CRUCES PROPERTIANAE*

In classical antiquity Propertius' eloquence was renowned. His successor Ovid referred to the *blandi praecepta Properti* (*Trist.* 2.465) and to *blandi...Propertius oris* (ibid. 5.1.15). Quintilian (10.1.93) stated that to his taste the most *tersus* and *elegans* Latin elegist was Tibullus, but *sunt qui Propertium malint*. Martial (14.189) mentioned the *facundi carmen iuuenale Properti*.

Turn now from the opinions of ancient authors to those of some modern commentators as they try to elucidate various passages as presented in the extant manuscripts, and you encounter not the adjectives *blandus*, *tersus*, *elegans*, and *facundus*, but 'strange', 'obscure', 'odd', 'slovenly', and the like.

A major reason for such striking differences of opinion should be evident. Ovid, to whom Propertius was *blandi oris*, read a text separated from Propertius' autograph by at most a few decades. Modern scholars, however, must form their text from a few relatively late manuscripts,[1] none earlier than *c.* 1200, in which Propertius' eloquence has been obscured by over twelve centuries of careless blundering and deliberate interpolation by a succession of scribes.[2]

A generally accepted example of deliberate interpolation in the Propertian archetype is found at 2.32.3–6:

> nam quid Praenesti dubias, o Cynthia, sortes,
>   quid petis Aeaei moenia Telegoni?
> cur tua te Herculeum deportant esseda Tibur?
>   Appia cur totiens te uia †ducit anum†?

(*ducit* FLP, *dicit* N), where the name of some neighbouring town is required in the fourth verse to balance Praeneste, Tusculum, and Herculeum in the preceding three.[3] J. Jortin[4] brilliantly conjectured *Lanuuium*, and Housman offered a plausible account of the corruption: '*la* was lost in *ia*; *uianuuium* suggested *uia anum*, and *ducit* was added for the sake of the metre'.[5] When one must contend with an archetype corrupted by interpolations like this, true emendations need not closely resemble the *ductus litterarum*, especially when a cause of interpolation can reasonably be suggested.

Another such interpolation is found at 2.13.45–50, where Propertius gives an example of a man who would not have witnessed the death of a loved one if he had not lived so long. The manuscripts present

> nam quo tam dubiae seruetur spiritus horae?   45
>   Nestoris est uisus post tria saecla cinis.
> quis tam longaeuae minuisset fata senectae
>   †Gallicus† Iliacis miles in aggeribus,
> non aut Antilochi uidisset corpus humari,
>   diceret aut 'O mors, cur mihi sera uenis?'   50

47 minuisset NP, iurauisset F   49 aut *Mueller, om.* N, ille FP

Propertius seems to have composed the couplet 47–8 under the influence of Catullus' pentameter 68.86

> si miles muros isset ad Iliacos.

Before considering the emendation of the manifestly corrupt[6] *Gallicus* in verse 48, it will be well to attend to the less severe corruption in the first half of line 47. There is no reason to alter, as most editors do, the phrase *longaeuae...senectae*; cf. *senectae...uiuacis* at Pliny, *N.H* 7.167, and Camps has already adduced *longaeua uetustas* from Martial, *Spect.* 5.3. Thus we should read either *si tam longaeuae* with Volscus and Beroaldus or *cui si longaeuae* with Livineius and Heinsius; in the latter

---

[3] The requirement of the name of a town tells against Shackleton Bailey's effort (p. 126) to defend the *ducit anus* offered by the late manuscript Leidensis Vossianus 117; moreover, P. J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Leiden, 1962), 406, has refuted his attempt to reject the objection raised by J. J. Hartman, *Mnem.* 49 (1921), 315, and 50 (1922), 109, that *uia ducit aliquem* 'omni carere sensu nisi *quo* ducat addatur'. Shackleton Bailey's defence of the readings of the manuscripts was necessitated by his belief, articulated in his introduction (pp. xf.), that the archetype was free of interpolation. The archetype would be incriminated no less by Shackleton Bailey's own emendation of 1.2.13, where for *persuadent* he proposes the emendation '*sua gaudent*, reduced to *suadent* and then expanded, *metri causa*, to *persuadent* (see Housman, *Manilius*, I, pref. pp. lixff.)'.

[4] *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, Ancient and Modern*, (London, 1731), i.253ff., which to this day remains a useful discussion.

[5] *JPh* 21 (1893), 120. Richardson advocates his own conjecture *Ariciam* on the grounds of palaeographical facility, but *ariciā* bears only a marginal resemblance to *ducit*; moreover, *Ariciam anus* in unmetrical, for elegists elide only a short open vowel, and possibly only -*ĕ*, at this point in the pentameter; cf. M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge, 1951), 87 and 90, to whose examples should be added Propertius 3.11.22, as noted by R. J. Getty, *CPh* 48 (1953), 191 n. 3.

[6] I have no desire to slay the slain, so I shall only remark that anyone unlucky enough to stumble across the defence of *Gallicus* by T. Birt, *RhM* 51 (1896), 505ff., can restore his mental equilibrium by consulting A. E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (London, 1903), xlvf.

case *Cuisi* will have become *Quis* and then *tam* will have been imported from verse 45.

In place of *Gallicus* not less than 33 emendations have been proposed. The best of the palaeographical conjectures are E. H. van Eldik's *callidus*[7] and R. G. Bury's *chalceus*,[8] but even they are unsatisfactory, for what would the epithet 'experienced' or 'brazen' add to the context? Other critics have assumed that *Gallicus* has replaced some adjective meaning 'Trojan' or the like and accordingly have conjectured *Ilius*, *Troius*, *Troicus*, *Dardanus*, *Caricus*, and *Thracius*. However, these proposals fail to account for the appearance of *Gallicus* in the manuscripts.[9] Still other critics think that Propertius is alluding to an incident where Nestor's life was endangered, either by Hector, as described at *Il.* 8.99–197, or by Memnon, when Nestor tried in vain to save his son Antilochus (Quintus Smyrnaeus, 2.244; Pindar, *Pyth.* 6.28; this latter incident has provoked the conjectures *Africus, caerulus, Palticus*, and *illis Niliacus*); but these encounters took place in the Trojan plain away from the city, not *Iliacis...in aggeribus*.[10]

As a matter of fact, Nestor's life probably never was endangered by a soldier on the walls of Ilion; at *Il.* 4.321–5 Nestor says

> εἰ τότε κοῦρος ἔα, νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ὀπάζει.
> ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς ἱππεῦσι μετέσσομαι ἠδὲ κελεύσω
> βουλῇ καὶ μύθοισι· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ γερόντων.
> αἰχμὰς δ' αἰχμάσσουσι νεώτεροι, οἵ περ ἐμεῖο
> ὁπλότεροι γεγάασι πεποίθασίν τε βίηφιν,

and certainly we have no record of his ever having risked his life assaulting the walls of the city. Thus it would appear that Propertius' statement is purely hypothetical, and the reference is not to what a particular Trojan warrior failed to do to Nestor but to what any soldier might have done had Nestor been more reckless. The necessary sense was seen long ago by J. P. d'Orville when he made his impossible proposal to interpret *quis* as *aliquis*;[11] in the words of Butler and Barber, 'If some soldier on the walls of Troy had cut short his doom of long old age', and in those of Enk, 'melius...fuerat Nestorem ab aliquo ignoto aduersario interfectum esse quam filium vidisse interfectum'. The required sense is obvious, and this is how to obtain it:

> cui si longaeuae minuisset fata senectae
>   Iliacis aliquis miles in aggeribus

For parallels to *aliquis miles* in Propertius see 2.5.25 *rusticus...aliquis* and 3.23.19 *aliquis...auarus*, and for some in other poets see *aliquis senior* at Tibullus 2.4.47 and

---

[7] *Apud* Burman, *ad loc.*   [8] *PCPhS* 172–4 (1940), 7.

