The appearance of S. J. Heyworth’s Oxford Text (2007), his volume of critical discussions, combined with a translation, entitled Cynthia (also OUP 2007), and the very thorough, perceptive review by Antonio Ramírez de Verger in BMCR (2009-07-23) have prompted me to look at the text of Propertius again and write down a few ideas. I have also consulted G. Giar- dina’s new edition, with an Italian translation (Rome 2005, 2010). In addition, Brill’s Companion to Propertius, edited by H.-Chr. Günther (Leiden-Boston 2006) has been a great help, especially the chapters by P. Fedeli, J. Butrica and R. Tarrant. I did not have an opportunity to consult Fedeli’s commentary on B. II (with a new text) and Hutchinson’s commentary on B. IV, but I recommend them to the reader as important new contributions.

1 I am very grateful to Antonio Ramírez de Verger for a critical reading of my article, for adding valuable comments and for providing editorial help. I also wish to thank the anonymous referees of Exemplaria Classica for their suggestions. Thanks are due to Guillermo Galán Vioque for his kind assistance. My colleagues at Johns Hopkins University, Hérica Valladarez and Michael Sullivan have helped me in many ways, especially by locating the epigram by Hedylus which seems to support a conjecture in Propertius 2.29.15.
The reader will first find the text of P. Fedeli’s Teubner edition (Editio correctior 1994, repr. 2006) because in this way the progress marked by Heyworth in some cases becomes more visible. Fedeli is still useful for the readings and references in his Apparatus criticus, and I am aware of the merits of his work, but his text is too conservative, just as Giardina’s seems too bold. Whereas Giardina never hesitates to print his conjectures, Fedeli often tries to defend the paradosis with arguments that are not always compelling. But where is the via media? I can only try and show my own view of the poor shape of the paradosis and the remedies that have been proposed, offering a few new ones along the way.

This is not a review article. I simply wanted to write down a few ideas and test them against the new editions. There is still much work to be done. Heyworth’s edition represents real progress, and its companion volume is a store-house of solid learning and sound judgement.

If one spends many years of one’s life reading a poet one loves and admires, one almost inevitably changes one’s mind about some problems in the text. As important new contributions – such as the books mentioned above – appear, one sees things in a different light. This certainly happened to me.


There are reasons to believe that only a single copy of an ancient edition of Propertius, probably equipped with marginal notes, survived into the Middle Ages and was copied at least once in the 12th century somewhere in France. The state of the paradosis suggests that this copy was made in a very careless manner. It may be considered the common ancestor of the only two medieval MSS. – N (s. XII) and A (c. 1230-50) – which we have, but through lost links it may have produced a few other descendants as well.

A not very homogeneous group of extant MSS. may be placed between the two medieval witnesses and the many later Renaissance copies. These are F (c. 1380), L (1421) and P (1423). There is really no strict dividing line, and if one looks at their age, P is only six years older than H.’s T (1427). Most of H.’s younger witnesses as well as G.’s Z could be called Itali, yet these editors assign capital letters to them and distinguish them from the ’stigma’ group which H. defines as ‘anyone’s conjecture before 1600’.
A few witnesses which were highly estimated by previous editors are now radically discarded. Here is a list of them, along with the names of their main sponsors: D = Daventriensis (Burman, Baehrens, Housman); V = Vaticanus Ottobonianus (Heinsius, Baehrens); Vo = Leidensis Vossianus (Burman, Richmond); Groninganus (Broukhusius, Lachmann). No one would blame these scholars for putting too much trust into a witness from which they were expecting important new insights. Personally, I do not think that they are totally worthless; in fact, they preserve, perhaps by conjecture, a few good readings.

The value of the Itali, also known as recentiores or deteriores, is difficult to assess. There are about 150 of them. Quite a few can be dated exactly, and sometimes the names of their scribes and former owners and annotators are known. Here we find the names of famous humanists: Petrarca, Coluccio Salutati, Antonio Beccadelli, G. G. Pontano, Lorenzo Valla, Pomponio Leto. These MSS. are, in a way, the predecessors of our printed editions in the sense that they are not faithful copies of a single earlier text but the products of deliberate editing. We now lump them together, but former editors cited them by the names of their owners, e.g. as Askewianus, Cuiacianus, Mentelianus, etc.

The scribes and owners of these texts were, at this time, mostly scholars and poets, and it was their ambition to create a satisfactory text from the inferior sources they had at their disposal. Relying on their knowledge of classical poetry and their own poetic practice, they corrected the text of Propertius, as they went along. Many of their corrections are very good (in fact, some of them occurred again to the great critics of later periods, such as Scaliger and Heinsius), but some of them are not. It is always possible that a humanist had access to a bona fide ‘codex vetus’, now lost, but most of their changes were probably made ope ingenii. They have to be judged purely on their merit, as if they were conjectures made today. Some editors seem to be too rigorous in rejecting humanist readings because they tend to trust the ‘older’ witnesses.

There is a slim but important indirect tradition, including Pompeian graffiti and two florilegia. Scholars generally agree that the indirect tradition, where it goes against our MSS., offers a better text, a fact which, in itself, highlights the poor condition of the direct paradosis.

1.1.11-2

\[ \text{nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,} \]
\[ \quad \text{itbat et hirsutas ille videre feras} \]

\textit{Videre} has been taken in the sense of \textit{adire}, but editors seem to prefer \textit{ferire} (Itali, Heinsius) or \textit{comminus ille} (Palmer) which is a possibility (see 2.19.22 \textit{celer agrestes comminus ire sues}; Ov. \textit{fast.} 5.176 \textit{in apros/ auro-}
det et hirsutas comminus ire leas), but it would involve a major change. H(eyworth) accepts ille ferire but also assumes a lacuna after v. 11, following Housman, while G(iardina) prefers agitare (Burman). Li(berman) shows that videre is unsatisfactory. He favors comminus ille and adds that Milanion is probably hunting in Atalanta’s company. He calls ille ferire a ‘weak conjecture’. What we need, in my opinion, is ciere (Baehrens) which is close to videre palaeographically and has the technical sense of agitare, ‘to beat, to drive’; cf. Acc. trag. 494 cum <e> somno in segetem agrestes cornutos cient; Lucr. 5.1251 saepire plagis saltum canibusque ciere. The Hellenistic poet whom Propertius follows lets Milanion play the inferior role of a beater so he can be near the beloved, while she, as the hunter, plays a role more appropriate to a hero. A referee who likes ciere tentatively suggests illaqueare.

1.2.25

_ non ego nunc vereor, ne sim tibi vilior istis_ 

The poet compares Cynthia, not himself, to the heroines of myth. This makes the paradosis suspicious. To take _ista_ as ‘quae modo dixi’ seems more or less a ‘Verlegensheitslösung’. The poet knows that Cynthia is just as enchanting as all these beauties of the past. This would seem to exclude _sis mihi_ (Itali, Scaliger, Passerat). What should be considered is _sis tibi_ (Wehle). H. changes _non_ to _ergo_ which seems unnecessary (cf. 1.6.1; 19.1) and keeps _sim tibi_. G. prefers _sis mihi_. Li. mentions Jacob’s _verear … sim … istis?_

1.3.7-8

talis visa mihi mollem spirare quietem
_Cynthia non certis nixa caput manibus_

Read probably _consertis_ (Guyet) which is explained as ‘pectinatim’. This could be due to wrong word division and the misunderstanding of a prefix, both frequent sources of corruption in this paradosis. H. keeps the vulgate and refers (_C._, p. 16) to a work of art, as if her ‘restless hands’ (his translation) could be seen on it. And how do restless hands agree with her soft sleep? G. also has no objections to _non certis_.

1.3.13-8

_ et quamvis duplici correptum ardore iuberent_
_hac Amor hac Liber, durus uterque deus,
subiecto leviter positam temptare lacerto_
_osculaque admota sumere et arma manu,_
_non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietem,_
_expertae metuens iurgia saevitiae_
Gronovius’ *ad ora* (Obs. IV 6) is such a neat correction of the bizarre *et arma* that we hardly need any arguments. He kisses his hand and then touches her lips, as Burman explained. For *expertae* we should probably read *expertus* (cf. J. P. Sullivan, WS 74, 1961, 108); cf. 2.34.3 *expertus dico*. This is one of the many cases (already detected by Lachmann; see C., p. 23 and n. 19) where the ending of a word was adapted to agree with the last word of the line; see below on 1.20.14; etc. *Experte* is found in the Aldina and was conjectured by Markland. H. keeps *et arma* (see C., p. 17), while G. follows Gronovius who also corrected *arma* to *ora* in 4.4.34 (accepted by H. and G., but not by F.). In 3.13.54 the Groninganus has *in ora* for *in arma* (ω). Li. points out the metrical difficulties in v. 16, as transmitted, but he is not comfortable with Gronovius’ proposal and tends to prefer *osculaque … certa* which he attributes to Scaliger.

1.3.45-6

*dum me iucundis lapsam Sopor impulit alis.*  
*illa fuit lacrimis ultima cura meis*

F. lists no alternatives to *cura*, but we have a choice between *creta* (Scal., Guyet; cf. 4.2.58 *haec spatiis ultima creta*, where *meta* is a humanist conjecture) and *meta* (Askewianus, Heins. ex coni.). *CRETA* may be a little closer to *CVRA* palaeographically. Cynthia says that she finally stopped crying and fell asleep. That is all. But *cura* can also express this, as Li.’s elegant translation shows: “voilà ce qui fut le dernier objet de mes soucis, à moi qui pleurais.” He doubts that *cura* can mean ‘remedy’ and that the dative can take the place of the genitive one would expect. He does not mention *creta* and *meta*. H. leaves *cura* and translates (pp. 20; 519) ‘that was the final cure for my tears’. As far as I know, *cura* can mean the treatment of a sick person, but not, *per se*, as ‘cure’ in English, the successful treatment, the remedy that really works. G. also keeps *cura* which he takes as ‘pensiero’. Danilo Piana points out to me that *cura* can be taken in the usual senses of ‘love’ or ‘care’ or ‘worry’, describing her emotions before she falls asleep. In that case, *ultima* might refer to 44 *externo … in amore moras*, and 2.32.31 shows what *externus amor* means; cf. also 2.19.16.

1.4.5-8

*tu licet Antiopae formam Nycteidos, et tu*  
*Spartanae referas laudibus Hermionae,*  
*et quascumque tulit formosi temporis aetas;*  
*Cynthia non illas nomen habere sinat*

Read probably *Spartanam … Hermionen* (Lipsius ex coni.) … *vel … famosi* (Struve, Baehr.) … *sinet* (*V² alii, Dousa fil.*). *Formosum tempus can-
not really mean *tempus formosarum*, and F.'s reference to Ov. *fast.* 4.129 is totally misleading, for there it means ‘beautiful weather’. What the poet had in mind is probably *aetas fabulosa* = ‘the age of myth’. *Formosum* was influenced by *forma* (v. 5). In 4.4.32 *famosa* (ω) was corrected to *formosa* in the *Itali.* The future, *sinet*, seems needed, because the poet speaks of a judgment reached after comparing all these beauties. G. adopts *famosi* but keeps the genitives in v. 6 as well as *sinat*, while H. prints the vulgate throughout the two couplets. Li. objects to *famosi*, pointing out that it means ‘fameux’, not ‘fabuleux’, and he would prefer *melioris*.

1.4.13-4

*ingenuus color et multis decus artibus et quae gaudio sub tacita ducere veste licet*

Here, *multis ... artibus* is right and should not be touched. Cynthia’s many accomplishments are real (*nullis* P², Askewianus, Scioppius seems to be influenced by the theme of 1.2). We should compare 2.3a.9ff where there is the same transition from her beauty to her various gifts, there called *munera* (v. 25), *dona* (v. 27) and *bona* (*ibid.*). She can dance, sing, write poetry (17ff). Ov. *am.* 2.10.5-6 *utraque formosa est, operosae cultibus ambae, / artibus in dubio est haec sit an illa prior* also combines beauty and achievements in his praise. In the context of 1.4, her achievements clearly include her techniques of love-making; cf. 2.6.32 *orgia sub tacita condita lalatetitia.* In the pentameter, *dicere* (ω) does not make sense, and *ducere* (*Itali*) is not better. Heinsius’ *discere* seems to be the solution. I cannot find it in his *Adversaria*, but it is attributed to him first by Kuinoel. There he seems to accept Guyet’s proposal. Because Cynthia is so good at making love, this is an art that can be learned from her. H. prints *discere*, but accepts two awkward conjectures, *motis* (Goold) … *artubus* (Marcilius), which would restrict her many talents to one. But she is much more than just an accomplished dancer. Li. is right, I think, to sense in *multis ... artibus* an allusion to Cynthia’s ‘savoir-faire’ in the techniques of love-making. This would confirm *discere* in the next line. H. prints *decor* (*Itali*; Bentley on Hor. *carm.* 4.13.17), but *decus* is fine; it corresponds to the last word of the poem (*deus* codd.), as emended by Kraffert; see below. G. writes *nullis* (P²) *datus* (G.) *artibus ... sumere* (G.) *nocte* (Faltin, Palmer).

