

hominum risu cavillatus. The diplomatic situation then prevailing in the two Arab kingdoms lent itself to the intentionally barbed question: Would the Senate which refused the toga to one mini-monarch allow another the pretension of wearing it? There is as yet no evidence that Abgar II was refused this honor, but the known outline of his reign does not exclude such a possibility.²² The variant readings or emendations noted above are much less satisfactory or convincing precisely because they do not address themselves to the multiple factors involved.

We believe that the solution proposed above satisfies every consideration. The word to be restored must compare and contrast geographically, historically, and politically with *Commagenum* in the same sentence. Such a word must accommodate itself to a passage composed for delivery with intentional rhetorical flourishes. This same word must demonstrate that it would have been instantly comprehensible to Cicero's Senate colleagues. It must also plausibly demonstrate that it lends itself easily to errors of manuscript transmission. Lastly, it must satisfy the joking ambience which pervades all portions of the letter to which it relates.

Our examination of this crux benefits especially from a review of the historical and geographical background of Cicero's letter, important aspects overlooked by other commentators. We therefore submit that there is a solid basis, textual and contextual, for believing that the emendation we propose is preferable to anything so far suggested in the discussion of this notorious crux.

HENRY INNES MACADAM

American University of Beirut, Lebanon

NICHOLAS J. MUNDAY

Manchester Grammar School, England

22. If Dio's (40. 20) account is accepted, Abgar was a prime mover in the ultimate defeat of Crassus just eighteen months after Cicero wrote this letter. Was this Abgar's repayment of some Roman insult? No motives are given. Or was this Dio's way of shifting blame for a disastrous military blunder? If our interpretation of the historical background of this letter is correct, Abgar must have been somewhat mollified by having his territory returned and his rival dynast snubbed by the Senate. His subsequent betrayal of Crassus would then be less credible. It is worth noting that Plutarch's *Life of Crassus* omits any mention of Abgar; indeed, it is a certain Ariamnes, designated "phylarch of the Arabs" (21), who is blamed by Plutarch for betrayal of the Roman forces. This appears to be a parallel to the situation described by Strabo (*Geog.* 16. 4. 22–24) regarding the Nabataean guide Syllaes (whom Strabo refers to as *epitropos*), who was blamed for the failure of the Roman expedition to Arabia Felix under Aelius Gallus. There is some indirect evidence that Abgar II may not have lived to witness (or participate in) Crassus' final, fatal expedition; see J. B. Segal, *Edessa: The Blessed City* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 11–12, esp. p. 12, n. 2.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DIVISION OF PROPERTIUS, BOOK 2

The question of the unity of Book 2 of Propertius is a vexing one. The most recent contribution to the discussion is that of O. Skutsch,¹ who reviews critically the arguments for division, underlines the evidence of the ancient grammarians,²

1. "The Second Book of Propertius," *HSCP* 79 (1975): 229–33.

2. Based on the argument of B. L. Ullman, "The Book Division of Propertius," *CP* 4 (1909): 45–51.

and concludes that Book 2 must indeed be a conflation of an original two books. The relevant argument runs as follows:

(1) In excerpting a text, the grammarians habitually quote the first book most frequently. Of Propertius they adduce twelve different passages, none of them from Book 1—an unparalleled situation. Therefore, the text which they used began with our Book 2, and the *Monobiblos* was a separate and detached part of the original collection.³

(2) Nonius Marcellus locates a quotation from the present Book 3 in a Book 3. But Nonius must have been counting from the beginning of the present Book 2, which must therefore be a conflation.⁴

An examination of the evidence for both points will, however, show that this conclusion, though possible, is not inescapable.

I

Despite the appearance of the creation of a mere list, there is a need first to set down the exact words of the ancient loci. The convenient listing by P. J. Enk⁵ is not accurate in all respects and gives no sense of the context for most of the Propertian quotations. Some of the twelve passages appear in more than one source. A thirteenth is ascribed to Propertius.