[9] *Caricus* comes closest, and what little can be said in its favour has been presented by P. J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Leiden, 1962), 199; but the Carians played a very peripheral role in the Trojan War. They appear only twice in the *Iliad*; at 2.867 they are briefly mentioned along with the other Trojan allies, and at 10.428 they are sleeping πρὸς μὲν ἁλός. The proverb adduced by Shackleton Bailey (*apud* Enk), to the effect that Carians were contemptible, is of minimal relevance.

[10] It has been suggested to me that Propertius might have used *Iliacis...in aggeribus* metaphorically, like the English 'in the trenches', to denote the fighting in the Trojan plain; however, there seems to be no evidence that Romans ever used *in aggeribus* in this figurative sense, and in any event *in aggeribus* would be a pretty strange way of indicating the mobile warfare in the Trojan plain. At least for me, the meaning of 'si...minuisset fata...*Iliacis* miles *in aggeribus*' is established by the fact that Propertius is clearly imitating Catullus 68.86 'si miles *muros* isset *ad Iliacos*'.

[11] *Miscellaneae Observationes in Auctores Veteres et Recentiores* (Amsterdam, 1733), iii.435. Smyth attributes the same interpretation to F. Puccius.

Ovid, *Met.* 11.749, *aliquis...hospes* at *Amores* 3.15.11, *aliquis...sedulus* at *Ars Am.* 3.699, *aliquis casus* at *Rem. Am.* 673, and *aliquis scopulus* at *Ibis* 339.[12] The referee has reminded me that 'it is the Latin poetic manner to be specific in mythological scenes', which indeed is true – when an event handed down by tradition is being related. However, when a poet is hypothesising what *could* or *might* have happened, he of course cannot be nearly so specific. To take a clear-cut example, in his 15th Satire Juvenal relates an instance of cannibalism among the Egyptians, which he fears his audience will find incredible. He says that when Ulysses told the Phaeacians similar tales about the Cyclops and the Laestrygones, he perhaps provoked an angry outburst of disbelief. But of course nothing like this ever happened; on the contrary,

> ...οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
> κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα

(*Od.* 11.333–4 = 13.1–2). Juvenal concludes the hypothetical diatribe, which of course he cannot attribute to a particular Phaeacian, by saying (15.24–5)

> sic *aliquis* merito *nondum ebrius* et minimum qui
> de Corcyraea temetum duxerat urna.

Furthermore, with Propertius' figure of *aliquis miles* slaying Nestor compare Homer's employment of τις in similar scenes at *Il.* 4.196 = 206, 5.316 = 345, 8.95, 21.112, and 24.734.

I should suppose that the root of the corruption was the very common substitution of *c* for *qu*; under the influence of the preceding *Iliacis* an early scribe wrote *alicis* for *aliquis*. Now in mixed uncials there is a form of *s* which looks much like a minuscule *g*,[13] and if a Carolingian scribe found ιλιαϲιϲalιcιϲ in his exemplar he might well misread the first ϲ as ᵍ and write ιλιαϲιᵍalιcιϲ. For a French scribe the subsequent change of *galicis miles* to *gallicus miles* would be entirely natural, and the easiest way for the next scribe to repair the metre would be to transpose *iliacis* and *gallicus*. With the alteration of *aliquis* to *gallicus* compare the converse change of *galli* to *alii* at Caesar, *B.G.* 1.41.4 and Livy 24.42.7. The metrical transposition of *iliacis* and *gallicus*, although violent, is no more so than the metrical insertion of *ducit* at 2.32.6; several metrical transpositions in the manuscripts of other Latin poets were presented by Housman in his 'Manilius'.[14] If this type of multi-step corruption

[12] In place of *Gallicus* F. Kindscher, *RhM* 17 (1862), 216f., conjectured *Quiuis*, which is not hard palaeographically (*Quiuis* → *Gaiius* → *Gallicus*), but the adjective required is not 'whichever you choose' = *quiuis* but 'some' = *aliquis*.

[13] E.g. see E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford, 1912), Facsimile 97. The same error of *g* for *s* is found in the manuscripts of Caesar at *B.G.* 1.53.7, where the β manuscripts correctly have *ter sortibus* and the α manuscripts have the corruption *tergoribus*. Other instances, from Manilius and Vergil, were presented by Housman, *CR* 17 (1903), 343. A corruption at least partially due to the similarity of *g* and *s* in mixed uncials has occurred at Propertius 1.2.13–14:

> litora natiuis †persuadent† picta lapillis,
>   et uolucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.

We cannot be sure precisely what Propertius wrote in place of the inappropriate *persuadent*, but I am certain that it was either *praegaudent* (A. Otto, in *Commentationes Woelfflinianae* (Leipzig, 1891), 147, citing Silius Italicus 15.306) or *pergaudent* (P. J. Enk, *Mnemosyne* 3 (1935–6), 152f.; cf. Cicero, *Q, Fr.* 3.1.9) or *sua gaudent* (Shackleton Bailey, *ad loc.*). To illustrate this use of *gaudere* Enk adduced Propertius 3.14.9 'ad caestum gaudentia bracchia', Vergil, *Georg.* 4.120–1 'quoque modo putis gauderent intiba riuis | et uirides apio ripae', and Statius, *Silv.* 1.3.55–6 'uarias ubi picta per artes | gaudet humus', and Shackleton Bailey cited Petronius 120.74–5 'saxa | gaudent ferali circum tumulata cupressu'; I may add Vergil, *Ecl.* 9.48 'segetes gauderent frugibus' and *Lydia* 16–17 'gaudebunt siluae, gaudebunt mollia prata | et gelidi fontes, auiumque silentia fient'.

[14] *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (London, 1903), pp. lxviff.

seems unlikely, compare how 'diuolsus queremoniis', the reading of most of Horace's manuscripts at *Carm.* 1.13.19, was corrupted to 'diuolsusque prementibus' in a few s. IX/X manuscripts.[15]

At 3.9.37–40, amidst a panegyric on Maecenas, Propertius states that he will not narrate the destructions of famous cities, such as Thebes and Troy:

> non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse †paternos†
>   Cadmi nec septem proelia clade pari;
> nec referam Scaeas et Pergama, Apollinis arces,
>   et Danaum decimo uere redisse rates.   40

37 flebo FLP, phebo N   38 septem *Lipsius*, semper NFLP

Before proceeding with the consideration of the vexatious *paternos*, it will be well to establish the correctness of J. Lipsius' *septem*[16] against a misguided attempt to defend the manuscript reading *semper*. A. Palmer[17] and Housman[18] maintained that *nec semper proelia clade pari* could mean *et proelia non semper clade pari*. In support of this interpretation Butler and Barber adduce 2.28.52, where *nec proba Pasiphae* means *et improba Pasiphae*, but they admit that *nec semper proelia clade pari* 'is most obscure'. This interpretation is adopted with considerably greater confidence by Camps[19] and Richardson.

