The Cambridge Classical Journal (2024), **70**, 108–121
doi:10.1017/S1750270524000058

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Propertiana

A. J. Woodman

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA/Durham, UK
Email: ajw6n@virginia.edu

(Received 25 June 2023; revised 3 June 2024; accepted 3 June 2024)

Abstract
The textual criticism of various passages of Propertius.

The text of Propertius quoted in this paper is based on the Teubner edition of Fedeli (1994), which is conveniently conservative, but it is to be noted that Fedeli recently produced a revised text (2021-22), whose many changes from his earlier edition are evidence, if it were needed, of the continuing interest in the text of Propertius.[1] The selective apparatus criticus is drawn from Smyth's repertory of conjectures, from the Oxford Classical Text of Heyworth (2007a), and from the new Fedeli. Although one wants one's suggestions to be found convincing, often they are made in the hope that others may be prompted to take the matter further.

1.1.19–24

at uos, deductae quibus est fallacia lunae
et labor in magicis sacra piare focis,
en agedum dominae mentem conuertite nostrae,
et facite illa meo palleat ore magis!
tunc ego crediderim uobis et sidera et amnes
posse Cytinaeis ducere carminibus.

23 et manes et sidera uobis *Housman* amnes] umbras *Jeverus*
24 Cytinaeis *Hertzberg*: cytalinis *uel sim. MSS*

Propertius turns to witches to help him win round Cynthia. Numerous scholars have questioned *amnes* (23), since *amnes ducere* is a perfectly normal expression for 'directing a stream' (e.g. Plin. *NH* 33.75), which is 'one of the commonest operations of Italian agriculture'.[2] Heyworth (2007a) and Fedeli (2021) print Jeverus' *umbras*, but

[1] See too e.g. Hardy (2022).
[2] Housman (1972) 1.49.

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Cambridge Philological Society. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Housman more convincingly proposed *manes*, noting that 'the two words are much confounded'.[3] Yet difficulties arise from the resulting word order: not only is it considerably different from the paradosis but the sequence *et manes et sidera* is weak, since 'the trick of bringing down the moon' has already been mentioned in 19 and we expect the more spectacular and hitherto unmentioned feat of raising the dead to be listed second. These difficulties can be avoided if we print:

> tunc ego crediderim uobis, ut sidera, manes
> posse Cytinaeis ducere carminibus.
>
> then I would believe you that with your Cytinaean spells you can draw the spirits as you do the heavenly bodies.

ut and *et* are frequently confused (e.g. 1.2.11-12), and the use of *ut* is not essentially different from *ut prius* in line 18 above or 3.8.14 'Maenas ut icta'. *ut sidera* not only looks back to *deductae…fallacia lunae* in 19 but has the advantage of allowing the emphasis to fall on the more impressive of the two feats. It may well be that Tibullus had 1.1.19-24 in mind when he too introduced witches into his poetry (1.2.45-8):

> han*c ego* de caelo *ducentem sidera* uidi,
> fluminis haec rapidi *carmine uertit* iter,
> haec cantu finditque solum *manes*que sepulcris
> elicit et tepido deuocat ossa rogo.

This passage in its turn seems indebted to lines 97-9 of Eclogue 8 (cf. '*ego*…animas imis excire *sepulcris*…*uidi*'), a poem to which Propertius himself had alluded earlier at 1.1.4-6 (*Amor*…*docuit*… *improbus* ~ *Ecl.* 8.47-50 'Amor docuit…improbus…improbus').

1.2.9-14

> aspice quos summittat humus formosa colores,
> ut ueniant hederae sponte sua melius,
> surgat et in solis formosius arbutus antris,
> et sciat indocilis currere lympha uias.
> litora natiuis †persuadent† picta lapillis,
> et uolucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.
>
> 9 formosa *codd.*: non culta ς: non fossa *Allen: alii alia*
> 13 praelucent *Hertzberg*: per se ardent *Tremenheere*: praestant sua *La Penna, Helmbold* (superant depicta *Housman*): *alii alia*

[3] Housman (1972) 1.107.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Propertius is adducing examples from nature to dissuade Cynthia from beautifying herself. There are two principal difficulties. (a) The transmitted *humus formosa* has been widely queried on the ground that *formosius* appears only two lines below; moreover, if anything is to be described as 'attractive', it is not the earth but the variegated plants and flowers which the earth produces. The point of the line is that the earth requires no human attention to be productive: hence Allen's *non fossa* (printed in the OCT). But *ferme ipsa* is closer to the paradosis: 'Look at the colours which the earth generally puts forth by itself' (*OLD submitto* 3a, *fere* 3a, *ipse* 7). *ipsa* is well paralleled at Virg. *Ecl.* 4.21-3, where it is twice used thus in successive sentences. Admittedly the form *ferme* is not used elsewhere by Propertius (nor by Catullus or other Augustan poets), but it is 5× in Lucretius, whom Propertius imitates quite often.

