

NOTES ON PROPERTIUS, BOOKS III AND IV

I offer further notes on the text of Propertius. In the apparatus Ω is employed to indicate the archetype, i.e. the consensus of N and two separate groups of humanistic manuscripts that I denote by the letters Π and Λ . The Π MSS (FLP) derive from a lost manuscript of Petrarch, itself copied from the manuscript A (which is not extant after 2.1.63). The Λ MSS are largely a group isolated by J. L. Butrica (*The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, *Phoenix* suppl. vol. 17, Toronto, 1984, 62–95), which derive from a third medieval source discovered by Poggio and brought to Italy, apparently in 1423. The oldest Λ manuscript is Vat. lat. 3273, copied by Panormita in Florence in 1427, here called T.¹ Another independent descendant is S (Monacensis Univ. Cim. 22), written in Florence c. 1460 by Poggio's son Jacopo. Three other Florentine copies of the 1460s descend from a single source later than Λ : M (Paris. B. N. lat. 8233, formerly μ); U (Vat. Urb. lat. 641, formerly ν); and R (Bodmer. 141, once Abbey 5989). Butrica would cite also C (Romanus Casanatensis 15), written by Pomponio Leto c. 1470; but its witness is vitiated by the frequency both of error and of interpolation and its presence would confuse rather than clarify our picture of Λ . On the other hand I include the pair J (Parmensis Palat. Parm. 140, Florence, c. 1440) and K (Vratislaviensis Univ. Akc. 1948 KN 197, Padua 1469). Butrica, though acknowledging the independence of these from the other Λ MSS, discards them² because the text is (slightly) interpolated, and (slightly) contaminated from a Π source. I hope to discuss these matters more fully elsewhere. The symbol ς is retained for unauthoritative readings found in fifteenth-century MSS.

I refer to the following editions: Beroaldus (Bologna, 1487); Passerat (Paris, 1608); Burman–Santen (Utrecht, 1780); Paley (London, 1872); Postgate, *Select Elegies* (London, 1881); Rothstein (Berlin, 1924); Butler (Loeb, London, 1912); Butler and Barber (Oxford, 1933); Fedeli, Book 4 (Bari, 1965); Camps, Book 3 (Cambridge, 1966), Book 4 (Cambridge, 1965); Richardson (Norman, 1977); also to D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956).

3.1.9–14

quo me Fama leuat terra sublimis, et a me
 nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis, 10
 et mecum in curru parui uectantur Amores,
 scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas.
 quid frustra missis in me certatis habenis?
 non datur ad Musas currere lata uia.

11 curru *FP*, *Tp.c.*: currum *NLA* 12 meat *Rossberg* 13 immissis *Auratus*
 in mej mecum *P*, *ci. Heinsius*

Verse 12 is still regularly misinterpreted, although a plausible explanation is given by both Postgate, and Butler and Barber. They supply not *me comitantur* nor *incedit*

¹ Butrica uses lower-case letters for these MSS, which might suggest, quite wrongly, that they are less authoritative than, for example, P. Accordingly I adopt the equivalent capitals; but Vat. lat. 3273, for Butrica v, must have a new letter to avoid confusion with the traditional V, Vat. Ottob. lat. 1514, now discredited.

² He does, however, give them the siglum γ in his list of sources of conjectures (p. 173).

nor *est*, but *uectatur*: 'with me in the chariot drive tiny Cupids, and dogging my wheels <drive> a crowd of scribblers'. By suppressing the verb Propertius has artfully allowed the image of a triumph to continue: the victor is followed by the foot-soldiers. As soon as we realise the need for a main verb, the crowd of poets become drivers in a chariot race, attempting in vain to overtake the leader.

In verse 13 the *paradosis* is unlikely to be correct. After *certo*, *in* + acc. always indicates the field or purpose of strife, not the opponent (see *ThLL* 896.36–42). *pugno in*, adduced by Camps as a parallel, is not used of competing. The difficulty can be solved by replacing *in me* with *mecum*, as in the interpolated manuscript P. One would then assume that *ē* having been lost before *certatis*, *in* was added to restore the metre. If we also adopt *immissis* and suppose the dislocation of *in* contributed to the corruption, we restore to Propertius the idiomatic expression *immissis...habenis; mitto*, though frequently used of horses (e.g. Horace *Carm.* 4.14.24), does not seem to have been employed with *habenae* in the sense 'give rein' before Petronius (5, v. 13). It is of course possible that Propertius was the innovator; but the false *in me* for *mecum* makes *immissis* attractive.

3.3.1–14

Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra,
 Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi,
 reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum,
 tantum operis, nervis hiscere posse meis;
 paruaque iam magnis admoram fontibus ora 5
 unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit,
 et cecinit Curios fratres et Horatia pila,
 regiaque Aemilia uecta tropaea rate,
 uictricesque moras Fabii pugnamque sinistram
 Cannensem et uersos ad pia uota deos, 10
 Hannibalemque Lares Romana sede fugantis,
 anseris et tutum uoce fuisse Iouem;
 cum me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus
 sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra.