Against this sophistical defence of *nec semper* one may make a basic point which has as much to do with simple logic as with Latin grammar. In a sentence whose structure is *non* + verb + direct object + *nec* + direct object, the conjunction *nec* can only mean 'nor'; it negates the action of the verb, not a characteristic of the direct object. I do not propose to belabour this point, so I shall merely adduce the close parallel, in both subject and construction, at 2.1.19–22:

> non ego Titanas canerem, non Ossan Olympo
>   impositam, ut caeli Pelion esset iter,
> nec ueteres Thebas, nec Pergama nomen Homeri,
>   Xerxis et imperio bina coisse uada,

Would any defender of the proposition *nec semper = et non semper* dare to interpret *nec ueteres Thebas* as *et nouas Thebas*?

Camps rejected Lipsius' *septem* 'since it would bring in the two wars [of the Seven and the Epigoni] in inverted order and leave the point of the hexameter irretrievably obscure; moreover the Seven Champions were not all killed, Adrastus surviving'. In response I should say that inverted chronological order is not uncommon in Propertius; for one of many examples, see 3.1.25–8, where Propertius mentions first the Trojan Horse and then Achilles' battle with the rivers of the Trojan plain. Moreover, the cause of the irretrievable obscurity in the hexameter is not Lipsius' *septem* in the pentameter but the obscure *paternos* in the hexameter itself. Furthermore, Adrastus' survival poses no obstacle to *septem proelia clade pari*, for Propertius could well have followed the version, presented in Aeschylus' *Septem* and Euripides' *Supplices*, in which Adrastus was not reckoned as one of the Seven Champions, who were Tydeus, Capaneus, Eteoclus, Hippomedon, Parthenopaeus, Amphiaraus, and Polynices.

[15] Housman, *JPh* 18 (1890), 26.
[16] *Opera Omnia, quae ad Criticam proprie spectant* (Leiden, 1596), 57.
[17] *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum Libri* (London, 1880), *ad loc.*
[18] *CR* 9 (1895), 352.
[19] In fairness to Camps, I should say that after reading a draft of this article he wrote to me 'I'm [now] much less confident than I was in the reasoning in the note I provided on that passage'.

In support of the emendation *septem* Lipsius himself and then Burman adduced Propertius' own words at 1.7.17–18:

> ...longe miser agmina *septem*
> *flebis* in aeterno surda iacere situ,

a neat parallel to 'non *flebo...septem* proelia clade pari' which has been neglected by the host of subsequent editors who have rejected *septem*, which derives even further support from Manilius 3.14–16

> *non* annosa *canam* Messenes bella nocentis,
> *septenosue duces* ereptaque fulmine flammis
> moenia Thebarum et uictam quia uicerat urbem,

and from Ovid, *Trist.* 2.2.319–20

> cur *tacui* Thebas et uulnera mutua fratrum
>   et *septem* portas sub duce quamque suo?

Furthermore, Housman[20] records the identical corruption of *septem* to *semper* at Seneca, *Oed.* 130 'non satis septem patuere portae', where the *septem* of the MSS (s. XI and later) has been corrupted to *semper* in the *excerpta Thuanea* (s. IX).

Now we may turn our attention to the hexameter, and again we must confront a defence of a questionable phrase, in this case *cineres...paternos*. Tremenheere, Butler and Barber, Camps, and Richardson maintain that it indicates the ashes of the fathers of the Epigoni. This interpretation, however, is afflicted with difficulties. First, in the absence of an explicit mention of the Epigoni, the adjective *paternos* lacks a clear referent. Secondly, 'in cineres arcem sedisse paternos | Cadmi' is inconsistent both with the Athenian tradition, that the Seven were buried at Eleusis (Herodotus 9.27; Euripides, *Supplices*, passim; Pausanias 1.39.2; Plutarch, *Theseus* 29.4–5), and with that of the Thebans (Homer, *Il.* 14.114 (athetised by Zenodotus and not read by Aristophanes);[21] Pindar, *Olymp.* 6.23, *Nem.* 9.15; Pausanias 9.18.2),[22] who located the tombs and the pyres of the Seven at some distance from the Cadmeia;[23] Tydeus' ashes were covered by the χυτή...γαῖα according to Homer (*Il.* 14.114) and by a heap of stones according to the Thebans (Pausanias 9.18.2), not by the ruins of the Cadmeia. Thirdly and most importantly, Propertius' diction in this passage should be similar to that used by other Roman authors who describe similar destructions by conflagration; e.g., Vergil, *Aen.* 2.624–5

> Tum uero omne mihi uisum *considere in ignis*
> Ilium...

and *Aen.* 9.144–5

> ...at non uiderunt moenia Troiae
> Neptuni fabricata manu *considere in ignis*?

and Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.33.3 'cum omnia sacra profanaque *in ignem considerent*' [at Cremona], which were cited long ago by Broukhusius and more recently in the *ThLL*, which adds Ammianus Marcellinus 22.9.4 'cuius moenia cum uidisset *in fauillas miserabiles consedisse*' [at Nicomedia].[24] Thus we see that the *cineres* should be those

---

[20] *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (London, 1903), p. lix.

[21] See H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* III (Berlin, 1974), *ad* 14.114.

[22] None of these passages seems to have been cited by any commentator on Propertius.

[23] See F. Schober, *RE* 5A (1934), cols. 1443–5 and the map in cols. 1425–6, s.v. Thebai, for the sites of the pyres and the tombs indicated by the Thebans.

[24] J. Broukhusius, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum Libri Quatuor* (Amsterdam, 1727), 300, *ad loc.*; *ThLL* IV (1907), col. 435.67–71, s.v. *consido*. These passages are of considerably more

of the Cadmeia itself. Hence *paternos* cannot stand,[25] and we may now consider how
to emend it.

Heinsius proposed *paternam*, but the *arcem...paternam Cadmi* could only be his
birthplace, Tyre; the same objection applies to Unger's *arces...paternas*. Postgate, who
was under the impression that the passage alluded to Semele's destruction by a
thunderbolt at the birth of Dionysus, proposed *repentes*,[26] but the general context
demands a reference to a major war celebrated in an epic.

The examples of Horace, *Epod.* 10.13–14

> cum Pallas *usto* uertit iram ab *Ilio*
>   in impiam Aiacis ratem,

Seneca, *Contr.* 10.5.1 'super *exustae Olynthi cinerem* stetit', Lucan 3.340

> et post translatas *exustae Phocidos arces,*

9.964

> circumit *exustae* nomen memorabile *Troiae,*

and especially 5.27–8

>   Tarpeia *sede perusta*
> Gallorum facibus...

suggest that at 3.9.37–8 Propertius wrote

> non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse perustam
>   Cadmi, nec septem proelia clade pari.

The use of *perurere* in this sense is adequately illustrated in the *OLD*, so here I shall
concentrate on emphasising the vividness of Propertius' imagery: the buildings of the
Cadmeia are set afire, and after the flames have consumed the supporting timbers,
they collapse into fiery ashes. Propertius could not have chosen a more appropriate
word than *perustam* to indicate the total destruction of the Cadmeia by the Epigoni.

To account for the corruption of *perustam* to *paternos* I would suppose that first
the cross-stroke was omitted from the ρ to yield the unintelligible puſταm, which
was then made into the word παττum by the inversion of four letters[27] and the
alteration of ſ to τ, and next the unmetrical *cineres...patrum* was 'corrected'
to *cineres...paternos*.[28]

relevance to 3.9.37 than the alleged imitation cited by Shackleton Bailey (p. 301) from
Dracontius, *Laud. Dei* 3.454–5 'sic Numantini pro libertate cremati | in cineres iacuere suos cum
moenibus urbis', where, as A. Hudson-Williams, *CQ* 41 (1947), 107, had observed, *in cineres*
is governed by *cremati* and *suos* should be corrected to *suae*.