(1) Caesius Bassus quotes 2. 1. 2: "ad summam pentametrum heroum, qui habet dactylos duos, velut hunc 'unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber', adiectis duabus syllabis longis facies choriambicum ex heroo pentametro sic: 'unde meus (nunc) veniat mollis in haec ora liber' " (6:264.8–12 Keil = 141.250–54 Mazzarino).⁶

(2) Macrobius misquotes 2. 3. 24 in a paragraph on the frequentative form of the verb: "sternuto frequentativum est a principali sternuo: Propertius 'candidus augustae sternuit omen Amor' " (5:626.15–17K); "... sternuto, quod a sternuo. venit: Propertius 'candidus augustae sternuit omen Amor' " (5:651.27–29K).⁷

(3) Servius apparently misquotes 2. 9. 41 as a parallel to Virgil's use of *testes* to qualify natural phenomena: "sic Horatius 'testis Metaurum flumen', Propertius 'testes sunt sidera nobis' " (*Comm. in Virg. Ecl.* 5. 21).⁸

(4) Charisius quotes 2. 13. 35: "pulvis masculini generis est, quamvis Propertius dixerit 'qui nunc iacet horrida pulvis' " (113.5–7 Barwick = 1:89.22–23K).⁹ *De dubiis nominibus* quotes two words from the line: "Pulvis generis masculini; sed Propertius dicit 'horrida pulvis' " (5:588.5–6K).¹⁰

3. Skutsch, "The Second Book of Propertius," pp. 232–33.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 231.

5. *Sexti Properti Elegiarum Liber I (Monobiblos)*, 2 vols. (Leyden, 1946), 1:26–27.

6. H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols. (Leipzig, 1857–1880; repr. Hildesheim, 1961); A. Mazzarino, *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta Aetatis Caesariae* (Turin, 1955).

7. Different excerpts of Macrobius' *De differentiis et societatis Graeci Latineque* produce different language in the context, but their agreement on the quotation itself indicates that Macrobius did read *augustae*. The presently accepted reading of the line in Propertius is "candidus argutum sternuit omen Amor."

8. The text of 2. 9. 41 reads: "sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina."

9. K. Barwick, *Charisius* (Leipzig, 1925).

10. *De dubiis nominibus* has recently been reedited, though not with a fresh look at the manuscripts, by Fr. Glorie in the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, vol. 133A (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 743–820. In this instance, Glorie's reading (§§ 342–43) is the same as Keil's.

(5) Charisius quotes 2. 14. 1: "nam masculina modo es modo (a nominativo casu veteres) terminaverunt, velut Anchises Anchisa, Chryses Chrysa, Attes (Atta; similiter) Atrides Atrida, ut Propertius 'non ita Dardanio gavisus Atrida trium(pha)' " (85.6–10B = 1:67.11–14K).

(6) Charisius quotes most of 2. 33. 37: "serta neutro genere dicuntur, ut Vergilius, 'serta procul tantum capiti delapsa iacebant'. sed Propertius feminine extulit sic, 'tua praependent demissae in pocula sertae', et Cornelius Severus, 'huc ades Aonia crinem circumdataserta' " (137.23–28B = 1:107.25–30K). *De dubiis nominibus* quotes the line in full: "serta pluraliter dixit Vergilius (. . .) 'huc ades Aonia crinem circumdataserta'. sed Propertius dicit 'cum tua praependent demissae in pocula sertae'. sunt enim sertae sicut coronae" (5:590.23–25K).¹¹

(7) Donatus quotes 2. 34. 65–66: "Aeneidos vixdum coepta tanta extitit fama, ut Sextus Propertius non dubitaverit sic praedicare: 'cedite, Romani scriptores, cedite Graei: nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade' " (*Vit. Virg.* 30). The couplet appears in the same form as an epigram in the Codex Salmasianus.¹²

(8) Diomedes quotes part of 3. 8. 37: "quinta forma (sc. praeteriti) est quae desinit in xi syllabam, ut ango anxī . . . neglego neglexi; Aemilius Macer 'omnium nostrum neglexerit auctoritatem', quod est analogiae propius, quia et legerit: necto nexui vel nexi, Vergilius 'palmas amborum innexuit armis', Livius in *Odyssea* 'nexabant multa inter se', Maecenas 'nexisti retia lecto', Lucilius satirarum quinto 'tum retia nexit' " (1:369.9, 15–24K). The quotation is misascribed to Maecenas. Priscian quotes the line in full: "In 'to' c antecedente invenio 'pecto', cuius praeteritum plerique 'pexui', Asper tamen 'pectui', Charisius 'pexi' protulerunt. Maecenas in Octaviam: 'pexisti capillum naturae muneribus gratum'. similiter 'necto nexui' et 'nexi'. Vergilius in V: 'et paribus palmas amborum innexuit armis'. Sallustius in *historiarum* I: 'nexuit catenae modo'. Lucilius in V: 'hic solus vigilavit, opinor, / et cum id mi visus facere est, tum retia nexit'. Propertius: 'at tibi, qui nostro nexisti retia lecto' " (2:536.5–15K).