5 iam *Guyet*: tam Ω 7 cecini ζ 8 et 12 *inter se mut. Polster* 11 lares *FS*: lacies
N: lacres *LPTMURJK*

Otto Skutsch³ found a stylistic reason for adopting the early conjecture *cecini*. To him the sequence 'I laid my lips to the great springs from which Father Ennius drank; and he sang...(catalogue)...; when Apollo addressed me' seemed unworthy of Propertius. To my ears any awkwardness derives from the punctuation and paraphrase: rather 'I had already⁴ laid my lips to the great springs from which Father Ennius drank, and sang...; when Apollo saw and addressed me'. Hofmann–Szantyr observe on inverted *cum* sentences (p. 623): 'Im Hauptsatz steht meist ein duratives Tempus (Impf. oder Plqpf.), ganz selten das hist. Perf. seit Cic. *Phil.* 2.73 al.'⁵ There are then stylistic grounds for preferring the *paradosis* to the conjecture. Propertius uses his tenses (pluperfect of himself, preterite of Ennius) to guide the reader through the long

³ *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968), 141 n. 10.

⁴ Propertius has *tot* 18 times, *tam multi* 6 or 7 times (2.8.13 being the doubtful case); *tantus* some 40 times, *tam magnus* never. *iam* usefully points the structure of the long sentence.

⁵ Propertius has imperfect at 4.8.47–8 and 2.26.19, imperfect and pluperfect at 4.6.25–6.

sentence. Moreover, one expects Apollo to intrude whilst the epic is being composed, as he does in the Sixth Eclogue (3–4):

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
uellit et admonuit.

Cf. also Cupid's interference with Ov. *Am.* 1.1.1–4

Arma graui numero uiolentaque bella parabam
edere, materia conueniente modis.
par erat inferior uersus; risisse Cupido
dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem;

the shutting of the mistress's door in *Am.* 2.1.11–17

ausus eram, memini, caelestia dicere bella, . . .
in manibus nimbos et cum Ioue fulmen habebam,
quod bene pro caelo mitteret ille suo.
clausit amica fores: ego cum Ioue fulmen omisi;

15

and the sudden appearance of Apollo at *Ars* 2.493

haec ego cum canerem, subito manifestus Apollo.

Horace too is interrupted before he can set sail on the epic sea:

Phoebus uolentem proelia me loqui
uictas et urbis increpuit lyra (*Carm.* 4.15.1–2).

Callimachean poets do not complete their fanciful epics before the Lycian god intervenes.

Why then have scholars such as Skutsch and Butrica⁶ adopted the conjecture? Because they believe Propertius cannot have portrayed Ennius as describing the triumphant return of L. Aemilius Paullus in 167 B.C.; for according to Cicero⁷ Ennius died in the consulship of Q. Marcius and Cn. Seruilius – 169 B.C. In fact I think the Propertian paradosis can be accepted without impugning Cicero's chronology⁸ or adopting the long-favoured but highly improbable explanation that verse 8 refers not to the fabled home-coming after Pydna but to some other Aemilian conquest.⁹

We should examine Propertius' practice elsewhere in paraphrasing poems. The best parallel for a summary of a literary work in Propertius is 2.34.67–76, which describes Vergil's *Eclogues*, a work that happens to be extant. Propertius does not refer to the poems in published order but recreates their spirit and tone, with allusions to a few specific lines and scenes; and, most significant of all for my argument, he introduces elements from outside the *Eclogues*. Thus the sex of the recipient of the apples (69) is not male as in *Ecl.* 3.70 but female as in the Theocritean original (*Id.* 3.10), and for the two young roe-deer of *Ecl.* 2.40–1 Propertius substitutes a newly weaned kid, recalling Theocritus 3.34. The Galaesus of verse 67 is from a Georgic not a Bucolic landscape (*Geo.* 4.126), whilst *pineta* is not a Vergilian word at all. Why then should we assume *Ennius cecinit* (parallel to *tu canis* 2.34.67) introduces an ordered and

⁶ *CQ* 33 (1983), 464–8. It will be clear that I reject Butrica's theory that the poem presents a chronological outline of a planned annalistic epic, although I do not draw out specific objections.

⁷ *Brut.* 78; *Sen.* 14.

⁸ As attempted recently by G. d'Anna: *Athenaeum* 51 (1973), 355–76; *RFIC* 107 (1979), 243–51. Cf. also Skutsch's rejoinders: *BICS* 24 (1977), 6; *BICS* 27 (1980), 103–4.

⁹ A sophisticated version of this has recently been proposed by M. Martina, *QFC* 2 (1979), 13–74 (esp. 45–61), and accepted by Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), 552.

accurate summary of the *Annales*? Butrica¹⁰ dismisses the disordered *Odyssey* (3.12.25ff.) as a parallel on the somewhat feeble grounds that Propertius makes no reference to the *Odyssey* of Homer; what of the elegiac *Iliad* at 3.1.25ff., which begins with the wooden horse, or Homer at 3.1.33 called 'the recorder of Troy's fall', an event narrated in epics usually not ascribed to Homer? Such provocative scholarly play seems to me exactly what one should expect from the self-proclaimed *Callimachus Romanus*. It is not Propertius' fault that the *Annales* has been lost so that we cannot judge his elegiac summary. Skutsch¹¹ believes that the Capitol was captured by the Gauls in Ennius' account, and that the story of the geese cannot therefore have come from the *Annales*. Is Propertius then offering an alternative to the Ennian narrative? *Curios* for *Curiatios* probably reflects a scholarly debate, if not Ennius' own usage; the nationality of the brothers is left open, but *Horatia pila* is specified by its syntax as a neuter plural. This is not simple writing. When, therefore, Propertius says *Ennius cecinit regia Aemilia uecta tropaea rate*, he may not be referring to an event actually narrated by Ennius.

