Lucubrationes Propertianae[1]

Georg Luck
Johns Hopkins University
gluck2@jhu.edu

SUMMARY

This article presents some critical notes on the text of Propertius which stem from a reading of the recent edition by Heyworth (Oxford 2007). These personal reflections are the fruit of many years' contact with the elegies.

RESUMEN

En este artículo se presentan unas notas críticas al texto de Propercio que surgen a raíz de la lectura de la reciente edición de Heyworth (Oxford 2007). Se trata de unas reflexiones personales fruto de muchos años en contacto con sus elegías.

KEYWORDS

Propertius, textual criticism, elegy

PALABRAS CLAVE

Propercio, crítica textual, elegía

The appearance of S. J. Heyworth's Oxford Text (2007), his volume of critical discussions, combined with a translation, entitled *Cynthia* (also OUP 2007)*,* and the very thorough, perceptive review by Antonio Ramírez de Verger in *BMCR* (2009-07-23) have prompted me to look at the text of Propertius again and write down a few ideas. I have also consulted G. Giardina's new edition, with an Italian translation (Rome 2005, 2010[2]).

In addition, *Brill's Companion to Propertius,* edited by H.-Chr. Günther (Leiden–Boston 2006) has been a great help, especially the chapters by P. Fedeli, J. Butrica and R. Tarrant. I did not have an opportunity to consult Fedeli´s commentary on B. II (with a new text) and Hutchinson´s commentary on B. IV, but I recommend them to the reader as important new contributions.

The reader will first find the text of P. Fedeli's Teubner edition (*Editio correctior* 1994, repr. 2006) because in this way the progress marked by Heyworth in some cases becomes more visible. Fedeli is still useful for the readings and references in his *Apparatus criticus*, and I am aware of the merits of his work, but his text is too conservative, just as Giardina's seems too bold. Whereas Giardina never hesitates to print his conjectures, Fedeli often tries to defend the paradosis with arguments that are not always compelling. But where is the *via media*? I can only try and show my own view of the poor shape of the paradosis and the remedies that have been proposed, offering a few new ones along the way.

This is not a review article. I simply wanted to write down a few ideas and test them against the new editions. There is still much work to be done. Heyworth's edition represents real progress, and its companion volume is a store-house of solid learning and sound judgement.

If one spends many years of one's life reading a poet one loves and admires, one almost inevitably changes one's mind about some problems in the text. As important new contributions – such as the books mentioned above – appear, one sees things in a different light. This certainly happened to me.

Before dealing with problems in the text, I ought to say something about the textual tradition of Propertius in general (cf. J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Toronto 1984; "Editing Propertius", *CQ* 47, 1997, 176-208; H. C. Günther, *Quaestiones Propertianae*, Leiden 1997; *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, Leiden, 2006, pp. 2-65: Fedeli, "The History of Propertian Scholarship"; Butrica, "The Transmission of the Text of Propertius", and Tarrant, "Propertian Textual Criticism and Editing"). Looking at the latest published research I think there is a general consensus, but also a good deal of disagreement concerning details. I will try to give a rough sketch of what seems to be the consensus today.

There are reasons to believe that only a single copy of an ancient edition of Propertius, probably equipped with marginal notes, survived into the Middle Ages and was copied at least once in the 12th century somewhere in France. The state of the paradosis suggests that this copy was made in a very careless manner. It may be considered the common ancestor of the only two medieval MSS. – N (s. XII) and A (c. 1230-50) - which we have, but through lost links it may have produced a few other descendants as well.

A not very homogeneous group of extant MSS. may be placed between the two medieval witnesses and the many later Renaissance copies. These are F (c. 1380), L (1421) and P (1423). There is really no strict dividing line, and if one looks at their age, P is only six years older than H.'s T (1427). Most of H.'s younger witnesses as well as G.'s Z could be called *Itali,* yet these editors assign capital letters to them and distinguish them from the 'stigma' group which H. defines as 'anyone's conjecture before 1600'.

A few witnesses which were highly estimated by previous editors are now radically discarded. Here is a list of them, along with the names of their main sponsors: D = Daventriensis (Burman, Baehrens, Housman); V = Vaticanus Ottobonianus (Heinsius, Baehrens); Vo = Leidensis Vossianus (Burman, Richmond); Groninganus (Broukhusius, Lachmann). No one would blame these scholars for putting too much trust into a witness from which they were expecting important new insights. Personally, I do not think that they are totally worthless; in fact, they preserve, perhaps by conjecture, a few good readings.

The value of the *Itali,* also known as *recentiores* or *deteriores,* is difficult to assess. There are about 150 of them. Quite a few can be dated exactly, and sometimes the names of their scribes and former owners and annotators are known. Here we find the names of famous humanists: Petrarca, Coluccio Salutati, Antonio Beccadelli, G. G. Pontano, Lorenzo Valla, Pomponio Leto. These MSS. are, in a way, the predecessors of our printed editions in the sense that they are not faithful copies of a single earlier text but the products of deliberate editing. We now lump them together, but former editors cited them by the names of their owners, e. g. as Askewianus, Cuiacianus, Mentelianus, etc.

The scribes and owners of these texts were, at this time, mostly scholars and poets, and it was their ambition to create a satisfactory text from the inferior sources they had at their disposal. Relying on their knowledge of classical poetry and their own poetic practice, they corrected the text of Propertius, as they went along. Many of their corrections are very good (in fact, some of them occurred again to the great critics of later periods, such as Scaliger and Heinsius), but some of them are not. It is always possible that a humanist had access to a *bona fide* 'codex vetus', now lost, but most of their changes were probably made *ope ingenii.* They have to be judged purely on their merit, as if they were conjectures made today. Some editors seem to be too rigorous in rejecting humanist readings because they tend to trust the 'older' witnesses.

There is a slim but important indirect tradition, including Pompeian graffiti and two florilegia. Scholars generally agree that the indirect tradition, where it goes against our MSS., offers a better text, a fact which, in itself, highlights the poor condition of the direct paradosis.

1.1.11-2
> *nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,*
> *ibat et hirsutas ille videre feras*

Videre has been taken in the sense of *adire*, but editors seem to prefer *ferire* (*Itali,* Heinsius) or *comminus ille* (Palmer) which is a possibility (see 2.19.22 *celer agrestes comminus ire sues*; Ov. *fast.* 5.176 *in apros/ au-*

det et hirsutas comminus ire leas), but it would involve a major change. H(eyworth) accepts *ille ferire* but also assumes a lacuna after v. 11, following Housman, while G(iardina) prefers *agitare* (Burman). Li(berman) shows that *videre* is unsatisfactory. He favors *comminus ille* and adds that Milanion is probably hunting in Atalanta's company. He calls *ille ferire* a 'weak conjecture'. What we need, in my opinion, is *ciere* (Baehrens) which is close to *videre* palaeographically and has the technical sense of *agitare,* 'to beat, to drive'; cf. Acc. *trag.* 494 *cum <e> somno in segetem agrestes cornutos cient;* Lucr. 5.1251 *saepire plagis saltum canibusque ciere.* The Hellenistic poet whom Propertius follows lets Milanion play the inferior role of a beater so he can be near the beloved, while she, as the hunter, plays a role more appropriate to a hero. A referee who likes *ciere* tentatively suggests *illaqueare.*

1.2.25
>   *non ego nunc vereor, ne sim tibi vilior istis*

The poet compares Cynthia, not himself, to the heroines of myth. This makes the paradosis suspicious. To take *ista* as '*quae modo dixi'* seems more or less a 'Verlegenheitslösung'. The poet knows that Cynthia is just as enchanting as all these beauties of the past. This would seem to exclude *sis mihi* (*Itali,* Scaliger, Passerat). What should be considered is *sis tibi* (Wehle). H. changes *non* to *ergo* which seems unnecessary (cf. 1.6.1; 19.1) and keeps *sim tibi.* G. prefers *sis mihi.* Li. mentions Jacob's *verear … sim … istis?*

1.3.7-8
>   *talis visa mihi mollem spirare quietem*
>   *Cynthia non certis nixa caput manibus*

Read probably *consertis* (Guyet) which is explained as '*pectinatim'.* This could be due to wrong word division and the misunderstanding of a prefix, both frequent sources of corruption in this paradosis. H. keeps the vulgate and refers (*C.,* p. 16) to a work of art, as if her 'restless hands' (his translation) could be seen on it. And how do restless hands agree with her soft sleep? G. also has no objections to *non certis.*

1.3.13-8
>   *et quamvis duplici correptum ardore iuberent*
>   *hac Amor hac Liber, durus uterque deus,*
>   *subiecto leviter positam temptare lacerto*
>   *osculaque admota sumere et arma manu,*
>   *non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietem,*
>   *expertae metuens iurgia saevitiae*

Gronovius' *ad ora* (*Obs.* IV 6) is such a neat correction of the bizarre *et arma* that we hardly need any arguments. He kisses his hand and then touches her lips, as Burman explained. For *expertae* we should probably read *expertus* (cf. J. P. Sullivan, *WS* 74, 1961, 108); cf. 2.34.3 *expertus dico.* This is one of the many cases (already detected by Lachmann; see *C.,* p. 23 and n. 19) where the ending of a word was adapted to agree with the last word of the line; see below on 1.20.14; etc. *Experte* is found in the Aldina and was conjectured by Markland. H. keeps *et arma* (see *C.*, p. 17), while G. follows Gronovius who also corrected *arma* to *ora* in 4.4.34 (accepted by H. and G., but not by F.). In 3.13.54 the Groninganus has *in ora* for *in arma* (ω). Li. points out the metrical difficulties in v. 16, as transmitted, but he is not comfortable with Gronovius' proposal and tends to prefer *osculaque … certa* which he attributes to Scaliger.

1.3.45-6
> *dum me iucundis lapsam Sopor impulit alis.*
> *illa fuit lacrimis ultima cura meis*

F. lists no alternatives to *cura,* but we have a choice between *creta* (Scal., Guyet; cf. 4.2.58 *haec spatiis ultima creta,* where *meta* is a humanist conjecture) and *meta* (Askewianus, Heins. ex coni.). *CRETA* may be a little closer to *CVRA* palaeographically. Cynthia says that she finally stopped crying and fell asleep. That is all. But *cura* can also express this, as Li.'s elegant translation shows: "voilà ce qui fut le dernier objet de mes soucis, à moi qui pleurais." He doubts that *cura* can mean 'remedy' and that the dative can take the place of the genitive one would expect. He does not mention *creta* and *meta*. H. leaves *cura* and translates (pp. 20; 519) 'that was the final cure for my tears'. As far as I know, *cura* can mean the treatment of a sick person, but not, *per se,* as 'cure' in English, the successful treatment, the remedy that really works. G. also keeps *cura* which he takes as 'pensiero'. Danilo Piana points out to me that *cura* can be taken in the usual senses of 'love' or 'care' or 'worry', describing her emotions before she falls asleep. In that case, *ultima* might refer to 44 *externo … in amore moras*, and 2.32.31 shows what *externus amor* means; cf. also 2.19.16.

1.4.5-8
> *tu licet Antiopae formam Nycteidos, et tu*
> > *Spartanae referas laudibus Hermionae,*
> *et quascumque tulit formosi temporis aetas;*
> > *Cynthia non illas nomen habere sinat*

Read probably *Spartanam … Hermionen* (Lipsius *ex coni.*) … *vel … famosi* (Struve, Baehr.) … *sinet* (V² *alii*, Dousa fil.). *Formosum tempus* can-

not really mean *tempus formosarum*, and F.'s reference to Ov. *fast.* 4.129 is totally misleading, for there it means 'beautiful weather'. What the poet had in mind is probably *aetas fabulosa* = 'the age of myth'. *Formosum* was influenced by *forma* (v. 5). In 4.4.32 *famosa* (ω) was corrected to *formosa* in the *Itali.* The future, *sinet,* seems needed, because the poet speaks of a judgement reached after comparing all these beauties. G. adopts *famosi* but keeps the genitives in v. 6 as well as *sinat,* while H. prints the vulgate throughout the two couplets. Li. objects to *famosi,* pointing out that it means 'fameux', not 'fabuleux', and he would prefer *melioris.*

1.4.13-4

> *ingenuus color et multis decus artibus et quae*
> *gaudia sub tacita ducere veste licet*

Here, *multis … artibus* is right and should not be touched. Cynthia's many accomplishments are real (*nullis* P², Askewianus, Scioppius seems to be influenced by the theme of 1.2). We should compare 2.3a.9ff where there is the same transition from her beauty to her various gifts, there called *munera* (v. 25), *dona* (v. 27) and *bona* (*ibid.*). She can dance, sing, write poetry (17ff). Ov. *am.* 2.10.5-6 *utraque formosa est, operosae cultibus ambae, / artibus in dubio est haec sit an illa prior* also combines beauty and achievements in his praise. In the context of 1.4, her achievements clearly include her techniques of love-making; cf. 2.6.32 *orgia sub tacita condita laetitia.* In the pentameter, *dicere* (ω) does not make sense, and *ducere* (*Itali*) is not better. Heinsius' *discere* seems to be the solution. I cannot find it in his *Adversaria,* but it is attributed to him first by Kuinoel. There he seems to accept Guyet's proposal. Because Cynthia is so good at making love, this is an art that can be learned from her. H. prints *discere,* but accepts two awkward conjectures, *motis* (Goold) … *artubus* (Marcilius), which would restrict her many talents to one. But she is much more than just an accomplished dancer. Li. is right, I think, to sense in *multis … artibus* an allusion to Cynthia's 'savoir-faire' in the techniques of love-making. This would confirm *discere* in the next line. H. prints *decor* (*Itali;* Bentley on Hor. *carm.* 4.13.17), but *decus* is fine; it corresponds to the last word of the poem (*deus* codd.), as emended by Kraffert; see below. G. writes *nullis* (P²) *datus* (G.) *artibus …* *sumere* (G.) *nocte* (Faltin, Palmer).

