

Catullus will have planned the initial spondee for special emphasis.¹ 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*,² which became *tumet* and then *timet*.³ 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*.⁴

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. 5,¹ I offer these observations:

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

(1) Since they do not conform to the patterns of usage, the following might well be removed from the *apparatus critici*:²

- Prop. 1. 11. 21 an mihi nunc] *ah* Lachmann
 1. 16. 14 supplicis a longis tristior excubiis] *ah longas . . . excubias* Broek-
 huyzen
 1. 19. 22 abstrahat a nostro pulvere] *a (= ah)* Richmond
 2. 3. 45 aut mihi] *ā* Fl : *ah* Puccius
 2. 12. 15 evolat heu nostro] *a!* Baehrens
 2. 22b. 44 quid iuvat haec nullo] *a!* Mueller³
 Ov. *Her.* 8. 104 Hoc munus nobis] *munus et a!* Ehwald
 10. 69 At pater et tellus] *A* Ehwald
 12. 91 an pars est] *a! pars est* L. Mueller
 20. 127 In caput ut nostrum] *a* L. Mueller, Dilthey

(2) Although the following do not conform to patterns of usage, they have been admitted to the texts and might well be reconsidered:

- Ov. *Her.* 21. 55 Dic a! nunc] *Dic a!* Palmer: *Dicam* codd.: *Dic mihi* Bentley: *Dic iam* Cuperius: *Dic age nunc* Van Lennep
 21. 236 A! desunt] *A!* Crispinus: *At* codd.
Ars. am. 3. 454 deceptae, a, multi] *a! multi* Ehwald: *a multis* codd.: *et multis* Burmannus
Tr. 4. 4. 40 a, sine me] *at* AHPVθω⁴

(3) The evidence of usage may also serve to support emendations:

- Ov. *Her.* 15. 191 A quanto melius] *A(ah)ς* Bentley: *At* Fw: *oς*

Also convincing is Bornecque's reading at *Her.* 17. 183:

Ah! peream] *Ah* Damsté: *et* codd.

(4) At *Heroides* 6. 131 Palmer seems to have removed the main difficulty with his reading *Hanc hanc o demens*. Perhaps *a demens* is required; *o demens* is found nowhere in Augustan elegy, *a demens* we find five times.

I take this opportunity to record three readings which I overlooked in my note of 1980: Ov. *Her.* 21. 72 *Mentior a demens!*; *Ars am.* 1. 707 *a, nimia est*; *Pont.* 1. 1. 7 *a quotiens*.⁵

ALLAN KERSHAW
University of California,
Santa Barbara

2. The comments throughout are based on the following texts and *apparatus*: Propertius—E. A. Barber (Oxford, 1960); Ovid—*Heroides*, A. Palmer (Oxford, 1898; repr. Hildesheim, 1967), *Ars Amatoria*, E. J. Kenney (Oxford, 1961), *Tristia, Ex Ponto*, S. G. Owen (Oxford, 1915).

3. In his recent Teubner edition, *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV* (Leipzig, 1979), R. Hanslik excludes all but Puccius at 2. 3. 45. *A! mihi* is unexampled in our poets (*ei mihi* is the rule). Hanslik does, however, accept into his text Housman's *ah tua quot* at 1. 18. 23.

4. In his Budé edition, *Ovide: "Tristes"* (Paris, 1968), J. André restores *at*. In the same series H. Bornecque, *Ovide: "Héroides"* (Paris, 1961), at 10. 112 prints Ah! simul aeterna] *ah!* Sedlmayer: *aut P: at G: haud* Riese: *simul* Damsté: *semel* codd.

5. I.e., one each in the *a demens* and *a quotiens* groups, and an additional variant in the *a nimium* group: see "Emendation and Usage," pp. 71–72.