(9) Charisius quotes 3. 11. 15: "cassidem dicimus nos ab eo quod est haec cassis; sed multi cassidam dicunt, ut et Propertius 'aurea cui postquam nudavit cassida frontem', et Vergilius 'aurea vati cassida' " (131.18–23B = 1:103.15–20K). *De dubiis nominibus* also quotes the line: "cassidem generis feminini, ut Propertius 'aurea cui postquam nudavit cassida frontem' " (5:576.22–23K).¹³

(10) Nonius Marcellus quotes 3. 21. 14: "secundare, prosperare. Vergilius, lib. VII: 'di nostra incepta secudent'. Propertius, *Elegiarum* lib. III: 'iam liquidum nautis aura secundat iter' " (169M).

(11)(a) Lactantius quotes 4. 1. 13–14, 11–12. The argument in the section is the invalidity of tradition in the face of reason. If reason shows the truth, there is no sense in following tradition, especially Roman tradition as it originated in

11. Glorie emends as follows: "SERTUM generis neutri, 'serta' pluraliter dicunt(ur, ut) Vergilius; (<'serta' genere feminino Cornelius:) 'huc ades aonia crinem circumdataserta', (<pluraliter 'sertae'>) ut Propertius dicit: 'cum tua praependent demissae in pocula sertae'—sunt enim 'sertae' sicut 'coronae' " (§§ 401–2).

12. F. Buecheler, A. Riese, and E. Lommatzsch, *Anthologia Latina*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1894–1926; repr. Amsterdam, 1964) 1:264.

13. Glorie emends as follows: "(CASSIS et) 'cassidem' generis feminini; (<sed multi 'cassida' dicunt et 'cassidam'>) ut Propertius: 'aurea cui postquam nudavit cassida frontem' " (§§ 127–28). The line is also quoted by Bede (7:266.24–27K), who reproduces exactly the passage in Charisius.

the earliest Senate. Romulus's Rome was founded as a community of shepherds and an asylum for criminals, and his Senate was "centum pelliti senes." "De quo Senatu Propertius elegiarum scriptor haec loquitur: 'bucina cogeat priscos ad verba Quirites: / centum illi in prato saepe senatus erat. / curia, praetexto nunc quae nitet alta senatu, / pellitos habuit rustica corda patres' " (*Div. Inst.* 2. 6).¹⁴

(b) Isidore, in a chapter on military equipment and games, slightly misquotes 4. 1. 13 to illustrate the use of a *bucina*: "De quo Propertius: 'bucina cogeat priscos ad arma Quirites' " (*Etym.* 18.4).

(12) *De dubiis nominibus* apparently once quoted 4. 10. 44: "Torques generis feminini, ut Propertius (. . .) 'torquem auream' " (5:592.5K).¹⁵

(13) Fulgentius ascribes to Propertius a line not found in any of our manuscripts: "Dividias dixerunt tristitiae, sicut Propertius: 'dividias mentis conficit omnis amor' " (*Serm. Ant.* 34).

II

The first observation to be made is that these items are not all of a piece. Though they are grouped together as the evidence of the ancient grammarians, all of the contexts are not grammatical, even in the wide sense. Item 7 is testimonial. Item 11a is a rhetorical illustration. Item 11b illustrates the use of the object, not of the word. Lines in praise of Virgil would have been found wherever they stood in the text. Lactantius and Isidore use the only passage in Propertius appropriate to their purposes.

Second, for item 13 there is no convenient home in any of the presently postulated lacunae. Also, Fulgentius is an unreliable witness.¹⁶

Third, Servius (item 3) is apparently quoting from memory. His comment on *Georgics* 1. 19 indicates no great familiarity with Propertius.¹⁷

Fourth, the grammarians do have a habit of scanning a text from the beginning until they find the first appropriate example for their purposes.¹⁸ But this is not a productive guide when applied to most of the remaining examples. Except for items 1 and 4, they are in fact the first available examples in Propertius. The fact that they lie after the Monobiblos tells us nothing about the arrangement of the ancient text.

Fifth, the habits of other grammarians aside, the habits of Caesius Bassus (item 1) are of some interest. Even if one is not so persuaded as Enk¹⁹ that he quoted from memory, there is something quirky about his choice of examples. In a section on developments from the Phalaecian hendecasyllable (136.98–137.126M =

14. Lactantius has inverted the distichs. The present reading of line 11 is: "curia, praetexto quae nunc nitet alta senatu."