(b) Line 13 has been subjected to very many emendations and is discussed by Heyworth (2007b) 12-13. *persuadent* makes little or no sense. Many scholars favour a verb such as *praelucent* ('beaches picked out with their natural stones shine forth'), but one expects a comparison (cf. Hor. *Epi.* 1.1.83 'nullus in orbe sinus Bais praelucet amoenis'). La Penna and Helmbold came up with *praestant sua* independently of each other; but not only is *sua* extremely awkward and a seeming repetition of *natiuis* but *praestant*, like Housman's clever *superant depicta lapillis*, lacks a comparandum: it is very difficult to imagine in either case that Propertius wants the reader to understand '…are superior <to shore-houses with their mosaics>', notorious though such houses were. On the other hand, clarity would result if *praestant* or *superant* were combined with an object such as *sŏla*: 'litora natiuis superant sola picta lapillis', 'beaches with their natural <stones> outclass floors decorated with stones'. Pebble beaches are more attractive than mosaic floors. *sola picta* reappears at Prud. *Symm.* 2.252, an author who may have been influenced by Propertius elsewhere.[4] The proposed dual meaning of *lapillis* as pebbles and mosaics (for the latter see Hor. *Epi.* 1.10.19) is a form of syllepsis.

1.4.9-10

nedum, si leuibus fuerit collata figuris,
inferior duro iudice turpis eat. 10

11 iusto *Heyworth*: quouis *Kenney*

Cynthia would make the famous beauties of mythology seem insignificant; still less would she be judged inferior if she were compared with unimportant girls. *duro* is odd. Camps explains that it is said 'from the loser's point of view', but this is very convoluted, since the viewpoint of the couplet as a whole is not that of the loser. Goold renders 'even by a fastidious judge', but there is no 'even' in the Latin and *durus* does not mean 'fastidious'. Heyworth (2007a) suggests, but does not print, *iusto*; perhaps better is *uero*, 'honest' (*OLD* 9b), a regular epithet for *iudex* (Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 84, Sen. *Contr.* 7.1.5, Tac. *D.* 35.5).

[4]Shackleton Bailey (1952) 321-2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.10.3-10

o noctem meminisse mihi iucunda uoluptas,
o quotiens uotis illa uocanda meis,
cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella
uidimus et longa ducere uerba mora!
quamuis labentes premeret mihi somnus ocellos
et mediis caelo Luna ruberet equis,
non tamen a uestro potui secedere lusu:
tantus in alternis uocibus ardor erat.

Although *uidimus* (6) clearly says that Propertius has been indulging in voyeurism, watching Gallus and his girlfriend in bed, many scholars believe that this is not the case and that Propertius is referring to an erotic episode which he has been reading in the poetry of Cornelius Gallus.[5] Although a major problem with this theory is that the addressee cannot be the poet Gallus,[6] there are other difficulties too. Line 4 is very hard to reconcile with a non-literary interpretation of *uidimus*: if Propertius had wanted to refresh his memory of the episode, all he had to do was look up the description in a book of Gallus' verses. Line 7 does not make good sense if *uidimus* is a reference to Gallus' poetry: it seems no compliment to Gallus' verses if Propertius says that he was in danger of falling asleep. It is difficult to see how the Moon's embarrassment can be reconciled with the theory that Propertius has merely been reading Gallus' poetry. Since he will have been reading silently to himself, like the girl waiting for her boyfriend at 3.3.19-20, the Moon could not hear him,[7] and in any case the Moon is associated above all with witnessing, not eavesdropping: she is the νυκτὸς ὀφθαλμός (Aesch. *Sept.* 390).[8] The Moon is blushing not because she overheard Gallus' verses being read aloud by a third party but precisely because, being conventionally modest (*Priapea* 66.1-2), she witnessed the proceedings (cf. Hor. *S.* 1.8.35-6 'Lunamque rubentem | ne foret his testis' with Gowers (2012) ad loc.).[9] Heyworth (2007b: 49) supports the view of Sharrock (1990) and says of line 10 that '*alternis* evokes the alternating structure of the elegiac couplet: the night of voyeurism is also the image of a night spent reading Gallus', but, although Sharrock produces several examples of the adjective *alternus* applied to the elegiac couplet, she quotes no parallel for *uox* meaning 'line of verse'. *alternis uocibus* means what the same words mean at Liv. 3.15.6 'alternae uoces "ad arma" et "hostes in urbe sunt" audiebantur' (so too Ov. *Met.* 3.385).

