an iambus or its resolved equivalent, is alone allowed."

10. Lachmann, on Lucr. 1. 360, indicates that the second syllable is short here. The supposition is gratuitous, necessitated by the assumption that Catullus could not have varied the pure tetrameter catalectic scheme, and an egregious example of the sort of *petitio principii* which vitiates much philological argument. To say a priori that metrical practice is so rigid and mechanical that no deviations (of stipulated sorts or at a low level of frequency) were allowed, and then

Carm. 1. 15. 36, where the second syllable of the glyconic is for once short.

As to sense: to what could *urbis opulentissime* refer? The plurals in *vestra* (13) and *fovetis* (21) forecast the expansion of the addressee from *imperator unice* (11) to others. Line 24 reveals *socer generque:* Caesar and Pompey. The last, plus the reference to Britain, seem to place the poem in late 55 or the first half of 54.[11] Who was *urbis opulentissimus*? Who would inevitably have been called to mind in conjunction with Caesar and Pompey at this time? Crassus. The triumvirate had been renewed in 56; Crassus and Pompey were consuls together for the second time in 55; Crassus was either about to depart or had just departed for Syria to try to match the military exploits of his partners. One could scarcely attack any of the triumvirate without implicating the others.

Catullus mentions no names in the piece, except that of Mamurra, introducing his major targets allusively, using their own appellations and actions with ironic, sarcastic effect: *imperator unice*, *socer generque*. With such a mechanism operative in the poem, how would one refer to Crassus? His outstanding characteristic and principal political weapon was his wealth (see, e.g., Sall. *Cat.* 48. 5–8).

The two major patterns of accusation developed in the poem (linked by the metaphors of eating) involve (1) sexual depravity (thereby giving additional coloring to the *socer generque* as a depraved sexual, as well as political, alliance) and (2) the squandering of wealth by and upon an unworthy man, an opponent of the *optimates*, *hunc malum*. Thus, as *socer generque* sums up ironically the techniques and depraved actions of Caesar and Pompey, so *urbis opulentissime* ironically calls to mind the evil uses to which Crassus has devoted his wealth. *perdidistis omnia* sums up the collective effect of all three since they have joined together.[12]

The expression *urbis opulentissime* is not merely metrical, grammatical, and intelligible. It participates fully in the technical and verbal structure of the poem, becomes indeed indispensable to it. I say indispensable advisedly. It is well known that by examining the political literature of the late Republic one can discern the slogans and phrases used in the propaganda of the various political groups: the old senatorial establishment and those who would undermine that establishment, concentrating power in extra-senatorial mechanisms (e.g., Catiline, Pompey, Crassus, Caesar, Lepidus, Antony). Because of the nature of the literary remains, the senatorial propaganda against its opponents is particularly evident.[13] The standard charges and epithets hurled against the subverters

---

to emend away all such deviations when found, or, failing that, to talk about arbitrary lengthening or shortening (in cases where there is no justification on historical grounds), is tautological and violates the plain testimony of much of our evidence (witness the metrical freedom of Pindar, Aeschylus, Plautus). We have only fragmentary evidence of ancient metrical habits and ought not to have converted descriptive generalizations from insufficient statistics into prescriptive rules. We should also be as cautious in taking the testimony of ancient grammarians on meter as linguists are concerning their statements on other facets of language. To avoid tautology in investigating metrical practice, we must examine the material and make emendations only on nonmetrical grounds. Cat. 25. 11 and Hor. *Carm.* 1. 15. 36 represent the sort of freedom to which we should be alert.

11. After the return of Caesar from his first expedition to Britain and before the death of Julia; possibly before Caesar wintered in Cisalpine Gaul, when he presumably saw Catullus and his father (Suet. *Iul.* 73).

12. It may be well to point out here that the issue involved in discussing this poem is not whether or not the charges are true, but how Catullus has manipulated language in a way to produce complex poetic meaning, which cannot be paraphrased in prose. Catullus shows how the general and trite terms of political propaganda may be infused with new life and vivid, specific, pointed meaning by a superb poet. The poem offers an acute insight into the moral dimensions of one area of Roman politics in this age, and indeed into a type of politics common to most ages.

