The Cambridge Classical Journal (2022) 68, 112–132 doi:10.1017/S1750270522000069
© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Cambridge Philological Society.

EMENDATIONS IN THE THIRD BOOK OF PROPERTIUS

Maxwell Hardy*†
Trinity College, Oxford, UK
*Corresponding author. Email: maxwell.hardy@trinity.ox.ac.uk

Five conjectures are proposed on the text of the third book of Propertius, one a slight alteration of an idea already proposed, four mainly original contributions: 1.23 *postremo* for *post obitum*, 4.18 *supra uinctos* for *subter captos*, 8.13 *seu grege custodum* for *custodum gregibus* (*custodum grege seu* Heinsius), 10.13 *somnos* for *somnum*, 11.40 *adulta canis* for *adusta nota*. One additional conjecture is made in passing on the text of Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.4.104, where *duces* probably ought to be read for *uiros*.

Introduction

Bumped off the heights of Helicon by Error and Neglect, Propertius has a long way to go before he reaches the top again. The purpose of these five notes is to help with his reascent. For each passage discussed I give the text of Stephen Heyworth's *OCT* with his sigla and apparatus, the latter augmented by readings culled from W. R. Smyth's thesaurus and other sources.[1] I have however placed for a visual aid two obeli around those words which others regard as corrupt, and I propose to emend anew.

3.1.21–4

at mihi quod uiuo detraxerit inuida turba,
  post obitum duplici faenore reddet honos.
omnia †post obitum† fingit maiora uetustas;
  maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora uenit.

22 reddet Λ : reddit ΝΠ | honos ς : onus Ω || 23 omnia] fame N : ferme *Palmer* | uetustas] uetuste N | fama p. o. cingit maiore uetusta (-tas) *Weidgen* : fama est post obitum: fingit m. u. *Alton* : fama p. o. adfingit m. u. *Barber* || 24 uenit] meum Π

† I am grateful to *CCJ*'s anonymous referee for their helpful comments and criticisms.

1 Heyworth (2007a); Smyth (1970).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

What Propertius says of poetry is refuted by his scribes. In v. 23 ΠΛ would have him say 'age makes all things greater after one's death'; N prefers 'it [sc. *honos*] fashions greater things after the death of old fame'. It requires no great penetration to see which of these readings is the better, but even the best is not wholly free of fault. There are two problems here essentially. In the first instance, N, commonly esteemed as the most 'honest' of the manuscripts, offers two singularly terrible variants for words which in ΠΛ are perfectly sound and in fact indispensable.[2] How is this to be squared with its typically impeccable reputation? To dismiss *fame* ... *uetuste* with A. E. Housman as a mere 'careless blunder' will not do:[3] N does not blunder this badly without reasonable cause, and editors are neglecting their charge if they do not make at least an attempt to explain it.[4] Secondly – a point made by Heyworth – *post obitum* is an otiose repetition after the same in v. 22, and fails to give good sense in its second appearance.[5] That the value of a person's works is appreciated after death is a thought already expressed in v. 22 with respect to Propertius and in v. 24 with respect to everyone else. Verse 23 seems to contain a statement of wider application, namely that age increases the worth of all things, period: a general truth in contrast to the particular circumstance described in vv. 21–2, and more than a mere echo of *maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora uenit* in v. 24.[6] That *post obitum* is corrupt, and N's *fame* and *uetuste* some desperate attempt to fix it, is the inevitable conclusion, and a successful answer to this crux must start from that as a premise. But, says Heyworth, '[i]t is difficult to see what else could fill the line; "time makes everything greater" is the required sense, and an insertion that was not tautologous would impair the verse.'[7] Ezra Pound added 'regardless of quality' to his paraphrase, but this is quite unlikely to be what Propertius actually said (as if he conceived his own poetry to be of doubtful quality).[8] I for my part would be satisfied with an adverb meaning merely 'in the end, eventually', and for *post obitum* therefore suggest *postremo*. Errors of perseveration (so the experts call them) are frequently triggered by a likeness in the beginnings of words; and in this case *postremo* could well have prompted the scribe of Ω to recall *post obitum* from the previous verse and so write it out in the next. That *postremo* can bear the sense of 'in the end, eventually' is illustrated

2 N's reputation is so highly exalted that some commentators go as far as to accept *famae* by mashing it together with ΠΛ's *uetustas* in a perverse misapplication of the principle of 'lectio difficilior potior'; cf. Foster (1912) 340–1; Butler and Barber (1933) 264; Richardson (1976) 320.

3 Housman (1893a) 155–6, followed by Fedeli (1985) 73.

4 Richmond (1928) 9, following Solbisky (1883) 175, believes *fame* to be an intrusive gloss of *uetustas*. Enk (1911) 204–5 wonders if it was a misreading of *fatum*, itself a gloss on *obitum*. Camps (1966) 56 admits the possibility that 'the line is garbled in both branches'.

5 Heyworth (2007b) 283.

6 Paley (1872) 144: 'the sense is, "when poems become old, they are always more valued than when new"'.

7 Heyworth (2007b) 283.

8 Pound (1921) 11: 'I shall have, doubtless, a boom after my funeral, | Seeing that long standing increases all things | Regardless of quality.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through several parallels gathered by the authors of the *OLD* s.v. 3, as well as a contextually relevant fragment of Enn. *Ann.* 16.5 (Skutsch) (= Gell. *NA* 9.14.5):

> postremo longinqua dies confecerit aetas . . .[9]

'In the end, the long age of day shall put an end to' probably the monuments discussed in the foregoing fragment, 16.4 (Skutsch). Whether *postremo* in Ennius' text truly means just 'in the end, eventually' cannot be known of a surety, but it is difficult to see what else it could signify, and all translators render it in this sense.[10] However, despite being a very apposite parallel for the meaning of *postremo* posited here, Enn. *Ann.* 16.5 appears to contain the only other instance of *postremo* in the sense of 'eventually' to be found in hexameters of the archaic and classical periods, save perhaps Sil. *Pun.* 13.28.[11] Lucretius has it seventeen times, but always in the sense of 'last of all, finally (in a logical sequence)' (*OLD* s.v. 1b).[12] In other words, *postremo* is very close to being a poetical *hapax legomenon*. In any other poet that fact might render its conjecture an illegitimate proceeding, but the *Sprachkunst* of Propertius is a very different piece of work from the polished idiom of a Tibullus or an Ovid, and archaisms and/or colloquialisms of this kind are scarcely rare. To cite just one further 'hapax', at 3.24.17 the verb *resipiscimus* has somehow survived into the thirteenth century without getting corrupted in either branch of the tradition, though it is not elsewhere to be found in classical Latin verse. Further poetical hapaxes include *argutat* at 1.6.7, *uenumdata* at 3.19.21 and *sirpiculis* at 4.2.40 (elsewhere only at Columella, *Rust.* 10.1.1.305), to name just three.[13] Between the evidence of Enn. *Ann.* 16.5 and Propertius' penchant for occasional colloquialism/archaism, and in view of the generally gnomic quality of vv. 25–6 (which certainly lends itself to an old-timey parlance), *postremo* here is established on perfectly good linguistic ground, and seems (at least to me) to be as close to a solution to this crux as we are likely to get. For it also carries with it a plausible explanation of the garbled text of N. Assume that the corruption of *postremo* into *post obitum* was obvious to the scribe that made it and prompted him to write *-remo* above or in the general vicinity of *obitum*; it is possible then to explain *fame . . . uetuste* as a mishandled attempt at effecting this correction. The diligent scribe of N saw *remo* in his exemplar, and bethinking himself of 2.3.41 *si quis uult fama tabulas anteire uetustas*, corrected the

9 On the text of this fragment see Holford-Strevens (2020) 100 and Skutsch (1985) 568–9.

10 'In the end, the long age of day will destroy', Goldberg and Manuwald (2018) 323; likewise Skutsch (1985) 568–9.

11 *postremo* in Sil. *Pun.* 5.124 and 16.452 is better interpreted in the sense of *OLD* s.v. 1 'last of all, lastly'. For *postremo* in the verse of late antiquity cf. Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 9.144, 16.50, and Prudentius, *Perist.* 10.968. At Juv. 11.91 *postremo* of the Pithoeanus is certainly an error, on which see Housman (1903) xxxv.