If, then, it is more plausible to interpret the passage simply as an account of voyeurism, *lusu* (9) seems anticlimactic after *morientem* (5), which refers to orgasm.[10]

[5] So e.g. Cairns (2006) 116-17.

[6] It is generally agreed that the Gallus addressed in 1.10 is the same Gallus as is addressed in 1.5, but, whereas the poet Cornelius Gallus was an *eques*, the addressee of 1.5 was a *nobilis* (lines 23-4), and the attempt by Cairns (2006) 79-80 to deny it is tendentious.

[7] The old theory that ancient Romans read aloud to themselves is increasingly questioned (see Heilmann (2021), with extensive bibliography).

[8] See ní Mheallaigh (2020) 24-5, 74.

[9] For *rubere* of an embarrassed moon see also Nisbet–Hubbard (1978) on Hor. *C.* 2.11.10.

[10] Adams (1987) 159.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

What we expect after the references in 7-8 to the poet's drooping eyes and the embarrassment of the lunar witness is *uisu* ('nevertheless I could not withdraw from the sight of you both'), picking up *uidimus* in line 6. Line 10 is not an argument against.

1.13.13-14

haec ego non rumore malo, non augure doctus;
uidi ego: me, quaeso, teste negare potes?

13 haec non *N*: haec ego non *A, al.*: haec non sum *Rossberg*:
haec cano non *Baehrens* (quae c- n- *Heyworth*)

Propertius is assuring Gallus that he has seen him in the arms of a beloved girl. Heyworth (2007b: 61) points out that *haec* is doubtful: the two preceding couplets have each begun with *haec*, but there the pronoun is fem. sing. and refers to the girl; it is impossibly confusing if we seem to be presented with a triple anaphora in which the third *haec* is acc. plur. and has a different reference altogether. Heyworth notes also that *ego* too is doubtful: not only is it omitted in N but 'it dissipates the effect of *ego* in the subsequent *uidi ego*'. Heyworth – modifying Baehrens' *haec cano non*, which is adopted by Fedeli (2021) – prints *quae canŏ non*, which involves a short final *–o* (almost unparalleled in Propertius). More plausible, I suggest, is a word such as *certus* or *falsus* or *monitus*, parallel to *doctus*; but where the word is to be fitted into the line is debatable. Since Propertius likes anaphoric *non* to begin a line (e.g. 1.5.11 'non tibi iam somnos, non illa relinquet ocellos', 1.6.29, 2.1.3, 2.1.19, etc.), albeit not invariably, perhaps we should read e.g.:

non rumore malo certus, non augure doctus,
uidi ego: me, quaeso, teste negare potes?

2.1.15-16

seu quidquid fecit siue est quodcumque locuta,
maxima de nihilo nascitur historia.

uersus secl. Gruppe

Propertius ends his list of his girl's attributes by referring to her doings and sayings. It is not clear whether line 16 is a generalisation, but, even if it is, it has to be applicable to the girl. One difficulty with the phrase *de nihilo* is that the girl's attributes are not 'nothing', as pointed out by, for example, Butrica when arguing that the lines should be deleted.[11] Another difficulty is that, although *de nihilo* can mean 'from nothing' (as often in Lucretius), Propertius elsewhere uses the phrase with the different meaning

[11]Butrica (1997) 199-200.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of 'without reason' (2.3a.16, 2.16.52). It is of course true that the same phrase need not always have the same meaning, but *de minimo* would produce a tempting allusion to the power of rhetoric, which is conventionally described as making small things great (e.g. [Plut.] *Vitae Dec. Orat.* 838F τὰ μὲν μικρὰ μεγάλα τὰ δὲ μεγάλα μικρὰ ποιεῖν). Propertius may even be making the further point that his girl's 'biography' – a genre which, unlike history, is conventionally associated with trivial doings and sayings (Plut. *Alex.* 1.2 πρᾶγμα βραχὺ πολλάκις καὶ ῥῆμα) – can be transformed by him into proper 'history'.

2.1.57-8

omnis humanos sanat medicina dolores:
solus amor morbi non amat artificem.

