

bellatorium stilum', Aulus Gellius 3.3.13 'stilum Plautinum', Pomponius Porphyrio (ad Horat. *Carm.* 2.1.9–10) 'tragico stilo', (ad Horat. *Epist.* 2.1.164) 'Latinum stilum', Terentianus Maurus 282 'siccioris... stili', Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Diu. Claudius* 8.1 'poeticus stilus', *Quadrigae Tyrannorum* 15.10 'stilo maiore', *Carus et Carinus et Numerianus* 11.1 'Tulliano... stilo', Servius (ad Vergil. *Ecl.* 1.10) 'rustico stilo', (ad *Ecl.* 10.50) 'Theocritio stilo', (ad *Ecl.* 10.71) 'tenuissimo stilo', (ad *Aen.* 1, praef.) 'stilus grandiloquus', (ad *Aen.* 4.1) 'comicus stilus', (ad *Aen.* 8.493) 'historicus stilus'.

Thus we have seen that the emendation 'Lucilius, qui primus condidit stili na<suti uer>sum' restores both sense and syntax, and is very much in accordance with the usage of Silver Latin authors generally and of Pliny in particular. If I have made any error in proposing this restoration, which does not involve the alteration of a single letter of the preserved text and posits a lacuna due to a *saut du même au même* of a type generally believed to have occurred in the preceding sentence, it is in sticking too close to manuscripts which we know are very corrupt.<sup>20</sup>

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

<sup>20</sup> I should like to thank Ian Rutherford, Richard Tarrant, and Richard Thomas for their reactions to my supplement, as well as the lynx-eyed reader for *CQ*, who noticed that H. Fuchs, in the König–Winkler edition (supra n. 11), p. 383, anticipated me in suspecting the transmitted text, although Fuchs' own supplement 'qui primus condidit <humilioris> stili nasum' is not plausible.

#### PROPERTIUS 1.9.30

Some time ago I noted that the generally accepted emendations *a! fuge* (1.9.30), and *a! ducere* (1.11.5) are suspect (*CPh* 75 (1980), 71–2). In his recent Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass. 1990), Goold in the latter passage restores the MSS. reading *adducere*; in the former, *quisquis es assiduas aufuge blanditias*, he prints Tappe's *tu fuge* for MSS. *aufuge*.<sup>1</sup> The best solution, it seems to me, is one which the modern editions, *Propertiana* included, are of a mind to ignore: Markland's *heu fuge*.

This expression is used twice by Virgil (*Aen.* 2.289; 3.44), and, together with a 'whoever you are' formula, by Valerius Flaccus (*Arg.* 4.140). *Aufuge* might easily have been an aural error for *heu fuge* in which case *tu* simply compounds that error.

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

<sup>1</sup> *Aufugio* seems to be used only intransitively. In addition to the passages adduced by Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), p. 28, I note also Petronius 81.3 *effugi iudicium*] *effugi lp*<sup>2</sup>: *aufugi rtp*<sup>1</sup>.

#### ON ELEGIAC EN

Propertius uses this particle at 1.1.21

en agedum dominae mentem convertite nostrae.

The recent editors, Luck (Zürich, 1964), Hanslik (Leipzig, 1979), and Goold (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), allow into the text these emended instances of *en*:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have also taken into account the editions of Barber (Oxford, 1960), Camps (Cambridge, 1961–7), Richardson (Oklahoma, 1977), and Fedeli (Stuttgart, 1984).

- 2.12.15 evolat en nostro quoniam de pectore nusquam *Passerat*, *Hanslik* è *vel e mss.*  
 2.22b.44 quid iuvat en nullo ponere verba loco *Heinsius (olim)*, *Hanslik* (pondere v. loqui *legens*) *et mss.*<sup>2</sup>  
 3.11.30 en famulos inter femina trita suos *Damsté*, *Hanslik* *et mss.*  
 4.6.45 en nimium remis audent prope turpe Latinos *dett.*, *Luck*, *Goold* (pro, turpe *legens*) *et mss.*  
 4.6.60 en deus est nostri sanguinis ista fides *Hanslik* *sum deus est mss.* *est]* *en dett.*, *Markland*  
 4.11.14 en sum, quod digitis quinque legatur onus *dett.*, *Guyet*, *Goold* *et mss.*

Table 1 illustrates the frequency and use of *en* as it has been preserved in the MSS. The examples may be categorised: column A contains the figures for *en* used with the first person singular; B, with the imperative; C, with *etiam*; D, other usage.

Table 1. *Frequency and use of en*

	A	B	C	D
Tib. Corpus	1	1	—	—
Prop.	—	1	—	—
Ovid	22 <sup>a</sup>	5 <sup>b</sup>	2 <sup>c</sup>	3 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Of the twenty-three examples, fourteen have *ego*: Tib. 1.2.25; *A.A.* 3.598; *Am.* 1.2.19, 3.2.26; *Her.* 4.61, 6.114, 14.119; *Tr.* 3.7.45; *Fas.* 3.554, 5.459; *Pont.* 1.1.45, 2.3.25, 4.4.15, 4.15.19. Six have the simple first person: *A.A.* 1.205, 1.555; *Tr.* 3.11.35, 5.2.45; *Fas.* 6.125; *Pont.* 3.7.33. Two have *iterum*: *A.A.* 2.559; *Her.* 20.33. One has *etiam*: *Rem.* 524.

<sup>b</sup> Tib. 2.2.10; Prop. 1.1.21; *Am.* 1.8.31; *Fas.* 1.6, 3.471 and 472 (each with *iterum*), 3.352.