1.4.17

> *non impune feres: sciet haec insana puella*

Read, perhaps, *haec, insane, puella* with the *Editio Gryphiana* (1551) and Kuinoel (1805, dub.). Cf. on 1.5.3 below. Actually, as a referee points out, *sciet hoc* (H. ex codd.) is better than *sciet haec.* Both G. and H. keep

insana, and Li. takes it as proleptic: "my mistress will be furious when she hears this."

1.5.3

        quid tibi vis, insane, meos sentire furores?

    Read *meae* (sc. *puellae;* cf. *tuae* in 1.9.22; 3.14.22), as proposed by Hemsterhuys (in Burman's edition, p. 925) and accepted by Lachmann, Housman and others. This use of the possessive pronoun as a noun, also attested in Greek, seems to be misunderstood by scribes and scholars in 4.6.60 (see below). But see, e. g., Prop. 3.8.22 *me doceat livor mecum habuisse meam;* Tib. 2.3.77 (81) *si clausa mea est, si copia rara videndi;* Hor. *carm.* 1.25.7 *me tuo longas pereunte noctes,/ Lydia, dormis?* On *insane* cf. 1.4.17 above. F.'s objection that *furores* must mean Propertius' insane love for Cynthia is one of his many attempts to save the paradosis, even where it cannot be saved. I would not call this "Korruptelenkult" (a term coined by B. Axelson), but it comes close to it. This seems to be another one of the cases where the ending of the last word of the line influenced the preceding adjective or pronoun which belongs to it. The *furor* of which Cynthia is capable, her *saevitia* (1.3.18), her *dementia* (cf. 1.8.1, but probably not 1.4.17) are well documented throughout Book I. Guyet changes *meos* to *suos*, and Heinsius accepted this. The whole poem, addressed to Gallus, is really a continuation of 1.4 which is addressed to Bassus. Both friends (apparently belonging to the group of *amici* in 1.1.25) are trying to talk the poet out of his devastating passion, using different arguments (perhaps in poems addressed to him), but he rejects their advice. *Meae* became *meos* under the influence of the last word of the line, as often (see on 1.3.18 etc.); perhaps the *s-* of *sentire* also played a role. H. leaves *meos* in the text; from G.'s *app. crit.* it appears that *feros* and *meros* are old variants for *meos* which he also prints. Li. considers *meos* more satisfactory than *meae* which, to me, is one of Hemsterhuys' best conjectures.

1.5.12

        illa feros animis alligat una viros

    I still think that we should write *ferox animis* (*AJPh* 100, 1979, 75). *Ferox* is found in the Dresden MS, as a referee points out. Who are the *feri viri* she attaches to herself? Propertius? One of his friends? But that is not the way he portrays himself. Both as a lover and as a poet he would like to be seen as *blandus,* while Cynthia's *ferocia* is evident in this poem as well as in the preceding one. For *ferocia animi* cf. Sall. *Catil.* 61.4; for *ferocia* in a woman cf. Tac. *ann.* 2.72.1. *Ferox* became *feros* because of the last word, *viros.* There is a similar case in 3.2.7 (see below). H. and G. accept *ferox*, while Li. who considers it also lists other possibilities.

1.6.27

> *multi longinquo periere in amore libenter*

In this context, *longinquo* strikes one as an error for *longaevo*, suggested by Fontein who surely deserves to be saluted as one of the best emendators of Propertius. Distance and space have nothing to do here; it is all a matter of time. Heinsius showed that *longinquus* can mean *longus, diuturnus,* but not that it can have this meaning with *amor*. Propertius leaves long trips to his friends and prefers to stay in Rome; this is where his *militia* and his hardships are, for years to come, if that is what the Fates have ordained for him (cf. 29-30; 2.13b.47). G. keeps *longinquo,* H. (pp. 25-6) follows Fontein, and Li. welcomes the change because it removes the 'ambiguity' of the para-dosis.

1.7.15-6

> *te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu,*
>   *+quod nollim nostros eviolasse+ deos,*

It is regrettable that the recent editors have not seen the merit of what is, to me, one of W. A. Camps' best ideas,

> *(quod nolim nostros, heu, voluisse deos)*

Camps (who followed Lipsius, Guyet and Heinsius) became aware of the fact (see his note, 1961, *ad loc.*) that, in this paradosis, the interjection *heu* sometimes appears in an abbreviated form, as *e* or *é* or *è*, for instance in 1.19.22 where *heu nostro* (Hertzberg) seems to have become *e nostro*; along the same lines, the Aldina (1515) offers *ei nostro*, and Richmond proposed *ah! nostro,* but F. prints *a nostro,* following the *Itali*. In 2.12.15 editors now print Muretus' *heu* for *é* (or something like it). In 4.10.27 *heu Veii veteres,* Lütjohann's emendation for *e* or *et,* is generally accepted. In our passage, H. cites the emendation but ascribes it to Markland and prints *te violasse,* while G. inflicts *quod nolis nostros evoluisse iocos* on Propertius. In v. 15 *percus-serit* (*Itali,* Lipsius, Guyet, Heins., Valckenar. on E. *Hipp.* 1303) is accepted by G., but not by H. This seems to be a case of the wrong prefix. Camps' note is very instructive. Liberman is in favor of *per-*.

1.7.25-6

> *tu cave nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu:*
>   *saepe venit magno faenore tardus Amor.*

Rossberg who more than once anticipated Housman, saw that *amor* cannot be right. Propertius thinks about his poetry and about his reputa-

tion as a poet, not about love or the god of love (why F. capitalizes *amor* is
a mystery). We have to read, with Rossberg, *honos* or *honor*. It is an easy
change. *(H)ONOS* has been corrupt to *onus* in a closely related passage,
3.1.21-2

> *at mihi quod vivo detraxerit invida turba,*
> *post obitum duplici faenore reddet honos,*

where the error has been corrected in the *Itali*. In 1.7, the verse ending *se-
rus amor* (20) may also have played a role. Note that in Cic. *Sull.* 12 and in
the *Ciris* 109 forms of *amor* and *honor* appear as vv. ll. A similar corruption
occurs in Ov. *met.* 5.526: Jupiter tries to make the abduction of Proserpina
acceptable to her mother, Ceres. It is by no means a *mésalliance,* he says; on
the contrary,

> *si modo nomina rebus*
> *addere vera placet, non hoc iniuria factum,*
> *verum honor est, neque erit nobis gener ille pudori.*

Here, all the MSS. have *amor* for *honor,* but it is quite clear from the story
that *amor* does not describe Proserpina's feelings. We need a contrast to *ini-
uria,* 'insult', and *pudor,* 'disgrace', and that can only be *honor*. Dis may not
be very high up in the divine hierarchy, but he would nevertheless make a
most respectable son-in-law. In Ovid, *amor* was emended by Schepper (Bur-
man II, 363-4; cf. *Exemplaria Classica* 12, 2008, 52-3 where I mention
G. Liberman's objections (*per litt.)* against the change in Propertius; in his
commentary he transposes the distich after v. 14, following Fischer (1863)
and Otto (1885). G. prints *Honos,* H. *honos.*

1.8.7-8
> *tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas,*
> *tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre nives?*

Fulcire is a strange verb in this context, and F.'s explanation '*Cynthiae
pedes nivem premunt eamque sustinent*' might be called outlandish, if the
OLD (p. 743 [2]) did not actually squeeze the meaning 'to tread' from the
dubious MS. reading in our passage (not supported by Celsus 1.17.5 where
the context is entirely different). F. mentions *sulcare* (P², Beroaldus) and
calcare (Passerat, Heins., Ayrmann) but pays no further attention to them.
Both G. and H. print *calcare*. Incidentally, Lachmann was impressed by
Hemsterhuys' defense of *fulcire* and called *calcare* 'rash', but see, e. g., Ov.
met. 2.852-3. Hemsterhuys' note can be found in Burman, *Addenda*, 927.
It seems to me that *sulcare* which is close to the 'ductus litterarum' should
at least be mentioned. It seems that *fulcire* was also influenced by the false

reading *ruinas* (N A F P) which once appealed to editors. But it could also be the other way around, as Li., following Housman, points out.

1.8.43

nunc mihi summa licet contingere sidera plantis

In this form, the hyperbole seems to border on the grotesque, but only if we imagine the speaker hanging upside down, his feet somehow attached to the stars. It is very tempting to read *palmis* (Scaliger *ex Italis, ut vid.,* Lipsius, Guyet, Heins.), but Broukhusius vigorously opposed the change, because he remembered Catull. **66.69** *sed quamquam me nocte premunt vestigia divum.* Propertius may compare himself to a deity who walks on top of the stars. H. (*C.,* pp. 39-40) shows that touching the stars with one's hand or head is also used with the same connotation, and he prints *palmis*; so does G. The last word may have been difficult to read. See on 1.20.27. Li. observes that Propertius would not have chosen *contingere* as a verb, if he had written *plantis*.

1.10.15

possum ego diversos iterum coniungere amantis
et dominae tardas possum aperire fores

Read probably *divisos* (Beroaldus, Passerat *ex Italis*); cf. 1.12.3; 10; 2.7.3; 33.5-6 *quae dea* (sc. Isis) *tam cupidos totiens divisit amantis,/ quaecumque illa fuit, semper amara fuit.* Forms of *diversus* and *divisus* are often confused in the MSS. As often, the so-called parallels cited by F. do not prove what he wants them to prove, i. e. that *diversus* here must mean *discors:* (1) Hor. *sat.* 1.5.29 *aversos … componere amicos* says nothing about *diversus;* (2) *Paneg. Mess.* 45 *diversi* (*divisi* unus Vaticanus, fort. recte) *… inconstantia vulgi* is of doubtful value; (3) Lucan. 6.783 *diversi* simply means 'others'; (4) Tac. *ann.* 6.22 *sapientissimos veterum … diversos reperies* refers to philosophical opinions. None of these passages invalidates a conjecture which establishes the sense we expect with a minimal change. We need a contrast to *coniungere,* and that is furnished by *divisos.* In the pentameter read perhaps *surdas* (Heins. dub.) for *tardas;* the point is probably not that the door opens slowly; the point is that it does not open at all, because the janitor is deaf to the lover's complaints; cf. 1.16.18 *quid mihi tam duris* (*surdis* Francius) *clausa taces foribus;* 4.5.47-8 *ianitor ad dantis vigilet: si pulset inanis,/ surdus in obductam somniet usque seram.* But *tardas* is suitable if one imagines a delay after which the door is suddenly opened, as if by magic. Incidentally, Heinsius' note on 1.8.41 (*Adversaria,* p. 663) makes one wonder whether forms of *surdus* should not be substituted to forms of *tardus* in 1.1.17; 37; 8.41 (Heins. ex coni.). H. adopts *surdas* (*C.,* p.

49)*, but keeps *diversos* (*ibid.*), while G. keeps *diversos … tardas.* Li. seems to have a slight preference for *divisos* but is not convinced by *surdas.*

1.11.28-9

multis ista dabunt litora discidium,
litora quae fuerant castis inimica puellis

To conjure up a 'gnomic future' in order to justify *dabunt*, as F. does, looks like a desperate attempt at defending a notoriously unreliable textual tradition at all costs. The obvious correction, *dabant,* is found in Vo² and a Bononiensis, and it was accepted by Burman, Lachmann and others. The Vossianus 117 may not be a very good witness, but its corrector obviously knew Latin. In this paradosis, endings are corrupted so often, and *a* is so frequently read for *u* that a small change like this does not have to be explained at great length. Lachmann printed *dissidium,* rejecting *discidium,* but cf., e. g., 2.24c, 32; *OLD s. v. 'discidium'.*

In the following line read *fuerunt* (Scaliger, Livineius). See on **2.8.10** below. The poet does not refer to a mythical past: Baiae as *the* fashionable resort in his own time has a bad reputation. Other resorts should also be avoided by lovers (see 1.20.7ff), but Baiae is especially dangerous. H. does not reject *dabunt* but prints *fuerunt* in the next line (see *C.*, pp. 56-7). G. edits *dabunt … fuerunt.* Li. does not object to *dabunt* but favors *fuerunt* and explains the mechanism of the error.

1.13.13-4

haec ego non rumore malo, non augure doctus:
vidi ego: me quaeso teste negare potes?

Propertius lists three different sources of information, ranked according to their degree of credibility: (1) rumor; (2) prophecies; (3) himself as an eye-witness. It does not matter whether the rumor is good or bad (**2.23.24** is different); what matters is only whether it can be trusted or not. Haupt's *aio* for *malo* is weak, as F. points out, but Francius' *vago* seems excellent to me. We should remember Ovid's wonderful description of the rumors floating around in the house of *Fama*, in *met.* 12.53-5 *veniunt, leve vulgus, euntque/ mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur/ milia rumorum confusaque verba volutant.* The verb *vagantur* would seem to lend support to Francius' suggestion. G. and H. do not mention *vago,* but Li. supports it by a number of parallels, e. g. Ov. *met.* 11.667 *non ista* (*ficta* Heins.) *vagis rumoribus audis.* Incidentally, Rossberg's *haec non sum* also occurred to Housman; see Heyworth, in: Butterfield and Stray (edd.), *A. E. Housman: Classical Scholar,* London 2009, 16. This is not the only coincidence of this kind.

1.13.23-4

>*nec sic caelestem flagrans amor Herculis Heben*
>*sensit ab Oetaeis gaudia prima rogis*

It is a pleasure to note that F. prints this couplet as it was restored by Scaliger and Schrader from the corrupt MS. readings *in … iugis* (ω) and that he avoided the errors of Beroaldus and Enk. One could consider taking *gaudia prima* as an apposition, placing the two words between commas. *Amor Herculis* means 'Hercules in love', and Hebe *is* his first joy after becoming immortal. H. also opts for *ab … rogis*. G. writes *caelestis flagrans amore* [sic] *Herculis Hebe* [sic] which must be a misprint (see his p. 20), but even what he intended, *caelestis, flagrans amor Herculis, Hebe* seems strange. Li. supports Schrader's proposal by Stat. *silv.* 3.1.7; 4.6.53.

