

substituted for *depulisti* I do not know; possibly a compound of *ferre* like *protulisti* or Lambinus's *attulisti* or Schütz's *intulisti*. The word should be obelized.<sup>2</sup>

W. S. WATT

Aberdeen, Scotland

2. I am very grateful to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet for commenting on the suggestions made in this article.

### MAMURRA'S NEXT GORGE

parum expatrat an parum elluatus est ?  
 paterna prima lancinata sunt bona,  
 secunda praeda Pontica, inde tertia  
 Hibera, quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus:  
 nunc Galliae timetur et Britanniae. 20  
 quid hunc malum foveas ? aut quid hic potest  
 nisi uncta devorare patrimonia ?

Such is R. A. B. Mynors' Oxford text (revised impression, 1967) of Catullus 29. 16–22. In "Mamurra's Fourth Fortune" (*CP* 72 [1977]: 320–22), E. Badian suggested that line 20 should be emended in this way:

nunc Galli(c)ae timetur et Britanni(c)ae.

It is Mamurra's fourth fortune, after his patrimony and his Pontic and Spanish fortunes (all guzzled up), which is in jeopardy; fear is felt, not for Gaul and Britain, but for Mamurra's Gallic and British booty (sc. *praedae ex praeda*, 18).

Having discovered such booty, with tiny supplements of palmary stature, Badian surely ought to have jettisoned the feeble *timetur*, for polite fear is quite out of place in this poem of outraged, rhetorical questions (*Quis hoc potest videre . . . ? haec videbis et feres? et ille nunc . . . perambulabit . . . ? eone nomine . . . ut . . . ducenties comesset . . . ? quid est alid sinistra liberalitas ?*). Inevitably, unless Mamurra's patrons can be shamed to intervene (an unlikely possibility, given the rhetoric), his Gallic and British booty will feed the man's voracious appetites, just as his patrimony and Pontic and Spanish booties have fed them in the past. Another expression of outrage, not a confession of fearful concern, would seem to be needed here.

It will be recalled that in V the line read:

hunc gallie timet et britannie

While the fifteenth-century emendation of *hunc* to *nunc* bothers those readers who believe that Catullus composed the poem in pure iambic trimeters, *nunc* does sound just right ("first . . . second . . . then third . . . now"); if it is right,

Catullus will have planned the initial spondee for special emphasis.<sup>1</sup> Froelich's expansion of *timet* to *timetur* (1849) presupposes that the latter had been abbreviated, the final *-ur* being represented by an apostrophe; it presupposes, too, of course, that *timet* is sound.

The following conjecture, which includes Badian's supplements, is prompted largely by the poem's metaphors of gluttonous indulgence (14 *comesset*, 16 *elluatus est*, 17 *lancinata sunt*, 22 *devorare*). First, Catullus says, Mamurra tore to bits and devoured his patrimony (17), next his Pontic booty (18), then his Spanish booty (18–19). And now ? Read:

nunc Gallica tumebit et Britannica?

"Now, is he to swell up with his Gallic and British booty?" For *tumere* used of swelling up with food, compare Juvenal 3. 293 "cuius aceto / cuius conche tumes?" When he has gorged himself with his latest fortune, Mamurra will be *tumidus*, like Horace's *crudi tumidique* who must retreat to the hot bath to regain their appetite (*Epist.* 1. 6. 61). The proposed *tumebit* also will suit Mamurra the *diffututa mentula* (13); with *nunc . . . tumebit*, compare "et ille nunc superbus et superfluens / perambulabit omnium cubilia" (6–7) and *parum expatrat* (16).

Corruption of *nunc* to *hunc* was easy, with an attractive *hunc* at the beginning of the next line. Minuscule *tumebit* will have been transmitted in its abbreviated form, *tumeb*,<sup>2</sup> which became *tumet* and then *timet*.<sup>3</sup> Since *c* and *e* are confused readily in minuscule, *Gallica* will have been copied as *Galliae* (= *Gallie*) by inversion; *Britannica* was altered to *Britannie* to match the corrupt *Gallie*.<sup>4</sup>

ARCHIBALD ALLEN

Pennsylvania State University

1. Another spondee probably should be granted in the first foot of line 3, *Mamurram*, on which see Badian's discussion, and a third may be admitted, with the manuscripts' authority, in line 17, *paterna primum* (instead of *prima*); on the resulting sequence, *primum, secunda, tertia, nunc*, see J.-D. Minyard, "Critical Notes on Catullus 29," *CP* 66 (1971): 175.

2. See W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 340; D. Baines, *A Supplement to Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 56.

3. Compare, for example, the corruption of *tumentem* to *timentem* in Stat. *Silv.* 2. 1. 58 ("accensum quis bile fera famulisque tumentem / leniet"). Dousa suggested *tumens* for *timens* in Catull. 61. 54 ("te timens cupida novos / captat aure maritus"), but *tim-* there is correct.

4. I am grateful to the *CP* referee for several helpful suggestions.

## A! AND THE ELEGISTS: MORE OBSERVATIONS

Using the evidence against the introduction of *a!* at Propertius 1. 9. 30 and 1. 11. 5,<sup>1</sup> I offer these observations:

1. I refer the reader to my note, "Emendation and Usage: Two Readings of Propertius," *CP* 75 (1980): 71–72.