1.4.17

*non impune feres: sciet haec insana puella*

Read, perhaps, *haec, insane, puella* with the *Editio Gryphiana* (1551) and Kuinoel (1805, dub.). Cf. on 1.5.3 below. Actually, as a referee points out, *sciet hoc* (H. ex codd.) is better than *sciet haec.* Both G. and H. keep
insana, and Li. takes it as proleptic: “my mistress will be furious when she hears this.”

1.5.3

*quid tibi vis, insane, meos sentire furores?*

Read *meae* (sc. *puellae*; cf. *tuæ* in 1.9.22; 3.14.22), as proposed by Hemsterhuys (in Burman’s edition, p. 925) and accepted by Lachmann, Housman and others. This use of the possessive pronoun as a noun, also attested in Greek, seems to be misunderstood by scribes and scholars in 4.6.60 (see below). But see, e. g., Prop. 3.8.22 *me doceat livor mecum habuisse meam*; Tib. 2.3.77 (81) *si clausa mea est, si copia rara videndi*; Hor. *carm.* 1.25.7 *me tuo longas pereunte noctes,/ Lydia, dormis?* On *insane* cf. 1.4.17 above. F.’s objection that *furores* must mean Propertius’ insane love for Cynthia is one of his many attempts to save the paradoxis, even where it cannot be saved. I would not call this “Korruptelenkult” (a term coined by B. Axelson), but it comes close to it. This seems to be another one of the cases where the ending of the last word of the line influenced the preceding adjective or pronoun which belongs to it. The *furor* of which Cynthia is capable, her *saevitias* (1.3.18), her *dementia* (cf. 1.8.1, but probably not 1.4.17) are well documented throughout Book I. Guyet changes *meos* to *suos*, and Heinsius accepted this. The whole poem, addressed to Gallus, is really a continuation of 1.4 which is addressed to Bassus. Both friends (apparently belonging to the group of *amicis* in 1.1.25) are trying to talk the poet out of his devastating passion, using different arguments (perhaps in poems addressed to him), but he rejects their advice. *Meae* became *meos* under the influence of the last word of the line, as often (see on 1.3.18 etc.); perhaps the *s-* of *sentire* also played a role. H. leaves *meos* in the text; from G.’s *app. crit.* it appears that *feros and meros* are old variants for *meos* which he also prints. Li. considers *meos* more satisfactory than *meae* which, to me, is one of Hemsterhuys’ best conjectures.

1.5.12

*illa feros animis alligat una viros*

I still think that we should write *ferox animis* (AJPh 100, 1979, 75). *Ferox* is found in the Dresden MS, as a referee points out. Who are the *feri viri* she attaches to herself? Propertius? One of his friends? But that is not the way he portrays himself. Both as a lover and as a poet he would like to be seen as *blandus*, while Cynthia’s *ferocia* is evident in this poem as well as in the preceding one. For *ferocia animi* cf. Sall. *Catil.* 61.4; for *ferocia* in a woman cf. Tac. *ann.* 2.72.1. *Ferox* became *feros* because of the last word, *viros*. There is a similar case in 3.2.7 (see below). H. and G. accept *ferox*, while Li. who considers it also lists other possibilities.
1.6.27

multi longinquo periere in amore liberenter

In this context, longinquo strikes one as an error for longaevus, suggested by Fontein who surely deserves to be saluted as one of the best emendators of Propertius. Distance and space have nothing to do here; it is all a matter of time. Heinsius showed that longinquus can mean longus, diuturnus, but not that it can have this meaning with amor. Propertius leaves long trips to his friends and prefers to stay in Rome; this is where his militia and his hardships are, for years to come, if that is what the Fates have ordained for him (cf. 29-30; 2.13b.47). G. keeps longinquo, H. (pp. 25-6) follows Fontein, and Li. welcomes the change because it removes the ‘ambiguity’ of the paradosis.

1.7.15-6

+te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu,
+quod nollim nostros eviolasse+ deos,

It is regrettable that the recent editors have not seen the merit of what is, to me, one of W. A. Camps’ best ideas,

(quod nolim nostros, heu, voluisse deos)

Camps (who followed Lipsius, Guyet and Heinsius) became aware of the fact (see his note, 1961, ad loc.) that, in this paradosis, the interjection heu sometimes appears in an abbreviated form, as e or é or è, for instance in 1.19.22 where heu nostro (Hertzberg) seems to have become e nostro; along the same lines, the Aldina (1515) offers ei nostro, and Richmond proposed ah! nostro, but F. prints a nostro, following the Itali. In 2.12.15 editors now print Muretus’ heu for é (or something like it). In 4.10.27 heu Veii veteres, Lütjohann’s emendation for e or et, is generally accepted. In our passage, H. cites the emendation but ascribes it to Markland and prints te violasse, while G. inflicts quod nolis nostros evoluisse iocos on Propertius. In v. 15 percusserit (Itali, Lipsius, Guyet, Heins., Valckenar. on E. Hipp. 1303) is accepted by G., but not by H. This seems to be a case of the wrong prefix. Camps’ note is very instructive. Liberman is in favor of per-.

1.7.25-6

tu cave nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu:
+saepe venit magno faenore tardus Amor.

Rossberg who more than once anticipated Housman, saw that amor cannot be right. Propertius thinks about his poetry and about his reputa-
tion as a poet, not about love or the god of love (why F. capitalizes *amor* is a mystery). We have to read, with Rossberg, *honos* or *honor*. It is an easy change. (*H*)ONOS has been corrupt to *onus* in a closely related passage, 3.1.21-2

\[ at \ mihi \ quod \ vivo \ detraxerit \ invida \ turba, \]
\[ post \ obitum \ duplici \ faenore \ reddet \ honos, \]

where the error has been corrected in the *Itali*. In 1.7, the verse ending *serus amor* (20) may also have played a role. Note that in Cic. *Sull*. 12 and in the *Ciris* 109 forms of *amor* and *honor* appear as vv. ll. A similar corruption occurs in Ov. *met.* 5.526: Jupiter tries to make the abduction of Proserpina acceptable to her mother, Ceres. It is by no means a *mésalliance*, he says; on the contrary,

\[ si \ modo \ nomina \ rebus \]
\[ addere \ vera \ placet, \ non \ hoc \ iniuria \ factum, \]
\[ verum \ honor \ est, \ neque \ erit \ nobis \ gener \ ille \ pudori. \]

Here, all the MSS. have *amor* for *honor*, but it is quite clear from the story that *amor* does not describe Proserpina’s feelings. We need a contrast to *iniuria*, ‘insult’, and *pudor*, ‘disgrace’, and that can only be *honor*. Dis may not be very high up in the divine hierarchy, but he would nevertheless make a most respectable son-in-law. In Ovid, *amor* was emended by Schepper (Burman *ii*, 363-4; cf. *Exemplaria Classica* 12, 2008, 52-3 where I mention G. Liberman’s objections (*per litt.*) against the change in Propertius; in his commentary he transposes the distich after v. 14, following Fischer (1863) and Otto (1885). G. prints *Honos*, H. *honos*.

1.8.7-8

\[ tu \ pedibus \ teneris \ positas \ fulcire \ Pruinas, \]
\[ tu \ potes \ insolitas, \ Cynthia, \ ferre \ nives? \]

*Fulcire* is a strange verb in this context, and F.’s explanation ‘*Cynthiae pedes nivem premunt eamque sustinent*’ might be called outlandish, if the *OLD* (p. 743 [2]) did not actually squeeze the meaning ‘to tread’ from the dubious MS. reading in our passage (not supported by Celsus 1.17.5 where the context is entirely different). F. mentions *sulcare* (P², Beroaldus) and *calcare* (Passerat, Heins., Ayrmann) but pays no further attention to them. Both G. and H. print *calcare*. Incidentally, Lachmann was impressed by Hemsterhuys’ defense of *fulcire* and called *calcare* ‘rash’, but see, e. g., Ov. *met.* 2.852-3. Hemsterhuys’ note can be found in Burman, *Addenda*, 927. It seems to me that *sulcare* which is close to the ‘ductus litterarum’ should at least be mentioned. It seems that *fulcire* was also influenced by the false
reading *ruinas* (N A F P) which once appealed to editors. But it could also be the other way around, as Li., following Housman, points out.

1.8.43

\[nunc \ mihi \ summa \ licet \ contingere \ sidera \ plantis\]

In this form, the hyperbole seems to border on the grotesque, but only if we imagine the speaker hanging upside down, his feet somehow attached to the stars. It is very tempting to read *palmis* (Scaliger *ex Italis, ut vid.*, Lipsius, Guyet, Heins.), but Broukhusius vigorously opposed the change, because he remembered Catull. 66.69 *sed quamquam me nocte premunt vestigia divum*. Propertius may compare himself to a deity who walks on top of the stars. H. (C., pp. 39-40) shows that touching the stars with one’s hand or head is also used with the same connotation, and he prints *palmis*; so does G. The last word may have been difficult to read. See on 1.20.27. Li. observes that Propertius would not have chosen *contingere* as a verb, if he had written *plantis*.

1.10.15

\[possum \ ego \ diversos \ iterum \ coniungere \ amantis\]
\[et \ dominae \ tardas \ possum \ aperire \ fores\]

Read probably *divisos* (Beroaldus, Passerat *ex Italis*); cf. 1.12.3; 10; 2.7.3; 33.5-6 *quaee dea* (sc. Isis) *tam cupidos totiens divisit amantis, / quae- cunque illa fuit, semper amara fuit*. Forms of *diversus* and *divisus* are often confused in the MSS. As often, the so-called parallels cited by F. do not prove what he wants them to prove, i. e. that *diversus* here must mean *discors*: (1) Hor. *sat.* 1.5.29 *aversos ... componere amicos* says nothing about *diversus*; (2) Paneg. *Mess.* 45 *diversi (divisi unus Vaticanus, fort. recte)* ...

\[... inconstantia vulgi \] is of doubtful value; (3) Lucan. 6.783 *diversi* simply means ‘others’; (4) Tac. *ann.* 6.22 *sapiantissimos veterum ... diversos reperies* refers to philosophical opinions. None of these passages invalidates a conjecture which establishes the sense we expect with a minimal change. We need a contrast to *coniungere*, and that is furnished by *divisos*. In the pentameter read perhaps *surdas* (Heins. dub.) for *tardas*; the point is probably not that the door opens slowly; the point is that it does not open at all, because the janitor is deaf to the lover’s complaints; cf. 1.16.18 *quid mihi tam duris (surdis Francius) clausa taces foribus; 4.5.47-8 ianitor ad dantis vigilet: si pulset inanis, / surdus in obductam somniet usque seram*. But *tardas* is suitable if one imagines a delay after which the door is suddenly opened, as if by magic. Incidentally, Heinsius’ note on 1.8.41 (*Adversaria*, p. 663) makes one wonder whether forms of *surdus* should not be substituted to forms of *tardus* in 1.1.17; 37; 8.41 (Heins. ex coni.). H. adopts *surdas* (C., p.
but keeps diversos (ibid.), while G. keeps diversos ... tardas. Li. seems to have a slight preference for divisos but is not convinced by surdas.

1.11.28-9

multis ista dabunt litora discidium,
litora quae fuerant castis inimica puellis

To conjure up a ‘gnomic future’ in order to justify dabunt, as F. does, looks like a desperate attempt at defending a notoriously unreliable textual tradition at all costs. The obvious correction, dabant, is found in Vo² and a Bononiensis, and it was accepted by Burman, Lachmann and others. The Vossianus 117 may not be a very good witness, but its corrector obviously knew Latin. In this paradox, endings are corrupted so often, and a is so frequently read for u that a small change like this does not have to be explained at great length. Lachmann printed dissidium, rejecting discidium, but cf., e.g., 2.24c, 32; OLD s. v. ‘discidium’.

In the following line read fuerunt (Scaliger, Livineius). See on 2.8.10 below. The poet does not refer to a mythical past: Baiae as the fashionable resort in his own time has a bad reputation. Other resorts should also be avoided by lovers (see 1.20.7ff), but Baiae is especially dangerous. H. does not reject dabunt but prints fuerunt in the next line (see C., pp. 56-7). G. edits dabunt ... fuerunt. Li. does not object to dabunt but favors fuerunt and explains the mechanism of the error.