[25] Postgate, *CR* 15 (1901), 408, n., refuted Housman's attempt, *CR* 9 (1895), 352, to make
cineres...paternos mean 'the ashes of the former defenders' of Thebes.

[26] Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius* (London, 1881), *ad loc.*; *Sexti Propertii Carmina*
(*Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* I) (London, 1894), *ad loc.*; *CR* 15 (1901), 408. Butler and Barber
refute Postgate's interpretation.

[27] Other examples of the inversion of four letters were provided by Housman, *JPh* 18 (1890),
17f., to which should be added '*latias*' → '*italas*' at Manilius 4.661 cited by him at *M. Manilii
Astronomicon Liber Quintus* (London, 1930), 108. Housman's examples include '*et integras*' for
'*et nigras*' in the Propertian archetype at 3.5.24. The corruption of '*septem*' to '*semper*' in the
pentameter is the rearrangement of four letters with the change of one.

[28] The referee has suggested to me the alternative *tepentes* and has adduced in its
support Ovid, *Met.* 14.575 '*tepida* latuerunt tecta *fauilla*' [of the ruins of Ardea], 8.241 '*tepidum
cinerem* dimouit' [of a hearth], and Statius, *Silv.* 3.3.181–2 '*tepentes* | adfatur *cineres*' [of a funeral
pyre]. His proposal yields good sense, and *tepentes* might easily have become first *petentes* (or
patentes; Housman, *JPh* 18 (1890), 17, notes that *tepet* is altered to *patet* at Horace, *Serm.* 1.4.30)

In the elegy 4.3 Arethusa complains of her husband Lycotas' absence on campaign. The manuscripts NFLP present verses 7–10 thus:

> te modo uiderunt †iteratos Bactra per ortus,†
> te modo munitus †hericus† hostis equo,
> hibernique Getae pictoque Britannia curru,
> ustus et Eoa discolor Indus aqua.   10

7 bactra per ortus *om.* N, blactra F¹LP¹   9 pictoque N, picto F¹LP

Three minor emendations seem virtually certain: Beroaldus' *munito* in verse 8, and in verse 10 Housman's *tusus*[29] and the Renaissance conjecture *decolor*. However, the phrase *iteratos...per ortus* and the word *hericus* have long been cruxes, as one can judge from the number of conjectures which they have provoked.

It is generally recognised that the *blactra per ortus* of F¹LP¹ is not an interpolation but a corruption of a phrase present in the archetype.[30] The phrase *iteratos...per ortus* has been interpreted as 'throughout the oft-visited (or twice-visited) East', but the support this rendering derives from 'cras ingens iterabimus aequor' at Horace, *Carm.* 1.7.32 and 'obliquae signa iterata rotae' at Propertius 4.1.82 is eroded by an even closer parallel at Ovid, *Fasti* 6.199

> mane ubi bis fuerit Phoebusque iterauerit ortus,

which was cited long ago by Housman[31] and quite recently by Richardson. Moreover, the structure of the two couplets, in which nations are linked with a characteristic item or an appropriate epithet:

†hericus† hostis (a cataphract)	munito...equo
Getae	hiberni
Britannia	picto...curru
decolor Indus	Eoa...aqua

indicates that what is required in line 7 is not a vague geographical phrase but something typical of Bactra. This point tends to discountenance Housman's proposal

> te modo *Ituraeos* uiderunt Bactra per *arcus*,

for the Ituraean archers were *Roman* auxiliaries. However, Housman's *arcus*, which could easily have been corrupted to *ortus*, is well worth retaining, for Eastern peoples in general and the Bactrians in particular were famous for their archery; cf. Herodotus 7.64 Βάκτριοι...ἔχοντες...τόξα...καλάμινα ἐπιχώρια, Oppian, *Hal.* 4.205

> Βάκτρων τ' ἐνναετῆρας, ἑκηβόλον ἔθνος ὀϊστῶν,

and then *paternos*; at 4.2.2 our very manuscripts of Propertius have *paterna* N rightly, *petenda* FLP. I slightly prefer *perustam* to *tepentes* because the former seems the more dramatic word and I do seem to detect an echo of 'sedisse perustam' in Lucan's 'sede perusta', but in any event one or the other is surely right. Previously we had no satisfactory emendation of *paternos*; now we have not just one but two. This surely is progress, although an element of uncertainty must remain.

[29] *JPh* 16 (1888), 13, with a justification at *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Quartus* (London, 1920), 75f. (*ad* 4.602), to which Shackleton Bailey (p. 230) has drawn attention.

[30] A possible explanation of the omission of the phrase in N and its corruption in FLP is that it was barely legible in the archetype.

[31] *JPh* 21 (1893), 161f. Shackleton Bailey, who seems to have overlooked Ovid's *iterauerit ortus* cited by Housman, asks 'what is amiss with "the much-traversed East"?' A problem with this rendering, or any other in which *per ortus* = 'throughout the East', is that a phrase of such sweeping geographical extent is hardly appropriate to an event which occurred at a single city.

Silius Italicus 3.613

>   ...uacuasque ostendent Bactra pharetras,

and Sidonius, *Carm.* 2.602–3

>   ...positisque pharetris
>   exarmata tuum circumstent Bactra tribunal.

Moreover, the Bactrians' *arcus* will neatly balance the cataphract's *munito...equo* in the next line. Adopting Housman's *arcus*, Postgate[32] proposed

>   te modo uiderunt ire acris Bactra per arcus,

compared his proposal with Propertius 3.9.25

>   uel tibi Medorum pugnaces ire per hastas,

and for parallels to *acris...arcus* adduced Vergil, *Aen.* 7.164 *acris tendunt arcus* and 9.665 *intendunt acris arcus* and Plutarch, *Crassus* 24.5 εὐτόνους τὰς πληγὰς καὶ βιαίους διδόντες ἀπὸ τόξων κραταιῶν καὶ μεγάλων [at Carrhae]. Although each of the several changes which would have converted *ire acris* into *iteratos* is quite easy ($r \to t$, r transposed across two letters, $c \to t$, $i \to e \to o$), still we might hesitate to believe that all of them had occurred in this one place. Moreover, the principal reason Postgate gave for suggesting *ire* ('the uncomfortable detachment of *per* and its noun from the main construction') is fundamentally unsound; cf. 4.2.7–8

>   hac quondam Tiberinus iter faciebat, et aiunt
>   remorum auditos per uada pulsa sonos.

In poetry *per* is occasionally used in situations where *inter* would be more appropriate to the sense but would wreck the metre. Housman noted on *per noua...munera* at Manilius 4.203ff.:

>   librantes noctem Chelae cum tempore lucis
>   per noua maturi post annum munera Bacchi
>   mensurae tribuent usus ac pondera rerum
>   et Palamedeis certantem uiribus ortum,

that '*per* non multum differt ab *inter*' and cited 4.152ff.

>   mollius e Geminis studium est et mitior aetas
>   per uarios cantus modulataque uocibus ora
>   et gracilis calamos et neruis insita uerba
>   ingenitumque sonum:...

and 1.814ff.