13. For all of which see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 149–61, and *Sallust* (Berkeley, 1957), *passim*, in particular, pp. 60–82; also, J. R. Dunkle, *TAPA*, XCVIII (1967), 151–71.

of senatorial dominance are easy to determine: *malus, impudicus, ganeo, aleator, adulter, corruptor iuventutis, corruptus, perditus, superbus, liberalitas, largitio, luxuria, avaritia, libido,* the desire for *potentia* or even *regnum,* vast indebtedness as the sole motivation for their actions, depravity revealed by sexual aberrations. The list could be extended. Consideration of Sallust's works, Cicero's orations and the relevant letters, Caesar's *Bellum civile,* Calvus' attacks on Caesar and Pompey, Plutarch's *Lives* for this period, and Suetonius' *Divus Iulius* and *Divus Augustus* will make the elements of the propaganda clear. A few examples will suffice:

1. Sallust on Catiline's followers: "nam quicumque inpudicus ganeo aleator manu ventre pene bona patria laceraverat, quique alienum aes grande conflaverat, quo flagitium aut facinus redimeret . . . , ei Catilinae proxumi familiaresque erant" (*Cat.* 14. 2–3).

2. On Catiline's defense against senatorial accusations: ". . . non quin aes alienum meis nominibus ex possessionibus solvere non possem (et alienis nominibus liberalitas Orestillae suis filiaeque copiis persolveret) . . ." (*Cat.* 35. 3). He then picks up the *meis nominibus, alienis nominibus* from their use as accounting terms and employs the phrase metaphorically in "hoc nomine satis honestas . . . spes . . . sum secutus" (*Cat.* 35. 4). See also *Cat.* 11. 5 on Sulla; 49. 3 on the reasons why Caesar's opponents think it an opportune moment to attack him; and 52. 22 on Cato's attack.

3. Cicero on the triumvirate: "nam iracundiam atque intemperantiam illorum sumus experti qui Catoni irati omnia perdiderunt . . ." (*Att.* 2. 21. 1). Compare *Att.* 14. 1. 1, 14. 14. 3, and *Ad Brut.* 1. 3. 1, for similar uses of *omnia perdere* to describe the actions of his opponents. See also *In Cat.* 2. 4. 7, for his language in describing the followers of Catiline.

4. On Antony: "quae Charybdis tam vorax?" (*Phil.* 2. 27. 66); and "domus erat aleatoribus referta" (*Phil.* 2. 27. 67).

5. Plutarch, reporting on Clodius' activities against Pompey: the former gathered his band at the trial of Milo in 56 and in Pompey's presence put to them the questions: *τίς ἐστιν αὐτοκράτωρ ἀκόλαστος; τίς ἀνὴρ ἄνδρα ζητεῖ; τίς ἑνὶ δακτύλῳ κνᾶται τὴν κεφαλήν;* The answer was inevitably *Πομπήϊος* (*Pomp.* 48. 12). The epithet in the first question looks like the Greek for *imperator unicus.* The second question is similar to the charges made against Caesar and echoed in Catullus by *cinaedus,* and in a fragment of Calvus by *pedicator Caesaris* (Suet. *Iul.* 49; Baehrens, p. 322, Frag. 17). The last two questions repeat the attack on Pompey contained in another fragment of Calvus: "Magnus, quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno / scalpit. quid credas hunc sibi velle? virum" (Sen. *Contr.* 7. 4 [19]. 7 and 10. 1 [30]. 8; schol. Luc. 7. 726; Baehrens, p. 322, Frag. 18).

6. And, finally, the words Seneca the Elder has put into the mouth of Arellius Fuscus: "Ille Croesus inter reges opulentissimus, memento, pos terga vinctis manibus ductus est. Tu, Crasse, post evestigata illa fugitivorum arma urbis Romanae divitissimus, quid nunc? apud Parthos eges sepulcro quoque" (*Contr.* 2. 1 [9]. 7). This mirrors exactly the propaganda against the Senate's opponents and suits very well the historical context and implications of Catullus' poem.[14]

In Poem 29, the entire senatorial litany is present, combined with obscene invective: *impudicus, vorax, aleo, superbus, imperator unice, sinistra liberalitas, paterna bona lancinata, quid hunc malum fovetis, perdidistis omnia,* the reference to indebtedness through prodigality, and even the use of *eone nomine* as in Sallust *Cat.* 35. 3. The poem is an extremely intricate verbal structure created from the basic elements

14. In addition, see G. V. Sumner, "Cicero, Pompeius, and Rullus," *TAPA,* XCVII (1966), 572–75, for the various tales of the association of Caesar and Crassus (e.g., in the alleged early conspiracies of Catiline). Whether true or not, they reflect the political propaganda of the time, on which Catullus was drawing, showing that Crassus was an object of it as much as the other two and was associated with Caesar.

of senatorial propaganda. As *imperator unice* and *cinaede Romule* could refer insultingly either to Pompey or Caesar (the primary function of the latter expression being a general apostrophe to Rome, contrasting its present degradation with the glories of the past—Romulus is now *cinaedus*), so *sinistra liberalitas* could indicate either Caesar or Crassus. *quid hunc malum fovetis* makes the accusation of *patrocinium malorum*, the charge against Crassus (Sall. *Cat.* 48. 8). *perdidistis omnia* was a standard charge against the entire triumvirate. Given the language of the poem, we should rather have been surprised to find Crassus excluded than to discover him mentioned in an oblique, ironic way, as are Caesar and Pompey.