1.13.13-4

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

Propertius lists three different sources of information, ranked according to their degree of credibility: (1) rumor; (2) prophecies; (3) himself as an eyewitness. It does not matter whether the rumor is good or bad (2.23.24 is different); what matters is only whether it can be trusted or not. Haupt’s aio for malo is weak, as F. points out, but Francius’ vago seems excellent to me. We should remember Ovid’s wonderful description of the rumors floating around in the house of Fama, in met. 12.53-5 veniunt, leve vulgus, euntque/ mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur/ milia rumorum confusaque verba volutant. The verb vagantur would seem to lend support to Francius’ suggestion. G. and H. do not mention vago, but Li. supports it by a number of parallels, e.g. Ov. met. 11.667 non ista (ficta Heins.) vagis rumoribus audis. Incidentally, Rossberg’s haec non sum also occurred to Housman; see Heyworth, in: Butterfield and Stray (edd.), A. E. Housman: Classical Scholar, London 2009, 16. This is not the only coincidence of this kind.
1.13.23-4

\textit{nec sic caelestem flagrans amor Herculis Heben sensit ab Oetais gaudia prima rogis}

It is a pleasure to note that F. prints this couplet as it was restored by Scaliger and Schrader from the corrupt MS. readings \textit{in ... iugis (ω)} and that he avoided the errors of Beroaldus and Enk. One could consider taking \textit{gaudia prima} as an apposition, placing the two words between commas. \textit{Amor Herculis} means ‘Hercules in love’, and Hebe \textit{is} his first joy after becoming immortal. H. also opts for \textit{ab ... rogis}. G. writes \textit{caelestis flagrans amore [sic] Herculis Hebe [sic]} which must be a misprint (see his p. 20), but even what he intended, \textit{caelestis, flagrans amor Herculis, Hebe seems strange. Li. supports Schrader’s proposal by Stat. silv. 3.1.7; 4.6.53.}

1.15.19-20

\textit{Hypsipyle nullos post illos sensit amores, ut semel Haemonio tabuit hospitio}

Others may feel differently, but to me \textit{nullos ... illos} produces an unpleasant sound effect. Once again, a scribe seems to have anticipated the ending of the last word of the line. In this case, he was also, perhaps, influenced by the ending of \textit{nullos}, and the ending of \textit{illos} may have been affected by the \textit{s-} of \textit{sensit}. Burman suggested \textit{post illum} (i.e. after Jason), and it is such an easy change that it should be at least mentioned in the \textit{app. crit.} of a modern edition. G. leaves \textit{illos}, H. accepts \textit{illum} (see C., p. 67-8), Li. is aware of the conjecture but does not assess its value.

1.16.13-4

\textit{has inter gravibus cogor deflere querelis supplicis a longis tristior excubiis}

Read probably: \textit{has (ω) propter (Giardina) gravius (Scal.) cogor deflere querelas (Scal.)/ supplicis a longis tristior excubiis}. Cf. 3.10.28 where \textit{gravius} (Beroaldus, Guyet, accepted by H., but rejected by F. and G.) also became \textit{gravibus}. Here, in 1.16, the door is moved more deeply by the particular complaints of one rejected lover (anticipating vv. 17-44) and feels more sadness because of the long hours he wasted in front of the house. \textit{Gravius} and \textit{tristior} correspond to each other. \textit{Haec} (cod. vetus Passeratii) has no clear reference, but \textit{has} goes with \textit{querelas} which may have been become \textit{querelis} because of \textit{gravibus}, one corruption creating another. H. prints \textit{has} ... \textit{gravibus ... querelis/ ... a}, and G. gives us \textit{hanc propter gravibus ... querelis}, introducing two of his own changes. Actually, his \textit{propter} is quite attractive, but with \textit{has querelas}, not with \textit{hanc ... querelis}. Liberman’s
discussion of this passage is particularly enlightening. He calls F.’s text “un
charabia opaque” and takes a as the preposition (see my note on Ov. trist. 4.3.36), not the interjection (Passerat, Broukh., Heins. ex codd.) which is bet-
ter, especially if we accept propter, because the two prepositions indicating a
reason would correspond to each other, just like gravius and tristior.

1.18.9-10

quid tantum merui? quae te mihi carmina mutant?
an nova tristitia caus a puella tuae?

The poet wants to know what he did to make Cynthia angry. On tristi-
titia = ira, inimicitia cf. 1.6.10. To take carmina as carmina magica (F. ad
loc., following Beroaldus and Passerat) is out of the question. Whatever it
was, it had to come from him, not from any witches. Read crimina (Puccius
ex coni.). The ghost of Cynthia herself tells him what she had in mind: celo
ego perfidia crimina multa tuae (4.7.70). Crimina agrees with notam (8)
in the sense of ‘stigma’; it also reinforces the concept of merui: cf. Tac. hist.
3.78 Antonius praepostero obsequio ... crimen meruit. F. cites Leo and
Solmsen who support crimina but keeps carmina in his text. One should
remember that crimina does not always mean ‘crimes’, but often ‘reproach-
es, charges, accusations’, i. e. something that exists in Cynthia’s mind, not
something he actually committed. H. and G. print crimina which is also the
reading preferred by Li. who takes it to mean ‘accusations’, i. e. ‘slanders of
enemies’, following Paley.

1.18.21-2

a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras
scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus

Here some major damage has to be repaired, as Lachmann saw. Propertius
addresses trees which were (perhaps) once human beings or nymphs and
were transformed because of some great passion (see A. Hollis, in: Brill’s
Companion to Propertius, 106-7; P. Knox, ibid., 138-9). Therefore they
know how he feels. At one point in the transmission of the text, corticibus
seems to have lost its proper epithet, teneris (proposed by Heins.) or rather
it was moved to the preceding line where it managed to push out the proper
epithet of umbras. According to Guyet, Schrader and Koppiers (1771), the
distich in its original form looked like this

a quotiens vestras resonant mea verba sub umbras
scribitur et teneris ‘Cynthia’ corticibus
This was accepted by Lachmann and others, but would one not expect *vestra ... sub umbra* (Liberman) or *vestris ... sub umbris?* H. accepts *tenera ... sub umbra* (Hall) and *vestris ... corticibus* (N T Y C). Cf. C., pp. 81-2. G. introduces another conjecture, *tenues* (already proposed by F. G. Barth, 1777), for *teneras*, but this is not better than Guyet’s *virides*. Li. accepts the switch of epithets and furnishes an ingenious explanation of the error.

1.19.21-2

*quam vereor, ne te contempto, Cynthia busto,*

*abstrahat a nostro pulvere iniquus Amor*

Read probably *heu* (Hertzberg) for *e* (ω), *a* (Italii) or *ah* (Richmond). See above on 1.7.16. H. and G. prefer *a*, but G. changes *amor* to *amans*, a kind of *acte gratuit*.

1.20.9-10

*sive Gigantea spatiabere litoris ora,*

*sive ubicumque vago fluminis hospitio*

In v. 9 read probably *Gigantei* (Italii), in v. 10 *vagi* (D V Vo, Auratus, Passerat, Heins.). For *Gigantei ... litoris* cf. 1.11.2 qua iacet Herculeis semita litoribus. For *vagi fluminis* cf. 2.19.30 *vaga muscosis flumina fusa iugis*. F. speaks of an ‘enallage’, but we seem to have two more cases (in the same couplet) of the attraction of an epithet to the last word of the line. Both G. and H. print *vago*. H. gives us *Gigantei* while G. keeps the vulgate. Li. reminds us of Shackleton Bailey’s support of *Gigantei* (see Propertiana, 56), and this conjecture was also accepted by George Goold. Li. is in favor of *vagi* but suspects a major corruption in the line.

1.20.12

*(non minor Ausoniis est amor Adryasin)*

*Adryasin* is Struve’s conjecture for *adriacis* (ω), and it has been accepted by editors, but *Adryas* must be a tree nymph, and the word itself is weakly attested in Greek and Latin. Actually, the poet is thinking of Italian water nymphs, i.e. of Roman beauties who visit fashionable bathing resorts, such as Baiae, and are always ready to seduce handsome young men. (See Camps, in his Commentary, 1961, 93, who attributes this very plausible view to a friend). What one would expect is Lachmann’s *Hydriasin* which is well attested (see his note). Accordingly, we would also need *Ephydriasin* (Baehr.) in v. 32 and *Hydriades* (Unger) in v. 45, it seems to me. G. and H. (see C., pp. 88-90) read *Adryasin* (12) ... *Hamadryasin* (32) ... *Dryades* (45). It is true that the poets do not always distinguish between water nymphs and tree
nymphs (Li., referring to Housman on Lucan. 7.871), but here the point of
the whole poem is lost if these ladies are not clearly defined as creatures of
the water.

1.20.13-4

ne tibi sit duros montes et frigida saxa,
Galle, neque expertos semper adire lacus

I see no way of explaining expertos ... lacus, and F.'s references are only
designed to illustrate neque expertos = et inexpertos. Read experto (Livi-
neius). The –s was added by dittography or by the tendency of a scribe to
adjust a word ending to the ending of the last word of the line; see on 1.3.18;
20.10. Experto goes with tibi and must mean 'after what you have experi-
cenced', for this sort of thing probably happened before, and Propertius re-
minds him (see v. 51 monitus; cf. on 1.3.18 above). H. and G. leave expertos
which, I suppose, could be taken as passive (Li. who compares 1.2.5 mercato;
19.6 oblito).

Two (in my opinion) outstanding emendations allow us to understand
and appreciate the ending of this poem. As usual, I first print F.'s text:

1.20.49-52

,cui procul Alcides iterat responsa; sed illi
 nomen ab extremis montibus aura refert.
his, o Galle, tuos monitus servabis amores,
formosum Nymphis credere visus Hylan.

Read in v. 49 with Fontein and Huschke ter 'Hyla' respondet, at (or: re-
sponsat, at) illi and in v. 52 with Palmer formosum ni vis perdere rursus
Hylan. F. mentions the second conjecture, as modified by Housman (rusus
for rursus) but feels no need to change anything. G. rewrites the two cou-
plets extensively: quem procul Alcides rogitat ... Nymphis credere nil sit.
H. accepts Fontein's reading in v. 49, but prints nymphis credere rursus
in v. 52, postulating a lacuna of two lines before 51 and 52. See C., p. 93-4. I
prefer Palmer's neat solution. Li. calls Fontein's solution 'géniale' and is aware
of the advantages of Palmer's proposal.

2.2.4

Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tua

This pentameter has a weak ending, I think. Read probably tibi for tua
with Heinsius who refers to Passerat's defense of ignosco (ignoro N F P
alii). Tua was probably influenced by furta. It is interesting that, in Enk's
paraphrase, cited by F., tibi appears along with tua: ‘ignosco tibi, Iuppiter, pristina furtu tua; nam tam formosa est Cynthia, ut optime intellegam te olim puellas mortales rapuisse.’ G. keeps tua, H. (p. 114) accepts tibi.

2.3a.17

quantum quod posito formose saltat Iaccho

The context seems to require cum (Lachmann; see his note), probably written QVOM; cf. 19 et quantum Aeolio cum temptat carmina plectro. Otherwise, we would have to change cum in v. 19 to quod (Guyet). It should be either cum ... cum or quod ... quod. But because of si in v. 15 and cum in v. 21 (which cannot be changed to quod; see below), cum is more likely in v. 17. Both G. and H. see no problem with quod ... cum... cum, but H. at least cites the two conjectures.

2.3a.23-4

non tibi nascenti primis, mea vita, diebus
candidus argutum sternuit omen Amor?

Here, as usual, the indirect tradition (Macrob., GLK V 625, 15) is right. Candidus became arbidus (vel sim.) in the direct tradition, probably because the first letter of the first word was lost. (The explanation of the error was already offered in the Cambridge edition of 1702; I know this book only through the references in F. G. Barth’s edition, 1777, who treats it with great respect). This disposes of Beroaldus’ fervidus and of Heinsius’ aureus. There is no need to document candidus in the sense of ‘favorable’, said of a deity (see OLD, p. 265, [5b; 7a]. Should one also change argutum to argute (Heins., ‘fort. recte’ F.)? Probably not: see Cic. div. 2.29 sunt ... qui vel argutissima haec exta esse dicant. G. prints fervidus ... argutum, H. (p. 123) edits nam (Q) ... candidus ... argutum.

2.3b.45-6

I still think (cf. my edition, Zürich 1996, 62) that this couplet marks the beginning of a new poem which originally included nr. 4. This would give us an elegy of 32 (10+22) lines. Schrader and Lachmann, following the Aldina of 1502, connected 2.3b.45-54 with 2, 4. But no matter how we separate the poems, the text printed by F. and others seems wrong:

his saltem ut teneor iam finibus! ah mihi si quis
acrius ut moriar, venerit alter amor!
Years ago (cf. my edition, Zürich 1996, 62 and 369) I defended Tyrrell’s easy change of *ut tenear* to *aut tenear* which allows us to keep *aut mihi* (N P F man.4) in the same line. F. replaces this by *ah* (Puccius); others have preferred *(h)ei* (Lachmann), *at* (Paley) or *an* (F). In v. 46 *acrior* (*Itali*) seems to be an improvement over *acrius* (ω) which F. tries to defend by a reference to Plaut. *Trin.* 540 where swine are said to die a very painful death from an acute throat infection. This, I am sorry to say, does not work, nor is Giardina’s objection (1977, p. 126) at all convincing: ‘*qui possit fieri, ut alter post acerrimam Cynthiam [sic] acrior poetae videatur amor?’ This is exactly what the poet has in mind. His next love – if there ever will be one – will have to be so strong that it could kill him. So far, his love for Cynthia, overwhelming as it is, has not destroyed him completely, but a new passion which would obviously separate him from Cynthia, could only lead to his death. For *acer amor* cf. *Verg.* Aen. 12.392 *iamque aderat Phoebο ante alios dilectus Iapyx/ Iasides, acri quondam cui captus amore/ ipse suas artis, sua munera, laetus Apollo/ augurium citharamque dabat celerisque sagittas.* Here we have a powerful description of what *acer amor* can do – even to a god! This testimony counts, perhaps, a little more than the dying swine in Plautus. I still believe that we should read, with the proper punctuation:

*his saltem aut tenear iam finibus aut mihi, si quis, acrior, ut moriar, venerit alter amor.*

Here, *ut moriar* perfectly well explains *acrior*. G. prints *ut ... at ... ne ... acrius*, and H. (pp. 125–6) has a long, involved discussion; in his OCT he leaves aut the word after *saltem* altogether and reads *ei ... acrius*. He prints three dots before vv. 45 and 47, making the couplet float in a kind of no man’s land, a kind of treatment that surely does not do a service to the poet – or to the reader.