15. Glorie restores as follows: "(*TORQUIS* generis masculini, pluraliter 'torques', ut Prudentius: 'aureos auferte torques'; sed melius) 'torques' generis feminini, ut Propertius (: 'torques ab incisa decidit uncula'; Varro ad Ciceronem: 'torques aureae', et Hieronymus): 'torquem auream' " (§§ 433–34).

16. For example, in *Serm. Ant.* 22, he ascribes an iambic line to Propertius. In 59, he apparently believes Callimachus to be a Latin author. For a discussion, see S. Timpanaro, "Per una nuova edizione critica di Ennio," *SIFC* 22 (1947): 199–207.

17. "Unique puer monstrator aratri. Alii Triptoleum, alii Osirim volunt, quod magis verum est, ut dicit Propertius vel Tibullus. Nam Triptolemus frumenta divisit."

18. Ullman, "The Book Division of Propertius," pp. 49–51.

19. *Elegiarum Liber I*, 1:28.

6:258.32–260.11K), he draws on Horace *Odes* 4. 1. 1, 1. 1. 1–2, and 1. 11. 1 for his illustrations. He would have been as well served by 1. 3. 1 instead of 4. 1. 1. In discussing the first two syllables of the Phalaecian line (138.148–55M = 6:260.37–261.7K), he uses Catullus 2. 1 to illustrate a spondaic opening, 1. 2 for a trochaic opening, and 1. 4 for an iambic opening. But a spondaic opening could as well be illustrated by 1. 1. In discussing the galliambic and its permutations (139.180–140.219M = 6:261.27–263.11K), he uses Catullus 63. 2 instead of the equally useful 63. 1. In these instances, an open text would have provided the more obvious examples. Or, if he did use an open text, he did not employ the first useful example. Ullman shows that Caesius could have performed the metrical legerdemain in item 1 on the fourth line of the Monobiblos instead of the second line of Book 2.²⁰ But this does not mean that Caesius found his example by pulling down the first volume of his copy of Propertius and seeking the first suitable line. It is possible, but not inevitable.

Sixth, another habit of the grammarians must be taken into account, the habit of reading their predecessors instead of the evidentiary texts themselves.²¹ So much is quoted in item 8 not as proof but as example. Diomedes, who wrote probably in the late fourth century, garbles and abbreviates his illustrations. Priscian, probably in the early sixth century, apparently corrects and amplifies them. Diomedes and Priscian use the same loci from Virgil and Lucilius. Diomedes alone uses Livy; Priscian alone uses Sallust. Diomedes gives Propertius's line to Maecenas. Priscian gives Maecenas his own line and restores the Propertian ascription. Priscian is not using Diomedes, but both have at least one source in common, which was more ample than either remnant would indicate by itself; and that source is not the authors themselves but an earlier grammarian.

This habit of the grammarians may be sufficient to cast doubt on the worth of item 4. Feminine *pulvis* is illustrated by Propertius 2. 13. 35. It could have been illustrated by 1. 22. 6. Another example occurs later, at 4. 9. 31. These three, and two instances in Ennius, are the only extant examples of feminine *pulvis*. Now *pulvis* is a word of interest to a number of grammarians. The standard observation is that it is masculine and always singular.²² Servius, Pompeius, and Cledonius add an exception, a plural use, and illustrate with Horace *Epodes* 17. 48. But Aulus Gellius (19. 8. 13) remarks that *pulvis* is not always used in the singular, and his linking of *pulvis* with *mare, terra, ventus*, and *fumus*, words for which the use of the plural abounds, implies that he has in mind more than a single exception. Since Gellius is talking about the usage of good writers, one would expect the examples to have been collected. Yet grammatical lore has passed on only one. Charisius and Nonius (217M) note the exception to gender, but Nonius illustrates with the Ennian lines and Charisius with one of three from Propertius. Nonius's source was a grammatical work of some sort. Item 8 exemplifies the availability of more material than a given grammarian might choose to transmit. This is plausibly the case with *pulvis*.

20. "The Book Division of Propertius," p. 50.

21. See K. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars Grammatica* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 3–111. In view of this, the figures which Skutsch uses, "The Second Book of Propertius," pp. 232–33, while still valid, are not as overwhelming as they first appear.