It is easy to form hypotheses to explain this oddity. For example, it is generally agreed that Books 17 and 18 must have related something of the Third Macedonian War, so it is possible that Propertius is using synecdoche when he alludes to this concluding episode. Such a device would be particularly appropriate, as the work must have been essentially unfinished if it abandoned the account of this war before the spectacular return of Paullus. And lack of finish is surely a fitting charge for Propertius to be making, even in this oblique manner, against the Callimacheans' bugbear, Ennius. Moreover, if the work, and in particular Book 18, was left unfinished by Ennius, others (e.g. Pacuvius) may have attempted to complete it, so there could conceivably be a scholarly point in Propertius' verse.

Polster's transposition of 8 to follow 11, and 12 to follow 7, is shown to be unnecessary by the same parallels. Butrica, arguing in its favour, points to the homoeomeson (*fratres, lacres*) as an explanation for the corruption. But this would have led to omission of 12, 9, 10, 11 and he gives no account of the further transposition.

3.3.47–50

quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantis
nocturnaeque canes ebria signa fugae,
ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas
qui uolet austeros arte ferire uiros.

50

48 nocturnasque...faces Markland

Calliope says Propertius will sing of comastic lovers and their attempts to seduce the locked-in lady with song. What within this context can be the 'flight' or 'rout' of 48? If, like most commentators, we assume the comasts are driven away by the husbands or keepers of the women, then we must face the following difficulties: (i) although Propertius and the other Roman love poets frequently allude to the scene at the doorstep, we never find a *fuga* described. It is odd that Calliope should choose as typical and refer so elliptically to something quite new. (ii) The routing of the lover

¹⁰ *CQ* 33 (1983), 464 n. 2.

¹¹ *Studia Enniana* 138–41, and, less confidently, in his commentary, p. 408. (Skutsch's reference in n. 18 to W. D. Lebek's article on the alleged fragment of Lucan should apparently read *Mittellat. Jahrbuch* 18 [1983], 226–32.)

fits awkwardly between the general statement of 47 and the successful outcome predicted in 49–50. (iii) What are the drunken signs of flight? For the torch, garland etc. littering the doorstep are the conventional signs of the *comus* and not of flight.

There is an erotic night-time rout in 4.8, but that later, very specific poem has nothing to do with the comastic scene of 47 and 49. If *fugae* were taken as ‘withdrawal’, as at 4.9.54, then the phrase would be equivalent to *exclusi signa* at 1.16.8 (see below); but objection (ii) stands against this, and anyway *nocturnus* is hardly the right epithet – it is morning when the lover departs (cf. 1.16.46, Ov. *Am.* 1.6.65–6). Richardson suggests *fuga* means the girl’s flight – an anticipation of 49–50 (cf. 4.7.15–20) – but fails to answer objection (iii). Camps took *signa* as a metonymy for ‘warfare’, but with a genitive following this is intolerably awkward.

Markland’s conjecture recalls 1.16.8 and involves the elegant *schema Cornelianum*,¹² but one looks for a genitive after *signa. fugae*, I suggest, has replaced some other iambic word, meaning ‘*comus*’. There is no need to assume that the lost word was of similar appearance: metrical substitution at the end of the line is very frequent, especially in the pentameter. S alone presents the following: 2.19.12 *comas] manus*; 2.34.36 *uias] rates*; 3.8.14 *uias] comas*; 3.12.24 *morae] uiae*. My conjecture is *morae*, ‘lingering’, a word used by Propertius 21 times. Cf. 1.16.39–40

ut me tam longa raucum patiare querela
sollicitas triuio peruigilare moras. 40

The whole context recalls an earlier passage in the same poem (5–8):

nunc ego nocturnis potorum saucia rixis¹³
pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus,
et mihi non desunt turpes pendere corollae
semper et exclusi signa iacere faces. 5

The *signa* are the wine flask, torch and garland traditionally left on the doorstep by the subservient lover as he leaves: cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.67–70:

at tu, non laetis detracta corona capillis,
dura super tota limina nocte iace;
tu dominae, cum te proiectam mane uidebit,
temporis absumpti tam male testis eris. 70

Thus the *exclusus amator* will in time charm the girl and cheat her protectors.

Beroaldus, followed by many later commentators, found a strong contrast between *ebria signa* and *Mariano signo* (43). But the words *signa* and *fugae* were never prominent enough to make the contrast between military and amatory affairs a major part of the quatrain. Without *fugae*, *signa* remains a functional word.

3.8

Towards the end of his article on 3.8,¹⁴ J. L. Butrica makes the following statement: ‘the greatest paradox of all is that Cynthia’s infidelity is supposed to be proof of her passion and that Propertius is supposed to enjoy that infidelity, when the lover traditionally desires sole possession of the beloved’. I can find nothing in the poem

¹² I.e. the enclosure of an appositional phrase between adjective and noun, so named by O. Skutsch *RhM* 99 (1956), 198. Propertian examples occur at 1.11.30; 1.19.13; 2.3.14; 2.29.3 (reading *minuti*); 2.31.8; 3.3.31; 3.22.24; 4.1.12; 4.9.3, 18. Cf. also Williams, *Tradition and Originality* (Oxford, 1968), 317–18, 726–8, 770–1, and *Change and Decline* (Berkeley, 1978), 236.