2.6.5

*nec quae deletas potuit componere Thebas,*

*Phryne*

Here we should, perhaps, pick a plausible conjecture. The paradosis offers *delectas* which was changed to *deletas* by a younger hand in N; but we also have a choice between *deiectas* (Gebhard) and *disiectas* (Schrader, *Emend.* C. VI, p. 121), both better than *deletas* (defended by Broukhusius), because the *c* in *delectas* is likely to be part of the original reading. As a contrast to *componere*, we might find *deiectas* more appealing; see also 2.8.10 *et Thebae steterunt* (*Itali, Scaliger : -ant ω*), but Val. Max. 1.5.1 *urbe a Gallis disiecta* would confirm Schrader’s suggestion. H. (pp. 134–5) makes a good case for *deiectas*; G. leaves *deletas* in the text.
2.6.31-2

*ah gemat in tenebris, ista qui protulit arte*
*turpia sub tacita condita laetitia*

F. accepts Fontein’s emendation of *terris*. As often, a longer word has been contracted into a shorter, look-alike form that makes a certain amount of sense. The poet has in mind the darkness of the underworld; see 4.9.41 *Stygias ... tenebras*. But F. also prints *turpia* (Herwerden) for *iurgia* (ω), a gross trivialization and much inferior to Ruhnken’s *orgia*. See above on 1.4.14. H. accepts *tenebris* and *orgia* (C., pp. 136-7), G. keeps *terris* and introduces his own *crimina*.

2.6.41-2

*nos uxor numquam, numquam deducet amica:*
*semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.*

Years ago (*AJPh* 100, 1979, 77-8) I argued that this distich is really the beginning of a new poem, 2.7 and I did not know that Havet had proposed this already. We should also read *diducet* (Lachmann; see his note) for *de-ducet* (wrong prefix, as often). See now my article in *A. E. Housman: Classical Scholar*, edited by D. J. Butterfield and C. A. Stray (London 2009), 138-40. H. (pp. 138-40) rejects my idea and places the couplet between 2.7.5 and 7, reviving a suggestion he found in Sandbach’s lecture notes. This is probably not the best of all possible solutions. G. leaves the couplet at the end of 2.6, reading *subducet* with Burman. Scaliger, followed by other editors, placed the couplet after 2.7.20.

2.8.8

*vinceris aut vincis: haec in amore rota est*

In order to restore the text of 2.8.8, we first have to reconcile the information given by our sources. It seems best to begin with Smyth’s *Thesaurus Criticus*. The reading *aut vinces* which already appears in the *Itali* is usually ascribed to Arthur Palmer. But at one time (*Hermathena* 9, 1983, p. 448), Palmer also wrote: “The correction *at vinces* is easy and, in my opinion, certain”. At another time he tried *aut vincis: sic* (*P. Ovidii Nasonis HEROIDES XIV*, 1874, p. XXXVI. I am indebted to Antonio Ramírez de Verger for this clarification. On the wheel of Fortune as a symbol for the vicissitudes experienced in love cf. Tib. 1.5.69-70 *at tu, qui potior nunc es, mea furta caveto (timeto v. l.):/ versatur celeri fors levis orbe rotae*. It seems that *rota* is not only the wheel itself but its movement.
2.15.23-6

dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore:
nox tibi longa venit nec reditura dies.
atque utinam haerentis sic nos vincire catena
velles, ut numquam solveret ulla dies!

To whom is velles addressed? To Cynthia, according to F. who refers to tibi, but this form is best understood as a ‘dativus ethicus’. Baehrens’ vellet (sc. catena) uti offers a way out, but Burman’s vellent (sc. fata) is excellent, I think, and it was accepted by Kuinoel. If this is accepted, we may have to change the punctuation somewhat:

dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore
(noxtibi longa venit nec reditura dies)
atque utinam haerentis sic nos vincire catena
vellent, ut numquam solveret ulla dies!

The chain by which the Fates bind the two lovers together is a striking image. Lucr. 4.1109 usque adeo cupide in Veneris compagibus haeret is slightly different, because here Venus takes over the role of the binding power; see also [Tib.] 4.5.13-6 nec tu sis iniusta, Venus: vel serviat aequo/ vinctus uterque tibi, vel mea vincla leva./ sed potius valida teneamur uterque catena,/ nulla queat posthac quam soluisse dies; Stat. silv. 5.1.44 is similar, and the poet seems to have this passage and 4.7.19-20 pectore mixto in mind: vos collato pectore mixtos/ iunxit inabrupta Concordia longa catena. Here Concordia (not Venus, as in Lucretius) takes the place of the deity that applies the chain. G. and H. keep velles without citing any alternatives, but, as the passages cited show, we need a higher power to bind the lovers together.

2.15.47-8

haec certe merito poterunt laudare minores:
laeserunt nullos pocula nostra deos

Fontein, an outstanding textual critic, objected to pocula and proposed proelia or oscula; before him, the Itali tried lumina. But no change is necessary. Propertius almost certainly alludes to the disgrace of Cornelius Gallus, and when he speaks of ‘offended gods’, he must have in mind Augustus. Propertius contrasts his own way of life, dedicated to making love. In v. 47, hoc would be better than haec, as one of the referees notes. Drinking wine, writing poetry to those who, like Gallus (or Tullus, see above on 1.6.21-2) fought Rome’s battles and contributed their share to Rome’s triumphs, though Gallus also achieved fame as a poet. The allusion to Gallus was first
recognized by David Ruhnken, it seems, but also by others, e. g., by Ch. Merivale, History of the Roman Empire, vol. IV (1903), p. 103, as cited by Enk in his commentary on Book II, 1962, 227. D’Orville and others thought of M. Antonius. But see Ov. trist. 2.445-6 nec fuit opprobrio celebresse Lycorida Gallo, / sed linguam nimio non tenuisse mero. Gallus acquired laus as a soldier and a love-poet, but he also managed to offend Augustus by boasting about his exploits when he was in his cups. Propertius who has no military ambitions can at least claim for himself that he never offended ‘the gods’, even when he had too much to drink. H. (pp. 176-7) leaves pocula in the text but prefers me (Itali, Heins., Lachm.) to haec (N post corr. F² vel Colucius Q S); G. prints nos (Baehr.) … proelia (Fontein). But both me and nos, followed by certe, sound too assuming, I think: Propertius only demands laus in one small domain: He never offended any deity. Haec (= nec N primo, F P B etc.) seems necessary as a preparation of the next line.

2.16.29

aspice quid donis Erphyla invent amaris

Rossberg proposed amari which was accepted by H. (p. 181) who recognized the influence of the prae-caesural noun. G. conjectured opertis for amaris, but quid … amari seems to restore what the poet wrote. E. Hipp. 1411 (Poseidon’s ‘bitter gifts’) could be cited to support the paradosis, but it does not seem to be a very close parallel.

2.16.49-50

vidisti toto sonitus percurrere caelo
fulminaque aetheria desituisse domo?

Read probably tonitrus (Francius, cited anonymously by Broukhus.) for sonitus. Francius’ conjecture can be supported by Verg. Aen. 8.391-2, cited by H. tonitru cum rupta corusco / ignea rima micans percurrit lumine nimbos. As often, a longer word got shortened in transcription. I also wonder whether percurrere would not require totum … caelum; see, e. g., Lucr. 5.1221 cum … magnum percurrunt murmura caelum. As far as endings are concerned, the paradosis of Propertius is often unreliable, and in this case the endings aetheria … domo might have influenced the preceding line. Guyet (or Heinsius) proposed procurrere, while Lachmann postulated an intransitive use of percurrere. H. (pp. 183-4) accepts tonitrus, but G. feels comfortable with sonitus (cf. Ramírez de Verger, BMCR 2009-07-27, 7).

2.20.9-12

mi licet aeratis astringant brachia nodis,
sint tua vel Danaes condita membra domo,
in te ego et aeratas rumpam, mea vita, catenas, ferratam Danaes transiliamque domum

Transiliamque is a conjecture noted by V², the hand of a humanist. The broad paradosis offers stasiliamque. What one would expect is insiliamque, and this was proposed (dub.) by Burman. F. tries to save the earlier conjecture by referring to 2.32.59 nec minus aerato Danae circumdata muro which, according to him, must mean that Danae’s house was surrounded by a wall over which one had to jump. But in fact it means that she was surrounded by walls, i.e. the walls of her domus. Even if one had jumped over that imaginary wall, one still was not with Danae, for she was inside the tower, and Propertius could not possibly say that he would jump over her tower. The s- of stasiliamque probably results from dittography, and then we would only have to deal with –ta- which could very well hide in-. What transilire means in Propertius is shown by 2.18b.38 et terram rumor transilitt et maria. Guyet proposed very plausibly mi licet aerati constringant brachia nodi (wrong prefix and adjustment of endings to restore metre). G. prints mi ... bracchia ... tua ... transiliamque, while H. (p. 195) accepts insiliamque but follows ω in printing me for mi (Itali); he also prefers vincula (van Jever) to bracchia. Incidentally, tua in v. 10 is Santen’s correction for mea (ω) which editors had accepted before.

2.20.28
possum ego naturae non meminisse tuae?

Read possim (Guyet, Heins. on Ov. epist. 8.5; met. 14.172) ego nunc curae (Suringar). NUNCCURAE became naturae, because a scribe ignored the word division, omitted one C and shortened a sequence of letters, as often. H. feels comfortable with both changes (see pp. 196-7), while G. leaves possum ... naturae in the text.

2.20.35-6
hoc mihi perpetuo ius est, quod solus amator nec cito desisto nec temere incipio

Housman has repaired the passage by writing haec (Itali) ... laus, and this was accepted by Goold and others. Only by a long stretch can ius in this context stand for mos, as F., following Paley, asserts. If that were the case, Propertius could have written hic ... mos, but this is not at all what he means. An abbreviated haec became hoc, but a reference suggests that haec could have become hoc from a simple palaeographical error of hec > hoc. Similarly, hoc could become haec by mistake (see above) and LAVS became IVS because L looks like I, and A was omitted. Cf. 2.1.47 laus in amore
mori: laus altera, si datur uno/ posse frui. H. leaves the couplet as it is in ω, but deletes it, following Jacob. Apparently, it is also missing in one or several Itali (probably because of the homoeoteleuton haec ... haec ... nec). This is not the only time that H. removes a portion of the text in one way or another, because a simpler remedy (he mentions Housman) apparently does not appeal to him. G. leaves hoc ... ius in the text.

2.22b.44

*quid iuvat heu nullo ponere verba loco?*

This is another example of the corruption of *heu* which here appears as *et* in ω; it was changed to *et* by Haupt, and *heu* is due to Rothstein (see above on 1.7.16). In this case F. has accepted the conjecture, but he ignores Beroaldus' *nullo pondere ... loqui* which should at least be cited in the *app. crit.* of a modern edition. Beroaldus actually wrote *in* for *et*, following a humanist source. *Pondere* lost a letter, and the last word of the line was changed to make some sort of sense. Cf. 3.7.43-4 *quod si .../ verba ... duxisset pondus habere mea;* Ov. *epist.* 3.98 *at mea pro nullo pondere verba cadunt.* H. (p. 205) accepts Beroaldus' emendation which he ascribes to Itali, while G. rewrites the verse as follows *quid iuvat, a! nullo perdere* (G.) *verba lucro* (G.)