12 He does however have the collocation *omnia postremo* twice at the beginning of a verse (2.408, 456), as here, whatever that coincidence may be worth. Cf. also Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.4 *omnia postremo quae uindicaris in altero tibi ipsi uehementer fugienda sunt*.

13 I would have cited for a similarly ill-attested adverb *ecquandone* at 2.8.15, but the passage to which it is attached has been suspected, and may not belong where it is now found; see Heyworth (2007b) 144–5. On Propertius' colloquialisms and *hapax legomena* in general see Tränkle (1960).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

verse according to his honest if defective interpretation of the ductus.[14] The rest of the manuscripts, ΠΛ, simply ignored what appeared to be the meaningless ablative or dative form of the Latin word for 'oar'. Or, in other words,

omnia postremo fingit maiora uetustas

became in Ω

remo
omnia post obitum fingit maiora uetustas,

which in N was made

fame post obitum fingit maiora *uetuste*

and in ΠΛ remained

omnia post obitum fingit maiora uetustas.

Such – upon my theory – was the genesis of these variants. For another example of 'corrections in Propertius gone wrong', compare the corruption of 3.5.35 *plaustra Bootes* by N to *flamma boon* and by F to *flamma palustra*, the latter of which is evidently a mislaid correction of *flamma* back to *plaustra*.[15] In this instance F's mistake is telling: if its testimony were all we had to go on, how many editors would dare to print the emendation *plaustra Bootes*?

3.4.11–18

I present these lines in the order in which they are given by the manuscripts, but concede that some verses may be out of place and others perhaps are missing.

Mars pater, et sacrae fatalia lumina Vestae,
  ante meos obitus sit precor illa dies,
qua uideam spoliis oneratos Caesaris axes,
  ad uulgi plausus saepe resistere equos,
inque sinu carae nixus spectare puellae
  incipiam et titulis oppida capta legam,
tela fugacis equi et bracati militis arcus,
  et †subter captos† arma sedere duces.

15 inque simul . . . nisus *Bonazzi* | nixus] nexus *Bosscha* : uinctos *Sterke* : exuuias *Baehrens* | 18 et] haec *Richmond* | captos] cautos *Housman* | et subter captos] captiuos subterque *Baehrens*

14 That the juxtaposition of *fama* and *uetustas* at 2.3.41 may have had something to do with the corruption is another point made by Heyworth (2007b) 283. Note that *fama* has also appeared fourteen lines earlier in 3.1.9 *quo me fama leuat sublimis*.

15 On this verse see Housman (1893b) 175.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Verse 18 presents two problems of interpretation, the first of which arises from *subter*, the second from *captos*. With *subter* it is the word order that causes issues: the adverb at first sight appears to go with *captos*, but because the 'spoils' of captive chieftains were normally borne above them, not below, editors take it with *arma*. On this Butler and Barber have the following to say: '*subter* governs *arma*; but the distortion of the natural order is not merely harsh, but ambiguous, since *subter* should *prima facie* govern *captos* … *duces*'.[16] 'Ambiguity' is not really the right word for this phenomenon. Prepositions normally go with the noun to which they are closest, and to understand them otherwise is to fight against the current of the syntax.[17] *sedere* moreover is a questionable verb to apply to captives in a triumph, for normally they are represented as being led in chains before the triumphator's chariot: *Res gest.* 4.3 *in triumphis meis ducti sunt ante currum meum reges aut regum liberi nouem*, Liv. 3.29.4 *ducti ante currum hostium duces*, 34.52.9 *hostiae ductae et ante currum multi nobiles captiui obsidesque*, 39.7.2 *duces hostium duo et quinquaginta ducti ante currum*. It is conceivable that Propertius envisaged the chieftains as sitting upon a vehicle in the procession with the trophies situated high above them;[18] but if that is what the poet had in mind, one wonders why he would choose to signify it by *subter*, which at first sight gives the very opposite of his meaning, instead of *supra*, which gives it exactly.[19] If *supra* is indeed what Propertius wrote, then *arma* is the subject of *sedere* (*OLD* s.v. 6a '(*of things*) to be placed, rest, sit, lie'), and the sense is simply: '… and the arms sitting above the chieftains'. This combination of *sedere* and *super*/*supra* is found elsewhere in Propertius, as at 2.30.8 *et grauis ipsa super libera colla sedet*, and the two are even placed in the same metrical seat as here by Martial 12.70.2 *et supra togulam lusca sederet anus*. The reverse corruption, of *subter* to *supra*, happens to occur at App. Verg. *Cul.* 155; and Edward Courtney makes a convincing case in favour of reading *supra* for *subter* at *Cul.* 75, which error he explains as arising from the likeness of *sup̄* (*supra*) and *sup̄t* (*supter*).[20] The same corruption appears to have happened at Pers. 3.39–40 *et magis auratis pendens laquearibus ensis | purpureas subter ceruices territus*, where the emendation of Sandford (1890), *supra* for *subter*, is well supported by Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.17 *destrictus ensis cui super inpia | ceruice pendet*,

16 Butler and Barber (1933) 271, following Rothstein (1898) 27 and Paley (1872) 142.

17 Constructions vaguely analogous to this do occasionally crop up in Latin poetry, but few are so egregiously confusing; see Housman (1903) 22–3 (ad Man. 1.245). 3.2.12 *nec camera auratas inter eburna trabes*, adduced by Fedeli (1985) 169–70, is no adequate parallel, for in that instance there can be no ambiguity as to what noun *inter* governs, in contrast to *subter* here.

18 Thus Camps (1966) 71. Modern commentators supply no parallel, but cf. Sen. *Ep.* 71.22 *qui ante currum uehitur inuictus animo* and Sil. *Pun.* 17.629–30 *ante Syphax, feretro residens, captiua premebat | lumina, et auratae seruabant colla catenae*, adduced by Burman (1780) 509–10. The image of captives sitting bound beneath trophies (not, presumably, as part of the triumphal procession itself) is paralleled in the iconographical tradition: Richardson (1976) 322 compares the lower panel of the *Gemma Augustea* (*CAH* Plate 4.156a); to this add the west face carvings of the *Tropaeum Alpium*. The same depiction was common to coins in Propertius' own time and later: cf. e.g. *RIC* I.41 Augustus 6, II/1.206 Titus 102, III.308–9 Marcus Aurelius 1185–89.

19 For *supra* so used cf. 1.20.35 (*super* S 'metro repugnante'), 2.6.38, 2.30.7, 2.31.11 and 4.5.76. Baehrens (1880) 110 here preferred to write *captiuos subterque*, but the elision is improbable.

20 See Housman (1908) 16; Courtney (1967) 46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Quint. *Decl. min.* 305.14 *non licet tibi gladium supra ceruices diu tenere*, and Sil. *Pun.* 7.702–3 *ferrumque super ceruice tremiscens | palluit infelix subducto sanguine Maurus.* I turn now to consider the second difficulty of this line, the repetition of *captos* after *capta* in v. 16.

captos in v. 18 is a vacuous epithet: the reader knows from the context that these chieftains are 'captive', and to state the fact over again serves no discernible purpose. In v. 16 however the adjective is exquisitely apt: by *oppida capta* the poet intends to signify the *simulacra* of conquered cities carried in the procession; 'captured', therefore, in both a literal and figurative sense.[21] In default of a compelling excuse for the repetition, a repetition so obvious that Propertius could hardly have overlooked it, one must assume that *captos* is an error for another epithet or participle, probably *uinctos*. The chieftains are nowhere else in this poem represented as 'enchained', but it is an image so common to descriptions of triumphs that its absence here is keenly felt. Only a handful of witnesses need be called to make the point; I start with Cic. *Pis.* 60:

> disseres de triumpho: 'quid tandem habet iste currus, quid uincti ante currum duces, quid simulacra oppidorum, quid aurum, quid argentum, quid legati in equis et tribuni, quid clamor militum, quid tota illa pompa?'

Tib. 1.7.5–6:

> euenere: nouos pubes Romana triumphos
> uidit et euinctos bracchia capta duces.

Ov. *Ars am.* 1.215–16:

> ibunt ante duces onerati colla catenis
> ne possint tuti, qua prior, esse fuga.

