

of "protecting" or "standing guard over."<sup>12</sup> It has the same sense in *Pro Milone* 101, where Cicero talks of the court on the occasion of Milo's trial as "armatis et huic iudicio praesidentibus." The story that a bodyguard was voted to the consuls of 65 for protection against an alleged assassination plot might well have arisen out of the appearance of the consuls, presumably with an armed guard, at the senate's direction, to keep an eye on the disturbed trial.

BRUCE MARSHALL

*The University of New England,  
Australia*

12. This is the interpretation of Phillips, "Prosecution," p. 604; cf. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), p. 262. For Asconius' use of *exercere*, cf. 29. 8, 62. 5, and 74. 3C.

### MAMURRA'S FOURTH FORTUNE\*

Catullus 29 has much to say about Caesar's *praefectus fabrum*, in comment on both his sexual morals and his financial prudence. It is the latter aspect that concerns us here, since there is one line that has been unfortunate in the treatment it has received. The relevant passage is thus printed in the Oxford Text of R. A. B. Mynors:

eone nomine, imperator unice,	
fuiſti in ultima occidentis inſula,	
ut iſta ueſtra diffututa mentula	
ducenties comeſſet aut trecenties?	
quid eſt aliſid ſiniſtra liberalitas?	15
parum expatrauit an parum elluatus eſt?	
paterna prima lacinata ſunt bona,	
ſecunda praeda Pontica, inde tertia	
Hibera, quam ſcit amnis aurifer Tagus:	
nunc Galliae timetur et Britanniae.	20

Except for line 20, the text is not in any real doubt. That line, however, was already corrupt in the Veronensis ("hunc gallie timet et britannie") and has become a *locus uexatissimus*, as any major apparatus abundantly testifies.<sup>1</sup> Proposals have ranged from free composition<sup>2</sup> through various degrees of infelicity and obscurity<sup>3</sup> to exasperated deletion.<sup>4</sup> However, a consensus seems to have developed around

\* I should like to thank my colleague, Professor Shackleton Bailey, for reading a first draft of this idea and encouraging me to pursue it. He is not to be blamed for the precise form in which it has been done.

1. See, e.g., Baehrens-Schulze, *ad loc.*, for a selection of what had accumulated by 1893. Recent editors seem to have been less lavish, or more critical in what to admit.

2. Instances abound. To choose, *per tutti*, the obscure Giacomo Giri (*De locis quae sunt aut habentur corrupti in Catulli carminibus* [Turin, 1894], pp. 126 ff.), we find "bona iste Galliae et tenet Britanniae?" (It took five pages to argue.)

3. E.g., H. A. J. Munro's "et huicne [*sic*] Gallia et metet Britanniae?" is rightly attacked by Ellis; and Ellis' "neque una Gallia aut metent Britanniae?" is rightly attacked by Munro. (For these, see Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus* [Cambridge, 1878], pp. 98 ff., and Ellis' edition of 1878. In his Oxford Text [1904] Ellis abandoned his first idea, obelized the line [as given in the MSS] in his text, and in the apparatus suggested "ruina Galliae est, erit Britanniae"—which, in the context of the poem, is hard to understand.)

4. Starting with Joseph Justus Scaliger.

*nunc* as the first word (a fifteenth-century correction) and Froehlich's *timetur*, to give the text Mynors prints.

It is clearly an approach to a correct text. The case for *nunc* is surely irrefutable. The only objection has been to the spondee in the first foot. Mynors, though worried about this ("repugnantibus tamen numeris"), was at least not deterred from putting *nunc* in his text. Others have refused to consider it. A parallel, of course, is not far to seek: the name of Mamurra provides (one would think) an inescapable one, in line 3 of the poem. The length of the vowel in that name is established by Horace *Satires* 1. 5. 37, in fact also probably by Catullus himself in 57. 2, in precisely the same position in the verse. (This is not unimportant, though the meter is different.) It is strongly supported by "Māmur(r)ius" in Propertius and Ovid. No one could seriously maintain that either Catullus or Horace did not know how to pronounce the name of an eminent contemporary family. The parallel can only be denied by excogitating a *syllaba anceps* as the first syllable of Mamurra's name. Needless to say, the well-tried techniques of *petitio principii* and formulation of *ad hoc* rules have not been lacking, in the pursuit of this worthy purpose.<sup>5</sup>

For those who care about the sense of the poem, the decisive point is surely that made by W. Kroll: "[Es] ist davon auszugehen, dass im Gegensatz zu den früheren Beuten die jetzige stehen muss." This simple and obvious point not only makes *nunc* inevitable, but it provides the clue to the proper restoration and interpretation of what follows. The corruption of *nunc* is probably due, at least in part, to *hunc* in the next line.