In not naming Caesar, Pompey, or Crassus, the poet has referred to them through the mechanism of propagandistic invective, leaving himself freedom to use terms which might suggest two, or all three at once. He thus increases the complexity of meaning and effect and ties the three more closely together, in the structure of the language as in their depravity. We must not pin down each allusion any more than the poet has done. Where he has left room for double reference, we must not strip away the ambiguities and deny the effect of his techniques. He could have used names (as in 57, 93, 113, 28, 47) but did not. We ought not to act as if he had.

A final metrical point. Poem 29 is a poem of political and personal invective. Catullus was quite aware of the Archilochian nature of this genre, incorporating this awareness into his poetry by referring to his invectives, whether written in iambics or hendecasyllabics, as *mei iambi* (54, Frag. 3). Poem 4 is in pure iambic trimeter; it is not an invective. Poems 29 and 52 are invectives; they are written *Archilochiis iambis*.[15]

II

Exploiting these insights into the poem's language, we may consider two other places in the text—these surely corrupt. I say surely because neither *cum te* in line 4 nor *aut ydoneus* in line 8 make any sense at all.[16] Emendation in poetry is difficult, because poetry by its very nature exploits radical experiments with grammar and word coinage (as poets from Aeschylus, Pindar, Lucretius, Propertius to Shakespeare, Hopkins, Pound, and Cummings reveal). However, *cum te* and *aut ydoneus*

15. It is true (as mentioned to me by Professor L. W. Daly) that *opulentissime* may conceal *opulentissimae*, as *Gallie, Britannie* stand for *Galliae, Britanniae*. This solution can be defended. The MS reading is preserved, the Archilochian meter remains. An effective contrast is realized between the references to wealth and destruction: the riches of the world have been destroyed because of the prodigality of Caesar, Pompey, Mamurra. Thus the theme of wasting wealth is maintained throughout the poem. I should interpret the phrase then: "Father-in-law, son-in-law (rulers) of the richest city, you have wrecked everything." The best of the older conjectures is, I think, *o piissimi*, based on Lachmann's *o piissime*. The arguments of Ellis (n. 2 above), "Excursus on xxix. 20 and 23," p. 106, Munro (n. 1 above), pp. 103–4, and Fordyce (n. 7 above), *ad loc.*, against the conjecture, in terms of Catullus' inability to use a word condemned by Cicero for its bad Latinity, are misdirected. If Caesar or the others referred in their propaganda to themselves as *piissimi* (and *pius, pietas, fides* were much bandied about in the propaganda), and if the word was, in the eyes of conservatives, bad Latin, what better way to mock ironically their pretensions than to make sport of the word in a poem which relates their depravity in other areas? (See Ellis, p. 106, who sees the point and rejects it.) Cicero attacks Antony in this very way (*Phil.* 13. 19. 43), thus violating the rule laid down by critics for Catullus on the basis of what Cicero would have thought. Was Antony copying Caesar? Their conduct belies the adjective, the adjective itself is bad form. The technique is the same as the ironic mocking in *imperator unice, Adoneus*, and *socer generque*. It was used to mock Arrius in Poem 84: the bad Latinity of *chommoda, hinsidias, Hionios* did not prevent Catullus from employing them in a poem whose effect depends upon that very fact. The rest of the conjectures show little to choose among them. Note that G. P. Pighi, *RFIC*, XXX (1952), 38–48, has conjectured *urbi(s) divitissimei*, which is no less dubious metrically than the MS reading. The adjective is actually used of Crassus in the passage from Seneca quoted above, but Pighi does not see him in the poem. Watt (n. 1 above), p. 256, n. 1, mentions *o ditissimi* as an intermediate in the process of corruption from *editissimi* to *opulentissime*. His intermediate is better than his original.

16. *ydoneus* (OG) is a common miswriting for *idoneus*, which is found in R and the Marcianus. In order to make that fit, the preceding *aut* must be changed to *haut*. But this alteration produces a reading so weak and out of place in this poem of charged and intricate expression that I think we must look elsewhere for the truth.

do not fit this experimental category because they cross the boundary from complex sense to nonsense.