Ov. *Tr.* 4.2.19–22:

> ergo omnis poterit populus spectare triumphos
> cumque ducum titulis oppida capta leget,
> uinclaque captiua reges ceruice gerentes
> ante coronatos ire uidebit equos.

And especially Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.101–6:

> prome quod inicias umeris uictoribus ostrum:
> ipsa potest solitum nosse corona caput.
> scuta sed et galeae gemmis radientur et auro

21 Butler and Barber (1933) 271; Camps (1966) 71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stentque super uinctos trunca tropaea uiros.
oppida turritis cingantur eburnea muris
fictaque res uero more putetur agi.[22]

To the last of these parallels it may not be amiss to add, in view of Cic. *Pis.* 60 *uincti ante currum duces*, Tib. 1.7.6 *euinctos … duces*, Ov. *Ars. am.* 1.215 *duces onerati colla catenis*, *Pont.* 2.1.3–4 *totque tulisse duces captiuos addita collis | uincula*, that *uiros* in v. 104, colourless and unspecific, is, I conceive, probably a mere banalisation of *duces*, occasioned by the similar sound and appearance of *uinctos* preceding. Precisely the same mistake occurs at Verg. *Aen.* 8.120 and Ov. *Tr.* 2.365, where *duces* is in both places reduced to *uiros* by certain aberrant manuscripts.[23]

Returning to the matter at hand, the same parallels aforecited tend to support the reading of *uinctos* in Prop. 3.4.18. *uinctus*, *uictus* and *captus* are often confused, as at Prop. 2.10.18 *capta*] *uicta*, Ov. *Met.* 14.299 *uictos*] *captos*, *Tr.* 3.10.61 *capta*] *uincta*.[24] Further examples include Ov. *Pont.* 4.13.45 *sic capto Latiis Germanicus hoste catenis*, where M. Akrigg has convincingly emended *capto* (meaningless with *catenis* for a modifier) to *uincto*, and Tib. 1.1.55 *me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae*, where *uinctum* is a corruption of Postgate's *captum* owing to *uincla* at the end of the line (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.1.38 *iam captum teneo*).[25] But to go on adducing further examples here would be supererogatory, for *captos* in v. 18 is plainly due to the reminiscence of *capta* in v. 16.[26]

3.8.11–18

Rather than present these lines with Butrica's *grege si* (thus Heyworth), I have retained *gregibus*, albeit with an obelus on either side of it.

quae mulier rabida iactat conuicia lingua,
haec Veneris magnae uoluitur ante pedes;
custodum †gregibus† circa se stipat euntem,
seu sequitur medias Maenas ut icta uias,
seu timidam crebro dementia somnia terrent,
seu miseram in tabula picta puella mouet,

22 For further parallels see Watson (2003) 277 on Hor. *Ep.* 7.8 *catenatus*.

23 See the apparatus of Conte (2009) 233 and of Hall (1995) 74.

24 See the apparatus of Hertzberg (1853) 46, of Anderson (1982) 337, and of Hall (1985) 120.

25 Akrigg (1986) 322. Courtney (1989) 129 preferred his own *apto* (from **apere*, 'to fasten'), but his admission that 'Ovid nowhere else uses the word in this archaic way' is its undoing, so to speak. On Tib. 1.1.55 see Watt (1991) 15.

26 Cf. e.g. 1.8b.45 *certos*] *summos* A due to *summa* in v. 43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his ego tormentis animi sum uerus haruspex;
has didici certo saepe in amore notas.

13 custodum] custodem LP | gregibus NΠΤ : gregi SΓ : gregis Υ : que gregi C : grege si *Butrica* : grege seu *Heinsius, Postgate suo Marte* : grex hanc *Giardina*

In the absence of a *seu* or a *si*, one naturally interprets v. 13 as the apodosis of a conditional completed by the alternative protases of vv. 14–16: 'She surrounds herself with troops of protectors, *whether* she dashes down the thoroughfare like an inspired Maenad, or is driven mad by frightening dreams, or is moved to melancholy by the portrait of a girl.' This interpretation is clearly erroneous, but it is one of only two that the paradosis will admit of. The other is to take v. 13 as a sentence by itself (and thus to punctuate with a full stop after *euntem*), and to construe vv. 17–18 as the apodosis of a conditional whose protases consist in vv. 14–16. The reader is constrained to choose between these two unhappy alternatives because, as E. Wistrand has pointed out, in Latin one cannot coordinate two full secondary clauses by a single *seu* between them.[27] And the reason for this hardly needs stating: without a *si* or *seu* to mark it, the first protasis of a conditional that contained more than two further protases would be indistinguishable from its apodosis. Paolo Fedeli appears to miss this point when he adduces for the omission of the initial *seu* Prop. 2.6.33–4:

et tabula una duos poterit componere amantes,
prora cubile mihi seu mihi puppis erit.[28]

Citing this in defence of v. 13 is to confuse the issue. Nobody questions whether a single *seu* or *siue* may satisfy for a simple disjunctive coordinator of noun, adjective or verb phrases.[29] Lines such as Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.15–16 *quo non arbiter Hadriae | maior, tollere seu ponere uult freta* and *Sat.* 2.8.16–17 *Albanum, Maecenas, siue Falernum | te magis adpositis delectat, habemus utrumque* are proof enough of that. The question is whether a single *seu* can link alternative conditional clauses (ideally without causing any ambiguity of sense), such as vv. 13–16 must be. In the absence of a direct parallel, this must be assumed impossible.

Most modern editors accept this analysis of the problem, and nearly all of them print a conjecture for *gregibus* of NΠΤ, *gregi* of SΓ and *gregis* of Y (curious variants in the Λ branch, mind). G. P. Goold (1990) and S. Viarre (2005) adopt Heinsius and Postgate's correction, *grege seu*; Heyworth prefers Butrica's *grege si* on palaeographical grounds.[30] *grege seu* or *grege*

27 Wistrand (1977) 63–4.

28 Fedeli (1985) 287.

29 See, for example, the copious illustrations of Pinkster (2015–21) II.665–7. Often the second conjoin expresses a correction of the preceding formulation, as in Cic. *Brut.* 180 *sed omnium oratorum siue rabularum*, 'but of all those orators, or rather tub-thumpers'.

30 Further converts to this point of view include Hubbard (1978) 233 and Scioli (2015) 221 n. 2. On the other hand, Giardina (2005), by printing his own *grex hanc*, seems to have misconceived the problem entirely. For *grege si* see Butrica (1984) 84–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

si is clearly what the sense requires, but the rhythm of both seems rather odd. There are ten other places in Propertius where at the start of a line I find a molossus or a choriamb followed by a pyrrhic followed by a monosyllable:

1.4.13 ingenuus color et motis decus artubus, et quae
2.5.5 inueniam tamen e multis fallacibus unam
2.13.41 interea caue sis nos aspernata sepultos
2.29.1 hesterna, mea lux, cum potus nocte uagarer
2.29.17 afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores
3.11.51 fugisti tamen in timidi uaga flumina Nili
3.16.9 peccaram semel et totum sum pulsus in annum
3.22.25 Albanus lacus et socia Nemorensis in unda
4.4.1 Tarpeium nemus et Tarpeiae turpe sepulchrum
4.10.41 Vindomari. genus hic Rhaeno iactabat ab ipso.