¹³ *rixis* does not imply a fight, but the noise and violence of the *comus* itself: cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.71.

¹⁴ *TAPhA* 111 (1981), 23–30.

to suggest that infidelity proves passion; rather passion of one sort (*ira, furor, dolor, suspiria, lacrimae, iurgia*) indicates, and also enhances, passion of another (*calor, fides, amor* – note how these nouns are intensified by their epithets *uerus* 9, *grauis* 10, *certus* 18 and 19). Again, he says (p. 28), ‘Propertius implies that the infidelity gave him pleasure, not pain, and that it shows that Cynthia really loves him’, when in fact it is the *rixa* that gives him pleasure (*dulcis*), and the *rixa* that shows that Cynthia really loves him. We are not told the reason for the *rixa*, but it cannot simply be Cynthia’s infidelity, which would anger Propertius not Cynthia. The immediate cause is not important; what is important is the conclusion Propertius can draw – that Cynthia is emotionally attached to him.¹⁵ The flow of generalisations in the centre of the poem leads to the idea of rivals and at the end the poet reveals that there *is* a rival in his case. Cynthia’s show of passion has been so sweet because it has confirmed Propertius in his hopes that despite the rival’s temporary success he himself is in possession of her soul. Thanks to the *rixa*, he can end not with a whimpering curse but with a confident assertion that Cynthia feels nothing for his rival and all for himself.

One of Butrica’s footnotes does, however, draw attention to a forgotten textual problem. In verses 3–4 the paradosis *cur...?* (‘Why do you madly throw things at me?’) is impossible, for the question implies a rebuke and a request to desist, both of which conflict with the invitation to quarrel that follows. The conjectures *dum* and *cum* make the couplet a feeble adjunct of the previous one; there is no reason why Propertius should have put emphasis on the time at which he enjoyed the row. My solution is this:

Dulcis ad hesternas fuerat mihi rixa lucernas	
uocis et insanae tot maledicta tuae.	2
tu uero nostros audax inuade capillos	5
et mea formosis unguibus ora nota,	
tu minitare oculos subiecta exurere flamma,	
fac mea rescisso pectora nuda sinu!	8
cum furibunda mero mensam propellis et in me	3
proicis insana cymbia plena manu,	4
nimirum ueri dantur mihi signa caloris:	9
nam sine amore graui femina nulla dolet.	10

9–10 *post* 4 *iam* Carutti 3 *cum* Beroaldus: *cur* Ω 9 *haec ante* ueri Fontein

The transposition will have been the result of omission due to either homoeoarchon (*tu minitare* 7/ *cum* 3) or homoeoteleuton (*sinu* 8/ *manu* 4). There is now no need for an editor to introduce an exempli gratia conjecture to remove the improbable repetition of *insanus* in identical positions in consecutive pentameters. Moreover, with the traditional order verse 9 is somewhat unconnected with what precedes, the present indicative *dantur* assuming performance of the imperatives; the transposition relieves this slight awkwardness.

A problem of interpretation in the following lines was considered by Margaret Hubbard.¹⁶

quae mulier rabida iactat conuicia lingua,
 haec Veneris magnae uoluitur ante pedes;
 custodum grege si circa se stipat euntem,
 seu sequitur medias Maenas ut icta uias,

¹⁵ A similar idea is expressed by Catullus in poems 83 and 92.

¹⁶ *CQ* 18 (1968), 315–16.

seu timidam crebro dementia somnia terrent,
 seu miseram in tabula picta puella mouet,
 his ego tormentis animi sum uerus haruspex;
 has didici certo saepe in amore notas.

15

11 rabida *Scaliger*: grauida Ω 12 haec *Livineius*: et Ω 13 custodem *LP* grege
 si *Butrica*¹⁷ (grege seu iam *Heinsius*): gregi *SJK*: gregis *MUR*: gregibus *NTII* sej seu
Lachmann

She asserted that *his...tormentis animi* (17) refers not to the preceding alternatives (13–16) but to the *conuicia* of 11 on the grounds that 13 ‘does not look in the least like a symptom of love’. However, the other three lines clearly describe the lack of balance caused by strong emotion and can be paralleled in ancient poetry. Thus 16 recalls 2.6.9 ‘me iuuenum pictae facies, me nomina laedunt’, where Propertius is describing his own extravagant feelings;¹⁸ verse 15 reminds one of Dido: ‘Anna soror, quae me suspensam insomnia terrent!’ (Verg. *Aen.* 4.9); and for the Maenad used as an image of unrestrained passion the parallels are manifold – we may compare particularly Cat. 64.61, Verg. *Aen.* 4.300–3, Ov. *Ars* 2.379–80, 3.709–10, *Ciris* 163–7, Sen. *Medea* 382–6 and 849–51: all but the passage from the *Ciris* describe a woman made jealous, or fearful that she is losing her love. Thus these three lines, like verse 11, describe *tormenta animi* from which one can deduce powerful feelings of love. Interpretation of verse 13 must begin from this understanding of its context.