>   ...subitas candescere flammas
>   aera per liquidum natosque perire cometas
>   rara *per ingentis uiderunt* saecula *motus.*

Like Postgate, I should adopt Housman's very appropriate suggestion *arcus*, but I should restore

>   te modo uiderunt intentos Bactra per arcus,

'at one time Bactra saw you amidst drawn bows', i.e. Lycotas had been surrounded by a throng of enemies with drawn bows, much as Homer at *Il.* 16.772–5 says

>   πολλὰ δὲ Κεβριόνην ἀμφ' ὀξέα δοῦρα πεπήγει
>   ἰοί τε πτερόεντες ἀπὸ νευρῆφι θορόντες,
>   πολλὰ δὲ χερμάδια μεγάλ' ἀσπίδας ἐστυφέλιξαν
>   μαρναμένων ἀμφ' αὐτόν·...

[32] *CPh* 8 (1913), 331.

For the threat to Lycotas posed by the Bactrians' *intentos...arcus*, cf. Cicero, *Pro Sest.* 15 '*intentus* est *arcus* in me unum' which is figurative), and for parallels in Latin poetry see Manilius 2.171–2 'ut Capricornus et *intentum* qui derigit *arcum* | iunctus equo' 4.785–6 'celeris hinc Creta sagittas | asserit *intentosque* imitatur sideris *arcus*', Statius, *Theb.* 10.891 'maestus et *intento* dubitat Tirynthius *arcu*', Ovid, *Ex Pont.* 1.2.21–2 'et semel *intentus* neruo leuis *arcus* equino | uincula semper habens inresoluta manet'.

The conversion of *intentos* into *iteratos* is very easy. Let *intentos* be written as *ĭtētos* and then miswritten as *ĭietos*[33] and you will have the contraction for *iteretos*, from which only *iteratos* could result.

Next we come to *munitus hericus hostis equo*. Beroaldus' widely accepted change of *munitus* to *munito* is surely correct, for *munito...equo* makes a particularly apt reference to the cataphract cavalry so distinctive of Eastern nations. The word *hericus*, a *uox nihili*, is obviously corrupt. Beroaldus proposed to alter it to *Sericus*, and at least superficially this looks promising: each step in the sequence *munitosericus* → *munitos ericus* → *munitus hericus* is easy. However, *Sericus* would not have been apposite to a cataphract. Propertius uses *serica* at 1.14.22

> quid releuant uariis serica textilibus?

where no better word could have been chosen to denote silk cloth, and at 4.8.23 critics see in Beroaldus' emendation *Serica...carpenta* a reference to a carriage 'lined with silk' or 'fitted with silken cushions', but nowhere else does the word occur in Propertius, who uses the names of other peoples, Parthians, Persians, Medes, and Indians, to indicate Eastern foes.[34] Butler and Barber and Camps defend *Sericus* by adducing Horace, *Carm.* 1.12.56, 3.29.27, and 4.15.23, where the Seres are hyperbolically mentioned, along with other Eastern peoples, as enemies of Rome, but such passages, although they would justify *Sericus hostis* by itself, are no warrant for *munito Sericus hostis equo*, especially not if there exists another adjective metrically equivalent to *Sericus* and superior in sense which *facundus* Propertius could have employed. Furthermore, no real support for *Sericus* is derived from *Carm.* 1.29.9–10, where an Eastern youth is described as

> doctus sagittas tendere Sericas
> arcu paterno,

for here *Sericas* should be interpreted literally; cf. Chariton (fl. *c.* A.D. 100?), 6.4.2, where the weapons of a Persian king are described: φαρέτρα καὶ τόξον αὐτῷ παρήρτητο, Σηρῶν ἔργον πολυτελέστατον, adduced in 1843 by J. G. Orelli[35] and more recently by Nisbet and Hubbard,[36] and Orosius 6.13.2, where the Parthian ambassadors warned Crassus that 'pro auro Parthico *Serico ferro* oneraretur', a pungent epigram which surely goes back to Orosius' source Livy.

Since *munito* may have been deliberately changed to *munitus* so that it would agree with the adjoining *hericus hostis*, whatever lies behind *hericus* need not have begun

---

[33] An example of this very easy type of corruption occurs at Tibullus 1.3.38, where various s. XV manuscripts correctly have *uĕtis* (= *uentis*), which in the s. XIV codex Ambrosianus has been corrupted to *uĕiis* (= *ueteris*).

[34] Parthians: 2.10.14, 2.14.23, 2.27.5, 3.9.54, 3.12.3, 4.3.67, 4.6.79; Persians: 3.11.21; Medes: 3.9.25, 3.12.11; Indians: 2.9.29, 2.10.15, 2.18.11, 3.4.1, 3.17.22, 4.3.10.

[35] *Q. Horatius Flaccus...* (Zurich, 1843), *ad loc.*

[36] *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford, 1970), *ad loc.* Cf. the scholiast's comment 'Serica gens enim est Parthis uicina, sagittandi arte famosa, a qua et Sericum uocatur', O. Keller, *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora* [Leipzig, 1902], *ad loc.*).

with the letter *s*. When the *ductus litterarum* is so unreliable, the best guide is the context. With which nation would a Roman have associated a cataphract? *Parthicus* seems too violent a change, so read *Persicus*, which even if it were not often used as a substitute for *Parthicus* would be very appropriate, for the first cataphracts indeed were Persian; cf. Arrian, *Tact.* 19.4 τῶν δὲ ᾿Ασιανῶν πάλαι μὲν Πέρσαι ἐπήσκησαν τὴν τῶν δρεπανηφόρων τε ἁρμάτων καὶ καταφράκτων ἵππων διφρείαν, ἀπὸ Κύρου ἀρξάμενοι; Xenophon, *Cyr.* 6.1.50 περὶ τοὺς τεθωρακισμένους ἵππους τε καὶ ἱππέας; ib. 6.4.1 ὥπλιζον δὲ καὶ ἵππους προμετωπιδίοις καὶ προστερνιδίοις; ib. 7.1.2 οἱ δὲ ἵπποι [ἦσαν ὡπλισμένοι] προμετωπιδίοις καὶ προστερνιδίοις καὶ παραμηριδίοις χαλκοῖς; *Anab.* 1.8.7 οἱ δ᾽ ἵπποι πάντες εἶχον καὶ προμετωπίδια καὶ προστερνίδια [at Cunaxa]; Q. Curtius Rufus 3.11.15 *equi pariter equitesque Persarum, serie lamnarum ... graues* [at Issus] and 4.9.3 *equitibus equisque tegumenta erant ex ferreis lamminis serie inter se conexis* [at Gaugamela]. These passages should suffice to demonstrate the aptness of *munito Persicus hostis equo*;[37] furthermore, the corruption of *persicus* into *hericus* is not hard: in early Carolingian minuscules ⌐ and ⌐ (= *s*) are very similar and so the latter might easily be omitted by haplography and *p* might be replaced by *h* under the influence of the succeeding ʻ*hostis*ʼ.

I had thought that *Persicus* was my own emendation, but from Smyth's *Thesaurus Criticus* I learned that I had been anticipated in 1592 by Janus Dousa the younger, who under the heading ʻCastigatus Propertii locus uitii manifestus certiori conjecturaʼ wrote ʻ... mihi in mentem venit scribendum: *Te modo munito Persicus hostis equo.* Vel, si id minus alicui arridet, *Parthicus hostis.* & quidem aut vera est restitutio nostra, aut proxime veram.ʼ[38] The passages I have adduced above amply confirm Dousa's *certior coniectura*, which in the last 160 years has not even been mentioned by a single critic or editor of Propertius.[39]

At 4.3.11–16 Arethusa continues to reproach her husband Lycotas for his extended absence:

[37] P. J. Enk, *Ad Propertii Carmina Commentarius Criticus* (Zutphen, 1911), 306, adduced in support of *Sericus* the coupling of the Seres with Bactra at Horace, *Carm*, 3.29.27–8
> quid Seres et regnata Cyro
> Bactra parent Tanaisque discors,
but this passage does not alleviate the incongruity of a Chinese cataphract.