Four of these (1.4.13, 3.16.9, 3.22.25, 4.4.1) have *et* in the crucial position; the rest Propertius could not have arranged otherwise without either employing different vocabulary (2.5.5, 2.29.1, 2.29.17, 2.13.41, 3.11.51) or giving undue emphasis to an unemphatic word (4.10.41 *Rhaeno genus hic*). Here, in v. 13, there are not the same constraints. In fact, I really cannot conceive why our poet should wish to place *custodum* so far ahead of *seu*. Is it so important that 'protectors' be the first word of the line? Is *seu* ever trajected so far from its usual position? For what reason, when it was perfectly within his power, would Propertius not write simply *seu grege custodum*, and thereby attain not only the usual word order, but also the quadruple anaphora of *seu*? Would he have missed a trick like this? The author of *CIL* VI.21521, vv. 31–4, certainly did not:

die Nepos, seu tu turba stipatus Amorum
laetus Adoneis lusibus insereris,
seu grege Pieridum gaudes seu Palladis [arte,
omnis caelicolum te chor[u]s exc[ipiet.[31]

A parallel for the trajection of *seu* over two words (or even over one word) is not forthcoming from the poetry of Propertius. Instead, the reader is confronted with scores of passages of the following shape (1.20.7–12):

huic tu siue leges Umbrae rate flumina siluae,
siue Aniena tuos tinxerit unda pedes,
siue Gigantei spatiabere litoris ora,
siue ubicumque uago fluminis hospitio,

31 The same poet's *nam me sancta Venus* etc. (v. 27) bears a curious resemblance to Heyworth's emendation of Prop. 1.1.33. Might *sancta* be Propertius' own? Cf. Catull. 68.5–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nympharum semper cupida defende rapina
(non minor Ausoniis est amor Adryasin).

Parallels could be multiplied.[32] Only J. S. Phillimore, displeased with the tautological function of *circa*, appears to have hit upon the right order with his conjecture *siue ea custodum gregibus se stipat euntem*. Closer to the text would be Heinsius' emendation in reverse order: *seu grege custodum circa se stipat euntem*.[33] Editors of Propertius are more comfortable with the transposition of couplets than of words within a couplet, but the phenomenon is common enough in Latin literature generally to present no difficulty here in point of palaeographical likelihood.

3.10.13–14

Propertius instructs his girlfriend to wake up for her birthday.

ac primum pura somnum tibi discute lympha,
et nitidas presso pollice finge comas.

13 ac] at ς

There is an ambiguity in the hexameter. *ac primum* must be taken as a unit, meaning 'but first'. *somnum* however invites an epithet, and readers (this reader certainly) may be tempted to take *primum* as such a one. Commentators may try to keep them from error by pointing to the status of *ac primum* as a set phrase (cf. e.g. Verg. *G.* 3.166, Ov. *Met.* 11.20). 'But so is *primum somnum*', readers will say, quoting Prop. 1.3.3 *qualis et accubuit primo Cepheia somno*, Verg. *Aen.* 1.469–70 *Rhesi … tentoria … primo quae prodita somno*, Phaedr. 3.10.31 *sopita primo quae nil somno senserat* and Stat. *Theb.* 10.115 *primosque hortantia somnos*. Servius on Verg. 1.470 interprets this phrase *primum somnum* to mean the 'beginning of night', i.e. *prima pars noctis*; J. Henry with greater probability takes it to mean in every instance 'the first part of sleep', that is, 'sleep having only just begun'. He illustrates this sense by quoting Sil. *Pun.* 9.90 *ecce sub aduentum noctis primumque soporem*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.268 *prima quies* and Valerius Flaccus 8.81 *primi percussus nube soporis*.[34] Now Henry's interpretation of *primus somnus* accords perfectly with Prop. 1.3.3 *qualis et accubuit primo Cepheia somno* (primarily because of *accubuit*), but it makes havoc of 3.10.13 *ac primum pura somnum tibi discute lympha*. For how can Propertius' girlfriend shake off 'the beginning of sleep' if the morning has only just begun (vv. 1–2 *mane … sole rubente*)? All these considerations taken together suggest that *somnos* should be read for *somnum* in v. 13. The

32 Cf. e.g. the exceptionally long list of *siue*'s and *seu*'s in 2.1.5–16.

33 Further parallels for same word order in the same metrical seat include Juv. 9.143 *de grege Moesorum*, 12.116 *de grege seruorum* and 15.143 *a grege mutorum*.

34 Henry (1873) 707–18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

grammatical ambiguity is then dissolved, the meaning is left unchanged, and a parallelism is established between *somnos* here and *somnos* in v. 25 *dulciaque ingratos adimant conuiua somnos*. For the plural in connection with *dis-/excutere*, compare Ov. *Ib*. 156 *excutiam somnos uisus adesse tuos*, [Sen.] *Oct*. 123 *excutit somnos* and Stat. *Theb*. 2.129 *somnosque excussit*.[35] Errors of assimilation, whereby a noun or adjective assumes the case of an adjacent word, are some of the commonest in the Propertian tradition: 1.11.15 *amoto*] *amota* NATΓYC due to *puella* following; 1.18.10 *puella*] *puellae* Γ due to *nequitiae… tuae*; 1.20 *Gigantei*] *Gigantea* Ω due to *ora*; 2.27 *ruinas*] *ruinam* FLT due to *flammam* preceding.

3.11.39–46

Propertius speaks to Cleopatra. For this passage I give vv. 40 and 46 as they appear in Ω, without the emendations printed by Heyworth and other editors.

scilicet incesti meretrix regina Canopi,
  una Philippeo sanguine †adusta nota† 40
ausa Ioui nostro latrantem opponere Anubim,
  et Tiberim Nili cogere ferre minas,
Romanamque tubam crepitanti pellere sistro,
  baridos et contis rostra Liburna sequi,
foedaque Tarpeio conopia tendere saxo, 45
  iura dare statuas inter et arma Mari!

39 *nou. el. indic.* ΠΥ (*tit.*), Γ (*int.*), T (*mg.*) : ¶ N *mg.* || 40 una Ω : illa *Damsté* : ima *Richmond* | Philippeo sanguine adusta Ω : Philippei sanguinis usta *Heyworth* | inusta ς : es usta *Lachmann* || 41 nostro] nostro est P : nostro es *Heyworth* || 46 dare Ω : dare ut C : dare et ς : daret *Calderinus* | dares … Mari? *Palmer* | dicere ius *Trappes-Lomax* (2013) 98–9

This long sentence is compact of several problems, and as there is a good chance of getting lost in the maze of them, it may help to give a summary at the outset: (1) the sentence beginning with v. 39 and ending with v. 46 is without a finite verb; (2) the scansion of *dare* in v. 46 as an iamb before *statuas* is unparalleled in Propertius and scarcely paralleled in elegy;[36] (3) *ausa* in v. 41 governs five syndetically coordinated infinitives between vv. 41–5, but *dare* in v. 46 it governs in asyndeton (a discomposing irregularity); (4) the meaning of *una Philippeo sanguine adusta nota* in v. 40 is obscure and the syntax ambiguous. Problems (2) and (3) are usually answered by the inserting of <*et*> (ς) between *dare* and *statuas* in v. 46. But *et* produces its own problems and for various

35 That *excutere* is the usual word for 'brushing off' sleep was observed by Broukhusius (1702) 265. For the ritual implications of 'dispersing sleep' with water, see Burman (1780) 579 and Butler and Barber (1933) 287.

36 The only forthcoming authority for this scansion in elegy is Tib. 1.5.28 *pro segete spicas*, on which see Trappes-Lomax (2013) 96–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reasons is unlikely to be right. In the first place, as Heyworth remarks, the trajection of *et* beyond second position finds no adequate parallel in Propertius.[37] Secondly, the use of *et* to connect one clause with another, while in that same clause an entirely different *et* is used to connect two nominal phrases, creates a certain amount of visual confusion for the reader, especially as the former of these two instances of *et* would have to sit directly in front the noun *statuas*, implying a correlative usage where no correlative is meant. In other words, the statement *iura dare et statuas inter et arma Mari* at first sight reads as if it meant 'dispensing justice amidst *both* the statues *and* the arms of Marius': a perplexing and unhappy inelegance to introduce by conjecture.[38] Finally, the addition of *et* fails to resolve our initial problem: the sentence spanning vv. 39–46 remains without a finite verb, and in order to fashion one for it editors are compelled to supply either <*est*> (5) or <*es*> (Heyworth) after *nostro* in v. 41. The loss of such a small word is not unimaginable, but neither is it easily accounted for. If a solution were found that could answer all three problems by a single change – the missing verb, the prosody of *dare*, the asyndeton of v. 46 – that would be much more attractive than the printing of piecemeal supplements such as <*et*> and <*est*> or <*es*>.