57 omnis namque hominum *Heimreich* 58 habet *Florileg.*

Since it is not true that 'medicine cures all human pain', the contrast between the two lines is rhetorically ineffective. We need a word like *saepius* or *corporis* instead of *omnis.*

3.1.1-6

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in uestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.
dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro?
quoue pede ingressi? quamue bibistis aquam?

1 fata *Baehrens* (et consors umbra *uel* atque his comes umbra *Fontein*: Coi et simulacra, Phileta *Kämmerer: alii alia*) 3-4 *secl. Valckenaer*

These famous opening lines pose two problems, one recognised, one less so. (a) Remarking that the interpretation of *sacra* (1) has presented serious problems to Propertian scholars, Fedeli (1985) has a long note in which he explains and assesses the numerous meanings which have been attributed to the word and the various ways in which it has been combined with others to produce meaning, himself agreeing with those who think that the line means 'Shades and poetry of Callimachus and Philetas'. Heyworth/Morwood (2011) say that *sacra* means literally 'sacred rites' but that the word really means 'poetry' (they refer to *OLD sacrum* 3e). The difficulty with all such interpretations is that we expect a word that is of the same order as *Manes*, that can be used of an addressee in the vocative, and that coheres with *uestrum…nemus* (2), which from the context seems intended to suggest 'grove of the dead' (as at Juv. 3.13). The obvious word is *umbra*, which, since it does not scan, requires substantial alteration elsewhere in the line, as Fontein's attempts indicate. Kämmerer's proposal is attractive: *et* is often postponed in Propertius and other elegists, and *simulacra*, regularly

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

found as a plural for singular (*OLD* 4b), might easily have been corrupted into *sacra* by abbreviation (e.g. *ſlacra*). There seems no need to eliminate the genitive, however; 'Shade of Callimachus and ghost of Coan Philetas' makes good sense.

(b) The logic of the first six lines is surely very odd as transmitted. In 1-2 the poet directs an address to Callimachus and Philetas and pleads to enter their grove, which in 3-4 he appears already to be entering; but it next turns out that the poet cannot identify the right grove, and he has to resort to a second imperative and ask his addressees which grove is theirs (5-6).[12] How can the poet be entering the grove if he does not know where it is? I suggest that this is one of the numerous places in Propertius where lines have been transposed and that Propertius originally wrote as follows:

Callimachi Manes, Coi et simulacra Philitae,
  in uestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro? 5
  quoue pede ingressi? quamue bibistis aquam? 6
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos 3
  Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros. 4

It will not be denied that formally the imperative *dicite* follows much more naturally after *sinite* and its twin vocatives, rather than after the interruption of the first-person *ingredior*, and logically it is better for the poet to identify the grove before announcing his entrance into it. It may be objected that *primus ego ingredior* does not in fact refer to Propertius' entering the grove but means 'I am the first to begin to carry…' (so Heyworth/Morwood ad loc.), and that therefore the alleged illogicality is non-existent; but after *in uestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus* it is virtually impossible not to understand *primus ego ingredior* as 'I am the first to enter', which is indeed how Goold translates it. Besides, although inceptive expressions are commonly pleonastic, 'I am the first to begin to carry' seems almost banal and is quite unsuited to the context: Camps and others are surely right to take *ferre* as an infinitive of purpose, a construction which is regular after a verb of motion and one of which Propertius is fond.[13] Although it cannot be adduced as a decisive argument in favour of the transposition, it so happens that the allusions to Georgics 3 are now in the same order as they are found in Virgil: *carmen tenuastis* ∼ *G.* 3.3 *tenuissent carmine, primus ego* ∼ *G.* 3.10 *primus ego*. The lines mean: 'Shade of Callimachus and ghost of Coan Philitas, allow me, I pray, to come into your grove. Tell me, in what glade did both of you spin your song? With what foot did you enter? What water did you drink? *I* am the first to enter there as a priest to bear from a pure spring amidst Greek dances Italian emblems.' We have to imagine a pause between lines 6 and 3 to allow time for Propertius to receive an answer to the questions of 5-6, and *ingredior* in 3 is probably to be read as having a future aspect, as often with first-person verbs.[14] The polyptoton *ingressi* ∼ *ingredior* is the kind of repetition one expects in an antiphonal context.