Since Arethusa is lamenting Lycotas' long travels in the East, it may be worth adducing Euripides, *Bacch.* 14–15, where Dionysus has wandered throughout the East but has now left the Περσῶν θ᾽ ἡλιοβλήτους πλάκας | Βάκτριά τε τείχη (cf. Propertius 4.3.63 *ascensis ... Bactris*). In any event, the Persians and the Bactrians were often coupled by ancient writers; as representative examples I may adduce Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.60.4 *Persis et Bactriano* and Appian, *Syr.* 55 Περσῶν καὶ Παρθυαίων καὶ Βακτρίων. Furthermore, the phrase *equitata Bactra Parthis* from Sidonius, *Carm.* 23.249, at least illustrates the appropriateness of pairing Bactra with a Persian or Parthian cataphract.

Rothstein defends Jacob's *Neuricus* by referring to Cassius Dio 54.20, but this campaign by the Romans on the lower Danube against the Sarmatians, who were Scythians, had nothing whatsoever to do with the Neuri, who were proto-Balto-Slavs and lived on the upper Dnepr, over 500 miles away. A better conjecture is Postgate's *ferreus* (op. cit. 331f.), which is palaeographically easy and quite appropriate; Postgate himself adduced the *ferreus ... cataphractus* at 3.12.12. However, an ethnic adjective would better suit the context of 4.3.7–10, where we find the sequence *Bactra,* †*hericus*†, *Getae, Britannia, Indus.*

[38] *In Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium Coniectanea & Notae* (Leiden, 1592), 122, ad 4.3.8.

[39] The latest citation which I have been able to find in a critical edition or a commentary is in the 1822 Delphin edition of Propertius, where the notes of the younger Dousa were reprinted intact.

> haecne marita fides et †parce auia† noctes,
>   cum rudis urgenti bracchia uicta dedi?
> quae mihi deductae fax omen praetulit, illa
>   traxit ab euerso lumina nigra rogo,
> et Stygio sum sparsa lacu, nec recta capillis   15
>   uitta data est: nupsi non comitante deo.

11 parce auia N, pacatę mihi FL, pacte iam mihi P   13 omen N, omni FLP   15 recta NLP, ructis F   16 uitta N, uita FLP

G. P. Goold[40] has convincingly argued that the common ancestor of *parce* and *pacatę* is *pactę*. But as was argued a century ago by T. Korsch[41] and more recently by Goold, *pactae...noctes* would indicate 'nights pledged by a woman to her lover' (cf. Ovid, *Rem. Am.* 505 '*pacta* tibi *nocte* uenito' adduced by Korsch; I may add 'et prope *promissae* tempora *noctis* erunt' (ibid. 400), 'clausa tibi fuerit *promissa* ianua *nocte*' (*Ars Am.* 2.523), and 'ubi *nox* mihi *promissa* est' (Tibullus 2.6.49)), and hence would be inappropriate to the context, which requires a reference to faithful companionship, not sexual gratification. Housman's insightful objection to *pactae...noctes*, 'As if the bride who according to her own account "dedit bracchia uicta urgenti" can represent herself as there and then bargaining for "noctes"!',[42] suffices to dispose of Rothstein's 'et pactae in gaudia noctes' and Haupt's 'et pactae in sauia noctes'; the former is further vitiated by what in the context would be a strong connotation of 'sexual pleasures', while the latter suffers from the additional problem that no husband says to his new bride 'Give yourself to me tonight and I shall *kiss* you night after night'. Lucian Müller's 'pactae et mihi gaudia noctis' is afflicted with similar problems: besides the inappropriateness of *pacta...nox* to a wedding night, Arethusa could hardly ask 'Are these the joys of the wedding night?' long after that night had passed.

Housman, Postgate, and Goold have proposed emendations which feature the conjecture *praemia*. Housman suggested 'et primae praemia noctis', Postgate[43] offered 'pacta haec mihi praemia noctis' and Goold would write 'et pacta haec praemia noctis'. Despite the improvement in sense afforded by these proposals, I find them unconvincing. The word *praemia* has a distinct connotation of material rewards, and a husband does not say to his bride 'Give yourself to me tonight and I will reward you'; such language would be directed more appropriately to a *meretrix*. And my dissatisfaction with *praemia* is only intensified by the *pacta...praemia* adduced by Goold from Cicero, *Epist. ad Q. Fr.* 3.3.2, for there the *pacta praemia* are bribes offered by the candidates to the consuls; a similar case is Cicero, *Philipp.* 11.39, where evidently material *praemia* are *promissa* to legionary soldiers.

C. B. R. Pelling and M. D. Reeve have independently suggested to me that Propertius might have written 'primae *foedera* (or *pignora*) noctis'; then *pacta* will have been a marginal gloss which replaced *foedera* or *pignora*. The sense afforded by these proposals is the best so far realised, but they are sufficiently distant from *pacte auia* for it to be legitimate to consider quite a different approach to resolving this long-standing crux.

This very passage, which is now so desperately corrupt, was imitated soon after it was written by Ovid at *Her.* 6.41–6, where Hypsipyle says to Jason

[40] *HSCP* 71 (1966), 66f.
[41] *Nordisk Tidskrift for Filologi*, N.R. 5 (1880–1882), 276.
[42] *JPh* 21 (1893), 148.
[43] *Sexti Propertii Carmina* (*Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, I) (London, 1894), *ad loc.*

> heu, ubi pacta fides? ubi conubialia iura
>   faxque sub arsuros dignior ire rogos?
> non ego sum furto tibi cognita; pronuba Iuno
>   adfuit et sertis tempora uinctus Hymen.
> at mihi nec Iuno, nec Hymen, sed tristis Erinys
>   praetulit infaustas sanguinolenta faces.

The parallels are manifold:[44] Propertius makes Arethusa say 'Stygio sum *sparsa* lacu' and Ovid mentions a 'blood-spattered' Erinys, who '*praetulit...faces*', which is based on Propertius' '*fax* omen *praetulit*'. In both cases the *fax* was appropriate for a funeral pyre: cf. Propertius' '*fax...illa* traxit ab euerso lumina nigra *rogo*' with Ovid's '*faxque* sub arsuros dignior ire *rogos*'. The initial hexameters are also very similar, but with one difference: Ovid couples *pacta* with *fides* and *conubialia* with *iura*, whereas the adjectives *pacta* and *marita* (= *conubialia*) appear in inverse order in our manuscripts of Propertius. Hence I suspect that in Ovid's copy of Propertius' works the couplet 4.3.11–12 looked something like this:

> haecine pacta fides? haec noctis iura maritae,
>   cum rudis urgenti bracchia uicta dedi?

Since *haecine* cannot simultaneously be both feminine singular and neuter plural, it is necessary to emend *et* to *haec*; the two words are frequently confused in mediaeval manuscripts. The beginning of the hexameter now corresponds even more closely with Claudian's imitation '*haecine* uestra *fides*?' at *Rapt. Proserp.* 3.191. The hexameter also is now much closer to yet another of Ovid's imitations at *Fasti* 3.485, where Ariadne asks Bacchus

> heu, ubi *pacta fides?* ubi, quae *iurare* solebas?

Compare also the words of Propertius himself at 3.13.49

> auro pulsa *fides*, auro uenalia *iura*,

and at 4.5.29–30

> sperne *fidem*, prouolue deos, mendacia uincant,
>   frange et damnosae *iura* pudicitiae!

