

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.²⁰

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

²⁰ 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*.¹ 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

¹ *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*²: *aufugi rtp*¹.

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*:¹

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