[12]For Propertius' use of *antrum* and *nemus* as synonymous terms see Cairns (2006) 131-6.
[13]See Kühner–Stegmann (1962) 1.681.
[14]See Pinkster (2015) 1.399-401.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.3.47-50

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

48 uiae *Burman*: morae *Heyworth*

The Muse says that Propertius’ verse will not be epic but will include komastic scenes. Heyworth demonstrates that the transmitted *fugae* is unacceptable,[15] but can we do better than his own suggestion, *morae*, which is printed by Goold? The lyre and lyre-like instruments ‘played a large role in…the komos’, as demonstrated by the numerous references assembled by Cummings:[16] a good example is *C.* 3.26.3-4, where Horace hangs up his lyre to indicate that his life as a komastic lover is over.[17] We might therefore consider *lyrae* (‘and you will sing of the drunken indications given by the night-time lyre’); *signum* is here being used to mean ‘Something perceived by the mind or senses from which an inference may be drawn’ (*OLD* 4a): when the girl hears the lyre, she knows she is wanted outside; this leads particularly well into *excantare* (‘charm forth’) in line 49.

3.11.5-6

†uenturam† melius praesagit nauita †mortem†,
uulneribus didicit miles habere metum.

uersus secl. Georg

Line 5 has been much emended, but *uulneribus* in line 6 perhaps suggests that all that is missing is an ablative noun: ‘uent<is uent>uram praesagit nauita mortem’ (‘from the winds the sailor has foreknowledge of his approaching death’). Parablepsy may have caused the elimination of *uentis*, a gap which was then filled by the unnecessary *melius*; plays on *uentus* and *uenturus* recur elsewhere (Germ. fr. 3-4.153-4, Sen. *Ag.* 469, Luc. 3.596) and are perhaps intended to suggest an etymological connection. Whether the lines are genuine is a different matter: their deletion is accepted by Heyworth (2007a) and tempts Fedeli (2022) to say ‘fortasse recte’.

3.16.1-2

Nox media, et dominae mihi uenit epistula nostrae:
Tibure me missa iussit adesse mora…

[15]Heyworth (1986) 202-3.
[16]Cummings (2001) 46 n. 27.
[17]See Woodman (2022) ad loc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Propertius has been sent a letter by his beloved, demanding his immediate presence at Tibur. *missa* is confusing, since the reader expects it to refer to *epistula*; should we read *amissa* ('abandon': *OLD* 5 'w. abs. obj.') or *omissa* (as Suet. *Otho* 6.3)? Propertius regularly elides *me* before a following vowel (e.g. 3.24.19), although nowhere else in a pentameter.

3.16.19-20

sanguine tam paruo quis enim spargatur amantis
improbus? †exclusis† fit comes ipsa Venus?

19 prauo *Dorville*: sacro *Sterke*: puro *Fischer*: parui *Damsté*
20 et cursus *Lachmann*: ecce suis *Fischer* (et cuius sit *Palmer*): *alii alia* it *Dorville, alii*

Propertius is trying to persuade himself that he will be safe if he journeys to his beloved. Lovers are supposed to be pale and anaemic, but scholars have had trouble with *paruo*, which does indeed seem odd: the only two other exs. of the phrase are in Lucan, where 6.157 refers to general bloodshed and 6.226 is 'somewhat different', as Shackleton Bailey says.[18] The word one would expect is *parco* (cf. Sil. 11.54 'respersis non parco sanguine mensis').

Many scholars agree that *exclusis* is inappropriate here (the *exclusus amator* is not in question), and, of the many emendations that have been proposed, Heyworth (2007b: 373) favours Fischer's *ecce suis*, rightly sensing a 'change of direction' after *improbus*; perhaps better than *ecce* is *rursus*, a favourite of Propertius, which means both 'on top of that' and 'conversely' (*OLD* 5-6). I suggest that Propertius wrote *improbus? et rursus fit comes ipsa Venus* (for *improbus et* cf. also 1.1.6, and for *et rursus* cf. 2.22b.49). It would follow that Dorville's *it comes*, common elsewhere (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.159, 6.448, Ov. *AA* 1.301, Luc. 6.828, *al.*) and printed by Heyworth (2007a), is ruled out.