For other couplings of *fides* and *iura*, see for example Vergil, *Aen.* 2.541, Ovid, *Her.* 2.31, *Met.* 5.44, Lucan 8.450, and Statius, *Ach.* 1.403. With *iura maritae* compare Horace, *Ars Poet.* 398

> concubitu prohibere uago, dare *iura maritis*,

and Ovid, *Ars Am.* 2.381–2

> coniugis admissum uiolataque *iura marita* est
>   barbara per natos Phasias ulta suos.

A vestige of the original *iura* seems to be preserved in N's corruption *auia*. The transposition of words within a line is a type of emendation which most editors of Propertius have been reluctant to accept, so I may refer to *Culex* 366, where most manuscripts (s. IX and later) have

> legitime cessit cui facta potentia regis,

and only a single manuscript of the 15th century, Corsinianus 43 F 5, reflects the author's original

---

[44] Even the differences exhibit Propertius' influence on Ovid. Propertius refers to Hymen's absence with 'nupsi non comitante deo'; Ovid says 'adfuit et sertis tempora uinctus Hymen'.

> cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis.

My emendation of 4.3.11 is really no more violent than any of the 'palaeographical' conjectures proposed by other scholars in disregard of Ovid's two imitations of this verse.

At 4.3.47–8 Arethusa wishes that she could accompany Lycotas on his expedition to the East:

> nec me tardarent Scythiae iuga, cum Pater altas
> †Affricus† in glaciem frigore nectit aquas.

Aside from Butler and Barber's objection that 'a SW. wind is unlikely to bring frost', the epithet *Pater* is not elsewhere applied to a wind; hence *Affricus* must be corrupt. The deity who froze water was Jupiter; cf. Horace, *Carm.* 3.10.7–8

> ...et positas ut glaciet niues
> puro numine Iuppiter?

which was adduced by E. H. van Eldik.[45] A similar passage where Jupiter is denoted by the epithet *Pater* alone is *Carm.* 1.2.1–2

> iam satis terris niuis atque dirae
> grandinis misit Pater...

which suffices to establish *Pater* in verse 47.

Smyth lists several emendations of *Affricus* in verse 48, among them Keil's *acriter* and Postgate's *acrius*. The merit which these superficially seem to possess is derived from an impreciseness of thought. Cold is 'sharp', but it does not follow that Jupiter 'sharply' binds deep waters to ice, nor has any critic produced a passage where *acriter* is used in this manner. The adverb which would be required to modify 'binds' of course is 'tightly', so a Roman would have used not *acriter* or *acrius* but *astricte*.

But is *nectit* right? In defence of *in glaciem...nectit aquas* Burman adduced passages not from classical poets but from the s. IV 'Carmina Duodecim Sapientum', namely,

> labentes haec durat aquas et flumina nectit

at *Anthologia Latina* (ed. A. Riese) 568.4,

> uis hiemis glacie currentes adligat undas

at *Anth. Lat.* 567.4, and

> qua ratis egit iter, iuncto boue plaustra trahuntur,
> postquam tristis hiems frigore uinxit aquas

at *Anth. Lat.* 531; this last passage was also adduced by Shackleton Bailey, who accepted the ill-advised conjecture *iunxit*.[46] Now although the construction

---

[45] *Apud* Burman, *ad loc.*

[46] Of the MSS on which Riese bases his text, T (s. IX), V (s. IX), and B (s. X/XI) have *uinxit*, P (s. IX) has *fixit*, and C (s. X/XI) has *iungit*, which is probably just a corruption, like its *Quadratis cogit* for *Qua ratis egit* in the hexameter, due to the preceding *egit...iuncto*. So far as I can tell, *iungere* is not elsewhere used to describe the freezing of water, whereas the use of *uincire* is frequent. The superiority of some s. XVIII critics to various s. XIX/XX editors is well illustrated by contrasting Riese's passive acceptance of *iunxit* from the corruption *iungit* with Burman's note on this same passage in his *Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum, siue Catalecta Poetarum Latinorum* (Amsterdam, 1773), ii.377, *ad loc.*: '...recte N. Heinsius in suo codice, & Muncker. ad Hygin. fab. 120. corrigunt *uinxit*. quod firmatur a cod. Vossiano, & utraque ed. Aldina. & sic Francius & Tollius in margine ed. Scalig. emendaverant. praecedenti enim versu *juncto bove* & hoc loco *junxit aquas* inconcinniora sunt.

alligare/astringere/nectere/uincire aquas/flumina/undas is well attested,[47] the Romans
seem not to have used a verb meaning 'to bind' in the sense 'to bind something into
something else'.[48] 'Pompei densis acies stipata cateruis | iunxerat in seriem nexis
umbonibus arma' at Lucan 7.492–3 is not such a case, for it denotes not the joining
of shields to produce another material but the adoption of the close-ordered formation
the Greeks called συνασπισμός,[49] and *in seriem* expresses manner, a usage illustrated
in the *OLD*, s.v. *in*, no. 18, just like the ablative *serie* at Curtius Rufus 4.9.3 'equitibus
equisque tegumenta erant ex ferreis lamminis serie inter se conexis' and the phrase
in longam seriem at Seneca, *de Breu. Vit.* 9.3 'quid securus et in tanta temporum fuga
lentus menses tibi et annos in longam seriem...exporrigis?'

    While other scholars are combing through esoteric late sources in search of a parallel
to *in glaciem...nectit aquas*, I propose to illustrate how two of Propertius' most
prominent contemporaries expressed the transformation of water into ice and *uice
uersa*. The freezing of lakes is described by Vergil at *Georg.* 3.365

        et totae solidam in glaciem uertere lacunae,

and the melting of snow by Ovid at *Amores* 3.5.11f.

        candidior niuibus, tunc cum cecidere recentes,
          in liquidas nondum quas mora uertit aquas.

I also hope that those searching through the *Anthologia Latina* for a parallel to *in
glaciem...nectit aquas* will not overlook the pentameter

        in glaciem solidam uersus ut amnis abit

at 534.2, and that they will also remember that the most natural way in Latin to express
the transformation of one material into another is *uertere aliquid in aliquid*. Thus
without further ado I should propose that Propertius wrote

        nec me tardarent Scythiae iuga, cum Pater altas
          astrictam in glaciem frigore uertit aquas,

passim vero haec duo verba *junxit* & *vinxit* confunduntur, ubi de aqua gelu durata sermo est.
Rutilius Lib. I. Itin. 489
        Juncta fluenta gelu conspecto Sole liquescunt.
ubi recte Castalio *Vincta.* idem mendum in Priapejis Carm. lxiii.
        Parum, quod imi perfluunt sinus imbres,
        Et in capillos grandines cadunt nostros,
        Rigetque dura barba vincta crystallo.
sic enim cum viris eruditis, Heinso, Graevio, Tollioque legendum ex MSS. fide, non *juncta*, ut
edidit Scaliger, Aldum secutus. Avienus Fab. xxix.
        Vinctaque durato stringeret arva gelu.
ubi plura in notis suis congessit eruditissimus H. Cannegieterus. & Patruus meus ad illud Petronii
in Satyr. cap. 123.
        Prima quidem glacies, & cana vincta pruina
        Non pugnavit humus.
& sic alibi saepissime. vide N. Heins. ad Claudian. Epigr. x. *mirusque latex quod flumina vinxit.*
& Graevii Lect. Hesiod. cap. xiv. pag. 70...'