2.23.11-2

*quam care semel in toto nox vertitur anno!*

*a pereant, si quos ianua clausa iuvat!*

The presence of *care* in the hexameter should alert readers that one must read *venditur* (Hemsterhuys, Schrader, *Emend.,* c. VI. p. 127). *Perditur* (Broukhus.) is less appealing; cf. Sen. *dial.* 10.16.5 *noctes quas tam care mercantur,* perhaps a reminiscence of this passage. It is the same theme: someone (a messenger, the door keeper, the mistress herself) has to be bribed by the lover in order to gain access or to keep an assignment; see Ov. *am.* 1.10.29-32 *sola viro mulier spoliis exultat ademptis,/ sola locat noctes, sola licenda (Y : locanda P S, recc.) venit/ et v e n d i t quod utrumque iuvat, quod uterque petebat,/ et pretium quanti gaudeat ipsa facit.* The parallel shows that the lady herself, not only her servants, expected gifts or cash; hence, in Propertius, we might consider *quas* (Itali) for *quos* in v. 12. Propertius and Ovid are not speaking of prostitutes but of ladies of the upper classes. H. introduces his own conjecture *venerit* which is no improvement. His objections against *venditur* are found in C., pp. 208-9. He accepts *quas* in v. 12. G., too, prefers a conjecture of his own, *ducitur,* to *venditur* and leaves *quos.*
2.26.49-50
iam deus amplexu votum persolvit; at illi
aurea divinas urna profudit aquas

The myth itself and the context which it illustrates suggest nam (Vahlen)...amplexae (Postgate) ...et (J K W) for iam ... amplexu ... at. That iam here means statim is one of F.’s improbable assertions. Amplexae is better than amplexus (Passerat), because it provides an indirect object to persolvit and avoids the homeoteleuton deus amplexus. It also anticipates illi and confirms et, I think. Amymone allowed herself to be seduced by Poseidon, because he promised her something, and he kept his promise; that is why she pours divine waters out of a golden urn, testifying that gods can be kind and fair to mortal women. A logical sequence connects the god’s promise, Amymone’s willingness and her reward; hence et instead of at. H. (p. 227) gives us nam ... amplexae ... at, while G. prints iam ... amplexu ... at. Incidentally, Vahlen’s nam for iam is a good illustration of Kenney’s First Law (CQ 8, 1958, 65) that “any monosyllable at the start of the verse may have arisen from any other” (see H., C., p. 410).

2.28.15-6
sed tibi vexatae per multa pericula vitae
extrema veniet mollior hora die

It seems to me that post (Pricaeus on Apul. met. 11. P. 666, Markland) would make more sense than per, since the poet is really thinking of her last day of life when all crises are behind her. Per would be better with vexata ... vita (Itali). Furthermore, veniat (Itali) may be better than veniet which is itself a conjecture (V²) for the impossible venit (ω). The paradosis lost a letter, and the optative veniat is, perhaps, more suitable than the straightforward prediction veniet. Finally, aura (Passerat ex codd., Pricaeus) should replace hora. Once more, the passages assembled by F. prove nothing, for in Ov. epist. 3.44 and Pont. 3.3.84 most editors now prefer aura: see also trist. 4.5.20 (and my note, 1977). Read probably

sed tibi vexatae post multa pericula vitae
extrema veniat mollior aura die.

G. keeps per, changes vexatae to versatae, prints aura and considers veniat his own conjecture. H. (p. 233) edits per ... veniat ... hora. H. notes that pericula vitae is a standard phrase which allows vexatae to be read with tibi and per to be retained.
2.29.15-8

quae cum Sidoniae nocturna ligamina mitrae
solverit atque oculos moverit illa gravis,
afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores,
sed quos ipse suis fecit Amor manibus

Read Sidonias, nocturna ligamina, mitras. The garment Cynthia wears at night is not a *mitra* which, in the singular, designates an ‘oriental headdress fastened under the chin’ (*OLD s.v.*, referring to Prop. 4.2.31 *cinge caput mitra*). Only the plural, *mitrae*, describes the two cups of her brassiere which had, indeed, ribbons attached to them and may have vaguely looked like a pair of headdresses connected with each other. The function of Cynthia’s garment has often been misunderstood, e.g. by G., in his translation. It was not a night cap. Propertius almost certainly had in mind an epigram by Hedylus (II Gow and Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965 = *AP* 5.195.5):

σάνδαλα καὶ μαλακαὶ, μαστῶν ἐνδύματα, μίτραι

These articles had belonged to Aglaonike and are still redolent of her perfume (vv. 3-4; cf. Prop. vv. 17-8). After a symposion and a night with her lover, Aglaonike dedicated her sandals and her *strophion* (see Gow and Page, pp. 177; 578) to Aphrodite. This poem from Meleager’s *Garland*, a collection which Propertius knew (see A. Hollis, in *Brill’s Companion*, 107-8) also uses the type of apposition which is familiar from Verg. *ecl.* 1.57 *raucae, tua cura, palumbes.* Otto Skutsch called it *schema Cornelianum* because he thought that Gallus had introduced it into Roman poetry (see my note on Ov. *met.* 4.669 in *Exemplaria Classica* 12, 2008, 50-1, n. 3). Clearly, Gallus could have found it in Hellenistic poetry, and the similarities pointed out make Propertius’ direct knowledge of Hedylus almost certain. In the paradosis of Propertius, this type of apposition was not always recognized, it seems, and the plural was changed to singular; see below on 4.7.63-4 and the conclusions.

2.32.15-6

The poet describes (11-6) some of the splendid new attractions of Rome. One of them is the fountain of Triton. The transmitted text is unsatisfactory in several ways. F. has removed the most obvious error, but two more remain in his text:

et leviter toto (tota ω) nymphis crepitantibus orbe (urbe ω)
cum subito Triton ore recondit aquam
Heinsius proposed *toto ... orbe*, but he also proposed *refundit* for the unusual *recondit*. The mechanism of the fountain seems to work like this: every now and then Triton refills the basin with water flowing from the *concha* he is holding to his mouth, and this produces the gentle crackling sound the poet describes; see *Verg. Aen.* 11.299 *fremunt ripae crepitantibus undis*. The water which fills the basin is, of course, identical to the liquid mentioned in the hexameter and it is difficult to understand why F. insists on printing *nymphis* which evokes the wrong associations. Former commentators though of statues surrounding the basin (see Lachmann’s note). The word was corrected to *lymphis* in the *Itali*, and F.’s references to 3.16.4; 22.26 are not helpful; he himself prints forms of *lympha* in 1.2.12; 11.12; 3.3.51; 3.10.13; 4.6.7; 9.35; 59. G. prints *toto nymphis ... orbe / cum ... refundit* (Heins.), while H. keeps *tota nymphis ... urbe*; he also accepts Heinsius’ *refundit* but changes the beginning of the hexameter to *et sonitus*.

2.34.19-20

*ipse meas solus, quod nil est, aemulor umbras,*  
*stultus, quod stulto saepe timore tremo.*

For the second *quod* which is probably repeated after the first, as F. observes, we find *qui* in the *Itali* (*quid D V*), and for *stulto* Heyworth now offers *falso* which must be right. Thus we have two “errors of perseveration” in one couplet. Read:

*stultus qui falsa saepe timo tremo.*

H. also adopts Heinsius’ *meae ... umbrae* (proposed doubtfully *Adversaria*, p. 714) which has been neglected by recent editors; *aemulor*, ‘I am jealous of’, requires the dative; cf. *Cic. Tusc.* 1.44. G. keeps *meas ... umbras* and prints Heinsius’ *stultus et in nullo*.

3.2.3-6

*Orphea detinuisse feras et concita dicunt*  
*flumina Threicia sustinuisse lyra;*  
*saxa Cithaeronis Thebas agitata per artem*  
*sponte sua in muri membra coisse ferunt.*

Two famous examples for the power of music. In v. 3 read perhaps *delinisse* (Ayrmann, in: *Sylva Emendationum Criticarum*, p. 7); cf. *Hor. ars* 393 (Orpheus) *dictus ... lenire tigris rabidosque leones; Quint. inst.* 5.8.1 *Sirenum cantu deleniti; Apul. flor. 17 ille immanium bestiarum delenitor*. The word may have been corrupted by the anticipation of *sustinuisse*. If Mart. 14.166.2 is sound, the corruption could be very old. In v. 15 *per artem* seems too vague; we need an epithet. *Thebas* (probably a gloss) is unconvinc-
ingly defended by F.; read Phoebeam (Jortin); cf. Stat. silv. 3.2.41 nec cano degeneri Phoebeum Amphiona plectro. In Propertius, Threicia lyra and Phoebea ars would balance each other. G. keeps detinuisse and Thebas but changes the innocuous agitata to advecta. H. (pp. 286-7) also keeps detinuisse (cf. Hor. carm. 1.33.14; H.’s parallels are not of equal value), and he prefers Thebanam (Heins.) to Phoebeam.

3.2.7-8

quin etiam, Polypheme, fera Galatea sub Aetna
ad tua rorantis carmina flexit equos

Read ferox (Wakker who also changed equos to aquas). It is the same case as 1.5.12: the epithet was assimilated to the last word of the line. ‘Wild Aetna’ is irrelevant: the point is that even wild Polyphemus was able to charm beautiful Galatea with his songs. Butrica (CQ 47, 1997, 148) also found ferox attractive. Cf. Cic. Tusc. 5.115 Polyphemum cum Homerus immanem fer- umque finxisset (not the same story, but the same type of uncouth character and presumably the same locale). H.’s objections (p. 288) are not compelling; for epithets following vocative names cf. 2.33b.29; 3.3.30 Pan Tegeae; 4.11.38. G. also leaves fera in the text.

3.6.21-2

ille potest nullo miseram me linquere facto
et qualem nolo dicere habere domi

This couplet illustrates both the sad state of the paradosis and the remarkable ingenium of Arthur Palmer. N comes closest to the truth with et qualem (also found by Broukhus.) nullo (influenced by nullo immediately above), but the broad paradosis has (a)equalem nulla, and Palmer found nolo hidden in nullo. G. prints Palmer’s corrections but reads domo (ω) for domi (Heins. ex Italis). I suspect that an original domi was assimilated to the corrupt form nulla and thus became domo. H. follows Palmer and Heinsius. To witness how the great critics of past ages struggle with a problem whose solution was found later – knowing the solution – is always an experience.

3.6.27-30

illum turgentis ranae portenta rubetae
et lecta exsuctis anguibus ossa trahunt
et strigis inventae per busta iacentia plumae
cinctaque funesto lanea vitta toro

Ranae ... rubetae is a tautology, because a rubeta actually is a kind of frog. Heinsius (Castigationes in Vell. Paterc. 2.7) saw that sanie is hiding in
ranae, and this is what the poet probably wrote (see R. Tarrant, in Günther’s *Companion to Prop.*, 52). The corruption may have been caused by a gloss. In the pentameter *exsertis unguibus* (Mitscherlich on Hor. *epod.* 5.20 after Broukhus.) is very attractive. In v. 29 read *recentia* (Francius, Heins.) for the meaningless *iacentia*. In magic it was important that the places of cremation and burial where bones and other requisites could be found had been used recently. The *tabellae defixionum* were regularly buried in or near a fresh tomb. *Tinctaque* (Barber) for *cinctaque* (o) should not be ignored: visual evidence that the *vitta* had actually served in a burial would make it more potent. The color is indicated by Ov. *Ib.* 233-4 *membraque vinxerunt tinctis ferrugine pannis/ a male deserto quos rapuere rogo.* H. (pp. 306-7) accepts *sanie* and prints *exsucis* (Burman) *anguibus* as well as *recentia*, but he prefers his own conjecture, *rapta*, to *tincta*. I wonder how bones could be collected from or by ‘dried up snakes’. Witches worked with human bones, and *exsertis unguibus* describes exactly the fingers of those collecting them; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.513 *acuens exsertos protinus unguis* (of the Sphinx). G. keeps *ranae* and picks *ex sectis* (P, Otto) *anguibus*.

3.7

Our understanding of this elegy has been greatly advanced by the discussion of some fragments from a Hellenistic poem by E. Livrea in *ZPE* 139, 2002, 37ff; cf. also G. O. Hutchinson, *ibid.* 138, 2002, p. 6. This poem, probably Euphorion’s *Philoctetes*, which almost certainly served as a model to Propertius, seems to confirm, among other things, Muretus’ transposition of vv. 21-4 between 38 and 39, accepted *dubitanter* by F., following Housman (see Heyworth, in *Housman*, etc., p. 18) and Butler & Barber (1933, p. 277).

Furthermore, the Greek fragments show that, in v. 60,

*attulimus longas in freta vestra manus*

we are not dealing with an ‘error Wattianus’ (W. S. Watt, in *CQ* 54, 2004, 659-60). There is no need to change *longas* to *castas* or *puras* (Francius) or *vacuas* (Giardina), nor should we change *manus* to *comas* (Oudendorp, van Eldik accepted by Watt). What Propertius wrote is *longas* … *manus* (printed by F., *dubitanter*), and this is entirely consistent with the poet’s emphasis on Paetus’ greed.