The only rivals for consideration in the place of *cum te* are *uncti*, proposed by Faernus (d. 1561, *teste Statio*), and Statius' *ante* (1566). I shall not attempt to arbitrate the paleographic arguments crystallized on either side by Munro (n. 1 above; p. 106) and Ellis (n. 2 above; *ad. loc.*) but shall rather propose some additional arguments in support of *uncti*. Its primary meaning here is "wealth," fitting the theme of Mamurra's squandering of money presented in lines 13–22. He shall have new riches to waste, those of Britain and Gaul, which is why he is a fearful thing to them in line 20. *unctum* also means "feast." A basic feature of the poem is its metaphors of eating and allusions to gluttony: *vorax, comesset, elluatus, devorare. uncti* thereby gains metaphorical meaning: he is to have the provinces' "feast" as he has "eaten up" wealth before, his only capacity being *devorare uncta patrimonia*. In the first instance the metaphor is contained in the noun, in the second in the verb, the second confirming the metaphorical level of the first by uniting the significance "rich" with a verb meaning "to eat." In this way, the present context of the word makes active these various connotations. In a poem which exploits so thoroughly the device of repetition, *uncti* in line 4 fits in perfectly with the structure and techniques of the whole.

There is another level that requires consideration. *unctum* is also "ointment," "perfume." As such, it is used to describe the appearance and ornament of the morally and sexually depraved.[17] Sexual depravity is a central theme in the poem. Mamurra, who is *impudicus, cinaedus, diffututa mentula*, is bringing back the "ointments" Britain and Gaul have to adorn himself in his depravity, as he walks through *omnium cubilia*. Note here the parallelism in language with Horace *Epod.* 5. 69: *indormit unctis omnium cubilibus*. The repeated *vorax* also helps to bring out this additional aspect. It denotes a form of sexual depravity in Catullus' other poems on Caesar and Mamurra (57. 8; see also 88. 8). This level of *vorax* is brought into play by the general context of the whole poem and its close association with *impudicus*.[18] In all of this, the primary meaning, "riches," is metaphorically given more specific imagistic and implied moral content by the connotations associated with "feast" and "ointment."

Words often have a number of meanings and many connotations. An author may eliminate all but one by the context in which he places a word; or, by placing it in a different environment, he may exploit several or all of its meanings. He may, moreover, extend the meaning by metaphor. These are normal techniques of using language, employed with especial frequency and intensity in poetry. We know what meaning is operative in a word from its context; we have no other clue. If *uncti* is the true reading here, not only can it have all the significance claimed above, but there is no way in which it cannot. To surround a word having the various meanings of *uncti* with references to sexual depravity, gluttony, and wealth is to make active all those meanings and connotations of the word, whether the poet "intended" to do so or not (a point which can never be solved). The consideration of "intention" is irrelevant: even if he did not intend to do this, this is in fact what has been done (if the reading is correct). Our search is for what words mean as they appear in their various contexts, not for illusive "intentions."

17. See Cat. 10. 11; Hor. *Ep.* 1. 14. 21, *Epod.* 5. 19; Pers. 4. 33–36; Apul. *Met.* 10. 21.

18. Note also the more obliquely associated references to eating and sexual depravity at *c.* 32. 10–11.

Because of the factors enumerated, *uncti* appears to be a reading so superior to *ante* (which does nothing for the linguistic patterns of the poem) as to be the closest to the truth we are likely to get, if it is not the truth itself.

For *aut ydoneus*, Statius (1566) read *aut Adoneus*, with most of his successors, including Mynors (1958). Sillig (1823) proposed *haut idoneus*, while Luck, following Oksala, speaks favorably of *Cydonius*.[19] I believe we have had the truth since Statius and shall add some more arguments in support of this belief. Relevant here is the defense of the reading made some years ago by E. F. D'Arms.[20] He points out that a significant element in Caesar's propaganda was his claim of descent from Venus.[21] Thus here, as in the rest of the poem, Catullus has seized upon a theme of propaganda, this time that of the Caesarians, to use against one of the triumvirate. Mamurra is compared to an *albulus columbus* and *Adoneus*. What is the point? (1) Mockery: the diminutive and first part of the simile ridicule him (compare the use of diminutives in 57); the comparison with Adonis ridicules him by the difference. The poet attributes a pretension to Mamurra and ridicules him through its lack of fitness. (2) Irony: the poet turns Caesar's own propaganda against him. If Caesar is descended from Venus, who are Venus' *columbus* and Adonis? Mamurra, Caesar's hanger-on and, according to the poem, partner in depraved sex. (3) Sexual depravity: in 57 and 29, Caesar and Mamurra are *cinaedi, impudici, improbi, pathici.* Venus loved Adonis. Whom does Venus' descendant love? Mamurra. Venus: *albulus columbus* and *Adoneus*::Caesar:Mamurra. The very fact that the poet uses a simile in line 8 tells us we are to think in terms of comparisons. The use of the pet bird as a symbol for erotic activity is paralleled from Catullus himself in Poems 2 and 3, with his own symbol for love, Lesbia, and her *passer*. The use also fits one of the major techniques of the poem: the allusive, ironic reference which avoids naming names.