1.15.19-20

>*Hypsipyle nullos post illos sensit amores,*
>*ut semel Haemonio tabuit hospitio*

Others may feel differently, but to me *nullos … illos* produces an unpleasant sound effect. Once again, a scribe seems to have anticipated the ending of the last word of the line. In this case, he was also, perhaps, influenced by the ending of *nullos,* and the ending of *illos* may have been affected by the *s-* of *sensit.* Burman suggested *post illum* (i.e. after Jason), and it is such an easy change that it should be at least mentioned in the *app. crit.* of a modern edition. G. leaves *illos,* H. accepts *illum* (see *C.*, p. 67-8), Li. is aware of the conjecture but does not assess its value.

1.16.13-4

>*has inter gravibus cogor deflere querelis*
>*supplicis a longis tristior excubiis*

Read probably: *has* (ω) *propter* (Giardina) *gravius* (Scal.) *cogor deflere querelas* (Scal.)/ *supplicis a longis tristior excubiis.* Cf. 3.10.28 where *gravius* (Beroaldus, Guyet, accepted by H., but rejected by F. and G.) also became *gravibus.* Here, in 1.16, the door is moved more deeply by the particular complaints of one rejected lover (anticipating vv. 17-44) and feels more sadness because of the long hours he wasted in front of the house. *Gravius* and *tristior* correspond to each other. *Haec* (cod. vetus Passeratii) has no clear reference, but *has* goes with *querelas* which may have been become *querelis* because of *gravibus,* one corruption creating another. H. prints *has … gravibus … querelis/ … a,* and G. gives us *hanc propter gravibus … querelis*, introducing two of his own changes. Actually, his *propter* is quite attractive, but with *has querelas,* not with *hanc … querelis.* Liberman's

discussion of this passage is particularly enlightening. He calls F.'s text "un charabia opaque" and takes *a* as the preposition (see my note on Ov. *trist.* 4.3.36), not the interjection (Passerat, Broukh., Heins. ex codd.) which is better, especially if we accept *propter,* because the two prepositions indicating a reason would correspond to each other, just like *gravius* and *tristior.*

1.18.9-10

quid tantum merui? quae te mihi carmina mutant?
an nova tristitiae causa puella tuae?

The poet wants to know what he did to make Cynthia angry. On *tristitia = ira, inimicitia* cf. 1.6.10. To take *carmina* as *carmina magica* (F. *ad loc.*, following Beroaldus and Passerat) is out of the question. Whatever it was, it had to come from him, not from any witches. Read *crimina* (Puccius ex cod., *corrector Italus ap. Perreium,* Pocchus, Lipsius [*Lect. Ant.* IV 11] ex coni.). The ghost of Cynthia herself tells him what she had in mind: *celo ego perfidiae crimina multa tuae* (4.7.70). *Crimina* agrees with *notam* (8) in the sense of 'stigma'; it also reinforces the concept of *merui:* cf. Tac. *hist.* 3.78 *Antonius praepostero obsequio … crimen meruit.* F. cites Leo and Solmsen who support *crimina* but keeps *carmina* in his text. One should remember that *crimina* does not always mean 'crimes', but often 'reproaches, charges, accusations', i. e. something that exists in Cynthia's mind, not something he actually committed. H. and G. print *crimina* which is also the reading preferred by Li. who takes it to mean 'accusations', i. e. 'slanders of enemies', following Paley.

1.18.21-2

a quotiens teneras resonant me verba sub umbras
scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus

Here some major damage has to be repaired, as Lachmann saw. Propertius addresses trees which were (perhaps) once human beings or nymphs and were transformed because of some great passion (see A. Hollis, in: *Brill's Companion to Propertius,* 106-7; P. Knox, *ibid.*, 138-9). Therefore they know how he feels. At one point in the transmission of the text, *corticibus* seems to have lost its proper epithet, *teneris* (proposed by Heins.) or rather it was moved to the preceding line where it managed to push out the proper epithet of *umbras.* According to Guyet, Schrader and Koppiers (1771), the distich in its original form looked like this

a quotiens vestras resonant mea verba sub umbras
scribitur et teneris 'Cynthia' corticibus

This was accepted by Lachmann and others, but would one not expect *vestra … sub umbra* (Liberman) or *vestris … sub umbris?* H. accepts *tenera … sub umbra* (Hall) and *vestris … corticibus* (N T Y C). Cf. *C.,* pp. 81-2. G. introduces another conjecture, *tenues* (already proposed by F. G. Barth, 1777)*,* for *teneras,* but this is not better than Guyet's *virides.* Li. accepts the switch of epithets and furnishes an ingenious explanation of the error.

1.19.21-2
>   *quam vereor, ne te contempto, Cynthia busto,*
>   *abstrahat a nostro pulvere iniquus Amor*

Read probably *heu* (Hertzberg) for *e* (ω), *a* (*Itali*) or *ah* (Richmond). See above on 1.7.16 . H. and G. prefer *a,* but G. changes *amor* to *amans,* a kind of *acte gratuit.*

1.20.9-10
>   *sive Gigantea spatiabere litoris ora,*
>   *sive ubicumque vago fluminis hospitio*

In v. 9 read probably *Gigantei* (*Itali*), in v. 10 *vagi* (D V Vo, Auratus, Passerat, Heins.). For *Gigantei … litoris* cf. 1.11.2 *qua iacet Herculeis semita litoribus.* For *vagi fluminis* cf. 2.19.30 *vaga muscosis flumina fusa iugis.* F. speaks of an 'enallage', but we seem to have two more cases (in the same couplet) of the attraction of an epithet to the last word of the line. Both G. and H. print *vago.* H. gives us *Gigantei* while G. keeps the vulgate. Li. reminds us of Shackleton Bailey's support of *Gigantei* (see *Propertiana,* 56), and this conjecture was also accepted by George Goold. Li. is in favor of *vagi* but suspects a major corruption in the line.

1.20.12
>   *(non minor Ausoniis est amor Adryasin)*

Adryasin is Struve's conjecture for *adriacis* (ω), and it has been accepted by editors, but *Adryas* must be a tree nymph, and the word itself is weakly attested in Greek and Latin. Actually, the poet is thinking of Italian water nymphs, i. e. of Roman beauties who visit fashionable bathing resorts, such as Baiae, and are always ready to seduce handsome young men. (See Camps, in his *Commentary,* l961, 93, who attributes this very plausible view to a friend). What one would expect is Lachmann's *Hydriasin* which is well attested (see his note). Accordingly, we would also need *Ephydriasin* (Baehr.) in v. 32 and *Hydriades* (Unger) in v. 45, it seems to me. G. and H. (see *C.,* pp. 88-90) read *Adryasin* (12) …*Hamadryasin* (32) … *Dryades* (45). It is true that the poets do not always distinguish between water nymphs and tree

nymphs (Li., referring to Housman on Lucan. 7.871), but here the point of the whole poem is lost if these ladies are not clearly defined as creatures of the water.

1.20.13-4
> *ne tibi sit duros montes et frigida saxa,*
> > *Galle, neque expertos semper adire lacus*

I see no way of explaining *expertos … lacus,* and F.'s references are only designed to illustrate *neque expertos = et inexpertos.* Read *experto* (Livineius). The –*s* was added by dittography or by the tendency of a scribe to adjust a word ending to the ending of the last word of the line; see on 1.3.18; 20.10. *Experto* goes with *tibi* and must mean 'after what you have experienced', for this sort of thing probably happened before, and Propertius reminds him (see v. 51 *monitus;* cf. on 1.3.18 above). H. and G. leave *expertos* which, I suppose, could be taken as passive (Li. who compares 1.2.5 *mercato;* 19.6 *oblito*).

Two (in my opinion) outstanding emendations allow us to understand and appreciate the ending of this poem. As usual, I first print F.'s text:

1.20.49-52
> *cui procul Alcides iterat responsa; sed illi*
> > *nomen ab extremis montibus aura refert.*
> *his, o Galle, tuos monitus servabis amores,*
> > *formosum Nymphis credere visus Hylan.*

Read in v. 49 with Fontein and Huschke *ter 'Hyla' respondet, at* (or: *responsat, at*) *illi* and in v. 52 with Palmer *formosum ni vis perdere rursus Hylan.* F. mentions the second conjecture, as modified by Housman (*rusus* for *rursus*) but feels no need to change anything. G. rewrites the two couplets extensively: *quem procul Alcides rogitat …Nymphis credere nil sit.* H. accepts Fontein's reading in v. 49, but prints *nymphis credere rursus* in v. 52, postulating a lacuna of two lines before 51 and 52. See *C.,* p. 93-4. I prefer Palmer's neat solution. Li. calls Fontein's solution 'géniale' and is aware of the advantages of Palmer's proposal.

2.2.4
> *Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tua*

This pentameter has a weak ending, I think. Read probably *tibi* for *tua* with Heinsius who refers to Passerat's defense of *ignosco* (*ignoro* N F P alii). *Tua* was probably influenced by *furta.* It is interesting that, in Enk's

paraphrase, cited by F., *tibi* appears along with *tua: 'ignosco tibi, Iuppiter, pristina furta tua; nam tam formosa est Cynthia, ut optime intellegam te olim puellas mortales rapuisse.'* G. keeps *tua,* H. (p. 114) accepts *tibi.*

2.3a.17
> *quantum quod posito formose saltat Iaccho*

The context seems to require *cum* (Lachmann; see his note), probably written *QVOM*; cf. 19 *et quantum Aeolio cum temptat carmina plectro.* Otherwise, we would have to change *cum* in v. 19 to *quod* (Guyet). It should be either *cum … cum* or *quod … quod.* But because of *si* in v. 15 and *cum* in v. 21 (which cannot be changed to *quod;* see below), *cum* is more likely in v. 17. Both G. and H. see no problem with *quod … cum… cum,* but H. at least cites the two conjectures.

2.3a.23-4
> *non tibi nascenti primis, mea vita, diebus*
> *candidus argutum sternuit omen Amor?*

Here, as usual, the indirect tradition (Macrob., *GLK* V 625, 15) is right. *Candidus* became *ardidus* (vel sim.) in the direct tradition, probably because the first letter of the first word was lost. (The explanation of the error was already offered in the Cambridge edition of 1702; I know this book only through the references in F. G. Barth's edition, 1777, who treats it with great respect). This disposes of Beroaldus' *fervidus* and of Heinsius' *aureus.* There is no need to document *candidus* in the sense of 'favorable', said of a deity (see *OLD,* p. 265, [5b; 7a]. Should one also change *argutum* to *argute* (Heins., 'fort. recte' F.)? Probably not: see Cic. *div.* 2.29 *sunt … qui vel argutissima haec exta esse dicant.* G. prints *fervidus … argutum,* H. (p. 123) edits *nam* (Q) … *candidus … argutum.*

2.3b.45-6

I still think (cf. my edition, Zürich 1996, 62) that this couplet marks the beginning of a new poem which originally included nr. 4. This would give us an elegy of 32 (10+22) lines. Schrader and Lachmann, following the *Aldina* of 1502, connected 2.3b.45-54 with 2, 4. But no matter how we separate the poems, the text printed by F. and others seems wrong:

> *his saltem ut tenear iam finibus! ah mihi si quis*
> *acrius ut moriar, venerit alter amor!*

Years ago (cf. my edition, Zürich 1996, 62 and 369) I defended Tyrrell's easy change of *ut tenear* to *aut tenear* which allows us to keep *aut mihi* (N P F man.4) in the same line. F. replaces this by *ah* (Puccius); others have preferred *(h)ei* (Lachmann), *at* (Paley) or *an* (F). In v. 46 *acrior* (*Itali)* seems to be an improvement over *acrius* (ω) which F. tries to defend by a reference to Plaut. *Trin.* 540 where swine are said to die a very painful death from an acute throat infection. This, I am sorry to say, does not work, nor is Giardina's objection (1977, p. 126) at all convincing: '*qui possit fieri, ut alter post acerrimam Cynthiam* [sic] acrior *poetae videatur amor?'* This is exactly what the poet has in mind. His next love – *if* there ever will be one – will have to be so strong that it could kill him. So far, his love for Cynthia, overwhelming as it is, has not destroyed him completely, but a new passion which would obviously separate him from Cynthia, could only lead to his death. For *acer amor* cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.392 *iamque aderat Phoebo ante alios dilectus Iapyx / Iasides, acri quondam cui captus amore / ipse suas artis, sua munera, laetus Apollo / augurium citharamque dabat celerisque sagittas.* Here we have a powerful description of what *acer amor* can do – even to a god! This testimony counts, perhaps, a little more than the dying swine in Plautus. I still believe that we should read, with the proper punctuation:

> *his saltem aut tenear iam finibus aut mihi, si quis,*
> *acrior, ut moriar, venerit alter amor.*

Here, *ut moriar* perfectly well explains *acrior.* G. prints *ut … at … ne … acrius,* and H. (pp. 125-6) has a long, involved discussion; in his OCT he leaves out the word after *saltem* altogether and reads *ei … acrius.* He prints three dots before vv. 45 and 47, making the couplet float in a kind of no man's land, a kind of treatment that surely does not do a service to the poet – or to the reader.

2.6.5

> *nec quae deletas potuit componere Thebas,*
> *Phryne*

Here we should, perhaps, pick a plausible conjecture. The paradosis offers *delectas* which was changed to *deletas* by a younger hand in N; but we also have a choice between *deiectas* (Gebhard) and *disiectas* (Schrader, *Emend. C. VI*, p. 121), both better than *deletas* (defended by Broukhusius), because the *c* in *delectas* is likely to be part of the original reading. As a contrast to *componere,* we might find *deiectas* more appealing; see also **2.8.10** *et Thebae steterunt* (*Itali,* Scaliger : *-ant* ω), but Val. Max. 1.5.1 *urbe a Gallis disiecta* would confirm Schrader's suggestion. H. (pp. 134-5) makes a good case for *deiectas*; G. leaves *deletas* in the text.