Butrica makes out a good case for believing that verses 25–6 should be either deleted or else preceded by a lacuna. But I cannot follow him in finding the couplet ‘very apposite in the context of difficulties in love’ (p. 27). He supposes that mention of another to whom the covert signs were directed came in the lacuna; but one is surprised to find this most important point ignored by the surviving couplet. Moreover, such covert infidelity is a very odd thing from which to derive pleasure: concealment suggests Cynthia does not want Propertius to know and therefore that her primary aim is not to hurt him. Nowhere else does he approve of infidelity itself as opposed to the pleasurable traumata of a fraught affair, and the surviving couplet is far more concrete than its context. With Jacoby¹⁹ I also feel that even a quatrain describing covert infidelity would upset the tempo here. Consequently I would delete the couplet.

An attempt to link the couplet 35–6 to its context was made by Hubbard.²⁰ She asked, ‘What is wrong with his going on to say he would not stand this behaviour from just anybody?’ We can answer ‘irrelevance to the main concerns of the poem’. 3.8 is about passionate anger and violence, not tyrannical behaviour (*superba*). *doleres*, as Hubbard remarks, hits a false note in the sense *κλάοις ἄν*, and nowhere else in the poem do we have any sense that Propertius is inclined to leave. Moreover the couplet intrudes between the first explicit mention of a rival for Propertius himself (33) and the exemplification of conflict with that rival, in the form of an elegiac curse.

3.13.15–16

felix Eois lex funeris una maritis
 quos Aurora suis rubra colorat equis.

15

16 aquis ζ (*Leid. Voss. lat.* 0 81, *Flor. Laur. pl.* 38, 37)

¹⁷ *The Manuscript Tradition*, 85.

¹⁸ Jacoby, *RhM* 69 (1914), 443–63, noted that *timidam* (15), *miseram* (16) echo *timidus*, *miser* at 2.6.13–14.

¹⁹ Op. cit. 455 n. 1.

²⁰ *CQ* 18 (1968), 316.

Happy <before all others> is one funeral practice of the Eastern husbands whom rosy Dawn colours with her horses.

How many *leges funeris* did these husbands have? The obvious parallel for *unus* in a beatitude is Vergil, *Aen.* 3.321:

o felix una ante alias Priameia uirgo,
hostilem ad tumulum Troiae sub moenibus altis
iussa mori, quae sortitus non pertulit ullos
nec uictoris heri tetigit captiua cubile.

Far from allaying doubts about *una*, this strengthens them; there were many daughters of Priam, but there is only one *lex funeris* for the Eastern men described. The particular pre-eminent maiden is defined by the rest of the sentence, but in the Propertian beatitude the particular *lex funeris* is not defined; it does not need to be, as there is only one, the well-known practice of suttee. Where *unus* is used in the sense *unus ante alios*,²¹ the substantive it qualifies is always specific, either referring to an individual member of an easily identified group, or else being defined by a demonstrative. What Propertius wrote is *illa*; the confusion of the words is universal – we may note 2.16.12 *illa TSMUR*: *una NITu.1.JK*. This provides the demonstrative element usual, almost obligatory, in a beatitude.

In the pentameter the humanistic reading *aquis* is, I believe, correct. We must contrast Tib. 2.3.55–6

illi sint comites fuscī, quos India torret
Solis et admotis inficit ignis equis, 55

where the participle forms an ablative absolute with the noun. The waters of the sun make an adequate instrumental ablative on their own. They are shown to be a suitable tanning agent by Martial 7.30.4 *a rubris et niger Indus aquis*; it was not absurd for an ancient to ascribe the sun's power to burn to its waters. Propertius himself accepted the account of Indian pigmentation alluded to by Martial – cf. 4.3.10

ustus et Eoa decolor Indus aqua.

Perhaps *ustus* should be replaced by Housman's *tusus* (cf. Cat. 11.4, cited below) or Postgate's *tinctus*; but I fancy the tradition is right, and Propertius is emphasising the paradox with which he has already played. An Ovidian couplet (*Ars* 1.723–4)

candidus in nauta turpis color: aequoris unda
debet et a radiis sideris esse niger.

provides an ambiguous account of tanning as a result either of sea and sun, or, if we read the ablatives as a hendiadys, of the sun's rays bouncing off water.

There is no difficulty in describing the waters as belonging to Aurora. The sea is often called after Aurora's Greek counterpart Eos (quietly juxtaposed here), for example at Catullus 11.3–4

litus ut longe resonante Eoa
tunditur unda.

Other passages (1.14.12 *Rubris aequoribus*; Tib. 2.2.16 *Eoi qua maris unda rubet*; Verg. *Aen.* 8.686; Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.31–2 *Eois...partibus Oceanoque rubro*; and [Tib.] 3.8.19–20

et quascumque niger Rubro de litore gemmas
proximus Eois colligit Indus aquis) 20

²¹ See J. P. Postgate, *JPh* 21 (1893), 66–8; he talks of 'the numerical reference which *unus* always imports'.

suggest there may be a further point: the *mare rubrum* is so coloured (and so called) because *Aurora rubra* rose thence. For *suus* used to point an etymology cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.823–4 ‘reddentemque suo non regia iura Quiriti | abstulit Iliaden’ and Sen. *Med.* 726 ‘nomenque terris qui dedit Baetis suis’.

My argument, then, is not that *equis* is impossible (after all Propertius is notoriously free in his use of the ablative), but that *aquis* gives the line far more point; given the ease with which these words are interchanged²² (especially at the end of the pentameter and in a context where either word makes sense) I would have little hesitation in accepting *aquis*.