One more point, not directly affected by the discovery of the papyrus. In vv. 47-8

*non tulit haec Paetus, stridorem audire procellae et duro teneras laedere fune manus*

I once liked *noluit* (O. Skutsch), but now I think we should write *praetulit haec Paetus: stridorem …* Paetus actually chose to expose himself to all
the hardships of a sea voyage in order to get rich, instead of staying at home, leading a simple life. The prefix of the first word of the line was not recognized. *Haec* points ahead, as in 1.20.1 (cf. *has* in 1.16.13, see above). Then we should also read *et* for *sed* in v. 49, an easy change. H. (pp. 310-1) deletes 21-4 and places the lines at the end of the poem. In v. 60 he follows Oudendorp and Watt. In v. 43 he reads (pp. 313-4) *nunc tulit et* (Barber and H.). G. also deletes vv. 21-4, following the Eton edition and reads *vacuas ... manus* (v. 60) and *non tulit haec* (v. 43). G. and H. do not seem to be aware of Livrea’s important contribution. On the connections between Euphorion, Cornelius Gallus and Propertius see the excellent observations of A. Hollis in: *Brill’s Companion*, pp. 97-101; Hollis deals briefly with 3.7.21-2 but concentrates on a similar poem, 2, 26A, which, to him, illustrates the ‘color’ of Euphorion. I find this very convincing.

3.13.7-8

*et Tyros ostrinos praebet Cadmea colores*

*cinnamon et multi pastor odoris Arabs.*

Propertius condemns the *luxuria*, the expensive life style of Roman ladies which requires costly dies and perfumes from the Near East. *Pastor* is hardly possible for someone who cultivates and sells plants, herbs and spices. *Pistor* (Bury, Shackleton Bailey), the one who grinds or mills them, is very close to the ‘ductus litterarum’, but the word is normally used for domestic millers and bakers, not for oriental exporters of luxury goods. According to F., Fontein proposed *multi cultor*, Lachmann suggested *culti messor*; the first conjecture can be supported by [Tib.] 3.8.18 *cultor odoratae dives Arabs segetis*, the second by Mart. 3.65.5-6 *quod myrtus, quod messor Arabs, quod sucina trita, / pallidus Eoo ture quod ignis olet* and perhaps also by Sen. *Herc. f. 909 quicquid Indorum seges/ Arabesque odoris quicquid arboribus legunt, / conferte in aras* where one may consider *Indo fert seges* (Koetschau). See Stat. *silv.* 3.3.33 *messes Cilicumque Arabumque superbas*. We should not forget Heinsius’ *multi coston odoris Arabs* which neatly balances *cinnamon*. G. replaces *pastor* by Rossberg’s *praestat*, and H. (pp. 347-8) prefers *culti messor*.

3.13.15-22

Propertius admires the Indian widows who consider it a privilege to die on their husband’s funeral pyre. In v. 21 *ardent victrices et flammas pec- tora praebent*, the first word must be corrupt. What the poet wrote is surely *gaudent* (H. Stephanus, *Schediasm.* V 10, followed by Passerat, Broukhus. and others). The first letter was lost, and *audent* was read as *ardent*, perhaps under the influence of *flammae*. It is quite clear that, for the widow who
won the competition (it is described as such), this was a kind of triumph. Following W. Heckel, J. C. Yardley and J. Butrica, H. (p. 349) cites the testimonies from Cicero, Diodorus and Valerius Maximus which confirm gaudent; they all stress the joy of the widow who is allowed to die. G. prints his own plaudunt (meaning that they applaud themselves as they burn on the pyre?), but H. (C., p. 349) recognizes the value of gaudent.

3.14.13–4

*qualis Amazonum nudatis bellica mammis*

*Thermodontiacis turba lavatur aquis*

It is difficult to understand how F. could still print *turba* without even mentioning *turma* (Gulielmius, *Quaest. Plaut.*, 240, Heinsius ex cod., Ramírez de Verger, 1989, 66), the obvious noun to go with *bellica*; see 2, 10, 3 fortis ... ad proelia turmas; Óv. Pont. 4.2.51 et tu, femineae Thermodon cognite turmae where the MSS. vary between *turmae* (B C), *turb(a)e* and *turbis*. Ovid probably had in mind this passage in Propertius. G. leaves *turba* in the text and transposes 15–6 after 19, following Palmer. H. (p. 360) prints *turma ... vagatur agris* (Heins.). Cf. Stat. *silv.* 1.6.53 *Thermodontiacas ... turmas.*

3.14.33–4

*quod si iura fores pugnasque imitata Laconum carior hoc esses tu mihi, Roma, bono.*

_Pugnasque_ is odd, for the poem deals mainly with the athletic training of the Spartan women, not with real battles. _Pugnosque_ (Otto) would fit the general theme and is very close to the ‘ductus litterarum’, but we would have to take it as a reference to boxing. _Moresque_ (Shackleton Bailey) and _legesque_ (Butrica) would go well with _iura_. But _luctasque_ (Fontein) seems superior to me, because the last couplet repeats essentially the first one: _multa tuae, Sparte, miramur iura palaestrae, / sed mage virginei tot bona gymnasii_. Here, _iura_ corresponds to _iura_, _tot ... bona_ corresponds to _hoc ... bono_, and what would best correspond to _palaestra_, the wrestling-place, appears to be _lucta_, the wrestling-match. H. keeps _pugnasque_, G. prefers _legesque_.

3.15.10, 45–6, 43–4, 11 ff.

This sequence of lines was proposed by Fischer, and I think he was right. It lends more credibility to a conjecture made in v. 11

*testis erit Dirce tam vero (vano Franz) crimine saeva.*
There are, of course, vera and falsa crимina, but Antiope, it seems to me, is punished by Dirce harshly for something she never did. This is the whole point, and the change seems necessary, no matter what order of lines we adopt. Cf. Ov. met. 7.829 crимine concita vano. H. (p. 365) adopts a different order: 3-4, 5-10, 45-6, 1-2, 43-4, 11ff. He also leaves vero in the text and defends it (pp. 365; 367-8), but I think he misunderstands the connection between Lycinna whom the poet calls non meritam (v. 43) and Antiope who, in his view, is also innocent. Otherwise she could not expect Jupiter to come to her aid (19-22), as he does (35-42). The gods are often fair to the mortal women they seduce (see above on 2.26.45-50). The poem loses its whole pathos if Antiope is guilty. G. solves the problem in his own manner, by writing non vero, at least doing justice to the context; he also changes saeva to questa.

3.15.39-40

Antiope, cognosce Iovem: tibi gloria Dirce
ducitur in multis mortem habitura locis

Most editors seem to have accepted mortem habitura, even though mortem obitura (Heins.) would restore the proper idiom. Mortem (h)abitura and mortem obitura look very much alike, but the latter is probably what the poet wrote. A similar corruption is found in Ov. met. 9.98-9 hunc tamen ablati doluit iactura decoris,/ cetera sospes habet, where it is said of Aechelous that in his fight with Hercules he lost his beautiful horn but was otherwise unhurt; here we need tantum (Paris. Lat. 8001, Markland) … abit (Heins. ex cod.); see Exempl. Class. 12, 2008, 57. In Prop. 3.15, both G. and H. adopt Heinsius’ correction, but H.’s punctuation tibi gloria; Dirce…, ‘yours is the glory; Dirce …’ (p. 579) is somehow affected, I feel; should we not take tibi gloria as an apposition?

3.17.23-4

vesanumque nova nequiquam in vite Lycurgum
Pentheos in triplices funera grata greges

Heyworth’s (pp. 378-9) admirable et tripli ... gregi makes all other attempts unnecessary. We need et which became in (loss of –t before t-, e taken for i), and the endings were adjusted accordingly). H. explains the corruption differently: An s which looked like an f was added to triplici from the following funera. G. prints in triplices f. carpta g. (Heins.).

3.17.29-38

Throughout this whole poem, Propertius speaks of himself, and we need the first person singular in some places where the paradosis has substituted...
other forms. Read *onerabo* (*Itali, Passerat*) for *onerato* in v. 29 and *libabo*, I think, (not *libabit* with Foster) for *libatum* in v. 38. In the paradosis the sequence of endings in –*abo* was misunderstood, it seems; other future endings were preserved. He now wishes to be a *vates*, priest and poet (cf. 4.6.1-10), in the service of Bacchus, and in exchange for his devotion, Bacchus will deliver him from a *servitium* that has become more and more difficult to bear (41-2) and cure him by his blessings (3-4). Bacchus once joined him to Cynthia, but he can also separate him from her (5). The whole poem is an announcement of the now inevitable separation from Cynthia, presented in the form of a hymn to Bacchus.

At the same time, it is a kind of preview of a more formal hymn to Bacchus in the style of Pindar. When Propertius says “I will burden your neck with a garland …”, he means “I will say that your neck is burdened by a garland …’ This is Pindar’s manner, as H. (p. 379), following Cairms, has now established. This is the key to the understanding of this elegy. H. (p. 379) prints *onerabo* and accepts *libabit* (Foster), but who else could be this priest but Propertius himself? G. reads *onerato* (29) and *libabit* (38).

3.19.21-2

*tuque o Minoa venumdata, Scylla, figura,*

*tondes purpurea regna paterna coma*

F. accepts *tondes* (*Y C, Dawes, Keil*) for *tondens*, but cites Markland’s *purpuream ... comam* only in his app. crit. Here, as in 2.19.15 (see above) and elsewhere, an apposition was misunderstood, and we have to restore the original endings. The purple lock on her father’s head is the royal power he has, and when Scylla cuts it off, he has lost his kingdom. The direct object of her action can only be the lock, but that lock represents his whole power as king. Read: *tondes purpurea, regna paterna, comam.* G. prints *tondes ... purpurea ... coma*, while H. (C., pp. 389-90), following Burman, keeps *tondens* but accepts Markland’s proposal, marking the apposition. Read also J. P. Postgate, “*Propertiana*”, *CPh* 8, 1913, 330-1, who supported this combination of proposals.

3.20.5-6

*at tu, stulta, deos, tu fingis inania verba:*

*forsitan ille alio pectus amore terat.*

Rossberg’s *stulta adeo’s* is very attractive. The gods really have nothing to do with this. The error can be explained by wrong word division, but we have a similar case in 3.16.14. See Butrica, in: *CQ* 47, 1997, 181-2 where the true reading, *nemo adeo ut feriat barbarus esse volet*, has only survived in the indirect tradition; all our MSS. have *nemo deo ut noceat b. e. v.* which
shows once more what strange things can happen in this paradosis. *Nemo deo* was probably the first step in the process of corruption, and then, since no one can 'hit' a god, *feriat* was changed to *noceat*. See also above on 1.4.26, below on 4.6.59-60. H. (pp. 392-3) leaves *deos* in the text but suggests in the app. crit. *testaris* for *tu fingis*. G. modifies Rossberg's idea to *adeo*, but we need the *es* which survives in *deos*.

3.20.25-7

*ergo, qui pactas in foedera ruperit aras,*  
*pollueritque novo sacra marita toro,*  
*illi sint quicumque solent in amore dolores*

In this poem which is not addressed to Cynthia but to a new, unnamed love everything indicates that the poet is now considering a serious relationship, akin to a marriage. The couple observes the *oma* (24), they sign a written agreement and seal it (15-8) and they apparently perform a kind of ritual in front of the domestic altar to make sure that the gods bless their union. It would make sense to read either *ergo qui tactis haec foedera ruperit aras* (Burman, van Eldik) or *ergo qui tacta sic foedera ruperit ara* (Housman). The plural is, perhaps, better, because to be on the safe side, two altars (his and hers) should be touched, and *sic* seems inferior to *haec* in this context. Surely there can be no question of breaking the altar or the altars. Lachmann was puzzled by this *‘mirus loquendi modus’*, and then found a slippery way around it. But only the *foedus* can be broken; *foedera* must be the object of *ruperit*, and *in* is corrupt. *Tactas* for *pactas* is already found in the *Itali*, and it is confirmed by Verg. *Aen. 12.200*–*1 audiat haec genitor qui foedera fulmine sancit./ tango aras, medios ignis et numina testor:/ nulla dies … foedera rumpet*. See C. O. Brink, in *RhM* 115, 1972, 31-2. G. has *tactis haec … aris*, H. *tacta … sic ara*.

3.21.27-8

*persequar et studium linguae, Demosthenis arma,*  
*librorumque tuos, docte Menandre, sales*

The poet is planning a trip to Athens, not just as a tourist, but to follow lectures in Plato's Academy and Epicurus' Garden, it seems, to study Greek rhetoric and to enjoy the wit of Menander's plays. *Librorumque* is perplexing. Would he have to read Menander's plays in a library or a bookstore in Athens instead of seeing them performed on the stage? Moreover, *persequar ...arma ... et sales* is a strange type of zeugma. We need another verb along with *persequar*, also with a future ending, and Suringar supplied it with *libaboque* (see Butler & Barber, *Comm.*, 315:). *Libo* 'to nibble at' can have as its object food as well as literature; hence it is particularly appropriate to the
two meanings of sales. Cf. Rhet. Her. 4.3.5 libandus est etiam ex omni ge-
nere urbanitatis facetiarum quidam lepos. The epithet docte can be sup-
ported by Manil. 5, 475, but coming after docte Epicure two lines before, it
is probably a mechanical repetition. The conservative editors like F. miss the
main point: it is possible to accept docte Epicure as well as docte Menandre
in separate contexts, but a poet like Propertius would never have used the
same epithet for two different authors twice within three lines. Read, per-
haps, culte Menandre with Heinsius. G. prints his conjecture urbanosque
… culte (Heinsius, Dorville), while H. accepts libaboque and prefers munde
(Kuinoel). Dorville also suggested compte, a quality attributed to Isocrates by
Quint. Inst. 10.1.79 and to Ovid by the Elder Seneca, contr. 2.2.8.