<sup>c</sup> *Tr.* 4.2.43; *Fas.* 2.147 (with iussive subjunctive).

<sup>d</sup> *Am.* 3.2.75, *en revocant* which answers *revocate* of two lines earlier; *Her.* 5.124, *possidet en* which is climactic after *io prohibe* (118), *heu* (120), and *a!* (123); *Pont.* 4.7.3. *aspicis en* (cf. *en aspice Am.* 1.8.31) which reappears at Martial 9.23.3.

These poets obviously had a very precise sense of the appropriateness of this particle *vis-à-vis* elegy.<sup>3</sup> A sense, it seems, not shared by many critics.<sup>4</sup> Of the examples admitted to the text *en sum* (Prop. 4.11.14) is the only one that does not offend elegiac usage. This is not to say that *en sum* is there correct, but it deserves entertaining. Nor are the poets to be denied their right to break the rules. Tibullus and Ovid, however, seem not to have done so.<sup>5</sup> Propertius, on one occasion, may have: *en nimium* (4.6.45) could be defended as a variant of *heu nimium*, the latter reading, however, though hitherto unproposed, seems to me even more likely than the former.<sup>6</sup>

A quick search of Smyth's Thesaurus produces more instances of *en* restored by a

<sup>2</sup> At both 2.12.15 and 2.22b.44 *heu* has been proposed. This particle does not so readily admit of classification as do *a* and *en*. These last, which have also been suggested here, should be rejected; at both passages, of the exclamatory particles, *heu* seems least objectionable. Cf. Shackleton Bailey, '*heu* seems the least unsatisfactory substitute for *et*' (*Propertiana* [Cambridge, 1956], p. 109).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Ovid's use of *en* (fifteen times) in the *Metamorphoses* where he is much less restrictive.

<sup>4</sup> I would not underestimate trivialisation, but the Propertian passages suggest a belief in some that *en* is always a good bet when it would be followed by initial *n*.

<sup>5</sup> And at Prop. 4.6.60 Markland's *sum deus*, *en* is plausible (not so Lachmann's *tum deus*: *en*) but unnecessary.

<sup>6</sup> For *heu nimium* cf. Ovid, *Tr.* 2.180; 3.1.8; 4.1.86. Slightly less attractive here is *a! nimium* (for which see my note *CPh* 75 [1980], 71–2), since the speaker, Apollo, might be expected to use the more 'elevated' *heu nimium*, an expression frequent in epic: cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 4.657; 6.189; 11.841; Lucan 8.139; Silius 8.169; 11.6; Statius, *Theb.* 7.547; 9.624.

variety of critics.<sup>7</sup> Of these restorations Baehrens' *i puer en* (2.12.18), and Heinsius' *respon-di en* (4.8.81) are the only ones to fit a pattern of elegiac usage.<sup>8</sup>

In short, if Propertius' MSS. have, in general, not served him well, his critics, in this particular, have served him less so.<sup>9</sup>

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

<sup>7</sup> I note the following 1.19.22; 2.12.18; 2.29.30; 3.13.47; 3.16.1; 4.1.81; 4.1.87; 4.1.116; 4.6.40; 4.8.81; 4.9.36; 4.9.70; 4.11.32; 4.11.97.

<sup>8</sup> Again, I do not suggest that these emendations are correct simply because they accord with usage.

<sup>9</sup> I thank the editors and anonymous referee for helpful criticisms and suggestions.

#### A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF SENECA'S *PHOENISSAE*<sup>1</sup>

In me arma et ignes uertite, in me omnis ruat  
una iuuentus quaeque ab Inachio uenit 444  
animosa muro quaeque Thebana ferox  
descendit arce: ciuis atque hostis simul...

444 unam E: una A

E's 'unam' is the reading favoured by all modern editors. Either reading is possible in terms of sense and metre, and the choice is not an easy one. The attraction of 'unam' is obvious and consists in the stress which it lays on Jocasta's isolation and vulnerability in the face of 'omnis...iuuentus'. The appeal of 'una' is a little more subtle. It emphasises the coming together of the youth, whether Argive or Theban, in common cause against the aged Jocasta. It is ironical that the two fiercely opposed sides are urged to come together not against a mutual foe but against a defenceless old woman. And even more ironical is the notion of the brothers' uniting to kill their mother: from the beginning of the play they have been portrayed as uncompromisingly hostile to each other; now, bent on the impious act of fratricide, they are envisaged as acting together for the first time, but only to accomplish an equally great or even greater impiety – matricide. The reading of A is attractive not only because of the characteristic irony which it expresses, but also because it heralds the even stronger expression of the same notion in 445 with 'ciuis atque hostis simul...'. One may note also that 'omnis ruat / una' appears to be an echo of Vergil's 'una omnes ruere' (*Aen.* 8.689).

University of the Witwatersrand

MARICA FRANK

<sup>1</sup> The text followed, except at the point under discussion, is that of O. Zwierlein, *OCT* 1986.

#### KAI FOR ET

The late Sir Roger Mynors, in a letter to Sebastiano Timpanaro quoted in the latter's *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome, 1978), p. 543 n. 15, states that he had wondered 'whether it might be a habit of Latin writers, when they were putting only one or two "parollette" between two pieces of Greek', to use Greek rather than Latin: he invents as an example 'ἦθος καὶ πάθος where logic demanded ἦθος et πάθος'. The answer is that they sometimes did: the present paper will concentrate on the type instantiated by his imaginary example, the use of καὶ for et. I do not claim to have recorded every case, but those I have observed are the following.