3.18.1-2

Clausus ab umbroso qua ludit pontus Auerno,
fumida Baiarum stagna tepentis aquae,…

1 tundit *Baehrens*: tendit *Barber*

Agrippa had famously linked Lake Avernus to the sea by connecting it to the Lucrine Lake, which lay in between them and afforded access to the gulf of Puteoli; he then closed off the Lucrine Lake by *claustra* (Virg. *G.* 2.161) as part of his construction of the Portus Iulius, and it is this closure to which Propertius seems to be referring ('the sea closed off by shady Avernus'). *ludit*, which Camps translates as 'dances', seems quite inappropriate to describe the sea's reaction to this reconfiguration: Virgil

[18] Shackleton Bailey (1956) 188.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

describes the sea as resentful (162 'indignatum magnis stridoribus aequor'). Perhaps *surgit* ('rouses itself to action') would describe the sea's attempts to escape from the confines in which Agrippa had enclosed it.[19]

3.18.21-6

sed tamen huc omnes, huc primus et ultimus ordo:
est mala, sed cunctis ista terenda uia est.
exoranda canis tria sunt latrantia colla,
scandenda est torui publica cumba senis.
ille licet ferro cautus se condat et aere,
mors tamen inclusum protrahit inde caput.

This elegy mourns the death of young Marcellus, the popular and favoured nephew of Augustus; in these lines Propertius is dwelling on the theme that death comes to everyone. Line 25 is doubly misleading. After four lines of generalisation (*omnes, cunctis*) the reader is likely to assume that *ille* (25) returns us to the subject of the poem, Marcellus; but this turns out not to be the case. Further difficulties then arise. What does *ille* mean? Scholars offer different possibilities: *either* the word is to be taken closely with *cautus* and means 'the cautious man' *or* Propertius is to be imagined as pointing to 'yonder man', in which case some think *cautus* is adverbial with *condat* ('yonder man…cautiously'), while others think the meaning is 'yonder cautious man'. Moreover, in the context of dying (21-4) one might reasonably expect *condat* to refer to burial, whereas it means 'hide' or (as Goold has it) 'shut himself up'. These confusions would be removed if the line were to read *seque licet ferro cautus circumdet et aere*, 'and although a cautious man may surround himself with iron and bronze'. Propertius does not elsewhere begin a line with *seque*, but Virgil does it twice (*Aen.* 1.627, 3.182) and Ovid many times, in both his hexameters and elegiacs. Heyworth/Morwood suggest that the poet has in mind either 'a man in a suit of armour or a room lined with metal': the latter possibility is more popular with other commentators and on the whole seems more likely, since thoughts of Death extracting the man's head from his helmet are unwelcome.

4.1.7-8

atque ubi Nauali stant sacra Palatia Phoebo,
Euandri profugae concubuere boues.
fictilibus creuere deis haec aurea templa,
nec fuit opprobrio facta sine arte casa;
Tarpeiusque pater nuda de rupe tonabat,
et Tiberis nostris aduena bubus erat.

8 bubus erat *obelis not. Hutchinson, qui et* bubus iit *tent.:* murus *Heyworth*

Propertius is describing the earliest days of Rome. Camps' comment on line 8 reads as follows: 'the Tiber, to the poet's contemporaries Rome's own river, flowing through

[19]Professor Maltby suggests *saeuit.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the centre of the metropolis, was then an alien stream, emerging from unknown territory and flowing through pastures on the outskirts of the tiny settlement. For the cattle suggesting a pastoral landscape cf. line 4 above.' Camps' contrast between past and present is surely correct, but his note that cattle have already been mentioned in line 4 suggests that Heyworth (1986: 208) is right to say that we do not want them again here in 8. Heyworth suggests instead *murus*, but, after a reference to the Tarpeian Rock, it seems odd to describe the River Tiber as a wall.[20] Lines 5-7 indicate that the context is that of divinities: if Propertius wrote *diuus* ('and the god Tiber was a stranger to our people'), it would sharpen the contrast between the former 'alien stream' and his contemporaries' 'own river', now recognised as a god. There seems to be no parallel for the description of the Tiber as *diuus*, but for *deus* cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.31.

4.4.19-20

uidit harenosis Tatium proludere campis
pictaque per flauas arma leuare iubas:

20 frena leuare *Palmer*: lora mouere *Hartman: alii alia* (*uersus 'nondum explicatus' Heyworth*)

Tarpeia spots Tatius exercising and is smitten. 'It is not apparent why weapons should be raised through the mane', says Hutchinson (2006); but, if Propertius had written *picta super flauas*, the Latin would correspond to Goold's understanding of the line ('uplifting his blazoned arms over his horse's golden mane'). 'Clausal asyndeton is common in Propertius', says Adams;[21] for some exs. see Camps on 3.12.34.

4.4.83-4

mons erat ascensu dubius †festoque remissus†
nec mora, uocalis occupat ense canis.