3.22.25-6
Albanus lacus et socia Nemorensis ab unda,
potaque Pollucis nympha salubris equo

The paradoxos offers socii, sotii and sotiis which was changed to socia
by Puccius, after a MS, it seems, to go with unda. But Housman recognized
in ABVNDADA the form ABVNDANNS which had lost two letters at the end
of line. The next step was to restore FOLIIS from SOTIIS which Hous-
man did. This is surely one of his most beautiful emendations. (On this type
of corruption see my note in MH 66, 2009, 88-9). Here one should quote
Christoph Martin Wieland, the German poet and translator who said: “Eine
Conjectur von Hemsterhuys, Bentley, Wolf kann mich unendlich glücklich
machen. die irren sehr stark, die glauben, dass solche Männer blosse Bü-
chermotten gewesen wären. Sie hatten Genie zu allem, was sie anfingen. Sie
hätten eben so gut grosse Dichter, als grosse Critiker werden können.” (I owe
this citation to Arnd Kerkhecker). Housman himself is the perfect illus-tration.
Maybe no one would rank him as a ‘great poet’ today, but his success
and his fame as a literary craftsman are undeniable. F. mentions Housman
in his app. crit. as one solution among others but sees no need to change his
text. G. seems happy with socia … ab unda, but H. (p. 405) gives Housman’s
emendation the place it deserves. Nympha does not make much sense; the
reading has been changed here and in related passages to lympfa long ago.

4.1.37-8
nil patrium nisi nomen habet Romanus alumnus:
sanguinis altricem non pudet esse lupam

It is not clear from F.’s apparatus that the reading non pudet is only
found in P. It seems to be an error in transcription or a bad conjecture for
non putet (N F L alii). A Roman should not be ashamed to descend from a
she-wolf, but looking at others he might wonder whether this is not just a
myth. But if putet is right, non becomes doubtful. Volscus proposed nunc pudet, Burman num pudet, and num would work very well with putet, making v. 38 a question: ‘Would he believe that a she-wolf nurtured the blood from which he sprang?’ Someone no doubt has suggested this before. G. has non pudet, while H. opts for non (ω) putat (R) and mentions Hutchinson’s quis for non.

4.1.45-6

tunc animi venere Deci Brutique secures,
vexit et ipsa sui Caesaris arma Venus.

Read probably hinc (Heins.) … rexit (Heins.) or auxit (L. Mueller). The first word of the line was probably difficult to read. Rexit (very close to the paradosis) could be supported by Stat. Theb. 7.251 video quae noster signa Menoeceus,/ quae noster regat arma Creon, while auxit has parallels in Ov. met. 14.454 auget uterque suas externo robore vires; Tac. hist. 2.32.2 tum auctis viribus certatusos. In both lines in the paradosis of Propertius the first word was difficult to read. There has to be a connection between the historical significance of Aeneas’ escape from Troy (39–44) and the heroes of Roman history. Tunc just indicates a vague chronological sequence. Vexit introduces a myth that is not attested anywhere, as far as I know. One cannot defend the paradosis by comparing Ov. met. 15.844–5 and Petron. 124.266–7, as F., following Waszink, attempts. Ovid refers to Venus’ intervention after the assassination of Julius Caesar, carrying his soul up to the heavenly sphere (no weapons mentioned), and Petronius’ vision of Venus leading Caesar’s army is different again: Dione/ Caesaris arma sui ducit; here the verb is ducit, not vexit, and arma means ‘army’, not ‘arms’. In Propertius, the context is different: The great deeds of the Roman national heroes (Decius, Brutus, Caesar) are derived from Aeneas’ devotion to the Trojan Penates and to his own father, Anchises, who had been beloved by Venus. Heinsius considered also hinc magni venere Deci which is excellent and duxit for vexit, actually referring to the passage from Petronius quoted above. G. prints hinc animi venere Deci and vexit, while H. (p. 420 leaves tunc and prefers venit (Hollis) to other conjectures. See also F. G. Welcker, Die Griechischen Tragoedien, Bonn, 1841, I, 1391.

4.2.9–10

at postquam ille suis tantum concessit alumnis,
Vertumnus verso dicor ab amne deus

‘but after he (the Tiber) granted so much to his foster-children...’ How much? Tantum is too vague and probably hides spatium (Heins.) or stagnum (Housman), through loss of s- after –s. Campum (Itali, Heins.) is also
plausible; it has been explained as *Campus Martius* and would have to be capitalized. H. (C. p. 437) prints *stagnum*, G. mentions *campum* and *spatium* but in the end keeps *tantum*. Write probably *spatium* (Heins.). *Tractum* was suggested by D. J. Butterfield (*Eikamos* 20, 2009, 198, n. 17).

4.3.11

*haecne marita fides et +parce avia+ noctes*

This is the text of N. To the many proposals listed by the more recent editors I would like to add the very attractive conjecture offered by Antonio Ramírez de Verger in his review of Heyworth’s *OCT* and *Cynthia* (in *BMCR* 2009):

*haecne marita fides et pactae gaudia noctis*

This is very close to N and gives exactly the meaning we would expect. *Pactae … noctis* stands for *primaes noctis matrimonii quud pacta sum*, and among the parallels listed by Ramírez de Verger, Ov. *ars* 3.461-2 is particularly striking: *si bene promittent, totidem promittite verbis: / si dederint, et vos gaudia pacta date*. Here, *gaudia pacta* corresponds perfectly to *pactae gaudia noctis*. H. (p. 446) prints *pacta haec foedera nobis* (Watt) where *nobis* seems redundant. G.’s *opacae gaudia noctis*, ‘le gioie di quella notte oscura’, borders on the whimsical.

4.3.53-4

*omnia surda tacent, rarisque assueta kalendis
vix aperit clausos una puella Lares.*

Read probably *limina* (Heins. dub.) and *ad sueta* (Palmer). *Omnia* is possible, but *limina* is more concrete, less vague. Heinsius refers to 1, 16, 18; 26. *Adsueta* can only be taken with *raris … kalendis* which makes very little sense, whereas *ad sueta*, ‘to perform the customary rites’ is supported, e. g., by Varro, *rust. 1.1.7 dei venerationem advocatis*; *Apul. met. 4.24 se … ad sectae sueta conferunt*. A case of wrong word division. H. takes *raris* as ‘widely-spaced’. *Clauasi Lares* must mean the front-door of the house as in 4.8.49-50 *cum subito rauci sonuerunt cardine postes / et levia ad primos murmura facta Lares*. G. leaves *omnia … adsueta* in the text, H. adopts *limina*, but keeps *assueta*.

4.4.1-2

*Tarpeium nemus et Tarpeiae turpe sepulcrum
fabor et antiqui limina capta Iovis*
Here, *nemus* ought to be *scelus* (Krafft: see Camps, 1965, *ad loc.*), and if we accept that, we should probably also consider *Tarpeiae* for *Tarpeium*. Neither Propertius nor (as far as I know) anyone else mentions a ‘Tarpeian Grove’; Verg. *Aen.* 8.347-8, cited by F., proves nothing at all. Throughout the poem, Propertius presents what Tarpeia did as a shameful crime for which she deserved to die (17-8; 43 *crimen*: 56 *prodita Roma*; 69 *culpam*; 85-7; 89 *sceleri*; 93-4). H. leaves *Tarpeium nemus* in the text, G. reads *Tarpeium montem* which seems quite improbable. In my opinion, *TARPEI(A)ES-CELVS* could easily become *TARPEIVMNEMVS*.

4.4.75-8

_anna pastorum convivia, lusus in urbe,_
_cum pagana madent fercula divitiis,_
_cumque super raros faeni flammantis acervos_
_traiicit immundos ebria turba pedes._

Propertius was a careful observer of Roman folklore, but the paradosis distorts the valuable information he passes on. For *divitiis* read *lautitiis* (Postgate), and for *raros* read perhaps *ternos* (Butrica). *Deliciis* (Beroaldus ex codd.) is also possible, and for *sacros* (Passerat) see below. *Immundos ... pedes* is a humanist conjecture, found, e. g., in the *liber Colotii*, and accepted by Passerat, Guyet and Heinsius. All major MSS. have *immundas ... dapes*. In v. 75 one should consider *herba* (Fontein) for *urbe*. This may have been written (*h*)erba which, at the end of the line, could easily become *urbe*. G. keeps *urbe* and *raros* but prints Postgate’s *lautitiis*, H. (p. 452) also keeps *urbe*; he does not change *divitiis*, but for *raros* he adopts *sacros* (Passerat) which is very good; the original reading may have been corrupted because the –r of *super* was written twice. Cf. Tib. 2.5.90 *flammas transiliet ... sacras*; [Tib.] 3.12.21 *sanctos ... turis acervos*.

4.4.93-4

_a duce Tarpeia mons est cognomen adeptus:_
_o vigil, iniustae praemia sortis habes_

Read probably *Tarpeium* (Palmer) ... *iniuste* (F L P alii, Lachmann dub.) *praemia mortis* (Lachmann, Lütjohann) *habes*. The sense is clear: *Mons Tarpeius* has its name after Tarpeia who led the enemy to its top. *Tarpeio* (ω) could be *TARPEIOM* after having lost its –M before *MONS* by haplography. *Tarpeia* is a humanist conjecture, but not a very good one. Tarpeia’s fate was not at all unfair; she deserved to die, but it is unfair that she was rewarded by giving her name to a prominent Roman hill. The *ThLL* 7.1.1689.60 explains *iniuste* correctly, I think, as *immerito*. There is a problem with *o vigil*; something was lost at the beginning of the line, but *non*
vigil (Peerlkamp) or o virgo (Guyet) can hardly be the solution. H. (453-4) prints a duce turpe Iovis (Weidgen) ... inuistae ... sortis, while G. resorts to a conjecture of his own and an older one: infaustae (G.) ...noctis (Itali apud L. Latinium). A referee asks “What is really so wrong with o virgo iustae...?” Nothing that I can think of right now.

4.5.7-8

Penelopen quoque neglecto rumore mariti
nubere lascivo cogeret Antinoo

Guyet’s quae ‘the sort of person who...’ should not be forgotten; the whole period flows more easily when we substitute it for quoque which may be interpolated, as more than once in the paradosis of Ovid’s met. H. accepts quae, G. keeps quoque.

4.6.3-4
cera Philiteis certet Romana corymbis
et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas

Propertius is competing with Philetas and Callimachus, and for this imaginary poetic agon he puts on a wreath in the Roman manner, just as the Greek poets would wear one in the Greek style. Cera cannot be right; we must read serta (Scal.) to balance corymbis. The first word of the line was misread and lost a letter in transcription. Certent (Scal.) is not absolutely necessary, for Propertius (2.33.37) uses serta like a fem. sg., as noted by Charisius and another grammarian. Here, as elsewhere, the indirect tradition seems to be reliable. H. (p. 457) accepts serta and keeps certet, while G. changes cera to ara (Haupt) and certet to niteat (G.), losing the idea of a poetic competition. Incidentally, if we read Cyrenaeis, should we not also read Philitaeis, as proposed by Volscus?

4.6.7-8

spargite me lymphis, carmenque recentibus aris
tibia Mygdoniiis libet eburna cadis

Modis is cited from Itali by H., and it was conjectured by Scaliger, but he does not put it into the text, even though cadis is extremely odd. One can understand a flute, playing in a certain style, offering a sacrifice of song at an altar, but how can a musical instrument draw its tunes from a vessel? Can one say that these large Phrygian jars full of wine correspond in some way to the pitcher providing water from Cyrene (v. 4)? The change from cadis to modis is very easy, especially at the end of the line. Heinsius cites the reading from a ‘vetus codex’ and from Beroaldus, while G. who accepts
it, ascribes it to Beroaldus and Pocchus. Scaliger actually printed Cadis with a capital C and was followed by Broukhusius and Lachmann, but what is gained by this?

4.6.17-8

Actia Iuleae pelagus monumenta carinae,
nautarum votis non operosa via

Editors have been printing this for centuries, probably without fully understanding it, but no real improvements were available. Now they are, thanks to Heyworth (pp. 458-60):

Actia Iuleae celebrant monumenta carinae,
nautarum votis nunc onerata via est

H. brilliantly changed pelagus to celebrant and operosa to onerata, while nunc for non is due to Carutti, and est survives in P. Obviously, the couplet suffered major corruption, and major efforts were needed to restore it, but now it makes very good sense. We now can envision an imposing monument celebrating Augustus’ victory at Actium, and a road leading up to it, flanked by the more modest votive offerings of the sailors who survived the battle. G. accepts the vulgate.