2.6.31-2
> *ah gemat in tenebris, ista qui protulit arte*
> *turpia sub tacita condita laetitia*

F. accepts Fontein's emendation of *terris*. As often, a longer word has been contracted into a shorter, look-alike form that makes a certain amount of sense. The poet has in mind the darkness of the underworld; see 4.9.41 *Stygias … tenebras.* But F. also prints *turpia* (Herwerden) for *iurgia* (ω), a gross trivialization and much inferior to Ruhnken's *orgia.* See above on 1.4.14. H. accepts *tenebris* and *orgia* (*C.*, pp. 136-7), G. keeps *terris* and introduces his own *crimina.*

2.6.41-2
> *nos uxor numquam, numquam deducet amica:*
> *semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.*

Years ago (*AJPh* 100, 1979, 77-8) I argued that this distich is really the beginning of a new poem, 2.7 and I did not know that Havet had proposed this already. We should also read *diducet* (Lachmann; see his note) for *deducet* (wrong prefix, as often). See now my article in *A. E. Housman: Classical Scholar,* edited by D. J. Butterfield and C. A. Stray (London 2009), 138-40. H. (pp. 138-40) rejects my idea and places the couplet between 2.7.5 and 7, reviving a suggestion he found in Sandbach's lecture notes. This is probably not the best of all possible solutions. G. leaves the couplet at the end of 2.6, reading *subducet* with Burman. Scaliger, followed by other editors, placed the couplet after 2.7.20.

2.8.8
> *vinceris aut vincis: haec in amore rota est*

In order to restore the text of 2.8.8, we first have to reconcile the information given by our sources. It seems best to begin with Smyth's *Thesaurus Criticus.* The reading *aut vinces* which already appears in the *Itali* is usually ascribed to Arthur Palmer. But at one time (*Hermathena* 9, 1983, p. 448), Palmer also wrote: "The correction *at vinces* is easy and, in my opinion, certain". At another time he tried *aut vincis*: *sic (P. Ovidii Nasonis HEROIDES XIV*, 1874, p. XXXVI. I am indebted to Antonio Ramírez de Verger for this clarification. On the wheel of Fortune as a symbol for the vicissitudes experienced in love cf. Tib. 1.5.69-70 *at tu, qui potior nunc es, mea furta caveto* (*timeto* v. l.):/ *versatur celeri fors levis orbe rotae.* It seems that *rota* is not only the wheel itself but its movement.

2.15.23-6

> *dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore:*
>> *nox tibi longa venit nec reditura dies.*
> *atque utinam haerentis sic nos vincire catena*
>> *velles, ut numquam solveret ulla dies!*

To whom is *velles* addressed? To Cynthia, according to F. who refers to *tibi,* but this form is best understood as a 'dativus ethicus'. Baehrens' *vellet* (sc. *catena*) *uti* offers a way out, but Burman's *vellent* (sc. *fata*) is excellent, I think, and it was accepted by Kuinoel. If this is accepted, we may have to change the punctuation somewhat:

> *dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore*
>> *(nox tibi longa venit nec reditura dies)*
> *atque utinam haerentis sic nos vincire catena*
>> *vellent, ut numquam solveret ulla dies!*

The chain by which the Fates bind the two lovers together is a striking image. Lucr. 4.1109 *usque adeo cupide in Veneris compagibus haeret* is slightly different, because here Venus takes over the role of the binding power; see also [Tib.] 4.5.13-6 *nec tu sis iniusta, Venus: vel serviat aeque / vinctus uterque tibi, vel mea vincla leva. / sed potius valida teneamur uterque catena, / nulla queat posthac quam soluisse dies*; Stat. *silv.* 5.1.44 is similar, and the poet seems to have this passage and 4.7.19-20 *pectore mixto* in mind: *vos collato pectore mixtos / iunxit inabrupta Concordia longa catena.* Here *Concordia* (not Venus, as in Lucretius) takes the place of the deity that applies the chain. G. and H. keep *velles* without citing any alternatives, but, as the passages cited show, we need a higher power to bind the lovers together.

2.15.47-8

> *haec certe merito poterunt laudare minores:*
>> *laeserunt nullos pocula nostra deos*

Fontein, an outstanding textual critic, objected to *pocula* and proposed *proelia* or *oscula;* before him, the *Itali* tried *lumina.* But no change is necessary. Propertius almost certainly alludes to the disgrace of Cornelius Gallus, and when he speaks of 'offended gods', he must have in mind Augustus. Propertius contrasts his own way of life, dedicated to making love. In v. 47, *hoc* would be better than *haec*, as one of the referees notes. Drinking wine, writing poetry to those who, like Gallus (or Tullus, see above on 1.6.21-2) fought Rome's battles and contributed their share to Rome's triumphs, though Gallus also achieved fame as a poet. The allusion to Gallus was first

recognized by David Ruhnken, it seems, but also by others, e. g., by Ch. Merivale, *History of the Roman Empire,* vol. IV (1903), p. 103, as cited by Enk in his commentary on Book II, 1962, 227. D'Orville and others thought of M. Antonius. But see Ov. *trist.* 2.445-6 *nec fuit opprobrio celebrasse Lycorida Gallo,/ sed linguam nimio non tenuisse mero.* Gallus acquired *laus* as a soldier and a love-poet, but he also managed to offend Augustus by boasting about his exploits when he was in his cups. Propertius who has no military ambitions can at least claim for himself that he never offended 'the gods', even when he had too much to drink. H. (pp. 176-7) leaves *pocula* in the text but prefers *me* (*Itali*, Heins., Lachm.) to *haec* (N *post corr.* F² vel Colucius Q S); G. prints *nos* (Baehr.) … *proelia* (Fontein). But both *me* and *nos,* followed by *certe,* sound too assuming, I think: Propertius only demands *laus* in one small domain: He never offended any deity. *Haec* (= *nec* N *primo,* F P B etc.) seems necessary as a preparation of the next line.

2.16.29
> *aspice quid donis Eriphyla invenit amaris*

Rossberg proposed *amari* which was accepted by H. (p. 181) who recognized the influence of the prae-caesural noun. G. conjectured *opertis* for *amaris,* but *quid … amari* seems to restore what the poet wrote. E. *Hipp.* 1411 (Poseidon's 'bitter gifts') could be cited to support the paradosis, but it does not seem to be a very close parallel.

2.16.49-50
> *vidisti toto sonitus percurrere caelo*
> *fulminaque aetheria desiluisse domo?*

Read probably *tonitrus* (Francius, cited anonymously by Broukhus.) for *sonitus*. Francius' conjecture can be supported by Verg. *Aen.* 8.391-2, cited by H. *tonitru cum rupta corusco/ ignea rima micans percurrit lumine nimbos.* As often, a longer word got shortened in transcription. I also wonder whether *percurrere* would not require *totum … caelum;* see, e. g., Lucr. 5.1221 *cum … magnum percurrunt murmura caelum.* As far as endings are concerned, the paradosis of Propertius is often unreliable, and in this case the endings *aetheria … domo* might have influenced the preceding line. Guyet (or Heinsius) proposed *procurrere,* while Lachmann postulated an intransitive use of *percurrere.* H. (pp. 183-4) accepts *tonitrus,* but G. feels comfortable with *sonitus* (cf. Ramírez de Verger, *BMCR* 2009-07-27, 7).

2.20.9-12
> *mi licet aeratis astringant brachia nodis,*
> *sint tua vel Danaes condita membra domo,*

> *in te ego et aeratas rumpam, mea vita, catenas,*
> *ferratam Danaes transiliamque domum*

Transiliamque is a conjecture noted by V², the hand of a humanist. The broad paradosis offers *stasiliamque*. What one would expect is *insiliamque,* and this was proposed (dub.) by Burman. F. tries to save the earlier conjecture by referring to 2.32.59 *nec minus aerato Danae circumdata muro* which, according to him, must mean that Danae's house was surrounded by a wall over which one had to jump. But in fact it means that she was surrounded by walls, i. e. the walls of her *domus*. Even if one had jumped over that imaginary wall, one still was not with Danae, for she was inside the tower, and Propertius could not possibly say that he would jump over her tower. The *s-* of *stasiliamque* probably results from dittography, and then we would only have to deal with –*ta*- which could very well hide *in*-. What *transilire* means in Propertius is shown by 2.18b.38 *et terram rumor transilit et maria.* Guyet proposed very plausibly *mi licet aerati constringant brachia nodi* (wrong prefix and adjustment of endings to restore metre). G. prints *mi … bracchia …tua … transiliamque,* while H. (p. 195) accepts *insiliamque* but follows ω in printing *me* for *mi* (*Itali*); he also prefers *vincula* (van Jever) to *bracchia*. Incidentally, *tua* in v. 10 is Santen's correction for *mea* (ω) which editors had accepted before.

2.20.28
> *possum ego naturae non meminisse tuae?*

Read *possim* (Guyet, Heins. on Ov. *epist.* 8.5; *met.* 14.172) *ego nunc curae* (Suringar). *NUNCCURAE* became *naturae,* because a scribe ignored the word division, omitted one *C* and shortened a sequence of letters, as often. H. feels comfortable with both changes (see pp. 196-7), while G. leaves *possum … naturae* in the text.

2.20.35-6
> *hoc mihi perpetuo ius est, quod solus amator*
> *nec cito desisto nec temere incipio*

Housman has repaired the passage by writing *haec* (*Itali*) … *laus*, and this was accepted by Goold and others. Only by a long stretch can *ius* in this context stand for *mos,* as F., following Paley, asserts. If that were the case, Propertius could have written *hic … mos*, but this is not at all what he means. An abbreviated *haec* became *hoc,* but a reference suggests that *haec* could have become *hoc* from a simple palaeographical error of *hec > hoc*. Similarly, *hoc* could become *haec* by mistake (see above) and *LAVS* became *IVS* because *L* looks like *I,* and *A* was omitted. Cf. 2.1.47 *laus in amore*

mori: laus altera, si datur uno/ posse frui. H. leaves the couplet as it is in ω, but deletes it, following Jacob. Apparently, it is also missing in one or several *Itali* (probably because of the homoeoteleuton *haec ... haec ... nec*). This is not the only time that H. removes a portion of the text in one way or another, because a simpler remedy (he mentions Housman) apparently does not appeal to him. G. leaves *hoc ... ius* in the text.

2.22b.44
> *quid iuvat heu nullo ponere verba loco?*

This is another example of the corruption of *heu* which here appears as *et* in ω; it was changed to *ei* by Haupt, and *heu* is due to Rothstein (see above on 1.7.16). In this case F. has accepted the conjecture, but he ignores Beroaldus' *nullo pondere ... loqui* which should at least be cited in the *app. crit.* of a modern edition. Beroaldus actually wrote *in* for *et,* following a humanist source. *Pondere* lost a letter, and the last word of the line was changed to make some sort of sense. Cf. 3.7.43-4 *quod si .../ verba ... duxisset pondus habere mea;* Ov. *epist.* 3.98 *at mea pro nullo pondere verba cadunt.* H. (p. 205) accepts Beroaldus' emendation which he ascribes to *Itali,* while G. rewrites the verse as follows *quid iuvat, a! nullo perdere* (G.) *verba lucro* (G.)

2.23.11-2
> *quam care semel in toto nox vertitur anno!*
> *a pereant, si quos ianua clausa iuvat!*

The presence of *care* in the hexameter should alert readers that one must read *venditur* (Hemsterhuys, Schrader, *Emend.,* c. VI. p. 127). *Perditur* (Broukhus.) is less appealing; cf. Sen. *dial.* 10.16.5 *noctes quas tam care mercantur,* perhaps a reminiscence of this passage. It is the same theme: someone (a messenger, the door keeper, the mistress herself) has to be bribed by the lover in order to gain access or to keep an assignment; see Ov. *am.* 1.10.29-32 *sola viro mulier spoliis exultat ademptis,/ sola locat noctes, sola licenda* (Y : *locanda* P S, recc.) *venit/ et v e n d i t quod utrumque iuvat, quod uterque petebat,/ et pretium quanti gaudeat ipsa facit.* The parallel shows that the lady herself, not only her servants, expected gifts or cash; hence, in Propertius, we might consider *quas* (*Itali*) for *quos* in v. 12. Propertius and Ovid are not speaking of prostitutes but of ladies of the upper classes. H. introduces his own conjecture *venerit* which is no improvement. His objections against *venditur* are found in *C.*, pp. 208-9. He accepts *quas* in v. 12. G., too, prefers a conjecture of his own, *ducitur,* to *venditur* and leaves *quos.*

2.26.49-50

> *iam deus amplexu votum persolvit; at illi*
> *aurea divinas urna profudit aquas*

The myth itself and the context which it illustrates suggest *nam* (Vahlen)…*amplexae* (Postgate) …*et* (J K W) for *iam … amplexu … at*. That *iam* here means *statim* is one of F.'s improbable assertions. *Amplexae* is better than *amplexus* (Passerat), because it provides an indirect object to *persolvit* and avoids the homoeoteleuton *deus amplexus*. It also anticipates *illi* and confirms *et,* I think. Amymone allowed herself to be seduced by Poseidon, because he promised her something, *and* he kept his promise; that is why she pours divine waters out of a golden urn, testifying that gods can be kind and fair to mortal women. A logical sequence connects the god's promise, Amymone's willingness and her reward; hence *et* instead of *at*. H. (p. 227) gives us *nam … amplexae … at,*while G. prints *iam … amplexu … at*. Incidentally, Vahlen's *nam* for *iam* is a good illustration of Kenney's First Law (*CQ* 8, 1958, 65) that "any monosyllable at the start of the verse may have arisen from any other" (see H., *C.,* p. 410).

2.28.15-6

> *sed tibi vexatae per multa pericula vitae*
> *extrema veniet mollior hora die*

It seems to me that *post* (Pricaeus on Apul. *met*. 11. P. 666, Markland) would make more sense than *per*, since the poet is really thinking of her last day of life when all crises are behind her. *Per* would be better with *vexata … vita* (*Itali*). Furthermore, *veniat* (*Itali*) may be better than *veniet* which is itself a conjecture (V[2]) for the impossible *venit* (ω). The paradosis lost a letter, and the optative *veniat* is, perhaps, more suitable than the straightforward prediction *veniet*. Finally, *aura* (Passerat ex codd., Pricaeus) should replace *hora*. Once more, the passages assembled by F. prove nothing, for in Ov. *epist*. 3.44 and *Pont*. 3.3.84 most editors now prefer *aura:* see also *trist*. 4.5.20 (and my note, 1977). Read probably

> *sed tibi vexatae post multa pericula vitae*
> *extrema veniat mollior aura die.*

G. keeps *per,* changes *vexatae* to *versatae,* prints *aura* and considers *veniat* his own conjecture. H. (p. 233) edits *per … veniat … hora*. H. notes that *pericula vitae* is a standard phrase which allows *vexatae* to be read with *tibi* and *per* to be retained.