Ovid brilliantly brought together the three Propertian passages (1.14.12, 3.13.16, 4.3.10) at *Ars* 3.130

quos legit in uiridi decolor Indus aqua.

His own contribution, the formulaic ‘green’ for sea, aptly displaces Propertius’ etymological *ruber*.

For other passages linking Indians, dark skin and water see Fedeli on 4.3.10. The concept reappears, of a different locality, at 3.11.18. For a prose discussion of whether the sun or drinking water is responsible for tanning, see Strabo 15.1.24.

3.22.11–14

tuque tuo Colchum propellas remige Phasim,
Peliacaeque trabis totum iter ipse legas,
qua rudis Argoa natat inter saxa columba
in faciem prorae pinus adacta nouae.

The grammar of the phrase *Argoa columba* has not been satisfactorily explained. Richardson, for example, calls it ‘a loose instrumental ablative’ – but with what verb does it stand in an instrumental relationship? We have to understand ‘led’; one might compare the omission of *tractum* at 3.1.28

Hectora per campos ter maculasse rotas,

but that is far easier because Hector has no other participle agreeing with him. If *columba* is an instrument, the syntax of the sentence would place it with *adacta*. Moreover, the attachment to *columba* of the adjective *Argoa* is, as Butler and Barber say, ‘a highly artificial way of introducing the name of the ship’. Indeed, after the proper names of the previous couplet and amidst the detailed description here, the name is quite superfluous. The combination of grammatical deficiency and this superfluity points to a corruption; *Argo* has entered the line from a clarifying supralineal gloss and extruded all but the last letter of the participial element of an ablative absolute. I would print <*immissa*>, comparing 2.26.40

dux erat ignoto missa columba mari.

But other verbs might serve as well or better.²³

I suspect *nouae* as well. Surely the point is not that this particular ship appeared new but that the form itself was new. Suggestions that we have a transferred epithet do not convince me. Hypallage commonly occurs when an epithet is applied not to

²² Cf. 4.11.102; Sen. *Herc.* 132–3 ‘iam caeruleis euectus aquis | Titan summa prospicit Oeta’: *aquis recc.*: *equis E*: *deest A* (a reference I owe to Professor Reeve).

²³ Oddly enough, Burman’s *Vaticanus quintus* is reported to have read *Argoduce*: a second gloss has extirpated the one surviving letter of the original word.

a genitive but to the noun on which it depends (cf. Bailey's list of transferred epithets in Lucretius, vol. 1, Prol. vii §12); here we find the opposite. Nor does *nouae* have any metrical benefit. Read *nouam*. For corruption caused by scribal desire to rhyme the precaesural and the final word see Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (Urbana, 1972), 102–8.

4.1.1–10

Hoc quodcumque uides, hospes, qua maxima Roma est,
ante Phrygem Aenean collis et herba fuit:
atque ubi Nauali stant sacra Palatia Phoebos,
Euandri profugae concubuerunt boues.
fictilibus creuere deis haec aurea templa, 5
nec fuit opprobrium facta sine arte casa;
Tarpeiusque pater nuda de rupe tonabat,
et Tiberis nostris aduena bubus erat.
qua gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulit, olim
unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus. 10

1 qua *Carrio*: quam *Ω* 8 bubus *NA*: tutus *II*: temptus *Baehrens*: tortus *Postgate*: Tuscus *Havet* 9 qua *ζ*: quo *IIA*: quod *N*: quot *Dieterich*

Verses 5–6 establish Rome's buildings as the subject, and this theme is continued by 7, 9–10, and the following couplets. If it is to fit within this context, 8 must either have a temporal sense subordinate to 7, or refer to buildings itself.

Commentators eagerly point to parallels for the presence of cattle in early Rome: e.g. Prop. 3.9.49; Verg. *Aen.* 8.360–1; Tib. 2.5.25–6; Ov. *Ars* 3.119–20, *Fast.* 5.639–42. But they fail to parallel two different groups of cattle grazing in one context. Either *boues* in 4 or *bubus* in 8 is superfluous.

Commentators either make nonsense of verse 8, or else mistranslate. Many, following Beroaldus, take <*tunc*> *aduena* as an opposition to *nunc urbanus*; but this misses the whole point: no oxen drank the Tiber at Rome under Augustus. Paley says, “‘the Tiber rolled his waters from afar (only) for our oxen’”, not for the inhabitants of a mighty city’. Where are the words ‘rolled his waters’ and ‘only’ in Propertius? Butler, in the Loeb, has ‘And Tiber still was strange to our cattle’. *aduena* does not mean ‘strange’; ‘still’ is not in the Latin. Butler and Barber render: ‘alien Tiber served our oxen’. *erat* does not mean ‘served’. Rothstein claims that Propertius is trying to say two things at once, which is tantamount to acknowledging that the sentence is a nonsense: ‘Der aus Etrurien kommende Tiber kam damals aus einem fremden Lande. Das ist der Hauptgedanke, aber auch *bubus* ist wichtig; an den Fluss, der jetzt von Villen eingefasst und von Fahrzeugen belebt ist, wurden damals die Herden zur Tränke geführt.’