22. The full list of references may be found in Glorie (ed.), *De dubiis nominibus*, p. 799.

Absence of the Monobiblos citation of feminine *pulvis* could also have a simpler explanation. The line occurs at nearly the end of the book. The finding of it would have required perusal of the entire roll. Its position makes it easy for the unpersistent to overlook it, especially since three examples of masculine *pulvis* (1. 17. 23, 19. 6, and 19. 22) precede it.

Neither of these is a probative argument, but together they caution us against taking the evidence of item 4 at its face value. At the very least, it is impossible to say what Charisius's source (or the source of his source) contained and how the entry for *pulvis* was compiled.

One might add that the quotations of Propertius by non-grammatical authors do not indicate any firsthand knowledge of his corpus. The praise of Virgil (item 7) may well have been leading an independent existence by the time of Donatus.²³ In Lactantius and Isidore, R. M. Ogilvie argues for a "derivative, second-hand source."²⁴ Of all the quotations, only one is likely to have come directly from Propertius—that by Caesius Bassus (item 1). Caesius lived at a time when texts of Propertius were readily available, was probably a poet himself,²⁵ and was a contributor to the development of Latin metrical theory rather than a transmitter of received doctrine.

To summarize the results of this broadside item by item:

(1) Caesius Bassus' use of Book 2 instead of Book 1 would argue for the absence of the Monobiblos from his text—if he worked from a text in this instance. There is room for doubt.

(2) *Sternuo* does not appear elsewhere in Propertius. The evidence is of no value to the question.

(3) Servius was quoting from memory. The evidence is of no value.

(4) Feminine *pulvis* could have been quoted from Book 1. But Charisius is derivative, and his entry may well represent a selection of available illustrative material. Further, the Monobiblos line is easy enough to miss. The evidence may add to the argument for the separation of the Monobiblos from the ancient text, but there is ample room for doubt. *De dubiis nominibus* is almost certainly quoting Charisius and is not independent evidence.

(5) *Atrida* is the only example of this kind of form in Propertius. The evidence is of no value.

(6) *Serta* appears only here in Propertius (unless it is to be restored at 4. 6. 3). The quotation is at least that of its first appearance. The evidence is of no value.

(7) The quotation would have been found wherever it appeared. It may have been circulating independently. The evidence is of no value.

(8) The perfect of *necto* is used only twice by Propertius. This is its first appearance. The evidence is of no value.

(9) *Cassida* appears only here in Propertius. The evidence is of no value.

(10) *Secundare* appears only here in Propertius. The quotation is of no value to the argument from silence. Its importance is in the locating of the quotation to Book 3. See the discussion below.

23. This seems to be the import of its appearance in the Codex Salmasianus, gathered with other praises of Virgil.

24. *The Library of Lactantius* (Oxford, 1978), p. 10.

25. If he is to be identified with the coeval and homonymous lyric poet; see Mazzarino 124–25.

(11) *Bucina* occurs only in Book 4. This is its first appearance. For Lactantius it is the only appropriate quotation and is probably derivative. The same is true for Isidore, and the *lapsus* further argues for quotation from memory. The evidence is of no value.

(12) *Torques* appears only here in Propertius. The evidence is of no value.

(13) Fulgentius is an unreliable witness. In any case, he points us not to what is in the text, but to what is not. The evidence is of no value.

Thus, T. Birt's argument for the separate existence of the Monobiblos may receive some support from items 1 and 4, but the support is not unassailable.²⁶ At that, the silence of two witnesses is far less striking than the silence of twelve, and the statistical argument is considerably weakened.

III

It is still possible, then, for a moderately unprejudiced reader to hold for the essential similarity of the ancient text of Propertius to the one printed in the OCT. If this is so, the book number in Nonius poses no problem, for Nonius's Book 3 and the OCT's Book 3 are the same. But if one insists on a two-part ancient edition, the worth of the number in Nonius must be considered—from two points of view: the worth of Nonius's source and the worth of the manuscript reading.

Working with Nonius Marcellus is a numbing experience. He is irritating in the mechanical regularity of his method and frustrating in those instances where a seeming departure from his method must be explained. It can be said of him, however, that he faithfully reproduced what he saw in his sources. And his source for the Propertius quotation was "a glossary of verbs in strict alphabetical order," possibly a section of a larger grammatical treatise. The run of quotations drawn from this source indicates that it was accurate and full. If there is fault to be found with the number, it is not in the nature of the source or in Nonius's careless use of it.²⁷

In estimating the worth of the manuscript reading, Lindsay silently altered III to IV.²⁸ In response, Ullman reexamined the manuscripts and concluded that the common archetype of the Nonius manuscripts had III, not IIII.²⁹ He adds that

26. *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882; repr. 1959), pp. 413–26.