2.29.15-8

> *quae cum Sidoniae nocturna ligamina mitrae*
> > *solverit atque oculos moverit illa gravis,*
> *afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores,*
> > *sed quos ipse suis fecit Amor manibus*

Read *Sidonias, nocturna ligamina, mitras.* The garment Cynthia wears at night is not a *mitra* which, in the singular, designates an 'oriental headdress fastened under the chin' (*OLD s.v.,* referring to Prop. 4.2.31 *cinge caput mitra*). Only the plural, *mitrae,* describes the two cups of her brassiere which had, indeed, ribbons attached to them and may have vaguely looked like a pair of headdresses connected with each other. The function of Cynthia's garment has often been misunderstood, e. g. by G., in his translation. It was not a night cap. Propertius almost certainly had in mind an epigram by Hedylus (II Gow and Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965 = *AP* 5.195.5):

σάνδαλα καὶ μαλακαὶ, μαστῶν ἐνδύματα, μίτραι

These articles had belonged to Aglaonike and are still redolent of her perfume (vv. 3-4; cf. Prop. vv. 17-8). After a symposion and a night with her lover, Aglaonike dedicated her sandals and her *strophion* (see Gow and Page, pp. 177; 578) to Aphrodite. This poem from Meleager's *Garland,* a collection which Propertius knew (see A. Hollis, in *Brill's Companion,* 107-8) also uses the type of apposition which is familiar from Verg. *ecl.* 1.57 *raucae, tua cura, palumbes.* Otto Skutsch called it *schema Cornelianum* because he thought that Gallus had introduced it into Roman poetry (see my note on Ov. *met.* 4.669 in *Exemplaria Classica* 12, 2008, 50-1, n. 3). Clearly, Gallus could have found it in Hellenistic poetry, and the similarities pointed out make Propertius' direct knowledge of Hedylus almost certain. In the paradosis of Propertius, this type of apposition was not always recognized, it seems, and the plural was changed to singular; see below on 4.7.63-4 and the conclusions.

2.32.15-6

The poet describes (11-6) some of the splendid new attractions of Rome. One of them is the fountain of Triton. The transmitted text is unsatisfactory in several ways. F. has removed the most obvious error, but two more remain in his text:

> *et leviter toto* (*tota* ω) *nymphis crepitantibus orbe* (*urbe* ω)
> > *cum subito Triton ore recondit aquam*

Heinsius proposed *toto … orbe,* but he also proposed *refundit* for the unusual *recondit.* The mechanism of the fountain seems to work like this: every now and then Triton refills the basin with water flowing from the *concha* he is holding to his mouth, and this produces the gentle crackling sound the poet describes; see Verg. *Aen.* 11.299 *fremunt ripae crepitantibus undis.* The water which fills the basin is, of course, identical to the liquid mentioned in the hexameter, and it is difficult to understand why F. insists on printing *nymphis* which evokes the wrong associations. Former commentators thought of statues surrounding the basin (see Lachmann's note). The word was corrected to *lymphis* in the *Itali,* and F.'s references to 3.16.4; 22.26 are not helpful; he himself prints forms of *lympha* in 1.2.12; 11.12; 3.3.51; 3.10.13; 4.6.7; 9.35; 59. G. prints *toto nymphis … orbe/ cum … refundit* (Heins.),while H. keeps *tota nymphis … urbe*; he also accepts Heinsius' *refundit* but changes the beginning of the hexameter to *et sonitus.*

2.34.19-20

> *ipse meas solus, quod nil est, aemulor umbras,*
> *stultus, quod stulto saepe timore tremo.*

For the second *quod* which is probably repeated after the first, as F. observes, we find *qui* in the *Itali* (*quid* D V), and for *stulto* Heyworth now offers *falso* which must be right. Thus we have two "errors of perseveration" in one couplet. Read:

> *stultus qui falso saepe timore tremo.*

H. also adopts Heinsius' *meae … umbrae* (proposed doubtfully *Adversaria,* p. 714) which has been neglected by recent editors; *aemulor,* 'I am jealous of', requires the dative; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.44. G. keeps *meas … umbras* and prints Heinsius' *stultus et in nullo.*

3.2.3-6

> *Orphea detinuisse feras et concita dicunt*
> *flumina Threicia sustinuisse lyra;*
> *saxa Cithaeronis Thebas agitata per artem*
> *sponte sua in muri membra coisse ferunt.*

Two famous examples for the power of music. In v. 3 read perhaps *delinisse* (Ayrmann, in: *Sylva Emendationum Criticarum,* p. 7); cf. Hor. *ars* 393 (Orpheus) *dictus … lenire tigris rabidosque leones;* Quint. *inst.* 5.8.1 *Sirenum cantu deleniti;* Apul. *flor.* 17 *ille immanium bestiarum delenitor.*The word may have been corrupted by the anticipation of *sustinuisse.* If Mart. 14.166.2 is sound, the corruption could be very old. In v. 15 *per artem* seems too vague; we need an epithet. *Thebas* (probably a gloss) is unconvinc-

ingly defended by F.; read *Phoebeam* (Jortin); cf. Stat. *silv.* 3.2.41 *nec cano degeneri Phoebeum Amphiona plectro*. In Propertius, *Threicia lyra* and *Phoebea ars* would balance each other. G. keeps *detinuisse* and *Thebas* but changes the innocuous *agitata* to *advecta*. H. (pp. 286-7) also keeps *detinuisse* (cf. Hor. *carm.* 1.33.14; H.'s parallels are not of equal value), and he prefers *Thebanam* (Heins.) to *Phoebeam*.

3.2.7-8
> *quin etiam, Polypheme, fera Galatea sub Aetna*
> *ad tua rorantis carmina flexit equos*

Read *ferox* (Wakker who also changed *equos* to *aquas*). It is the same case as 1.5.12: the epithet was assimilated to the last word of the line. 'Wild Aetna' is irrelevant: the point is that even wild Polyphemus was able to charm beautiful Galatea with his songs. Butrica (*CQ* 47, 1997, 148) also found *ferox* attractive. Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.115 *Polyphemum cum Homerus immanem ferumque finxisset* (not the same story, but the same type of uncouth character and presumably the same locale). H.'s objections (p. 288) are not compelling; for epithets following vocative names cf. 2.33b.29; 3.3.30 *Pan Tegeaee;* 4.11.38. G. also leaves *fera* in the text.

3.6.21-2
> *ille potest nullo miseram me linquere facto*
> *et qualem nolo dicere habere domi*

This couplet illustrates both the sad state of the paradosis and the remarkable *ingenium* of Arthur Palmer. N comes closest to the truth with *et qualem* (also found by Broukhus.) *nullo* (influenced by *nullo* immediately above), but the broad paradosis has *(a)equalem nulla,* and Palmer found *nolo* hidden in *nullo*. G. prints Palmer's corrections but reads *domo* (ω) for *domi* (Heins. ex Italis). I suspect that an original *domi* was assimilated to the corrupt form *nulla* and thus became *domo*. H. follows Palmer and Heinsius. To witness how the great critics of past ages struggle with a problem whose solution was found later – knowing the solution – is always an experience.

3.6.27-30
> *illum turgentis ranae portenta rubetae*
> *et lecta exsuctis anguibus ossa trahunt*
> *et strigis inventae per busta iacentia plumae*
> *cinctaque funesto lanea vitta toro*

Ranae … rubetae is a tautology, because a *rubeta* actually is a kind of frog. Heinsius (*Castigationes in Vell. Paterc.* 2.7) saw that *sanie* is hiding in

ranae, and this is what the poet probably wrote (see R. Tarrant, in Günther's *Companion to Prop.,* 52). The corruption may have been caused by a gloss. In the pentameter *exsertis unguibus* (Mitscherlich on Hor. *epod.* 5.20 after Broukhus.) is very attractive. In v. 29 read *recentia* (Francius, Heins.) for the meaningless *iacentia.* In magic it was important that the places of cremation and burial where bones and other requisites could be found had been used recently. The *tabellae defixionum* were regularly buried in or near a fresh tomb. *Tinctaque* (Barber) for *cinctaque* (ω) should not be ignored: visual evidence that the *vitta* had actually served in a burial would make it more potent. The color is indicated by Ov. *Ib.* 233-4 *membraque vinxerunt tinctis ferrugine pannis/ a male deserto quos rapuere rogo.* H. (pp. 306-7) accepts *sanie* and prints *exsucis* (Burman) *anguibus* as well as *recentia,* but he prefers his own conjecture, *rapta,* to *tincta.* I wonder how bones could be collected from or by 'dried up snakes'. Witches worked with human bones, and *exsertis unguibus* describes exactly the fingers of those collecting them; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.513 *acuens exsertos protinus unguis* (of the Sphinx). G. keeps *ranae* and picks *ex sectis* (P, Otto) *anguibus.*

3.7

Our understanding of this elegy has been greatly advanced by the discussion of some fragments from a Hellenistic poem by E. Livrea in *ZPE* 139, 2002, 37ff; cf. also G. O. Hutchinson, *ibid.* 138, 2002, p. 6. This poem, probably Euphorion's *Philoctetes,* which almost certainly served as a model to Propertius, seems to confirm, among other things, Muretus' transposition of vv. 21-4 between 38 and 39, accepted *dubitanter* by F., following Housman (see Heyworth, in *Housman,* etc., p. 18) and Butler & Barber (1933, p. 277).

Furthermore, the Greek fragments show that, in v. 60,

attulimus longas in freta vestra manus

we are not dealing with an '*error Wattianus*' (W. S. Watt, in *CQ* 54, 2004, 659-60). There is no need to change *longas* to *castas* or *puras* (Francius) or *vacuas* (Giardina), nor should we change *manus* to *comas* (Oudendorp, van Eldik accepted by Watt). What Propertius wrote is *longas … manus* (printed by F., *dubitanter*), and this is entirely consistent with the poet's emphasis on Paetus' greed.

One more point, not directly affected by the discovery of the papyrus. In vv. 47-8

non tulit haec Paetus, stridorem audire procellae
et duro teneras laedere fune manus

I once liked *noluit* (O. Skutsch), but now I think we should write *praetulit haec Paetus: stridorem …* Paetus actually chose to expose himself to all

the hardships of a sea voyage in order to get rich, instead of staying at home, leading a simple life. The prefix of the first word of the line was not recognized. *Haec* points ahead, as in 1.20.1 (cf. *has* in 1.16.13, see above). Then we should also read *et* for *sed* in v. 49, an easy change. H. (pp. 310-1) deletes 21-4 and places the lines at the end of the poem. In v. 60 he follows Oudendorp and Watt. In v. 43 he reads (pp. 313-4) *nunc tulit et* (Barber and H.). G. also deletes vv. 21-4, following the Eton edition and reads *vacuas … manus* (v. 60) and *non tulit haec* (v. 43). G. and H. do not seem to be aware of Livrea's important contribution. On the connections between Euphorion, Cornelius Gallus and Propertius see the excellent observations of A. Hollis in: *Brill's Companion,* pp. 97-101; Hollis deals briefly with 3.7.21-2 but concentrates on a similar poem, 2, 26A, which, to him, illustrates the 'color' of Euphorion. I find this very convincing.

3.13.7-8

> *et Tyros ostrinos praebet Cadmea colores*
> *cinnamon et multi pastor odoris Arabs.*

Propertius condemns the *luxuria,* the expensive life style of Roman ladies which requires costly dies and perfumes from the Near East. *Pastor* is hardly possible for someone who cultivates and sells plants, herbs and spices. *Pistor* (Bury, Shackleton Bailey), the one who grinds or mills them, is very close to the 'ductus litterarum', but the word is normally used for domestic millers and bakers, not for oriental exporters of luxury goods. According to F., Fontein proposed *multi cultor,* Lachmann suggested *culti messor;* the first conjecture can be supported by [Tib.] 3.8.18 *cultor odoratae dives Arabs segetis,* the second by Mart. 3.65.5-6 *quod myrtus, quod messor Arabs, quod sucina trita,/ pallidus Eoo ture quod ignis olet* and perhaps also by Sen. *Herc. f.* 909 *quicquid Indorum seges/ Arabesque odoris quicquid arboribus legunt,/ conferte in aras* where one may consider *Indo fert seges* (Koetschau). See Stat. *silv.* 3.3.33 *messes Cilicumque Arabumque superbas.* We should not forget Heinsius' *multi coston odoris Arabs* which neatly balances *cinnamon.* G. replaces *pastor* by Rossberg's *praestat,* and H. (pp. 347-8) prefers *culti messor.*

3.13.15-22

Propertius admires the Indian widows who consider it a privilege to die on their husband's funeral pyre. In v. 21 *ardent victrices et flammae pectora praebent,* the first word must be corrupt. What the poet wrote is surely *gaudent* (H. Stephanus, *Schediasm.* V 10, followed by Passerat, Broukhus. and others). The first letter was lost, and *audent* was read as *ardent,* perhaps under the influence of *flammae.* It is quite clear that, for the widow who

won the competition (it is described as such), this was a kind of triumph. Following W. Heckel, J. C. Yardley and J. Butrica, H. (p. 349) cites the testimonies from Cicero, Diodorus and Valerius Maximus which confirm *gaudent;* they all stress the joy of the widow who is allowed to die. G. prints his own *plaudunt* (meaning that they applaud themselves as they burn on the pyre?), but H. (C., p. 349) recognizes the value of *gaudent.*

3.14.13-4
> *qualis Amazonum nudatis bellica mammis*
> *Thermodontiacis turba lavatur aquis*

It is difficult to understand how F. could still print *turba* without even mentioning *turma* (Gulielmius, *Quaest. Plaut.*, 240, Heinsius ex cod., Ramírez de Verger, 1989, 66), the obvious noun to go with *bellica;* see 2, 10, 3 *fortis … ad proelia turmas;* Ov. *Pont.* 4.2.51 *et tu, femineae Thermodon cognite turmae* where the MSS. vary between *turmae* (B C), *turb(a)e* and *turbis.* Ovid probably had in mind this passage in Propertius. G. leaves *turba* in the text and transposes 15-6 after 19, following Palmer. H. (p. 360) prints *turma … vagatur agris* (Heins.). Cf. Stat. *silv.* 1.6.53 *Thermodontiacas … turmas.*

3.14.33-4
> *quod si iura fores pugnasque imitata Laconum*
> *carior hoc esses tu mihi, Roma, bono.*

Pugnasque is odd, for the poem deals mainly with the athletic training of the Spartan women, not with real battles. *Pugnosque* (Otto) would fit the general theme and is very close to the 'ductus litterarum', but we would have to take it as a reference to boxing. *Moresque* (Shackleton Bailey) and *legesque* (Butrica) would go well with *iura.* But *luctasque* (Fontein) seems superior to me, because the last couplet repeats essentially the first one: *multa tuae, Sparte, miramur iura palaestrae, / sed mage virginei tot bona gymnasii.* Here, *iura* corresponds to *iura, tot … bona* corresponds to *hoc … bono,* and what would best correspond to *palaestra,* the wrestling-place, appears to be *lucta,* the wrestling-match. H. keeps *pugnasque,* G. prefers *legesque.*

3.15.10, 45-6, 43-4, 11 ff.