  [47] Cf. *ThLL* I (1904), col. 1684.26–42, s.v. *alligo*; ibid. II (1903), col. 961.9–43, s.v. *astringo*;
see *Anth. Lat.* 568.4 cited above for *nectere*, and for *uincire* add Ovid, *Ex Pont.* 2.2.26 and 3.1.15
and *Trist.* 3.10.25 to the passages in n. 46 cited by Burman.

  [48] The construction *aliquid duratur in aliquid* is found at [Tibullus] 3.7.156, Seneca, *Nat. Qu.*
4.12, Pliny, *N.H.* 12.94, and Hyginus, *Fab.* 154 cited in the *ThLL* V. 1 (1934), col. 2294.1–29,
but *durare* does not mean 'to bind'.

  [49] This anachronism of course is not historical; see my remark in *AJA* 87 (1983), 27, n. 25.
I can now supply Lucan's source for his next two lines 'uixque habitura locum dextras ac tela
mouendi | constiterat gladiosque suos compressa timebat'. It is Vergil, *Aen.* 10.432–3 'extremi
addensent acies nec turba moueri | tela manusque sinit', as was noted by Servius *ad loc.*

'when Father Jupiter transforms deep waters into ice congealed by the cold'. I do not need to illustrate the perpetual confusion in minuscules of the virtually identical *u* and *n* and the hardly less similar *r* and *c*. S. W. Schippers' emendation *astrictam*,[50] which has largely been ignored by editors, is supported by *uentis glacies adstricta* adduced by Schippers himself from Ovid, *Met.* 1.120 and the similar phrase *adstricto...gelu* at *Trist.* 2.196 and 3.4b.2. Furthermore, *astrictam* could easily have been corrupted to *affrictam* (cf. Seneca, *Nat. Qu.* 5.14.4, where the manuscripts vary between *affrictu* and *astrictu*, and Horace, *Ars Poet.* 249, where *fricti* is corrupted to *stricti* in Monacensis 14685 [s. XI]), and from *affrictam* an impudent scribe, the sort of fellow who conjectured *Gallicus* at 2.13.48, might elicit *Affricus*.

At 4.6.71–4 Propertius describes some of the features of a dinner-party:

> candida nunc molli subeant conuiuia luco,
> blanditiaeque fluant per mea colla rosae,
> uinaque fundantur prelis elisa Falernis,
> perque lauet nostras spica Cilissa comas.

My concern here is with verse 74, where the *perque* of the principal manuscripts NFLP has been 'emended' to *terque* in various late Renaissance MSS from verse 6

> terque focum circa laneus orbis eat.

Butler and Barber translate *perque lauet* as 'drench'; they admit that '*perlauo* is not found again in classical poetry' and they note that it is 'the only *tmesis*[51] in Propertius'. In fact, the only other occurrences of *perlauo* are in manuscripts of late Latin authors and semi-barbarous translations of Greek medical writers.[52] Camps says 'there is nothing really unlikely about *per...lauat* [read *lauet*], for Cicero has *per mihi mirum*,

---

[50] *Specimen criticum inaugurale, exhibens Observationes criticas in Propertii librum quartum* (Groningen, 1818), 32. Van Eldik (*apud* Burman) had already conjectured *adstrictas*.

[51] Here *tmesis* has its conventional meaning 'the splitting of a word'.

[52] C. Questa, *BPEC* 24 (1976), 126, n. 12, defends *perque lauet* by adducing various passages in postclassical authors where the manuscripts present forms of *perlauare* and *perlauere*, namely: (i) *perlauatur* (for which M. Ihm reads *perluatur*) which is the reading of the *codex unicus* (a. 1485) of Pelagonius (s. IV²) at *Veterin.* 26; (ii) *perlauerint* in two s. VII in. and s. IX codices of the s. VI *Regula Magistri* at 30.4; (iii) *perlaues* in the s. VIII manuscript which preserves the s. VI Latin translation of Dioscorides; (iv) *perlauit* in a s. X translation of Oribasius. After citing these passages, which may well establish *perlauo* in Later Latin but hardly show that Propertius knew the verb, Questa proceeds to call lexicographers 'male informati' for choosing the manuscript reading *proleuabit* over *perlauabit* at Tertullian, *de Paen.* 4.3, but it is Questa himself who is at fault for ignoring the context: 'ergo paenitentia uita est, cum praeponitur morti. eam tu peccator, mei similis..., ita inuade, ita amplexare, ut naufragus alicuius tabulae fidem. Haec te peccatorem fluctibus mersum *proleuabit* et in portum diuinae clementiae protelabit'. What a shipwrecked man wants is not a bath (*perlauabit*) but something like a plank (*alicuius tabulae*) to buoy him up (*proleuabit*) and convey him to safety. Towards the end of his note Questa says 'personalmente attendo con una certa curiosità il prossimo fascicolo dell' *Oxford Latin Dict.*', which it turns out has no entry for *perlauo*, I presume because its compilers used Barber's 1953 O.C.T. of Propertius, and Questa then heartily thanked 'per controlli di testi e utili informazioni...il dr. Peter Flury, "Generalredaktor" del *ThLL*'. Hence I in turn await with interest the publication of the fascicle of the *ThLL* which will cover *perlauo*, for whether the *ThLL* attributes this verb to Propertius and Tertullian will provide a measure of how far the critical judgement of its compilers has progressed since the early 1900s.

P. Fedeli, *Properzio, Elegie, Libro IV* (Bari, 1965), 185, had already attributed *perque lauet* to Propertius and *perlauabit* to Tertullian, and in *Sexti Properti Elegiarum Libri IV* (Stuttgart, 1984), *ad loc.*, he refers to Questa's note and seriously suggests that the unparalleled tmesis confers *dignitas* on the postclassical *perlauare*. Besides mentioning the old maxim 'two wrongs don't make a right', I wonder how many certainly corrupt readings elsewhere could be 'dignified' in a similar manner.

perque iucunda etc., and Virg. *Georg.* 2.366 *interque legendae'*. Richardson reads *terque* but notes that 'the *per* of the text tradition is very attractive, echoing as it does the *per* of 72', and against *ter* he reasonably objects 'why should the poet be thrice drenched with saffron?'

The irrelevance of citing *perque iucunda* from Cicero and *interque legendae* from Vergil in defence of *perque lauet* in the manuscripts of Propertius is best exposed by citing the observation that 'the *tmesis* of *per* with adjectives and verbs is found only in the comic poets and the letters and dialogues of Cicero' made a century ago by R. Y. Tyrrell.[53] Moreover, this *tmesis* would be completely unnecessary, for *perque lauet* and *perlauet et* are metrically equivalent, and Propertius would not have avoided the repetition *-et et*; cf. 1.16.29–30, 32; 2.10.3; 2.22.19; 2.28.28; 2.33.40; 3.9.52; and 4.1.54. It seems incredible that Propertius would have used such an uncharacteristically violent construction as *tmesis* when he could easily have avoided it.

Moreover, the verb that is required is not the ill-attested *perlauare* but the well-attested *perluere*; cf. the close parallel of Petronius, *Sat.* 128

> ...sudor quoque perluit ora.

Hence I would propose that Propertius wrote

> uinaque fundantur prelis elisa Falernis,
>   perluat et nostras spica Cilissa comas.

Perluat et might easily be corrupted to the unmetrical *perlauet*. The occurrence of *-que* in the preceding line would then suggest to a scribe that he repair the metre by writing *perque lauet*.

University of Delaware   J. D. MORGAN

---

[53] R. Y. Tyrrell, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*[2] (London, 1885), i.69, n.