Such a solution was proposed in 1880, and editors have been sleeping on it ever since. Arthur Palmer, improving on the humanist emendation of *daret* for *dare* (46), conjectured *dares*, punctuating vv. 39–46 as a rhetorically charged question and assuming a 'polemical' use of the imperfect subjunctive in an interrogative sentence.[39] The sense would be 'harlot-queen of Canopus, did you really think (39 *scilicet*), daring to do X Y Z, that you would have dispensed laws amidst the statues and the arms of Marius?' This use of the present and imperfect subjunctive in questions of a polemical colour is sufficiently well attested to make Palmer's conjecture a compelling answer to our three problems.[40] *dares* for *dare* is the slightest of changes (*s* lost by haplography before *statuas*) and gives greater force and purpose to some of the other elements of vv. 39–46, such as *scilicet* in v. 39, termed 'feeble' in its present state by Heyworth.[41] The result is a long, suspenseful period with a barbed conclusion: Cleopatra, says Dio 50.5.4, really did conceive a desire to dispense justice on the Capitol (ποιεῖσθαι τὸ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ δικάσαι), and to be denied this opportunity must surely have rankled in her heart. Finally, if Palmer's *dares* is accepted, *meretrix regina Canopi* etc. in vv. 39–40 is then

37 Heyworth (2007b) 340; cf. Sandbach (1938) 214. If the two words intervening form a 'set phrase', such as *quo magis* at 1.4.4, trajection across two words is sometimes found, but under no other circumstances.

38 So inelegant that <*et*> prompts the following comment from Fedeli (1994) 176: 'intellege: "et iura dare inter statuas et arma Mari"'.

39 Palmer (1880) xxxvi, 89. The conjecture is accepted by Richmond (1928) 285.

40 Examples are gathered by Pinkster (2015–21) 1.486–7 and 489.

41 For *scilicet* beginning an indignant question (bearing the sense 'do you suppose that' or 'forsooth') cf. e.g. [Verg.] *Aen.* 2.577–8, Verg. *Aen.* 12.570–1; Ov. *Am.* 2.14.7–8, 2.19.53, *Her.* 13.37–8, *Ars am.* 3.523–4, 619–20; Luc. 1.314, 7.449. For *scilicet* in a question involving the imperfect subjunctive cf. e.g. Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.699–700 and 3.111–12. There is something to be said for punctuating Verg. *Aen.* 11.371–3 as a question with Conington in Conington and Nettleship (1875) 342.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allowed to serve as the vocative which *fugisti* in v. 51 presupposes but does not currently have.[42]

I turn now to consider the text of v. 40, the difficulty of which has long been acknowledged, but never satisfactorily answered. Butler and Barber list three possible interpretations of the appositional phrase *una Philippeo sanguine adusta nota*:

> (1) On the assumption that *nota* is nominative, the only probable sense is 'the unique disgrace branded by the blood of Philip'; i.e. branded on Rome. The lack of the dative *Romae* is a difficulty; but in the absence of any other possible object *Romae* must be supplied from the immediate context, whether we adopt Lachmann's transposition or no. (2) On the assumption that *nota* is ablative, two interpretations have been suggested. (a) Rothstein takes *Philippeo sanguine* as descriptive ablative; *sc.* 'the only woman of Philip's blood that has been branded with shame'. The sense is weak; the respect implied for other ladies of the Lagid dynasty is out of place on a Roman's lips; the supposition that Propertius is so far under the influence of Alexandrian court-poetry is incredible; and the double ablative is unpleasing. (b) Lachmann, transposing 36 and 40, took *una* with *harena*, and interpreted the pentameter, 'the one land branded with infamy by the blood of Philip'. The double ablative is here even more unpleasing, and the sense is weak and far-fetched … (3) The view held by many editors in the past that *sanguine* depends on *adusta*, and that the phrase means 'the unique disgrace branded on the blood of Philip' must be rejected. *adusta* requires a dative of the remoter object, and in all cases where the ablative is used with it, it is instrumental. *inusta* (ς, *Scaliger*) does not mend matters; for the normal construction after *inuro* is also the dative. Further, the interpretation, though not so weak as that given by Rothstein's theory, could only be accepted as a violent rhetorical exaggeration. On the whole (1) must be given preference.[43]

(1) is difficult for a further reason beside the absence of a dative in *Romae*: namely that Propertius has just called the assassination of Pompey a *notam* itself four lines ago (36 *tollet nulla dies, hanc tibi, Roma, notam*), and so to call Cleopatra 'the *one* mark [of disgrace] branded upon Rome' verges on the contradictory.[44] Shackleton Bailey and editors since have therefore preferred (3), primarily on the ground that, though Cleopatra may not have been 'the *only* disreputable Lagid', yet *una* elsewhere can mean something like *praecipua*, and so the meaning 'the *one* disreputable Lagid *above all others*' remains

42 That said, of course, the sudden transition from *Roma* as addressee in v. 49 to Cleopatra in v. 51, without a vocative to signal it, is difficult to believe. If vv. 51–4 have not been displaced from an original position after e.g. v. 46, positing a lacuna between vv. 50 and 51 with Baehrens seems necessary.

43 Butler and Barber (1933) 290.

44 Thus Lachmann (1816) 275: 'Miremur poetam eorum, quae ipse dixi, oblitum. Sola Cleopatra Ptolemaeorum sanguinem dedecoravit, non Auletes ille, a quo factam Pompejo injuriam non esse ultam aeterno Romae opprobrio. Nonne hic pariter ac Clytaemnestra inter Ptolemaeorum gentis dedecora numerandus?'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

possible.[45] Still, *una . . . nota* remains an unhappy choice of words after *notam* in v. 36; and the fact that *adusta* ordinarily requires a dative to govern, not an ablative, and the fact that *inusta nota*, not *adusta nota*, is the established idiom, do not help to cement one's confidence in the text. Moreover, is it not a curiously mixed metaphor that has the 'blood' of Philip 'branded' by Cleopatra's misdeeds? And why should Propertius be particularly concerned with the honour and the good breeding of the line of Philip anyway?[46]

Preference for any interpretation of the text, be it (1), (2) or (3), appears to have arisen rather out of resignation at the difficulty, than from any genuine confidence in the meaning of these words.[47] Emendation is therefore attempted by Phillimore, who adopting Lachmann's transposition of vv. 36 and 40 rewrites the line as *illa uelim proprio sanguine adusta natet*; Heyworth with little more deference to the ductus prints *una Philippei sanguinis usta nota*, while accepting that 'the corruptions are not easy to explain'.[48] When one observes that *nota* has been repeated from the end of *tollet nulla dies hanc tibi, Roma, notam* (36), rather like a *Perseverationsfehler*, it will be seen that these conjectures are targeted at the wrong part of the line.

The first step towards a restoration is to recognise that *Philippeo* does not here mean 'of Philip II of Macedon', and that interpreters have gone very far astray in thinking that it does. *Philippeo sanguine* refers not to the Macedonian blood that runs in the Lagid dynasty; rather it refers, as at Manilius 1.909, to the blood spilt at the battle of Philippi.[49] The carnage of this engagement is often mentioned in poetical descriptions of the Roman civil wars, frequently before Cleopatra and Actium are themselves introduced. Compare for instance Manilius 1.907–19:

> nec plura alias incendia mundus
> sustinuit, quam cum ducibus iurata cruentis
> arma Philippeos implerunt agmine campos,
> uixque etiam sicca miles Romanus harena
> ossa uirum lacerosque prius super astitit artus,
> imperiumque suis conflixit uiribus ipsum,
> perque patris pater Augustus uestigia uicit.
> necdum finis erat: restabant Actia bella

45 Shackleton Bailey (1956) 171–2; Heyworth and Morwood (2011) 212.

46 As Heyworth (2007b) 338 says: 'The descendants of Philip are not conspicuous for their honourability, and it would be surprising for Propertius to make Cleopatra a single blot on the family escutcheon.'

47 Camps (1966) 108 follows Butler and Barber preferring (1); Richardson (1976) 363, Fedeli (1985) 377–8, and Heyworth and Morwood (2011) 212 adopt Shackleton Bailey's analysis, while acknowledging the difficulties of the grammar, the latter saying: 'The text and and meaning of this line remain very uncertain.'