27. The description of the source is that of W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford, 1901; repr. Hildesheim, 1965), pp. 9 and 101. The ascription of the quotation to this source is that of W. Strzelecki, "Ein Beitrag zur Quellenbenutzung des Nonius," *ADAW* 13 (1959): 81–90. Attempts to find the source elsewhere are fruitless. Nonius did not consult a text of Propertius. His contempt for authors who lack the *auctoritas veterum* precludes his even having wanted to do so. The Propertius quotation here was probably swept in behind Virgil, the sole Augustan poet of any merit in the mind of Nonius. Ascription to a different glossarial source is unlikely. Besides, the rest of the glossarial sources are nearly as good as this one. A marginal notation in one of Nonius's other sources is unlikely because of the length and allocation of the quotation. D. Churchill White, "The Method of Composition and the Sources of Nonius Marcellus" (Ph.D. diss., Chicago, 1978), p. 133, notes the probability of learned interpolations in the text of Nonius. It would be pleasant to be able to prove this of the Propertius quotation, but who could show that the same eyes saw both Propertius and Nonius in the early Middle Ages?

28. In his Teubner text: *Nonii Marcelli "De Compendiosa Doctrina,"* 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1903; repr. Hildesheim, 1965).

29. "The Book Division of Propertius," p. 46. See also G. Maggiali, "Properzio in Nonio," *Studi Noniani II* (Genova, 1972), pp. 105–6.

the archetype may have been wrong, but that in twenty-two instances in Book 2 of Nonius of an interchange between III and IIII, seventeen show IIII for III, and only five show III for IIII. But a two-part ancient edition would mean that the choice is between III and II, not between III and IIII. For if the present Book 2 is a single book, then the present Book 3 should have been Book 2 for Nonius's source.

Where Nonius's references can be checked against extant works, the percentage of error in the transcription of numbers is rather small, just above six percent. Nearly a third of those, however, consist in the addition of a stroke. And certain environments are more prone to corruption than others—namely, those in which there is an immediately preceding or following i, l, m, n, t, u, or \mathfrak{L} (the presumed abbreviation for *libro*).³⁰ Where these letters congregate, the chance of corruption increases. The Propertian book number is sandwiched between *elegiarum libro* and *iam*. In fact, the *i* of *iam* could easily of itself have occasioned the addition of a stroke. The scribe of L (who doubtless saw *lib* for *libro* in the archetype)³¹ did write IIII for III, the fourth stroke later being erased.³² Thus, while the statistical odds are about fifteen to one against corruption, the possibility is more than minimal. And it is possible for one to believe both in the unity of Book 2 and in a two-part ancient edition of Propertius.

IV

The pieces of evidence which are admissible to this problem are fewer than they appeared to be at the outset. We are left with two quotations and a number, all of which allow contrary interpretations. The reasonable combinations and conclusions to be drawn are these:

- (1) Two-part edition and accurate number lead to the necessity of dividing Book 2, Skutsch's conclusion.
- (2) Two-part edition and corrupt number leave the text as it stands.
- (3) Complete edition and accurate number leave the text as it stands.

Those who hold for the essential unity of Book 2, then, are not indulging a fanciful wish. It may be an instance of faith seeking reason, but the faith is not entirely blind, even if the reason is not entirely compelling.

EDWIN P. MENES
Loyola University
of Chicago

30. These observations come from A. K. Frihagen, "Buchzahlen bei Nonius," *SO* 50 (1975): 149–53. The percentage of error should probably be increased by inclusion of places where Nonius could be expected to have included a book number but there is no trace of one in the text; e.g., s.vv. "aiat" (70M), "adtendere" (71M), and "indolentiam" (128M). Also, Frihagen does not discuss the script which might have given rise to corruption: she is making a statistical observation on the environments where corruption is most frequent.

31. Lindsay, in his review of *Nonius Marcellus "de Compensiosa Doctrina" I–III* by J. H. Onions (ed.), *CR* 9 (1895): 357, inclines to an Insular origin for the archetype. This is the indicated abbreviation. See W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 116.

32. Ullman, "The Book Division of Propertius," p. 46, notes the mistake and its correction.