Given the Ovidian parallels, *Fast.* 2.68

qua petit aequoreas aduena Thybris aquas

and *Fast.* 3.524

non procul a ripis, aduena Thybri, tuis,

it is probable that *aduena* is attributive not predicative; the sentence therefore lacks a complement. This grammatical deficiency and the superfluity of cattle together diagnose the corruption. The contextual emphasis on buildings points to the correction. For *bubus* read *murus*: ‘and foreign Tiber was the Romans’ wall’. The noun is used in this metaphorical way also at 4.4.13 (*muris erant montes*), and rivers serve

as protective walls in Curtius (7.4.5) and Ammianus (14.2.9). Substantival *nostri* for *Romani* is a natural Latin idiom. Though rare in poetry, it does occur. Ovid provides two examples (*Fast.* 6.545; *Trist.* 4.2.33) and Juvenal another (10.273); two Vergilian characters use *nostri* in the sense ‘my fellow citizens’ – Aeneas of the Trojans (*Aen.* 2.411), Evander of his Arcadian followers (*Aen.* 8.222); and Propertius himself has *nostra* for *puella Romana* at 3.14.29.

The verse now fits in its context: Jove had no temple, the citizens had no walls. The fact that the river is of foreign origin²⁴ added to the insecurity. The lack of walls fits chronologically before the mention of Remus (9), and is a detail picked out also by Tibullus in his description of primitive Rome (2.5.23–4).

It seems probable that the corruption occurred in a single stage. A scribe, with Evander’s cattle in his mind from verse 4 and recalling such lines as *Ov. Fast.* 1.244

tantaque res paucis pascua bubus erat,

wrote the wrong trochee. But it is also conceivable that the eight minims of *murus* were misread as *uuuus* and that in turn interpreted as *bubus*.

4.5.57–8

qui uersus, Coae dederit nec munera uestis,
istius tibi sit surda sine arte lyra.

58 istius ς: ipsius Ω arte Π: aere ΝΑ

It is not a foregone conclusion whether Π or ΝΑ is correct here. Either reading could have arisen through error or interpolation. *sine arte* is the more familiar phrase, and has occurred at 4.1.6; but Acanthis’ talk is all of gain, and there is contextual pressure (n.b. *aera* 50; *aurum* 53) for a change to *aere*. Modern editors are fairly evenly divided. The problem is compounded by doubt about how to construe the phrase: adjectivally with *lyra* (‘tuneless’, ‘penniless’), or adverbially, either with the whole clause (‘if he brings no money’) or with *surda* (‘tunelessly silent’). Against *arte* it is held that it introduces an ‘extraneous idea’ (Richardson): aesthetic criticism is no part of the *lena*’s character; against *aere*, that it inelegantly repeats the *nec munera dederit* of the hexameter. A fresh look at the hexameter suggests, however, that this objection is not as strong as Housman thought (*JPh* 21 [1893], 159 = *CP* 275). The reader who copied out 1.2.1–2 as a comment on 57 would have shown greater acuteness if he had chosen 2.1.5–6 instead:

siue illam Cois fulgentem incedere <uidi>,
totum de Coa ueste uolumen erit.²⁵

5

Thanks to Philetas, not only fine garments but fine poems may be made of Coan material. *uestis* is not apparently used of literary texture by other writers, but given the familiarity of weaving as a metaphor for writing,²⁶ it would have caused readers no difficulty. It is probable that Propertius owes the particular comparison to Callimachus: cf. fr. 532 τῷ ἱκελὸν τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κώϊον, and Pfeiffer’s note: Schneider had suspected this was a reference to the poetry of Philetas; Pfeiffer suggests further that Callimachus ‘comparat γράμμα Coum, ut λεπτόν, illi Coο ὑφάσματι tenuissimo’.

²⁴ In addition to the *Fasti* passages, cf. also Varro *L.L.* 5.29.

²⁵ I accept Schrader’s *totum de*, anticipated by an unknown Italian, to preserve the punning nature of the prologue; but this decision does not affect the current argument.

²⁶ Cf. e.g. E. Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto, 1972), 159–60.

4.5.54 has established that poems are not valuable, not real gifts; 57 can be translated ‘the man who gives you verses, and not dresses, of Coan cloth’, and means ‘the Philetean poet’. There should be a comma not after *uersus*, but after *dederit* and after *munera* (if at all). The use of *nec munera* is parenthetical, making a neat point that Propertius had used at 2.1.6 and thought worthy of repetition. Now we can accept *aere* in 58 and translate either ‘don’t listen to his penniless lyre’, *sine aere* characterising the poor elegiac poet, or ‘don’t listen to his lyre unless he pays you’. I prefer the former on the grounds that Propertius as poet *is* penniless, and because the insulting contrast set up with 45–6 is not then diminished by a rider; the elegiac poet has no money and so there are no circumstances under which it is worth while indulging him.

Someone may object that this learning fits the *lena* no better than aesthetic criticism. But a clear distinction must be drawn between diction and sentiment: cf. 43–4 with the erudite reference to Menander, and, perhaps, in the pentameter, to Terence, *Phormio* 47; and the *recherché* mythology of 4.3.21–2 used by the ingenuous Arethusa to make a heartfelt point. Propertius’ creations talk in Propertian verse, but their sentiments are true to their characters.

4.9.11–14

hic, ne certa forent manifesta^que signa rapinae, 11
 auersos cauda traxit in antra boues,
 nec sine teste deo: furem sonuere iuuenci,
 furis et implacidas diruit ira fores.