48 Phillimore (1914) 79; Heyworth (2007b) 339.

49 One has to go all the way back to Beroaldus (1487) to find this interpretation advanced: 'Philippeo sanguine. Hoc est Romana nota in Philippis bis civili proelio dimicatum est.' Cf. Postgate (1894) vi. For *Philippeus* = *Philippīus*/*Philippensis* see *OLD* s.v. *Philippeus* 2. For *sanguis* meaning 'bloodshed' see *OLD* s.v. 2b and cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 15.15.1 *odio ciuilis sanguinis*, 'hatred of civil bloodshed'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> dotali commissa acie, repetitaque rerum
> alea et in ponto quaesitus rector Olympi,
> femineum sortita iugum cum Roma pependit
> atque ipsa Isiaco certarunt fulmina sistro.

Compare also Ov. *Met.* 15.822–8:

> illius auspiciis obsessae moenia pacem
> uicta petent Mutinae, Pharsalia sentiet illum,
> Emathiique iterum madefient caede Philippi,
> et magnum Siculis nomen superabitur undis,
> Romanique ducis coniunx Aegyptia taedae
> non bene fisa cadet, frustraque erit illa minata,
> seruitura suo Capitolia nostra Canopo.

If 'by the bloodshed of Philippi' is the sense of *Philippeo sanguine*, then *adusta* cannot stand: one is not 'burnt' or 'branded' by the spilling of soldiers' blood. Whatever participle is to replace it must be one that can accept *sanguine* as an ablative of the instrument; and the only word that can serve this end and look anything like *adusta* (i.e. *adufta*) is, I believe, *adulta*, in the sense of 'nourished' or, by a metaphorical extension, 'strengthened' (cf. *OLD* s.v *adolesco* 5).[50] The collocation of this with *sanguine* is supported by an allusive couplet of Ausonius, 12.19.1–2 Green (from the *Epitaphia heroum*):

> cede procul myrtumque istam fuge, nescius hospes:
> telorum seges est sanguine adulta meo.

'Get thee hence, unknowing stranger, and shun that myrtle tree: the battlefield was nourished with my blood.'[51] The probability that Ausonius is here consciously or unconsciously repeating a phrase of Propertius' is increased when one observes that certain other of his verses do the same: compare e.g. Auson. *Parentalia* 21.6 *maesti carminis obsequio* and Prop. 1.8.40 *blandi carminis obsequio*; Auson. *Prof. Burd.* 1.28 *fundunt excisi per caua buxa gradus* and Prop. 4.8.42 *iactabat truncas ad caua buxa manus*.[52] In any case, whether the echo be intentional or not, it affords good evidence for the Latinity of *Philippeo sanguine adulta*, 'nourished' or 'strengthened by the bloodshed at Philippi'.[53] (*adulta*

50 The same error occurs at Petron. 109.4 *areaque attritis ridet adusta pilis*] *adulta* al.

51 The whole poem is allusive: *telorum seges* in v. 2 and *confixus iaculis* in v. 3 are taken right out of Verg. *Aen.* 3.45–6. Others in the same work are allusive too: *puluis et umbra sumus* in 12.17.2 (two epigrams prior to this one) derives from Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.16.

52 Neither phrase (*carminis obsequio* or *caua buxa*) appears elsewhere in Latin verse. Further lexical parallels between Propertius and Ausonius are collected by Shackleton Bailey (1952) 322 and Colton (1983).

53 For *adultus* + ablative cf. also App. Verg. *Priap.* 2.11 *adulta lacte … ubera*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

moreover recalls *adultera*, an epithet appropriate of Cleopatra as Propertius imagined her, given *meretrix* in v. 39.) Now if, as seems necessary, *adulta* be accepted for *adusta*, then *nota* must be altered as well: neither a brand nor a stain can be 'nourished' or 'strengthened' by the blood of Philippi. Strike it out and you have a line which runs as follows:

> scilicet incesti meretrix regina Canopi,
> una Philippeo sanguine adulta ⏑ ×
> ausa Ioui nostro etc.

What part of speech could end a pentameter like this? The possibility of a finite verb is excluded by two considerations: (1) as Palmer's *dares* is required to resolve the metrical and syntactical problems of v. 46, printing a verb at the end of v. 40 would split vv. 39–46 into two sentences and so deprive *dares* of an explicit subject (it would have to depend merely on *ausa* in v. 41); and (2) the only preterites of iambic prosody in Latin are *bibit*, *dedit*, *fidit*, *fluit*, *fuit*, *ruit*, *scidit* and *stetit* (none of which but *fuit* makes very much sense with *adulta*), but as the second person is required so as to make *incestri meretrix regina Canopi* the vocative which *fugisti* in v. 51 looks back to, no perfect or imperfect verb (excepting *dabas*) is metrically possible. So, our missing disyllable is probably not a finite verb. An adverb likewise is unpromising: *una ... adulta* would then have to depend entirely on *meretrix regina*, and no adverb that I can think of is so good as to compensate for the imbalance. A present participle or adjective, unless it were a very apt one, would be superfluous next to *Philippeo sanguine adulta*, so it seems Propertius did not write one of these either. The final word of v. 40 then can only be a noun: singular and feminine in agreement with *una*, standing in apposition to *incesti meretrix regina Canopi*, and expressive of a relation to the battle of Philippi (and/or Pharsalus) that is either peculiar to Cleopatra (*una* = *unica*, *OLD* s.v. 7 'the one and only') or more suited to her than to any other (*una* = *praecipua*, *OLD* s.v. 8 'one in particular'). The constraints of metre, grammar and sense limit the options to a very small number indeed.[54] Out of all the possibilities, *lues*, 'scourge', leaps out as one promising solution.[55] This word is frequently used in a pejorative sense of odious persons, including such threatening individuals as Hannibal (Sil. *Pun.* 16.622–3 *non dira illa lues notis iam moenibus urbis | adsiliet*). Cicero likewise combines *pestis*, a synonym of *lues*, with *adulta* (in the sense 'so far advanced') to describe the person of Catiline: *Cat.* 1.31 *delebitur non modo haec tam adulta rei publicae pestis, uerum etiam stirps ac semen malorum omnium*. However, though as a stand-alone description of

54 Those feminine or common pyrrhics/iambs which put in an appearance in poetic texts are (with real possibilities asterisked): *canis**, *capra*, *caro*, *casa*, *caua*, *ceres*, *chelys*, *chlamys*, *cinis*, *cliens**, *cohors*, *colus*, *coma*, *comes*, *curis*, *cutis*, *dea*, *dies*, *domus*, *dryas*, *faba*, *fames*, *febris*, *fera**, *fides*, *filix*, *fuga*, *gena*, *gula*, *iuba*, *lapis*, *laris*, *lea**, *lepra*, *Libys*, *Ligur*, *Locris*, *lues**, *lupa**, *lyra*, *maga*, *manus**, *metus**, *mitra*, *mola*, *mora*, *mucro*, *natis*, *nepos*, *nocens*, *nota*, *nurus**, *palus*, *parens**, *plaga*, *pyra*, *quies*, *ratis*, *rea*, *rosa*, *rota*, *rumex*, *salix*, *salus*, *seges*, *sera*, *sitis*, *soror**, *sudis*, *Syra*, *tigris**, *toga*, *tuba*, *uepris*, *uenus*, *uia*, *uicis*.

