fault with Homer's geography must surely be considered a most elegant and effective way to challenge the great model's claim to primacy in this field and to prove oneself superior in geographical πολυμάθεια.

Universität Bern MARTIN KORENJAK
martin.korenjak@kps.unibe.ch
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh073

PROPERTIUS 3.4, 1.1, AND THE *AENEID* INCIPIT

In a recent note in these pages F. Cairns[1] argued that the words *arma* (1), *uiri* (3), and *cano* (9) in Propertius 3.4 allude to *arma uirumque cano* in the incipit of the *Aeneid*:

Arma deus Caesar dites meditatur ad Indos,
  et freta gemmiferi findere classe maris.
magna, **uiri**, merces: parat ultima terra triumphos;
  Tigris et Euphrates sub tua iura fluent;
sera, sed Ausoniis ueniet prouincia uirgis;
  assuescent Latio Partha tropaea Ioui.
ite agite, expertae bello, date lintea, prorae,
  et solitum armigeri ducite munus equi!
omina fausta **cano**. Crassos clademque piate!
  ite et Romanae consulite historiae!

I quote Cairns: 'The combination can hardly be coincidental, since Propertius' allusive terms not only appear in the same order as the *Aeneid*'s *arma uirumque cano* (1.1), but each of them occupies the same *sedes* as its Virgilian counterpart (310).' That is true, though some may not agree that *uiri* 'men' immediately suggests *uirumque* '*the* man', or that *cano*, following nine lines past *arma*, is a powerful allusion. It is also true that Cairns's interpretation requires the reading *uiri* rather than the emendation preferred by the most recent editors, *Quiris*.

But to continue: 'Recognition of this pattern confirms (although confirmation is hardly needed) the spurious nature of the alternative *Ille ego . . . incipit* of the *Aeneid* (310).' Yet if we accept this line of reasoning, how are we then to regard Propertius 1.1.13ff:

ille etiam Hylaei percussus uulnere rami
  saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit.
ergo uelocem potuit domuisse puellam:
  tantum in amore preces et benefacta ualent.
in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artes,
  nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire uias.
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 amnis
  posse Cytinaeis ducere carminibus.
et uos, **qui** sero lapsum reuocatis, amici,

when compared with the first line of the 'alternative opening' of the *Aeneid*, ***ille ego qui*** *quondam gracili modulatus auena . . .* ? I would point out that Propertius' *ille*, *ego*, and *qui*, also, to use Cairns's words, 'not only appear in the same order as the *Aeneid*'s' *ille ego qui* (1.1), 'but each of them occupies the same *sedes* as its Virgilian

[1] F. Cairns, 'Propertius 3.4 and the *Aeneid* incipit', *CQ* n.s. 53 (2003), 309–11.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh074 Published online by Cambridge University Press

counterpart'. To those who object that *ille*, *ego*, and *qui* are not sufficiently allusive terms of the same rank as *arma*, *uiri* (if that is the true reading), and *cano*, I would reply that such is the nature of pronouns like *ille*, *ego*, and *qui*; and to those who would ask whether the allusion be too far buried in an improbable place, I would ask whether an allusion to the beginning of a great poem such as the *Aeneid* would be more likely found in the first poem of Propertius' first book, or the fourth poem of his third book. And finally, to those who say that the eleven lines in Propertius separating *ille* from *ego* constitute too much of a stretch, I would point out that *arma* is nine lines distant from *cano*; and only two verses apiece separate *ego . . . qui* and *arma . . . uiri*, respectively.

I draw no firm conclusions from either allusion, if they are not illusions, to the *Aeneid*. At a minimum, however, I would insist that we would be rash to assume that the *ille ego qui . . .* lines are spurious because of what Propertius says in the fourth poem of his third book. More adventurously, I would argue that if we permit the allusion in 3.4, we ought to permit it in 1.1; and if we do that, we may be constrained to believe that Propertius considered the *ille ego qui . . .* lines authentic.[2]

Cornell University MICHAEL FONTAINE
mf268@cornell.edu
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh074

[2] The best article dealing with the lines is that of L. Gamberale, 'Il cosidetto *preproemio* dell'*Eneide*', in Antonio Butteto and Michael von Albrecht (edd.), *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco* (Palermo 1991), 963–80, which reviews and supersedes most earlier treatments. The still-prevalent arguments of R. G. Austin ('*Ille ego qui quondam*', *CQ* n.s. 18 [1968] 107–15) are, to say the least, subjective, and are disposed of by P. A. Hansen in '*Ille ego qui quondam . . .* once again', *CQ* n.s. 22 (1972), 139–49.

OVID, *HEROIDES* 7.113[1]

occidit *internas* coniunx mactatus ad aras
et sceleris tanti praemia frater habet.

113 internas *Dp, Naugerius, Heinsius, quem secuti sunt edd. plerique*: in terras *P, recc. plerique*: ad terras *P3, recc. aliquot*: in terra *R:* in terris *T, recc. aliquot:* internis *E2:* (occiderat) tirias *cod. Turonensis Bibl. Comm. 881 (teste Dörrie):* Herculeas *Micyllus:* infernas *D. Heinsius*: Herceas *Heinsius in notis, Sedlmayer, Bornecque:* ut Tyrias *Dörrie*

This is the text of Heinsius' edition of 1661 (with my own apparatus),[2] and the one followed by almost all the editors.[3] The reading *internas* is a conjecture by Andreas Naugerius (1483–1529),[4] brilliantly correcting the unintelligible *in terras* of the older manuscripts. But Andrea Navagero's conjecture, though closer to the *ductus litter-*

[1] The line numbering is from Ovid's editors, except Dörrie (line 15 in his edition), since I also assume that the introductory couple (*accipe . . . legis*) is spurious; read P. Knox, *Ovid, Heroides: Select Epistles* (Cambridge, 1995), 36.

[2] Dp: Dresdensis, Landesbibl. Dc 142, saec. XIII (ex Dörrie's edition); P: Parisinus, Bibl. Nat. lat. 8242, Puteaneus, saec. IX 3/4; P3: Parisinus, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7993, saec. XII–XIII; T: Turonensis, Bibl. Munic., 879, *c.* 1200; E2: Etonensis 91 (Bk. 6.18), saec. XIII; R: Pragensis Bibl. Univ. 1630 sive VIII H 12, saec. XII ex. (ex Dörrie's edition).

[3] Dörrie asigns *internas* to the Dresdensis, Landesbibl. Dc 142, saec. XIII (Dp) and to Merkel and Riese.

[4] Read G. Luck, 'Ovid, Naugerius and we, or: how to create a text', *Exemplaria* 6 (2002), 8–9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh074 Published online by Cambridge University Press