Froehlich's "Galliae timetur et Britanniae" keeps commendably close to the tradition and makes what one may call "sense by the phrase"—the kind that learned scribes love to produce and that undemanding commentators will accept with unclouded joy.<sup>6</sup> Scholars who look at the poem as a whole cannot fail to notice a major difficulty. Kroll, noting that we have been told that Mamurra has already

5. Fordyce's comment *ad loc.* (*Commentary*, p. 163) denies the parallel, but as no argument is provided, it is not clear on which of these grounds. A referee for this journal considered the *syllaba anceps* "quite certain," basing that certainty mainly on F. Marx, *Molossische und bakcheische Wortformen*, Abh. d. phil.-hist. Kl. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss., 37.1 (Leipzig, 1926), to which he kindly referred me. Marx's splendid monograph will, in this instance, in fact serve to illustrate the techniques I have mentioned. As regards names, he establishes (and firmly supports, by overwhelming evidence) the law that molossic names (— —) are often, in classical verse, reduced to bacchiac scansion (— —) at the end of a line. Indeed, the occurrence of this shortening in any other position in the line can be used to prove how late authors (Paulinus of Nola, Ausonius, Dracontius) offended against the classical law, and it will date an anonymous poem of uncertain period not earlier than the second century after Christ (p. 22). Yet in the sole case of Catullus 29. 3, Marx *posits* bacchiac scansion for *Mamurram*, alleging "Versnot der reinen Iamben" as the reason—as if Catullus, had he felt that dire distress, could not have worked in his favorite substitute *Mentula* for the intractable name. Marx cites two parallels from Horace *Epodes* 16 in support, supposedly demonstrating the similar effect of *Versnot* on another naive poet. Neither involves a name (the words are *profugit* and *proteruus*) and neither (as Marx himself states) is ever found as a molossus after Horace, though one of them is before. Marx appears to have forgotten, for the purpose of establishing *Versnot* in Catullus 29, that he himself formulates the law that ordinary molossic words became bacchiacs "in der Aussprache des Volkes." Horace was presumably following the common pronunciation of his day, just as Catullus was following the common and correct pronunciation of the name in both 29. 3 and 57. 2. A short initial syllable in the former passage can be claimed only by first positing that Catullus was writing "reine Iamben" in that poem, from which it follows that *Māmurram* must be bacchiac and that *nunc* must be wrong. The hypothesis has not yet (as it consistently ought to be) been extended by its advocates to poem 52.

6. Fordyce comments that it "gives good sense," but does not explain how to fit that sense into the sense of the poem.

collected large sums from Gaul and Britain, finds the phrase "ein wenig matt." He was not sufficiently worried to pursue the matter. Quinn notes: "Mamurra has presumably brought back his loot (referred to in line 4), and the time for entertaining fears would seem to be past." He sees that an explanation is needed, but he can do no better than to suggest that what was feared was perhaps a second attack on Gaul and Britain. That will not do.

Fears for the fate of Gaul and Britain would indeed be belated. Lines 11–14 show that the British campaign is well and truly over. Although nothing in the poem reveals whether it was written after the first British campaign or after the second, there is no indication that Catullus thought another war there might be planned. As far as he is concerned, Gaul and Britain have already been stripped for Mamurra's benefit. Lines 3–4 are explicit: "Mamurram habere quod Comata Gallia / habebat ante et ultima Britannia." There was no further fortune waiting to be collected.

But not only belated. That the whole passage was carefully constructed to lead up to an expression of sympathy for the defeated and exploited enemy—that surely passes reasonable belief. We need not look very far to find Catullus' own views on such matters: no further than the preceding poem, in fact. *His* sympathy goes to the *cohors inanis*. *His* charge against the *decoctor Formianus* (poems 41 and 43) is not that he despoils the enemy, but that fortunes run through his fingers as fast as he makes them. The point of lines 17 ff. is to list those fortunes: first his *patrimonium*, second and third the enormous booty he brought back from Pontus and Spain—the continuation imperiously demanded (as Kroll observed, though he failed to follow it up) is a reference to his fourth fortune, his latest booty: that from Gaul and Britain, which has been one of the main themes of the poem ever since it was stated as such at the very beginning. It is not the enemy (who would care about that, even if it were relevant?)—it is Mamurra's fourth fortune that is in grave danger, for (as we are told in great detail) he has not changed his way of life. If we take Froehlich's text as it stands, we must interpret *Galliae et Britanniae* as meaning "the booty from Gaul and Britain," parallel to the *praeda Pontica* and (*praeda*) *Hibera* that precede and lead up to it.

As far as sense goes, there is no escape from this. Yet the synecdoche is intolerably harsh, the inconcinnity astonishing, in this kind of deliberately colloquial style. And it is all quite unnecessary. A minimal improvement in the text will give, in suitably plain language, the precise point that the passage has been leading up to. The change is so slight and obvious, once we take the trouble of analyzing the passage, that if we now repeat the four-line climax, the reader will at once see for himself what it was that Catullus must have written:

paterna prima lacinata sunt bona,  
secunda praeda Pontica, inde tertia  
Hibera, quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus:  
nunc Galli(c)ae timetur et Britanni(c)ae.

E. BADIAN  
*Harvard University*