55 *lues* is not used by the Augustan elegists, but Martial has it in this seat of the pentameter thrice (1.78.2, 1.101.6, 11.91.6).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cleopatra *lues* works quite well, it may be doubted whether 'scourge' goes quite so well with *una* and *adulta* as some of the other possibilities. *nurus* suggests itself as a lookalike of *nota*, but while Cleopatra could well be described as 'the one married woman who *profited* by the bloodshed at Philippi' (the other wives having lost their husbands in the fighting, Rome her soldiers in a futile civil war), *adulta* does not seem quite the right word to convey this sense, nor does 'married woman' square neatly with *meretrix* in the previous verse. The only disyllabic noun that can adequately describe Cleopatra by herself, as well as complete the metaphor suggested by 'growing fat on the blood(shed) of Philippi', is, I believe, *canis*.[56] 'Dog' has a very long history of use as a term of reproach in Latin literature as well as Greek. In scenic verse as well as prose it is hurled without qualification at odious persons: Ter. *Eun.* 803 *ain uero, canis?*; Petron. 74.10 *ultimo etiam adiecit: 'canis'*. The implication of it is sometimes one of shamefulness, as in Catull. 42.16–17 *quod si non aliud potest, ruborem | ferreo canis exprimamus ore* 'But if nothing else can be done, let us at least squeeze out a blush from the bitch's face.' In Prop. 1.11.40 that association would be appropriate after *incesti meretrix … Canopi*, but also annexed to this word is the idea of boldness, derived from the target's 'latrandi, mordandi, sim. libid[o]', as O. Prost puts it (*TLL* III.258.21–2): Plaut. *Bacch.* 1146 *est illic clam mordax canis*, *Men.* 837 *me ab laeua rabiosa femina adseruat*, 933 *uxorem suam esse aiebat rabiosam canem*. In Cleopatra's case a connotation of 'audacity' would lead well into the accusation that follows in v. 41, *ausa Ioui nostro latrantem opponere Anubim* 'daring to oppose barking Anubis against our Jupiter'.[57] Nor would she be the only famous woman to be so denominated. Of Hecuba, for instance, Plautus (*Men.* 717–18) has Sosicles say, *omnia mala ingerebat quemquem aspexerat: | itaque adeo iure coepta appellari est Canes*.[58] For Cleopatra the insult may have a special relevance, owing to the prominence in the Roman mind of 'dog-gods' in Egyptian culture: Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 2.354–5 *quasdam uicta dedit capitis Cleopatra canini | effigies*; Luc. 8.831–2 *nos in templa tuam Romana accepimus Isim | semideosque canes et sistra iubentia luctus*; Juv. 15.7–8 *illic aeluros, hic piscem fluminis, illic | oppida tota canem uenerantur* [sc. Anubim].

Now by itself *canis* would be a satisfactory insult, but combined with *una Philippeo sanguine adulta* it takes on a further significance. By 'nourished on the blood of Philippi' Propertius presumably envisaged Cleopatra as one dog out of many (*OLD* s.v. *una* 8) waxing fat on carrion: a metaphor for the rising strength and opportunism of the East, growing in proportion as Rome is withered by civil war. This is a commonly expressed anxiety in Roman literature; the *locus classicus* is Hor. *Epod.* 7.3–10:

56 If *nota* has come from *notam* in v. 36, palaeographical considerations are of small relevance.

57 For the collocation of *canis* and *ausa* cf. Prop. 2.19.20 *audaces … canes*; Tib. 1.10.35 *audax | Cerberus*; Grattius, *Cynegeticus* 165–6 *ultroque grauem succedere tigrim | ausa canis*; Sen. *Phaed.* 35 *genus* [sc. *canum*] *est audax | auidumque ferae*; Hom. *Od.* 19.91 θαρσαλέη, κύον ἀδεές.

58 The most notorious ancient woman to be labelled by this insult is of course Homer's Helen, who thrice describes herself by a term which *LSJ* considers as 'a word of reproach, freq. in Hom. of women, to denote shamelessness or audacity' (s.v. κύων II1), the *CGL* as 'a contemptuous term for a shameless person, esp. a woman' (s.v. 3); see Grover (1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parumne campis atque Neptuno super
fusum est Latini sanguinis
non ut superbas inuidae Karthaginis
Romanus arces ureret
intactus aut Britannus ut descenderet
sacra catenatus uia
sed ut secundum uota Parthorum sua
urbs haec periret dextera?

The idea of 'presenting' the nation's blood as a spectacle to foreign nations, whereby to feed the souls of the slain, is a topos often employed by Lucan: 1.9 *gentibus inuisis Latium praebere cruorem*, 39 *Poeni saturentur sanguine manes*, 6.310–11 *Poenorumque umbras placasset sanguine fuso | Scipio*. While an authority for describing Rome's eastern foes as 'jackals' may be wanting,[59] the image of dogs and vultures seeking carrion is a common one: Cic. *Mil.* 33 *cruentum cadauer … nocturnis canibus dilaniandum relinquisti*; Liv. 41.21.6 *cadauera intacta a canibus ac uolturibus tabes absumebat*; Luc. 9.141–2 *nam corpus Phariaene canes, auidaeque uolucres | distulerint*; Juv. 4.111–12 *et qui uulturibus seruabat uiscera Dacis | Fuscus*. A very long list of prosaic and poetical descriptions of hounds which 'laniant homines, devorant corpora' is supplied by Probst, *TLL* III.254.18–40; and a particularly relevant parallel for Propertius' *sanguine adulta canis* discovers itself in Ov. *Met.* 3.140 *canes satiatae sanguine erili* 'hounds sated with the blood of their master, Actaeon'. That *adulta* may serve for *nutritae* or *satiatae* is shown by Ausonius' imitation, *telorum seges est sanguine adulta meo*, which too connects *sanguine* with blood spilled in battle. Here, in Prop. 3.11.40, the metaphorical sense of *adulta* must also be present (*OLD* s.v. *adolesco* 5 'to attain power, become strong'; *TLL* I.802.1–35), a meaning illustrated in connection with warfare by Minucius Felix 25.4 *iam finitimos agro pellere, ciuitates proximas euertere cum templis et altaribus, captos cogere, damnis alienis et suis sceleribus adolescere cum Romulo regibus ceteris et posteris ducibus disciplina communis est*, the essential part of which is translated by G. H. Rendall as 'to wax fat on losses inflicted, and crimes committed'.[60] What Propertius means in 3.11.40, in other words, is that the losses which Rome sustained at Philippi served to strengthen, relatively speaking, the hand of Cleopatra.

If *nota* is emended thus, it will be noticed that *canis* and *Canopi* are placed in 'vertical juxtaposition', an arrangement which in Virgil and the Alexandrian poets is often used to suggest a shared etymology.[61] It may be that Propertius intended the same idea: to

59 Extortionists in the employ of Verres are described by Cicero (*Verr.* 2.4.46) as *Cibyratici canes, qui inuestigabant et perscrutabantur omnia*, but the image is rather one of hounds than of scavengers.

60 Rendall in Glover and Rendall (1931) 389. Similar is Tac. *Hist.* 5.8 *Macedoniis inualidis, Parthis non adultis* 'while the Macedonians were weak, and the Parthians not yet at full strength'.

61 Cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 1.337–8 *purpureoque alte suras uincire coturno. | Punica regna uides*. For a long list of 'vertically juxtaposed' wordplays in Virgil see O'Hara (1996) 86 n. 341. A bilingual example from Propertius, identified by Petrain (2000), may be 1.20.6–7 *Theidomanteo proximus ardor Hylae. | huic tu, siue leges umbrosae flumina siluae*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

etymologise the Egyptian city through one of Egypt's familiar associations.[62] The fact that Canopus was generally thought to be derived from Greek Κάνωβος, the pilot of the ship that carried Menelaus to Troy, by such authors as Statius and Silius Italicus does not pose an insurmountable obstacle to this theory.[63] Propertius was free to draw connections between such words as he pleased, and in this particular matter he may not be alone. For a similar juxtaposition obtains in a passage of Statius' *Silvae*, where Canopus and Cerberus (= Anubis) are placed in close connection (3.2.111–12): *curue Therapnaei lasciuiat ora Canopi,* | *cur seruet Pharias Lethaeus ianitor aras* 'why the shores of Spartan Canopus wanton, why the watchdog of Lethe guards Pharian altars'. While not a sufficient reason in itself to emend *nota*, the fact that a vertically juxtaposed attempt at etymologising *Canopus* through *canis* would obtain if it were indeed emended is an interesting consequence.

To sum up, many thoughts and meanings are constellated in this line: (1) the long history (from Homer to Catullus) of *canis*/κύων as a reproach of notorious women; (2) the cultural association in the Roman mind between Egyptian monarchs and their 'dog-gods'; (3) the conception of Rome's enemies as 'jackals' who profited by her self-inflicted wars; and (4) perhaps an attempt at 'etymologising' *Canopi* through Latin *canis*. Whether these various strands of thought make for a more interesting and more Propertian verse than the present reference to Philip of Macedon's 'branded bloodline' must be left for others to decide. But one thing may be added in conclusion. The Ptoemphani, a people who dwelled on a certain side of the upper Nile, were said to 'worship a dog for a king' (Plin. *HN* 6.192 *canem pro rege habent*).[64] It would have been an easy bigotry for Propertius to have turned this curious fact into a contumely against Cleopatra, *una Philippeo sanguine adulta canis* 'the bitch that grew fattest on the blood of Philippi'.