83 ascensum monstrat *Housman*: m- e- ascensus, dapibus *Jacob*
custosque remissus *Shackleton Bailey* *post* 83 *lacunam stat. Richmond: alii alia*

Tarpeia takes advantage of a holiday to betray the city to Tatius. Although numerous scholars defend *remissus* in the sense of 'unguarded' (Goold) or 'free' (Heyworth),[22] Hutchinson rightly calls it a 'doubtful usage' and prints the alternative reading *remissis.* The word for 'to leave unguarded, neglect' is *omittere* (*TLL* 9.2.582.47-58 'fere loca', 584.14-26): the verb is much more at home in prose than in verse (ibid. 581.45-52), but an occasional use is seemingly accepted (e.g. Ov. *Am.* 2.1.17). If Propertius wrote *mons erat ascensu dubius, festo uel omissus* ('the hill was awkward to climb (and) because of the

[20]For rivers as walls Heyworth quotes Curt. 7.4.5 and Amm. 14.2.9.
[21]Adams (2021) 23.
[22]Heyworth (1999) 83.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

holiday even unguarded:[23] without delay she forestalled with a sword the barking of the dogs'), the meaning would fit the situation perfectly; the asyndeton is of the type where the second term is 'semantically stronger'.[24] If the asyndeton is nevertheless found objectionable, one might consider *mons erat ascensu dubius festoque et omissus.* The meaning is the same, and, although elision at this point in the hexameter is rare, cf. 3.1.29, 4.7.33; for *et* 'even' cf. 2.9.1.

4.7.27-8

'denique quis nostro curuum te funere uidit,
atram quis lacrimis incaluisse togam?'

28 immaduisse ς

Cynthia is berating Propertius from beyond the grave: he has not grieved for her with sufficient passion. Passion and warmth are often associated with each other in elegy, but the combination of *incaluisse* with *togam* seems a very odd hyperbole indeed. *immaduisse* is supported by Ov. *Tr.* 1.9.34 'lacrimis immaduisse genas', but *commaculasse*, being transitive, would retain the focus on the unfortunate Propertius.

4.9.31-2

huc ruit in siccam congesta puluere barbam,
et iacit ante fores uerba minora deo:

31 collecta *Hutchinson*: coniecto *Bonazzi*: concreta *tent. Heyworth*

Exhausted by his encounter with Cacus, Hercules is about to seek help from women attending the rites of Bona Dea. Hutchinson describes the transmitted *congesta*, retained by Fedeli in both his editions, as 'too extreme' and regards *concreta*, which Heyworth (2007b: 488) suggests but does not print, more appropriate of blood. Perhaps *conferta* (used of dust at Fronto p. 210.11 vdH[2]; for *in* cf. e.g. Liv. 3.6.3, *Aetna* 157); the word is absent from Propertius elsewhere and from Ovid, but it is used by Lucretius and by Virgil in the Georgics.

4.11.69-72

et serie fulcite genus: mihi cumba uolenti
soluitur aucturis tot mea fata meis.
haec est feminei merces extrema triumphi,
laudat ubi emeritum libera fama rogum.

[23] For the noun *festum* see *OLD* s.v.
[24] Adams (2021) 716 (index).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

69 et *codd.*: uos *Withof* 70 aucturis ς: uncturis *LPΛ* facta ς
71-2 *post* 68 *transpos. Baehrens* 72 emeritam *Hosius*
torum *Markland*: iugum *Bücheler*

In this elegy the dead Cornelia, daughter of Scribonia (Augustus' first wife) and wife of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (cos. suff. 34 BC), speaks from beyond the grave and addresses the surviving members of her family: in addition to her husband there were two sons and a daughter. Discussion of the above couplets is made more difficult because between lines 61 and 75 scholars have proposed numerous transpositions, seen particularly clearly in the edition of Heyworth (2007a). Fedeli (1994, 2022) and Hutchinson, however, retain the transmitted order of couplets, as printed here. The imperative *fulcite* is addressed to Cornelia's offspring, who, it is hoped (69-70), will themselves have children and so extend the family line: Camps seems right to paraphrase 70b as 'when there are so many of mine in whose lives my own life will be prolonged'. But both the text and interpretation of 71-2 are disputed. Although Fedeli prints the transmitted *rogum*, in his commentary (1965) he had offered no explanation of what the lines might mean. Hutchinson and Fedeli (2022) both print *torum*, the former translating: 'A woman's triumph, her final reward, is when unbiased reputation praises the completed service of her bed'. In other words the '*merces* consists of the triumph' and is defined by line 72. Yet this interpretation seems not to follow after 69-70, since the context is not that of Cornelia's own procreation but of that of her children.