11 manifesta^que *Luck*: manifesta *Ta.c.MK*: manifestae *NITp.c.SURJ*

*Luck*²⁷ pointed out that the technical term *furtum manifestum* is not relevant here; it is the appearance of clear tracks that *Cacus* fears. He cites *Ov. Trist.* 3.5.19

multaque praeterea manifesta^que signa fauoris,

where the *Hauniensis* alone has *manifestaque*, whilst the *Laurentian*, the oldest and best witness, has *manifesta* and the residue *manifesti*. His conjecture is plausible, and receives support from three of the four independent branches of the *A* tradition: *TMK* preserve the same stage of corruption as the *Laurentian* in the *Tristia*. It is clear that *manifesta^e* or something similar must have stood in *A*, and may well have been in *Ω*. The unmetrical *-a* might have resulted from assimilation to the ending of *signa*, but given the sense and the *Ovidian* parallel, it seems more likely that the omission of *que* led to the corruption.

furem sonuere (13) is anomalous. Commentators have tried two main approaches. (i) Most take the verb in the sense ‘revealed’; but there are no passages closer than *Cic. Fin.* 2.6 (‘quid sonet haec uox uoluptatis’) and *Off.* 3.83 (‘ut haec duo uerba inter se discrepare, re unum sonare uideantur’), discourses of a quite different stylistic level, where the meaning is in fact ‘signify’ or ‘mean’, not ‘reveal’. (ii) More recently *Camps* and *Richardson* have taken the phrase to mean ‘lowed “Thief”’. One might adduce [*Sen.*] *Her. O.* 200 as a parallel:

natumque sonat flebilis *Atthis*;

but remarkable cattle as these were, they did not enunciate *fur* or *Cacus* in the way that *Procne* called on *Itys*.

The god earlier in the line is *Hercules* himself (cf. verses 32, 71, and *Verg. Aen.* 8.201): *Jove’s* awareness of the theft is irrelevant, and a link between it and the lowing of the

²⁷ *RhM* 105 (1962), 349.

cattle far-fetched. Consequently *nec sine teste deo* cannot belong with the preceding couplet: Hercules does not witness the actual theft. And yet the phrase cannot go with *sonuere iuueni*: why on earth stress that he heard the oxen lowing? It is the fact of the theft that the lowing reveals: cf. Dion. H. 1.39.3 καὶ ἐγγρόνει ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῶν κατήγορος τῆς κλοπῆς, and Verg. *Aen.* 8.213–18

interea, cum iam stabulis saturata moueret
Amphitryoniades armenta abitumque pararet,
discessu mugire boues atque omne querelis
impleri nemus et colles clamare propinqui.
reddidit una boum uocem uastoque sub antro
mugit et Caci spem custodita fefellit.

215

Write

nec sine teste deo furtum: sonuere iuueni;
furis et implacidas diruit ira fores.

‘But the theft did not go unnoticed by the god: the bulls lowed; and his anger destroyed the cruel gates of the thief.’

An advantage in taking Hercules as the *deus* in 13 is that it relieves the isolation of *ira* in 14, for the hero has not been mentioned otherwise since verse 4. One might have expected the noun to have a possessive adjective or a genitive to show that it is equivalent to *Hercules iratus* (cf. *amor Herculis* at 1.13.23), but any desire to change to *ille*, supposing corruption from 2.5.22 (‘nec mea praeclusas frerit ira fores’), should be resisted. For *ira* contributes to one of the many significant parallelisms²⁸ between the first and second halves of this elegy: cf. verse 62

nec tulit iratam ianua clausa sitim.

Anger is also a signal element of Hercules’ response to the theft in the *Aeneid* (cf. 8.219, 228, 230). Propertius follows Vergil’s account against an alternative tradition in having the stolen cattle reveal the theft itself. In Livy 1.7.6, Ov. *Fast.* 1.547–8, Dion. H. 1.39.3 the god has already counted the herd and noticed the loss before the hiding place is revealed by the lowing.

4.10.19

idem eques et frenis, idem fuit aptus aratris.

equis *Guyet* e frenis *Postgate*: ecfrenis *Richmond* idem et fuit *Livineius*

There are excellent analogies for *et* used only in the first half of a balanced line, at Ov. *Fast.* 6.224:

utilis et nuptis, utilis esse uiris,

and at Verg. *Buc.* 4.6, Ov. *Met.* 1.54, 5.612; one would say no more, if *eques* were not suspect. Camps well senses the problem, though he does not change the text: *eques* applies only to *frenis* – Romulus is not a knight when he walks behind the plough. If the noun is the subject, to be taken with each *idem*, it is most ineptly chosen, as it confuses the symmetry of the verse, by fitting one half and not the other. It is possible that the poet wrote *aeque*; *eque* gained an *f* from the following *f* and *et* was added for the metre. ‘This one man was equally suited to the use of reins and of the plough.’²⁹

University of Sheffield

S. J. HEYWORTH

²⁸ See W. S. Anderson, *AJPh* 85 (1964), 1–12, esp. 4.

²⁹ I owe sincere thanks to Mr W. A. Camps, Professors E. J. Kenney, F. H. Sandbach, and J. L. Butrica, and the editors of *CQ*, for their encouragement and critical comments.