This sequence of lines was proposed by Fischer, and I think he was right. It lends more credibility to a conjecture made in v. 11

> *testis erit Dirce tam vero* (*vano* Franz) *crimine saeva.*

There are, of course, *vera* and *falsa crimina*, but Antiope, it seems to me, is punished by Dirce harshly for something she never did. This is the whole point, and the change seems necessary, no matter what order of lines we adopt. Cf. Ov. *met.* 7.829 *crimine concita vano*. H. (p. 365) adopts a different order: 3-4, 5-10, 45-6, 1-2, 43-4, 11ff. He also leaves *vero* in the text and defends it (pp. 365; 367-8), but I think he misunderstands the connection between Lycinna whom the poet calls *non meritam* (v. 43) and Antiope who, in his view, is also innocent. Otherwise she could not expect Jupiter to come to her aid (19-22), as he does (35-42). The gods are often fair to the mortal women they seduce (see above on 2.26.45-50). The poem loses its whole *pathos* if Antiope is guilty. G. solves the problem in his own manner, by writing *non vero*, at least doing justice to the context; he also changes *saeva* to *questa*.

3.15.39-40

> *Antiope, cognosce Iovem: tibi gloria Dirce*
> *ducitur in multis mortem habitura locis*

Most editors seem to have accepted *mortem habitura,* even though *mortem obitura* (Heins.) would restore the proper idiom. *Mortem (h)abitura* and *mortem obitura* look very much alike, but the latter is probably what the poet wrote. A similar corruption is found in Ov. *met.* 9.98-9 *hunc tamen ablati doluit iactura decoris,/ cetera sospes habet,* where it is said of Achelous that in his fight with Hercules he lost his beautiful horn but was otherwise unhurt; here we need *tantum* (Paris. Lat. 8001, Markland) … *abit* (Heins. ex cod.); see *Exempl. Class.* 12, 2008, 57. In Prop. 3.15, both G. and H. adopt Heinsius' correction, but H.'s punctuation *tibi gloria; Dirce…*, 'yours is the glory; Dirce …' (p. 579) is somehow affected, I feel; should we not take *tibi gloria* as an apposition?

3.17.23-4

> *vesanumque nova nequiquam in vite Lycurgum*
> *Pentheos in triplices funera grata greges*

Heyworth's (pp. 378-9) admirable *et triplici … gregi* makes all other attempts unnecessary. We need *et* which became *in* (loss of *–t* before *t-*, *e* taken for *i*), and the endings were adjusted accordingly). H. explains the corruption differently: An *s* which looked like an *f* was added to *triplici* from the following *funera*. G. prints *in triplices f. carpta g.* (Heins.).

3.17.29-38

Throughout this whole poem, Propertius speaks of himself, and we need the first person singular in some places where the paradosis has substituted

other forms. Read *onerabo* (*Itali,* Passserat) for *onerato* in v. 29 and *libabo,* I think, (not *libabit* with Foster) for *libatum* in v. 38. In the paradosis the sequence of endings in –*abo* was misunderstood, it seems; other future endings were preserved. He now wishes to be a *vates,* priest and poet (cf. 4.6.1-10), in the service of Bacchus, and in exchange for his devotion, Bacchus will deliver him from a *servitium* that has become more and more difficult to bear (41-2) and cure him by his blessings (3-4). Bacchus once joined him to Cynthia, but he can also separate him from her (5). The whole poem is an announcement of the now inevitable separation from Cynthia, presented in the form of a hymn to Bacchus.

At the same time, it is a kind of preview of a more formal hymn to Bacchus in the style of Pindar. When Propertius says "I will burden your neck with a garland …", he means "I will say that your neck is burdened by a garland …' This is Pindar's manner, as H. (p. 379), following Cairns, has now established. This is the key to the understanding of this elegy. H. (p. 379) prints *onerabo* and accepts *libabit* (Foster), but who else could be this priest but Propertius himself? G. reads *onerato* (29) and *libabit* (38).

3.19.21-2

> *tuque o Minoa venumdata, Scylla, figura,*
> > *tondes purpurea regna paterna coma*

F. accepts *tondes* (Y C, Dawes, Keil) for *tondens,* but cites Markland's *purpuream … comam* only in his app. crit. Here, as in 2.19.15 (see above) and elsewhere, an apposition was misunderstood, and we have to restore the original endings. The purple lock on her father's head is the royal power he has, and when Scylla cuts it off, he has lost his kingdom. The direct object of her action can only be the lock, but that lock represents his whole power as king. Read: *tondes purpuream, regna paterna, comam.* G. prints *tondes … purpurea … coma,* while H. (C., pp. 389-90), following Burman, keeps *tondens* but accepts Markland's proposal, marking the apposition. Read also J. P. Postgate, "*Propertiana*", *CPh* 8, 1913, 330-1, who supported this combination of proposals.

3.20.5-6

> *at tu, stulta, deos, tu fingis inania verba:*
> > *forsitan ille alio pectus amore terat.*

Rossberg's *stulta adeo's* is very attractive. The gods really have nothing to do with this. The error can be explained by wrong word division, but we have a similar case in 3.16.14. See Butrica, in: *CQ* 47, 1997, 181-2 where the true reading, *nemo adeo ut feriat barbarus esse volet,* has only survived in the indirect tradition; all our MSS. have *nemo deo ut noceat b. e. v.* which

shows once more what strange things can happen in this paradosis. *Nemo deo* was probably the first step in the process of corruption, and then, since no one can 'hit' a god, *feriat* was changed to *noceat*. See also above on 1.4.26, below on 4.6.59-60. H. (pp. 392-3) leaves *deos* in the text but suggests in the app. crit. *testaris* for *tu fingis*. G. modifies Rossberg's idea to *adeo*, but we need the *es* which survives in *deos*.

　　3.20.25-7
　　　　ergo, qui pactas in foedera ruperit aras,
　　　　　　pollueritque novo sacra marita toro,
　　　　illi sint quicumque solent in amore dolores

　　In this poem which is not addressed to Cynthia but to a new, unnamed love everything indicates that the poet is now considering a serious relationship, akin to a marriage. The couple observes the *omina* (24), they sign a written agreement and seal it (15-8) and they apparently perform a kind of ritual in front of the domestic altar to make sure that the gods bless their union. It would make sense to read either *ergo qui tactis haec foedera ruperit aris* (Burman, van Eldik) or *ergo qui tacta sic foedera ruperit ara* (Housman). The plural is, perhaps, better, because to be on the safe side, two altars (his and hers) should be touched, and *sic* seems inferior to *haec* in this context. Surely there can be no question of breaking the altar or the altars. Lachmann was puzzled by this '*mirus loquendi modus*', and then found a slippery way around it. But only the *foedus* can be broken; *foedera* must be the object of *ruperit,* and *in* is corrupt. *Tactas* for *pactas* is already found in the *Itali*, and it is confirmed by Verg. *Aen.* 12.200-1 *audiat haec genitor qui foedera fulmine sancit./ tango aras, medios ignis et numina testor:/ nulla dies … foedera rumpet.* See C. O. Brink, in *RhM* 115, 1972, 31-2. G. has *tactis haec … aris,* H. *tacta … sic ara.*

　　3.21.27-8
　　　　persequar et studium linguae, Demosthenis arma,
　　　　　　librorumque tuos, docte Menandre, sales

　　The poet is planning a trip to Athens, not just as a tourist, but to follow lectures in Plato's Academy and Epicurus' Garden, it seems, to study Greek rhetoric and to enjoy the wit of Menander's plays. *Librorumque* is perplexing. Would he have to read Menander's plays in a library or a bookstore in Athens instead of seeing them performed on the stage? Moreover, *persequar …arma … et sales* is a strange type of zeugma. We need another verb along with *persequar,* also with a future ending, and Suringar supplied it with *libaboque* (see Butler & Barber, *Comm.*, 315;). *Libo* 'to nibble at' can have as its object food as well as literature; hence it is particularly appropriate to the

two meanings of *sales*. Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.3.5 *libandus est etiam ex omni genere urbanitatis facetiarum quidam lepos*. The epithet *docte* can be supported by Manil. 5, 475, but coming after *docte Epicure* two lines before, it is probably a mechanical repetition. The conservative editors like F. miss the main point: it is possible to accept *docte Epicure* as well as *docte Menandre* in separate contexts, but a poet like Propertius would never have used the same epithet for two different authors twice within three lines. Read, perhaps, *culte Menandre* with Heinsius. G. prints his conjecture *urbanosque … culte* (Heinsius, Dorville), while H. accepts *libaboque* and prefers *munde* (Kuinoel). Dorville also suggested *compte,* a quality attributed to Isocrates by Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.79 and to Ovid by the Elder Seneca, *contr.* 2.2.8.

3.22.25-6

> *Albanus lacus et socia Nemorensis ab unda,*
> *potaque Pollucis nympha salubris equo*

The paradosis offers *socii, sotii* and *sotiis* which was changed to *socia* by Puccius, after a MS, it seems, to go with *unda*. But Housman recognized in *ABVNDA* the form *ABVNDANS* which had lost two letters at the end of line. The next step was to restore *FOLIIS* from *SOTIIS* which Housman did. This is surely one of his most beautiful emendations. (On this type of corruption see my note in *MH* 66, 2009, 88-9). Here one should quote Christoph Martin Wieland, the German poet and translator who said: "Eine Conjectur von Hemsterhuys, Bentley, Wolf kann mich unendlich glücklich machen. **Die irren sehr stark, die glauben, dass solche Männer blosse Bü**chermotten gewesen wären. Sie hatten Genie zu allem, was sie anfingen. Sie hätten eben so gut grosse Dichter, als grosse Critiker werden können." (I owe this citation to Arnd Kerkhecker). **Housman himself is the perfect illustra**tion. Maybe no one would rank him as a 'great poet' today, but his success and his fame as a literary craftsman are undeniable. F. mentions Housman in his *app. crit.* as one solution among others but sees no need to change his text. G. seems happy with *socia … ab unda,* but H. (p. 405) gives Housman's emendation the place it deserves. *Nympha* does not make much sense; the reading has been changed here and in related passages to *lympha* long ago.

4.1.37-8

> *nil patrium nisi nomen habet Romanus alumnus:*
> *sanguinis altricem non pudet esse lupam*

It is not clear from F.'s apparatus that the reading *non pudet* is only found in P. It seems to be an error in transcription or a bad conjecture for *non putet* (N F L alii). A Roman should not be ashamed to descend from a she-wolf, but looking at others he might wonder whether this is not just a

myth. But if *putet* is right, *non* becomes doubtful. Volscus proposed *nunc pudet,* Burman *num pudet,* and *num* would work very well with *putet*, making v. 38 a question: 'Would he believe that a she-wolf nurtured the blood from which he sprang?' Someone no doubt has suggested this before. G. has *non pudet*, while H. opts for *non* (ω) *putat* (R) and mentions Hutchinson's *quis* for *non*.

4.1.45-6

> *tunc animi venere Deci Brutique secures,*
>   *vexit et ipsa sui Caesaris arma Venus.*

Read probably *hinc* (Heins.) … *rexit* (Heins.) or *auxit* (L. Mueller). The first word of the line was probably difficult to read. *Rexit* (very close to the paradosis) could be supported by Stat. *Theb.* 7.251 *video quae noster signa Menoeceus,/ quae noster regat arma Creon,* while *auxit* has parallels in Ov. *met.* 14.454 *auget uterque suas externo robore vires;* Tac. *hist.* 2.32.2 *tum auctis viribus certaturos.* In both lines in the paradosis of Propertius the first word was difficult to read. There has to be a connection between the historical significance of Aeneas' escape from Troy (39-44) and the heroes of Roman history. *Tunc* just indicates a vague chronological sequence. *Vexit* introduces a myth that is not attested anywhere, as far as I know. One cannot defend the paradosis by comparing Ov. *met.* 15.844-5 and Petron. 124.266-7, as F., following Waszink, attempts. Ovid refers to Venus' intervention after the assassination of Julius Caesar, carrying his soul up to the heavenly sphere (no weapons mentioned), and Petronius' vision of Venus leading Caesar's army is different again: *Dione/ Caesaris arma sui ducit;* here the verb is *ducit,* not *vexit,* and *arma* means 'army', not 'arms'. In Propertius, the context is different: The great deeds of the Roman national heroes (Decius, Brutus, Caesar) are derived from Aeneas' devotion to the Trojan Penates and to his own father, Anchises, who had been beloved by Venus. Heinsius considered also *hinc magni venere Deci* which is excellent and *duxit* for *vexit,* actually referring to the passage from Petronius quoted above. G. prints *hinc animi venere Deci* and *vexit,* while H. (p. 420 leaves *tunc* and prefers *venit* (Hollis) to other conjectures. See also F. G. *Welcker, Die Griechischen Tragoedien,* Bonn, 1841, I, 1391.