A military triumph would bring financial rewards (cf. 3.4.3); a woman's triumph is the successful production of children, and the final reward of that triumph is her children's children (whom, if she dies prematurely, she will not live to see). In other words *haec…merces* is not prospective, as Hutchinson renders it, but retrospective, looking back to 69-70. What, then, of line 72? Since *emeritus* is the technical term for a retired soldier (*OLD emereo* 1c), Hosius' *emeritam*, linking neatly with *feminei…triumphi*, deserves serious consideration. Hosius took *rogum* to be the object of *emeritam*, but the concept of 'earning' one's pyre seems quite wrong (contrast 61 'emerui generosos uestis honores'); and, besides, *emeritus* = 'retired' is so often used absolutely. Is it possible that Propertius wrote *rogi*? The lines would mean: 'This is the final reward of a woman's triumph, at the time when free speech at the pyre praises the one who has served her time'. *rogi* is a possessive genitive and *libera fama* refers to the eulogy which would be spoken at the pyre of the deceased woman; the eulogist describes her grandchildren as her 'final reward' because they will constitute her afterlife ('mea fata', 70), living their lives long after she has died.

Acknowledgements. For comments on earlier drafts of these notes I am most grateful to S.J. Heyworth, R. Maltby and an anonymous referee.

Works cited

Adams, J.N. (1987). *The Latin sexual vocabulary*. Rev. edn. London
Adams, J.N. (2021). *Asyndeton and its interpretation in Latin literature*. Cambridge
Butrica, J.L. (1997). 'Editing Propertius', *CQ* 47.176-208
Cairns, F. (2006). *Sextus Propertius: the Augustan elegist*. Cambridge
Camps, W.A. (1961-7). *Propertius: Elegies*. Books I-IV. Cambridge
Cummings, M.S. (2001). 'The early Greek paraclausithyron and Gnesippus', *Scholia* 10.38-53

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fedeli, P. (1965). *Properzio Elegie: Libro IV*. Bari
Fedeli, P. (1980). *Sesto Properzio: Il primo libro delle elegie*. Florence
Fedeli, P. (1985). *Properzio: Il libro terzo delle Elegie*. Bari
Fedeli, P. (1994). *Propertius*. Teubner edn. Stuttgart/Leipzig
Fedeli, P. (2021-22). *Properzio: Elegie*. Vols. 1-2. Milan
Goold, G.P. (1990). *Propertius: Elegies*. Loeb edn. Cambridge, MA/London
Gowers, E. (2012). *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge
Hardy, M. (2022). 'Emendations in the third book of Propertius', *CCJ* 68.112-32
Heilmann, J. (2021). *Lesen in Antike und frühem Christentum*. Tübingen
Heyworth, S.J. (1986). 'Notes on Propertius Books III and IV', *CQ* 36.199-211
Heyworth, S.J. (1999). 'Textual notes on Propertius 4.3, 4.4, 4.5', in S.M. Braund and R. Mayer (edd.), *amor: roma. Love and Latin literature* 71-93. Cambridge
Heyworth, S.J. (2007a). *Sexti Properti Elegi.* Oxford Classical Text. Oxford
Heyworth, S.J. (2007b). *Cynthia. A companion to the text of Propertius*. Oxford
Heyworth, S.J. and Morwood, J.H.W. (2011). *A commentary on Propertius Book 3*. Oxford
Housman, A.E. (1972). *The classical papers of A.E. Housman*. Vols. 1-3. Cambridge
Hutchinson, G.O. (2006). *Propertius: Elegies Book IV*. Cambridge
Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. (1962). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Vol. 1. 4th edn. Munich
ní Mheallaigh, K. (2020).*The moon in the Greek and Roman imagination*. Cambridge
Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1978). *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*. Oxford
Pinkster, H. (2015). *The Oxford Latin syntax*. Vol. 1. Oxford
Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1952). 'Echoes of Propertius', *Mnem*. 5.307-33
Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1956). *Propertiana*. Cambridge
Sharrock, A. (1990). '*Alternae uoces* – again', *CQ* 40.570-1
Smyth, W.R. (1970). *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*. Leiden
Woodman, A.J. (2022). *Horace: Odes III*. Cambridge

Cite this article: Woodman, A.J. (2024) 'Propertiana', *The Cambridge Classical Journal* **70**, 108–121. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270524000058 Published online by Cambridge University Press