Works cited

Akrigg, M. (1986) 'An intrusive gloss in Ovid *Ex Ponto* 4.13', *Phoenix* 40, 322.
Anderson, W. S. (ed.) (1982) *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphoses*, 2nd edn, Leipzig and Stuttgart.
Baehrens, E. (ed.) (1880) *Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri* IV, Leipzig.
Beroaldus, P. (1487) *Sextus Propertius: Elegiae*, Bologna.
Broukhusius, J. (1702) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri quatuor ad fidem veterum membrarum sedulo castigati*, Amsterdam.
Burman, P. (1780) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri iv cum commentario perpetuo P. B. secundi et multis doctorum notis ineditis*, Amsterdam.
Butler, H. E. and E. A. Barber (1933) *The Elegies of Propertius, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Oxford.

62 Cf. *Cynopolis*, 'city of the dog', home to the cult of Anubis. Propertius' interest in etymologising proper names discloses itself more fully in book 4; cf. e.g. Velabra from *uelifico* (4.9.5–6), Vertumnus from *uertebar* (4.2.46), and Iuppiter Feretrius from *ferit* (4.10.46) and *ferebant* (4.10.47). But being a technique much favoured by the Alexandrians, poetical etymologising has its place in book 3 as well; see Michalopoulos (1998) and Yardley (2001).

63 Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.111 *curue Therapnaei lasciuiat ora Canopi*; Sil. *Pun.* 11.431 *Memphis Amyclaeo pariter lasciua Canopo*. For the tale itself see Strabo, *Geographica* 17.1.17.

64 Krappe (1942).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Butrica, J. L. (1984) *The manuscript tradition of Propertius*, Toronto.
Camps, W. A. (1966) *Propertius: Elegies book iii*, Cambridge.
Colton, R. E. (1983) 'Some echoes of Propertius in Ausonius', *CB* 59, 62–5.
Conington, J. and H. Nettleship (1875) *P. Vergilii Maronis opera, with a commentary by J. C. and H. N.* Volume iii, 2nd edn, London.
Conte, G. B. (ed.) (2009) *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin and New York.
Courtney, E. (1967) 'Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*', *Phoenix* 21, 44–55.
(1989) 'Emendations in Ovid', *Symbolae Osloenses* 64, 125–9.
Diggle, J. and F. R. D. Goodyear (eds.) (1972) *The classical papers of A.E. Housman*, 3 vols., Cambridge.
Enk, P. J. (1911) *Ad Propertii carmina commentarius criticus*, Zutphen.
Fedeli, P. (1985) *Properzio. Il libro terzio delle elegie*, Bari.
Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1994) *Sextus Propertius: elegiarum libri IV*, 2nd edn, Stuttgart.
Foster, B. O. (1912) Review of C. Hosius's *Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV* and R. Ellis, J. P. Postgate and J. S. Phillimore's *Catulli, Tibulli, Properti carmina quae extant omnia*, *AJPh* 33, 330–42.
Giardina, G. (ed.) (2005) *Properzio. Elegie, edizione critica e traduzione*, Rome.
Glover, T. R., and G. H. Rendall (eds. and tr.) (1931) *Tertullian: Apology, De Spectaculis. Minucius Felix: Octavius*, Cambridge, MA.
Goldberg, S. M. and G. Manuwald (eds. and tra.) (2018) *Fragmentary Republican Latin.* Volume I: *Ennius: testimonia, epic fragments*, Cambridge, MA.
Goold, G. P. (1990) *Propertius: Elegies*, Cambridge, MA.
Grover, M. (1995) 'Dog-Helen and Homeric insult', *ClAnt* 14, 41–61.
Hall, J. B. (ed.) (1985) *Claudii Claudiani carmina*, Leipzig.
(1995) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristia*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Henry, J. (1873) *Aeneida; or critical, exegetical, and aesthetical remarks on the Aeneis*, London.
Hertzberg, W. (1853) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor.* Volume i, Halle.
Heyworth, S. J. (ed.) (2007a) *Sexti Properti elegos critico apparatu instruxit et edidit S. J. H.*, Oxford.
Heyworth, S. J. (2007b) *Cynthia: a companion to the text of Propertius*, Oxford.
Heyworth, S. J. and J. Morwood (2011) *A commentary on Propertius book 3*, Oxford.
Holford-Strevens, L. (2020) *Gelliana: a textual companion to the Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius*, Oxford.
Housman, A. E. (1893a) 'The manuscripts of Propertius', *JPh* 21, 101–60 = Diggle and Goodyear (1972) I.232–76.
Housman, A. E. (1893b) 'The manuscripts of Propertius', *JPh* 21, 161–97 = Diggle and Goodyear (1972) I.277–304.
Housman, A. E. (ed.) (1903) *M. Manilii Astronomicon: liber primus*, London.
Housman, A. E. (1908) 'The apparatus criticus of the *Culex*', *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* 6, 3–22 = Diggle and Goodyear (1972) II.773–86.
Hubbard, M. (1978) Review of G.C. Giardina's *Sex. Properti elegiarum liber II*, E. Wistrand's *Miscellanea Propertiana* and J. P. Sullivan's *Propertius: a critical introduction*, *JRS* 68, 232–5.
Krappe, A. H. (1942) 'The dog king', *Scandinavian Studies* 17, 148–53.
Lachmann, K. (1816) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina emendauit ad codicum meliorum fidem et annotauit C.L.*, Leipzig.
Michalopoulos, A. N. (1998) 'Some cases of Propertian etymologising', *PLLS* 10, 235–50.
O'Hara, J. J. (1996) *True names: Vergil and the Alexandrian tradition of etymological word*, Ann Arbor.
Paley, F. A. (1872) *Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina*, 2nd edn, London.
Palmer, A. (1880) *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum libri iv*, London and Dublin.
Petrain, D. (2000) 'Hylas and Silva: etymological wordplay in Propertius 1.20', *HSPh* 100, 409–21.
Phillimore, J. S. (1914) 'In Propertium retractiones selectae', *CR* 28, 79–82.
Pinkster, H. (2015–2021) *The Oxford Latin syntax*, 2 vols., Oxford.
Postgate, J. P. (ed.) (1894) *Sexti Properti carmina*, London and Cambridge.
Pound, E. (1921) *Poems 1918–21, including three portraits and four cantos*, New York.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Richardson, L. (1976) *Propertius: Elegies i–iv, edited with introduction and commentary by L. R. jr*, Norman, OK.
Richmond, O. L. (ed.) (1928) *Sexti Properti quae supersunt opera*, Cambridge.
Rothstein, M. (1898) *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*. Volume ii, Berlin.
Sandbach, F. H. (1938) 'Notes on Propertius', *CR* 52, 211–15.
Scioli, E. (2015) *Dream, fantasy, and visual art in Roman elegy*, Madison, WI.
Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1952) 'Echoes of Propertius', *Mnemosyne* 5, 307–33.
Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1956) *Propertiana*, Cambridge.
Skutsch, O. (ed.) (1985) *The Annals of Ennius*, Oxford.
Smyth, W. R. (1970) *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Properti textum*, Amsterdam.
Solbisky, R. (1883) *De codicibus Propertianis*, Leipzig.
Sandford, P. (1890) 'Pers. S. iii. 39–42', *CR* 4, 319–20.
Tränkle, H. (1960) *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Wiesbaden.
Trappes-Lomax, J. (2013) 'Some anomalous word junctions in the Augustan elegists: Ov. *Epist.* 7.152; Tib. 1.5.28; 1.6.34; Prop. 2.13.19; 3.11.46', *Exemplaria Classica* 17, 93–9.
Viarre, S. (2005) *Properce. Élégies*, Paris.
Watson, L. C. (2003) *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford.
Watt, W. S. (1991) 'Five notes on the *Corpus Tibullianum*', *Maia* 43, 15–16.
Wistrand, E. (1977) *Miscellanea Propertiana*, Göteburg.
Yardley, J. C. (2001) 'Word-play in Propertius', *CEA* 38, 129–34.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270522000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press