4.2.9-10

> *at postquam ille suis tantum concessit alumnis,*
>   *Vertumnus verso dicor ab amne deus*

'but after he (the Tiber) granted so much to his foster-children...' How much? *Tantum* is too vague and probably hides *spatium* (Heins.) or *stagnum* (Housman), through loss of *s*- after *–s*. *Campum* (*Itali,* Heins.) is also

plausible; it has been explained as *Campus Martius* and would have to be capitalized. H. (C. p. 437) prints *stagnum*, G. mentions *campum* and *spatium* but in the end keeps *tantum*. Write probably *spatium* (Heins.). *Tractum* was suggested by D. J. Butterfield (*Eikasmos* 20, 2009, 198, n. 17).

4.3.11
> *haecne marita fides et +parce avia+ noctes*

This is the text of N. To the many proposals listed by the more recent editors I would like to add the very attractive conjecture offered by Antonio Ramírez de Verger in his review of Heyworth's *OCT* and *Cynthia* (in *BMCR* 2009):

> *haecne marita fides et pactae gaudia noctis*

This is very close to N and gives exactly the meaning we would expect. *Pactae … noctis* stands for *primae noctis matrimonii quod pacta sum*, and among the parallels listed by Ramírez de Verger, Ov. *ars* 3.461-2 is particularly striking: *si bene promittent, totidem promittite verbis:/ si dederint, et vos gaudia pacta date.* Here, *gaudia pacta* corresponds perfectly to *pactae gaudia noctis*. H. (p. 446) prints *pacta haec foedera nobis* (Watt) where *nobis* seems redundant. G.'s *opacae gaudia noctis,* 'le gioie di quella notte oscura', borders on the whimsical.

4.3.53-4
> *omnia surda tacent, rarisque assueta kalendis*
> *vix aperit clausos una puella Lares.*

Read probably *limina* (Heins. dub.) and *ad sueta* (Palmer). *Omnia* is possible, but *limina* is more concrete, less vague. Heinsius refers to 1, 16, 18; 26. *Adsueta* can only be taken with *raris … kalendis* which makes very little sense, whereas *ad sueta,* 'to perform the customary rites' is supported, e. g., by Varro, *rust.* 1.1.7 *deis ad venerationem advocatis*; Apul. *met.* 4.24 *se … ad sectae sueta conferunt.* A case of wrong word division. H. takes *raris* as 'widely-spaced'. *Clausi Lares* must mean the front-door of the house as in 4.8.49-50 *cum subito rauci sonuerunt cardine postes/ et levia ad primos murmura facta Lares.* G. leaves *omnia … adsueta* in the text, H. adopts *limina,* but keeps *assueta.*

4.4.1-2
> *Tarpeium nemus et Tarpeiae turpe sepulcrum*
> *fabor et antiqui limina capta Iovis*

Here, *nemus* ought to be *scelus* (Kraffert: see Camps, 1965, *ad loc.*), and if we accept that, we should probably also consider *Tarpeiae* for *Tarpeium*. Neither Propertius nor (as far as I know) anyone else mentions a 'Tarpeian Grove'; Verg. *Aen.* 8.347-8, cited by F., proves nothing at all. Throughout the poem, Propertius presents what Tarpeia did as a shameful crime for which she deserved to die (17-8; 43 *crimen:* 56 *prodita Roma;* 69 *culpam;* 85-7; 89 *sceleri;* 93-4). H. leaves *Tarpeium nemus* in the text, G. reads *Tarpeium montem* which seems quite improbable. In my opinion, *TARPEI(A)ES-CELVS* could easily become *TARPEIVMNEMVS*.

4.4.75-8

> *annua pastorum convivia, lusus in urbe,*
>   *cum pagana madent fercula divitiis,*
> *cumque super raros faeni flammantis acervos*
>   *traiicit immundos ebria turba pedes.*

Propertius was a careful observer of Roman folklore, but the paradosis distorts the valuable information he passes on. For *divitiis* read *lautitiis* (Postgate), and for *raros* read perhaps *ternos* (Butrica). *Deliciis* (Beroaldus ex codd.) is also possible, and for *sacros* (Passerat) see below. *Immundos … pedes* is a humanist conjecture, found, e. g., in the *liber Colotii,* and accepted by Passerat, Guyet and Heinsius. All major MSS. have *immundas … dapes.* In v. 75 one should consider *herba* (Fontein) for *urbe.* This may have been written *(h)erba* which, at the end of the line, could easily become *urbe.* G. keeps *urbe* and *raros* but prints Postgate's *lautitiis,* H. (p. 452) also keeps *urbe;* he does not change *divitiis,* but for *raros* he adopts *sacros* (Passerat) which is very good; the original reading may have been corrupted because the *–r* of *super* was written twice. Cf. Tib. 2.5.90 *flammas transiliet … sacras;* [Tib.] 3.12.21 *sanctos … turis acervos.*

4.4.93-4

> *a duce Tarpeia mons est cognomen adeptus:*
>   *o vigil, iniustae praemia sortis habes*

Read probably *Tarpeium* (Palmer) … *iniuste* (F L P alii, Lachmann dub.) *praemia mortis* (Lachmann, Lütjohann) *habes.* The sense is clear: *Mons Tarpeius* has its name after Tarpeia who led the enemy to its top. *Tarpeio* (ω) could be *TARPEIOM* after having lost its *–M* before *MONS* by haplography. *Tarpeia* is a humanist conjecture, but not a very good one. Tarpeia's fate was not at all unfair; she deserved to die, but it is unfair that she was rewarded by giving her name to a prominent Roman hill. The *ThLL* 7.1.1689.60 explains *iniuste* correctly, I think, as *immerito.* There is a problem with *o vigil;* something was lost at the beginning of the line, but *non*

vigil (Peerlkamp) or *o virgo* (Guyet) can hardly be the solution. H. (453-4) prints *a duce turpe Iovis* (Weidgen) … *iniustae … sortis,* while G. resorts to a conjecture of his own and an older one: *infaustae* (G.) …*noctis* (*Itali apud L. Latinium*). A referee asks "What is really so wrong with *o virgo iustae...*?" Nothing that I can think of right now.

4.5.7-8

> *Penelopen quoque neglecto rumore mariti*
> *nubere lascivo cogeret Antinoo*

Guyet's *quae* 'the sort of person who…' should not be forgotten; the whole period flows more easily when we substitute it for *quoque* which may be interpolated, as more than once in the paradosis of Ovid's *met.* H. accepts *quae,* G. keeps *quoque.*

4.6.3-4

> *cera Philiteis certet Romana corymbis*
> *et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas*

Propertius is competing with Philetas and Callimachus, and for this imaginary poetic *agon* he puts on a wreath in the Roman manner, just as the Greek poets would wear one in the Greek style. *Cera* cannot be right; we must read *serta* (Scal.) to balance *corymbis*. The first word of the line was misread and lost a letter in transcription. *Certent* (Scal.) is not absolutely necessary, for Propertius (2.33.37) uses *serta* like a fem. sg., as noted by Charisius and another grammarian. Here, as elsewhere, the indirect tradition seems to be reliable. H. (p. 457) accepts *serta* and keeps *certet*, while G. changes *cera* to *ara* (Haupt) and *certet* to *niteat* (G.), losing the idea of a poetic competition. Incidentally, if we read *Cyrenaeis,* should we not also read *Philitaeis*, as proposed by Volscus?

4.6.7-8

> *spargite me lymphis, carmenque recentibus aris*
> *tibia Mygdoniis libet eburna cadis*

Modis is cited from *Itali* by H., and it was conjectured by Scaliger, but he does not put it into the text, even though *cadis* is extremely odd. One can understand a flute, playing in a certain style, offering a sacrifice of song at an altar, but how can a musical instrument draw its tunes from a vessel? Can one say that these large Phrygian jars full of wine correspond in some way to the pitcher providing water from Cyrene (v. 4)? The change from *cadis* to *modis* is very easy, especially at the end of the line. Heinsius cites the reading from a 'vetus codex' and from Beroaldus, while G. who accepts

it, ascribes it to Beroaldus and Pocchus. Scaliger actually printed *Cadis* with a capital *C* and was followed by Broukhusius and Lachmann, but what is gained by this?

4.6.17-8
> *Actia Iuleae pelagus monumenta carinae,*
> *nautarum votis non operosa via*

Editors have been printing this for centuries, probably without fully understanding it, but no real improvements were available. Now they are, thanks to Heyworth (pp. 458-60):

> *Actia Iuleae celebrant monumenta carinae,*
> *nautarum votis nunc onerata via est*

H. brilliantly changed *pelagus* to *celebrant* and *operosa* to *onerata*, while *nunc* for *non* is due to Carutti, and *est* survives in P. Obviously, the couplet suffered major corruption, and major efforts were needed to restore it, but now it makes very good sense. We now can envision an imposing monument celebrating Augustus' victory at Actium, and a road leading up to it, flanked by the more modest votive offerings of the sailors who survived the battle. G. accepts the vulgate.

4.6.27-8
> *cum Phoebus linquens stantem se vindice Delon*
> *(nam tulit iratos mobilis un[d]a Notos)*

Neither *unda* (ω) nor *una* (*Itali*) really works: what we need is *ante* (Lipsius; see Broukhus. *ad loc.*) which gives us the contrast to *stantem*. Delos once was a floating island, but after it had offered an asylum to Leto, his mother, Apollo became its protector and made it stable. See Ov. *met.* 6.333-4 *quam* (sc. *Latonam*) *vix erratica Delos / orantem accepit, tum cum levis insula nabat.* H., following Lachmann, accepts *ante,* G. is satisfied with *una.*

4.6.59-60
> *at pater Idalio miratur Caesar ab astro:*
> *'tu deus: est nostri sanguinis ista fides'*

Here, F. printed one of his own conjectures: *tu deus: est,* adapting Richter's equally misguided *tu deus es.* The MSS. are divided between *sum deus est* (N F L P V), *sum deus et* (D Vo V²) and *sum deus en* (*Itali*). But Caesar who became a god after his death cannot say to his <u>adopted</u> son who is still

alive 'I am a god, because you have just won this battle'; nor can he say 'you are a god, because etc.' He can say 'you are my <u>true</u> son, because you have just won this great victory'. Lachmann (*ad loc.*) described the *crux* very well: '*deum autem sese esse inepte nimis hic affirmabat Caesar, cum illud esset potius agendum, Augustum esse verum et dignum patre Caesare prolem.*' His own proposal, *tum deus* does not work, but his diagnosis lead to the solution found by Baehrens. Read *tu meus: est* (Baehrens). This is one of several cases in this paradosis where a form of *deus* was smuggled into the text; see above on 3.20.5-6. H. (pp. 460-1) cites Baehrens but prints *sum deus,* while G. modifies Baehrens' proposal by printing *es meus.* One could also consider *tu meus es.* This passage, like 1.5.3 (see above) may show that the emphatic use of *meus, mea* was misunderstood by scribes.

4.7.21-2
> *foederis heu taciti cuius fallacia verba*
> *non audituri diripuere Noti*

Read *pacti* (Palmer) for *taciti* which makes no sense because the words sealing their vows were, if not written, actually spoken by both lovers. This has been explained very well by Goold in *HSCP* 71, 1966, 68. When Propertius says to Cynthia 'I will love you forever', and she says the same words to him, this is a *foedus pactum,* but not a *foedus tacitum.* Whether the gods have heard it or not, is another question. It is simply not true, as F. contends, that *foedus tacitum* could mean *furtivus amor*, even though he cites Richard Reitzenstein and Shackleton Bailey. This mixes up two completely different things. The situation in 3.20 (see above) is similar: there we also have a *foedus pactum,* but this time (after the separation from Cynthia) it is actually written down and formally sealed (vv. 15-8; 21-30). That poem, we should remember, is not addressed to Cynthia but to another woman. Maybe the poet did not trust spoken vows any more and decided to have everything in writing. H. (p. 466) prints *pacti,* while G. introduces *sancti* which one recognizes at once as one of his creations.

4.7.47-8
The woman who melted the golden image of Cynthia is clearly one of her disloyal servants; the distich belongs after 35-40, the part of the poem which deals with that group (Lygdamus, Nomas), as Schrader saw. The good servants (Petale, Lalage) who are now being treated so badly are the subject of 43-6. The distich lost its place, perhaps because of the homoeoteleuta *humum / aurum / meum.* Once this is recognized, we also must separate the two groups by *at* (41) for *et*, as proposed by Markland. G. and H. keep the vulgate.

4.7.63-4

Andromedeque et Hypermestre sine fraude maritae
narrant historiae tempora nota suae

There seems to be no need to change *pectora* (ω) to *tempora* (Ayrmann). What needs to be changed, as Markland saw, are the endings of *historiae … suae*. He proposed *historias … suas* but kept *pectora nota* which remains a stumbling block. What Propertius may have written is *pectora fida*. Cf. Ov. *met.* 9.248-9, trist. 3.3.48; for the singular, cf. Lucr. 5.864, Hor. *carm.* 2.12.16, Sen. *Thy.* 334, *Phaedr.* 875, Stat. *silv.* 3.2.99, *Theb.* 2.364. The emphasis is on the faithfulness of these heroines, as opposed to Clytaemnestra and Pasiphae. I realize that *fida* is not very close to *nota* palaeographically, but it certainly fits the context; cf. 3.13.24 *fida Euadne … pia Penelope.* In 2.15.28 *masculus et totum femina coniugium,* Cornelissen very plausibly proposed *fidum* for *totum,* and when *fidum* could become *totum, fida* could easily be corrupted to *nota.* Cf. also Hor. *carm.* 2.12.16 *bene mutuis/ fidum pectus amoribus;* Ov. *met.* 9.249 (where Bömer's note has to be used with caution). Read perhaps

Andromedeque et Hypermestre, sine fraude maritae,
narrant historias, pectora fida, suas.