Adoneus satisfies all requirements: it fits, supplements, and extends the meaning (linguistic texture) of the poem. It is drawn from the same area of language as the rest of 29 (political propaganda). The fact that the form occurs in Plautus (*Men.* 144) is in its favor.[22] Of the other proposals, *Cydonius* would contribute something to the poem, but not nearly so much as *Adoneus. haut idoneus* offers nothing.

Finally, a word about *malum* in line 21. It is not an interjection.[23] The parallels cited by Fordyce and Munro are not precisely appropriate.[24] There is a difference between, for example, "quae malum est ista voluntaria servitus?" (Cic. *Phil.* 1. 6. 15) and "quae te malum ratio in istam spem induxit?" (Cic. *Off.* 2. 15. 53). Because of the kind of ambiguities inherent in Latin, it is reckless to assert that *malum* in the second sentence is merely a general interjection, strengthening the exclamation. It cannot be separated from *te* and is rather an adjective characterizing the person addressed,[25] strengthening the ex-

19. G. Luck, *Latomus*, XXX (1966), 282–83; P. Oksala, *Adnotationes criticae ad Catulli carmina* (Helsinki, 1965), pp. 39–41.

20. In *AJP*, LIII (1932), 165–67.

21. D'Arms (n. 20 above), p. 166, with citations, e.g., Suet. *Iul.* 6; Appian *BC* 2. 68 and 76; Plut. *Pomp.* 68.

22. Not only are the parallels between Catullus and the language of comedy numerous, but indeed the immediate context in Plautus is telling: "dic mi, enumquam tu vidisti tabulam pictam in pariete / ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum?" (*Men.* 143 f.). The comparison of the two actions and the implications *Catameitus* would have had for his readers expand the Plautine precedent from a merely morphologic to a conceptual or imagistic one.

23. I am here in agreement with Ellis (n. 2 above), *ad loc.*, and Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis liber*[2] (Leipzig, 1885), *ad loc.*

24. Fordyce (n. 7 above), *ad loc.*, and Munro (n. 1 above), p. 102. The latter (p. 112) admits the point is doubtful.

25. Or a substantive in apposition; it amounts to the same thing.

pression. Indeed, for Roman ears, the use of *malum* here, with its charged political connotations, could not help but give added weight to the passage which Cicero was translating from the Greek.[26] In the first sentence, there is no such ambiguity arising from the context, and the interjection may either refer to general disgust or be directed specifically against the person addressed. Likewise, *malum* in 29. 21 cannot be separated from *hunc*. But, unlike *te* in the second example, *hunc* refers not to the person addressed but to a third party. An interjection in such a context neither Munro nor Fordyce has paralleled; nor, due to the nature of Latin, could they.[27] The language of the poem is taken from the propaganda of the conflict between the senatorial establishment and its opponents. The partisans of the former called their opponents *mali*. By using *malum* here, Catullus completes the connection between all the vices he has catalogued and the opponents of the senatorial order. We are now fully prepared for an address to the triumvirate. "Why do you coddle him, this *malus*?" "Why" (the reader can now think), "because you, the triumvirate, are the chiefs of the *mali*, known for your *patrocinium malorum*."[28]

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

26. "What reasoning has led you *malus* (Alexander) into such a hope?" i.e., the hope (of benefit from *largitio*) that our Roman *mali* have.

27. An interjection here would not be ungrammatical in the strict sense. But it would certainly be incompetent writing to put an interjection of this sort in a place where all the grammatical clues supplied by the context lead the reader in another direction. And, as was pointed out with reference to *uncti*, specific context is of the highest importance in deciding such questions. To have been certain that *malum* be understood as an interjection, the poet would have had to rework the passage.

28. Thanks are due to Professors L. W. Daly and W. C. McDermott, Miss G. A. Machemer, and Mr. J. P. Rosso, all of the University of Pennsylvania, for their criticism and information.