The key words in the whole context are *fides* and *perfidia.* Andromeda and Hypermestra were faithful wives; this is why there allowed to dwell in a kind of Elysium, while the others, the unfaithful ones, inhabit a less desirable region of the underworld. In [Sen.] *Herc. O* 947ff Deianira admits her guilt in Heracles' death and is ready to go to the underworld, but not to the sacred grove reserved to the souls of faithful wives:

claudite Elysium mihi
quaecumque fidae coniuges nemoris sacri
lucos tenetis.

Here we find the word which we miss in the context of Propertius' elegy. For *pectora fida* a referee furnishes the following parallels: Ov. *Met.* 9.248-9; *Tr.* 3.3.48; Hor. *Carm.* 2.12.16; Stat. *Theb.* 2, 364; *Silv.* 3.12.99. E. Pasoli, in his edition of Book IV (2nd ed. 1967, 69) detected an apposition in the pentameter, comparing 4.1.12, though he kept *historiae tempora nota suae.* I agree as far as the apposition is concerned; in fact, we have two appositions in this couplet. See above on 2.29.15 and cf. 4.1.12 *pellitos habuit, rustica corda, Patres;* Verg. *Aen.* 2.349 *iuvenes, fortissima frustra/ pectora.* As a result of some agonizing (p. 471), H. prints *sine fraude marita* (Heins.)/ *narrant historias, foedera* (Heins.) *nota, suas.* G. follows Heinsius and Ayrmann.

4.7.69-70

> *sic mortis lacrimis vitae sanamus amores:*
> *celo ego perfidiae crimina multa tuae*

Some scholars wanted to change *mortis* which forms a contrast to *vitae,* but the real problem is *sanamus,* it seems (read Sh. Bailey, *Propertiana*, pp. 252-3). Even though love is often described as a kind of desease, it is not clear how it could be healed by the 'tears of death'. (Does this mean 'the tears shed by the dead' or 'the tears shed over the death of a beloved person'?) Among the proposals made, Rossberg's *sancimus* is still attractive. The tears we shed when someone we once loved has died prove, indeed, the reality of that love. Cynthia's ghost says this to Propertius, because his great passion for her is now a thing of the past, but the fact that he is still moved to tears proves to her that his feelings for her were sincere, and therefore she forgives him now his *perfidia.* And Propertius lets us know that he is crying over Cynthia and that he is sure of her forgiveness. Another possibility, *solamur* (v. l. *ap. Passerat.*, Broukhus.) could be mentioned, but it is really the one who weeps who need to be comforted, not the love felt long ago. Heinsius' *satiamus* is worth considering but has not appealed to editors, as far as I can see. H. adopts *sancimus,* and G. rewrites the line as follows: *si* (G.) *nostris* (Otto) *lacrimis veteres* (Burman) *renovamus* (G.) *amores* which is quite ingenuous as a rewrite job.

4.9.23-4

> *sed procul inclusas audit ridere puellas,*
> *lucus ubi umbroso fecerat orbe nemus*

Lucus and *nemus* here mean the same thing, and *lucus fecerat nemus* is nonsense, but there has to be a wall to separate the sacred precinct and the young women who serve in it from the outside world. Hence *murus …* *saepserat* (Fontein). The first word of the line was corrupted. We probably have to imagine a circular wall, but we should also consider *umbrosum* (Fontein), to go with *nemus,* for *umbroso,* because it is not likely that the wall cast a shadow over the grove. H. (pp. 487-8) accepts *murus …* *saepserat* and thinks *umbrosum* possible but not necessary. G. keeps the vulgate, including *ab* (*ubi* is Heinsius' emendation of *ab*). I think we should read *murus ubi umbrosum saepserat orbe nemus* (Fontein).

4.10.33-4

> *dumque aries murum cornu pulsabat aeno*
> *vinea qua ductum longa tegebat opus,*
> *Cossus ait …*

A Roman army is preparing to besiege Veii and starts to demolish its city walls. The two actions described in the couplet are simultaneous and connected with each other. They should also be joined syntactically. Read: *vineaque inductum* (*Itali,* Volscus). *QVE* was read as *QVA,* and the prefix was ignored. H. (p. 498) prints the humanist conjecture, G. keeps the vulgate created by Lachmann.

4.11.3-8

> *cum semel infernas intrarunt funera leges,*
> > *non exorato stant adamante viae.*
> *te licet orantem fuscae deus audiat aulae:*
> > *nempe tuas lacrimas litora surda bibent.*
> *vota movent superos: ubi portitor aera recepit,*
> > *obserat herbosos lurida porta rogos*

The whole passage is thoroughly corrupt. *Leges intrare* is apparently not impossible in Latin, as the quotation from a Christian author in F.'s app. crit. shows, but *infernas … sedes* (Heins., Burman, Schrader) would be certainly more idiomatic in Propertius; cf. 3.12.33-4 *nigrantisque domos animarum intrasse silentum* where *domos* takes the place of *sedes,* but the word itself is used by Ov. *Ib.* 174 *quas … tenet sedes noxia turba coles.* In the pentameter, one should consider Heinsius' *fores* or *serae* for *viae.* He later changed his mind, as he did about *sedes. Fores* could be supported by 1.16.18 *quid mihi tam duris clausa taces foribus?;* Ov. *met.* 4.453 *carceris ante fores clausas adamante sedebant; Ib.* 79-80 *quas … ferunt torto vittatis angue capillis/ carceris obscuras ante sedere fores.* Roads cannot really be addressed in prayers, but doors can (see 1.16.15ff; 4.9.31ff). But *serae* is also attractive; see v. 8 *obserat;* 26 *iaceat tacita laxa catena sera;* 4.7.90 *errat et abiecta Cerberus ipse sera.* If we accept *fores* (or *serae*) in v. 4, we should probably also accept *limina* (Fontein) for *litora* in v. The two conjectures support each other. Propertius envisions the entrance to the underworld as a huge gate, and the whole scene has been misunderstood in the paradosis. In addition, we need Fruter's *exorando* for *exorato*; cf. 3.18.23 *exoranda canis tria sunt latrantia colla;* Ps.-Quint. *decl.* 10.19 *crudelis et inexorabilis custos.*

In vv. 7-8, the poet draws a line between *di superi* and *di inferi.* While you are alive, the *superi* may listen to your prayers, but when you are dead, you have no one to appeal to. Again, we have the image of the *porta* to the underworld. But how could it possibly bar the access to 'pyres full of herbs'? It bars the access the world of darkness, hence *umbrosos* (Δ) *… locos* (Livineius or Markland, apparently from *Itali*). *Herbosos* is really just a conjecture in F, and we do not have N for this part of Propertius. *Umbrosas … domos,* proposed by Hemsterhuys (*Luciani Opera,* ed. Bipont., vol. II,

p. 516) is, perhaps, even better than *umbrosos … locos;* cf. 3.12.33 *nigrantis … domos animarum … silentum;* Sen. *Med.* 741 *opacam Ditis umbrosi domum;* Val. Fl. 1.781 (Alcimede) *Stygias … supremo/ obsecrat igne domos* (see Liberman [1997] *ad loc.*). Again and again, the poet refers to a world beyond our human experience, and he finds new expressions for the kind of reality awaiting us there. H. (pp. 502-5) has an excellent discussion of the passage. In his text, he keeps *leges, viae, litora,* but he prints *exorando* (Fruter) and *umbrosos … locos.* His interpretation of *umbrosi* is ingenious and enlightening, and the parallels which he cites (Sen. *Med.* 741 and *Epicedion Drusi* 427-8) are, to me, absolutely convincing. G. keeps *exorato* but accepts *sedes, fores, limina, umbrosos … locos* which he translates as 'luoghi tenebrosi'.

4.11.61-2
> *et tamen emerui generosos vestis honores,*
> *nec mea de sterili facta rapina domo*

F. defends *generosos,* but this seems to be just another case of a wrong adjustment; the ending *–osos* anticipates the ending of the last word of the line. Turnebus (*Adversaria* XXIII 7) proposed *generosae vestis,* and that seems to be the proper term for the *stola* to which she was entitled. The change proposed by Turnebus was accepted by Koppiers and Burman. She says that she truly deserved the honor of wearing this kind of garment. See Camps' note. (Tony Camps was a fine scholar who, in his own quiet way, did a great deal to emend and elucidate the text). We need a contrast to *sterili … domo.* Leumann (*ThLL* 6.2.1800.56) paraphrases '*generosarum vestis',* but compares Ov. *hal.* 66 *hinc generosus honos et gloria maior equorum* which is not very helpful. Both G. and H. keep *generosos.*

Can we draw any *conclusions* from these random comments? Perhaps we can.

I. They may confirm the impression that the indirect tradition is more likely to preserve what Propertius wrote than the extant MSS. See notes on 2.1.58; 3a.23-4; 3.20.5-6.

II. They may reveal a source of errors that has been described before: the tendency of scribes (or perhaps just one early copyist?) to assimilate the ending of a word in the first half of line (usually a pentameter) to the ending of a word at its very end. This tendency introduces rhymes probably not intended by the poet who, of course, uses the device often enough.

It appears that quite a few lines can be emended by removing 'false correspondences', if I may use the expression. When I saw that H., following Lachmann's hint, (see *C.,* pp. 23; 67; 303; 469) paid careful attention to this phenomenon, I decided to go through the whole *Corpus,* concentrating on

such cases. Actually, some of Rossberg's conjectures (1877) indicate that he was also aware of this source of errors. H.'s own list includes: 1.5.20 *exclusum ... domum* (ω : *domo* Heins.; see Lachmann's note *ad loc.*); 11.15 *amota* (N alii : *amoto* P S alii) *... custode puella*; 2.13.6 *Ismarias* (N *a. c.* : *Ismaria* N² alii) *arte feras;* 2.25.26; 4.2.44. He cites further examples from Virgil and Silius Italicus and for Ovid's *Amores* refers to G. W. Most, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist.* (Bruxelles 1979), 365. In Ov. *Ib.* 525 *utque lyrae vates fertur periisse severae,* B. W. Häuptli (1996), 279 explains *severae* as a case of 'enallage', but we should probably read *severus*.

A systematic search has yielded (besides the cases dealt with above which are: 1.5.12; 6.22; 12.16; 20.14; 2.22b.44; 3.2.7; 6.22; 12.28) the following passages: 2.7.16 *magnus* (ω : *magni* Schneidewin) *Castoris iret equus;* 2.12.18 *alio traice tela tuo* (ω : *loco* N rec. : *tua* vel *puer* Itali); 27. 7 *rursus et obiectum* + *fletus*+ *caput esse tumultu[m]* where the dative ending was restored by the *Itali;* 3.8.2 (possibly); 17.12 (possibly); 18.34 *ab humana cessit in astra via* (ω : *vice* Baehrens, better than *humano* [Henry] or *humanis* [Barber], I think); 21.12 *pares* (ω : *pari* Heins., very good) *ducite sorte vices;* 4.1.36 *Fidenas longa* (*-e* ω) *erat isse vias* (ω : *via* Itali); 3.34 (uncertain); 5.34 *puros ... deos* (L P alii : *dies* N alii); 11.94 *caelibis ad curas nec vacet ulla vias* (N : *via* F L P alii : *dies* Santen). Even if I have missed a few instances, the tendency has become pretty clear, I hope.

But it also happens that we may have to restore the 'rhyming effect' by conjecture. Take, e. g., 2.6.20 *nutritus durae* (Itali : *duro* ω)*, Romule, lacte lupae.* What F. says about 'hypallage' is hardly relevant, and the passage he cites, 4.4.54 *(quem)... nutrit inhumanae inhumanae dura papilla lupae* proves the opposite. See H., *C.*, p. 135 who however prints *duro* in his OCT. *Lac durum* would have to be ice-cream or cheese. Another such case 2.31.8 *quattuor artifices* (Broekhus. : *-is* ω), *vivida signa, boves* where G. accepts the conjecture while H. follows the MSS. In 4.3.8 *munitus* (ω : *-o* cod. Berol. Lat. 500, Beroaldus ex coni.) + *hericus*+ *hostis equo* all recent editors accept the change.

It also happens that an ending in the first half of a line influences the ending of the last word, as in 2.16.29 (see above).

III. H. (*C.,* pp. 213; 218; 248; 390; 471; 506) deals with the so-called enclosed apposition, also known as *Schema Cornelianum,* a stylistic device which is often misunderstood in this paradosis. This has been noticed, e. g., by Lemaire in his Paris edition (1832), on 3.21.27. Among the passages investigated above, the following seem to be affected by this particular form of misunderstanding: 1.13.24; 2.29.25; 3.19.22; 4.7.58; 64. H. acknowledges the following cases: 1.16.8 *exclusi[s] signa iacere faces* where *exclusis* was emended in the *Itali;* one could place *exclusi signa* between commata; 11.30 *Baiae, crimen amoris, aquae;* 2.3.14 *geminae, sidera nostra, faces;* 24.12 *manibus dura frigus habere pila* where H. accepts my proposal *duram*

... *pilam;* 25.1 *unica nata meo pulcherrima cura dolori* where H. (pp. 217-8), following Goold, prints Phillimore's *Cynthia* for *unica;* 29.3 *pueri mihi turba minuta* (*-i* Heins.); 31.8 (see above); 3.3.31 *volucres, mea turba, columbae* (reminiscent of Verg. *ecl.* 1, 57); 19.22 (see above); 4.1.12 *pellitos habuit, rustica corda, Patres;* 7.64 (see above); 9.3 *venit ad invictos, pecorosa Palatia, montis;* 11.15 *vos, vada lenta, paludes* (where H., *C.*, pp. 506-7 adopts Butrica's *Acherontis* for *paludes*). H. refers to J. B. Solodow's valuable paper in: *HSCP* 90, 1985, 129-53 to which he adds (p. 248) a few more examples.

IV. The first and last words of a line are often corrupt.

V. Forms of *deus* are introduced into the text by mistake.