4.6.27-8

cum Phoebus linquens stantem se vindice Delon
(nam tulit iratos mobilis unda Notos)

Neither unda (o) nor una (Itali) really works: what we need is ante (Lipsius; see Broukhus. ad loc.) which gives us the contrast to stantem. Delos once was a floating island, but after it had offered an asylum to Leto, his mother, Apollo became its protector and made it stable. See Ov. met. 6.333-4 quam (sc. Latonam) vix erratica Delos/ orantem accepit, tum cum levis insula nabat. H., following Lachmann, accepts ante, G. is satisfied with una.

4.6.59-60

at pater Idalio miratur Caesar ab astro:
‘tu deus: est nostri sanguinis ista fides’

Here, F. printed one of his own conjectures: tu deus: est, adapting Richter’s equally misguided tu deus es. The MSS. are divided between sum deus est (N F L P V), sum deus et (D Vo V²) and sum deus en (Itali). But Caesar who became a god after his death cannot say to his adopted son who is still
alive ‘I am a god, because you have just won this battle’; nor can he say ‘you are a god, because etc.’ He can say ‘you are my true son, because you have just won this great victory’. Lachmann (ad loc.) described the crux very well: ‘deum autem sese esse inepte nimis hic affirmabat Caesar, cum illud esset potius agendum, Augustum esse verum et dignum patre Caesare prolem.’ His own proposal, tum deus does not work, but his diagnosis lead to the solution found by Baehrens. Read tu meus: est (Baehrens). This is one of several cases in this paradox where a form of deus was smuggled into the text; see above on 3.20.5-6. H. (pp. 460-1) cites Baehrens but prints sum deus, while G. modifies Baehrens’ proposal by printing es meus. One could also consider tu meus es. This passage, like 1.5.3 (see above) may show that the emphatic use of meus, mea was misunderstood by scribes.

4.7.21-2

foederis heu taciti cuius fallacia verba non audituri diripuere Noti

Read pacti (Palmer) for taciti which makes no sense because the words sealing their vows were, if not written, actually spoken by both lovers. This has been explained very well by Goold in HSCP 71, 1966, 68. When Proper- tius says to Cynthia ‘I will love you forever’, and she says the same words to him, this is a foedus pactum, but not a foedus tacitum. Whether the gods have heard it or not, is another question. It is simply not true, as F. contends, that foedus tacitum could mean furtivus amor, even though he cites Richard Reitzenstein and Shackleton Bailey. This mixes up two completely different things. The situation in 3.20 (see above) is similar: there we also have a foedus pactum, but this time (after the separation from Cynthia) it is actually written down and formally sealed (vv. 15-8; 21-30). That poem, we should remember, is not addressed to Cynthia but to another woman. Maybe the poet did not trust spoken vows any more and decided to have everything in writing. H. (p. 466) prints pacti, while G. introduces sancti which one recognizes at once as one of his creations.

4.7.47-8

The woman who melted the golden image of Cynthia is clearly one of her disloyal servants; the distich belongs after 35-40, the part of the poem which deals with that group (Lygdamus, Nomas), as Schrader saw. The good servants (Petale, Lalage) who are now being treated so badly are the subject of 43-6. The distich lost its place, perhaps because of the homoeoteleuta humum/aurum/meum. Once this is recognized, we also must separate the two groups by at (41) for et, as proposed by Markland. G. and H. keep the vulgate.
Andromedeque et Hypermestre sine fraude maritae
narrant historiae tempora nota suae

There seems to be no need to change pectora (ω) to tempora (Ayrmann). What needs to be changed, as Markland saw, are the endings of historiae ... suae. He proposed historias ... suas but kept pectora nota which remains a stumbling block. What Propertius may have written is pectora fida. Cf. Ov. met. 9.248-9, trist. 3.3.48; for the singular, cf. Lucr. 5.864, Hor. carm. 2.12.16, Sen. Thy. 334, Phaedr. 875, Stat. silv. 3.2.99, Theb. 2.364. The emphasis is on the faithfulness of these heroines, as opposed to Clytaemnestra and Pasiphae. I realize that fida is not very close to nota palaeographically, but it certainly fits the context; cf. 3.13.24 fida Euadne ... pia Penelope. In 2.15.28 masculus et totum femina coniugium, Cornelissen very plausibly proposed fidum for totum, and when fidum could become totum, fida could easily be corrupted to nota. Cf. also Hor. carm. 2.12.16 bene mutuis/ fidum pectus amoribus; Ov. met. 9.249 (where Bömer's note has to be used with caution). Read perhaps

Andromedeque et Hypermestre, sine fraude maritae,
narrant historias, pectora fida, suas.

The key words in the whole context are fides and perfidia. Andromeda and Hypermestra were faithful wives; this is why there allowed to dwell in a kind of Elysium, while the others, the unfaithful ones, inhabit a less desirable region of the underworld. In [Sen.] Herc. O 947ff Deianira admits her guilt in Heracles' death and is ready to go to the underworld, but not to the sacred grove reserved to the souls of faithful wives:

claudite Elysium mihi
quaecumque fidae coniuges nemoris sacri
lucos tenetis.

Here we find the word which we miss in the context of Propertius' elegy. For pectora fida a referee furnishes the following parallels: Ov. Met. 9.248-9; Tr. 3.3.48; Hor. Carm. 2.12.16; Stat. Theb. 2, 364; Silv. 3.12.99. E. Pasoli, in his edition of Book IV (2nd ed. 1967, 69) detected an apposition in the pentameter, comparing 4.1.12, though he kept historiae tempora nota suae. I agree as far as the apposition is concerned; in fact, we have two appositions in this couplet. See above on 2.29.15 and cf. 4.1.12 pellitos habuit, rustica corda, Patres; Verg. Aen. 2.349 iuvenes, fortissima frustra/ pectora. As a result of some agonizing (p. 471), H. prints sine fraude marita (Heins.)/ narrant historias, foedera (Heins.) nota, suas. G. follows Heinsius and Ayrmann.
4.7.69-70

sic mortis lacrimis vitae sanamus amores:
celo ego perfidia crimina multa tuae

Some scholars wanted to change mortis which forms a contrast to vitae, but the real problem is sanamus, it seems (read Sh. Bailey, Propertiana, pp. 252-3). Even though love is often described as a kind of disease, it is not clear how it could be healed by the ‘tears of death’. (Does this mean ‘the tears shed by the dead’ or ‘the tears shed over the death of a beloved person’?) Among the proposals made, Rossberg’s sancimus is still attractive. The tears we shed when someone we once loved has died prove, indeed, the reality of that love. Cynthia’s ghost says this to Propertius, because his great passion for her is now a thing of the past, but the fact that he is still moved to tears proves to her that his feelings for her were sincere, and therefore she forgives him now his perfidia. And Propertius lets us know that he is crying over Cynthia and that he is sure of her forgiveness. Another possibility, solamur (v. l. ap. Passerat., Broukhus.) could be mentioned, but it is really the one who weeps who need to be comforted, not the love felt long ago. Heinsius’ satiamus is worth considering but has not appealed to editors, as far as I can see. H. adopts sancimus, and G. rewrites the line as follows: si (G.) nostris (Otto) lacrimis veteres (Burman) renovamus (G.) amores which is quite ingenuous as a rewrite job.

4.9.23-4

sed procul inclusas audit ridere puellas,
lucus ubi umbroso fecerat orbe nemus

Lucus and nemus here mean the same thing, and lucus fecerat nemus is nonsense, but there has to be a wall to separate the sacred precinct and the young women who serve in it from the outside world. Hence murus ... saepserat (Fontein). The first word of the line was corrupted. We probably have to imagine a circular wall, but we should also consider umbrosum (Fontein), to go with nemus, for umbroso, because it is not likely that the wall cast a shadow over the grove. H. (pp. 487-8) accepts murus ... saepserat and thinks umbrosum possible but not necessary. G. keeps the vulgate, including ab (ubi is Heinsius’ emendation of ab). I think we should read murus ubi umbrosum saepserat orbe nemus (Fontein).

4.10.33-4

dumque aries murum cornu pulsabat aeno
vinea qua ductum longa tegebat opus,
Cossus ait ...
A Roman army is preparing to besiege Veii and starts to demolish its city walls. The two actions described in the couplet are simultaneous and connected with each other. They should also be joined syntactically. Read: *vineaque inductum* (Itali, Volscus). *QVE* was read as *QVA*, and the prefix was ignored. H. (p. 498) prints the humanist conjecture, G. keeps the vulgate created by Lachmann.

4.11.3-8

> *cum semel infernas intrarunt funera leges,*
> *non exorato stant adamante viae.*
> *te licet orantem fuscae deus audiat aulae:*
> *nempe tuas lacrimas litora surda bibent.*
> *vota movent superos: ubi portitor aera recepit,*
> *obserat herbosos lurida porta rogos*

The whole passage is thoroughly corrupt. *Leges intrare* is apparently not impossible in Latin, as the quotation from a Christian author in F.’s app. crit. shows, but *infernas ... sedes* (Heins., Burman, Schrader) would be certainly more idiomatic in Propertius; cf. 3.12.33-4 *nigrantisque domos animarum intrasse silentum* where *domos* takes the place of *sedes*, but the word itself is used by Ov. Ib. 174 *quas ... tenet sedes noxia turba coles.* In the pentameter, one should consider Heinsius’ *fores* or *serae* for *viae*. He later changed his mind, as he did about *sedes*. *Fores* could be supported by 1.16.18 *quid mihi tam duris clausa taces foribus?*; Ov. met. 4.453 *carceris ante fores clausas adamanete sedebant; Iib. 79-80 quas ... ferunt torto vittatis angue capillis / carceris obscuras ante sedere fores.* Roads cannot really be addressed in prayers, but doors can (see 1.16.15ff; 4.9.31ff). But *serae* is also attractive; see v. 8 *obserat; 26 iaceat tacita laxa catena sera; 4.7.90 errat et abiecta Cerberus ipse sera.* If we accept *fores* (or *serae*) in v. 4, we should probably also accept *limina* (Fontein) for *litora* in v. The two conjectures support each other. Propertius envisions the entrance to the underworld as a huge gate, and the whole scene has been misunderstood in the paradosis. In addition, we need Fruter’s *exorando* for *exorato*; cf. 3.18.23 *exoranda canis tria sunt latrantia colla; Ps.-Quint. decl. 10.19 crudelis et inexorabilis custos.*

In vv. 7-8, the poet draws a line between *di superi* and *di inferi*. While you are alive, the *superi* may listen to your prayers, but when you are dead, you have no one to appeal to. Again, we have the image of the *porta* to the underworld. But how could it possibly bar the access to ‘pyres full of herbs’? It bars the access the world of darkness, hence *umbrosos* (Δ) ... *locos* (Livineius or Markland, apparently from *Itali*). *Herbosos* is really just a conjecture in F, and we do not have N for this part of Propertius. *Umbrosas ... domos*, proposed by Hemsterhuys (Luciani Opera, ed. Bipont., vol. II,
p. 516) is, perhaps, even better than *umbrosos ... locos*; cf. 3.12.33 *migrantis ... domos animarum ... silentum*; Sen. *Med.* 741 *opacam Ditis umbrosi domunum*; Val. Fl. 1.781 (Alcimede) *Stygias ... suprmo/ obsecretat igne domos* (see Liberman [1997] *ad loc.*). Again and again, the poet refers to a world beyond our human experience, and he finds new expressions for the kind of reality awaiting us there. H. (pp. 502-5) has an excellent discussion of the passage. In his text, he keeps *leges, viae, litora*, but he prints *exorando* (Fruter) and *umbrosos ... locos*. His interpretation of *umbrosi* is ingenious and enlightening, and the parallels which he cites (Sen. *Med.* 741 and *Epicedion Drusi* 427-8) are, to me, absolutely convincing. G. keeps *exorato* but accepts *sedes, fores, limina, umbrosos ... locos* which he translates as ‘luoghi tenebrosi’.

4.11.61-2

*et tamen emerui generosos vestis honores,*

*nec mea de sterili facta rapina domo*

F. defends *generosos*, but this seems to be just another case of a wrong adjustment; the ending –*osos* anticipates the ending of the last word of the line. Turnebus (*Adversaria* XXIII 7) proposed *generosae vestis*, and that seems to be the proper term for the *stola* to which she was entitled. The change proposed by Turnebus was accepted by Koppiers and Burman. She says that she truly deserved the honor of wearing this kind of garment. See Camps’ note. (Tony Camps was a fine scholar who, in his own quiet way, did a great deal to emend and elucidate the text). We need a contrast to *sterili ... domo*. Leumann (*ThLL* 6.2.1800.56) paraphrases ‘*generosarum vestis*’, but compares Ov. *hal.* 66 *hinc generosus honos et gloria maior equorum* which is not very helpful. Both G. and H. keep *generosos*.

Can we draw any conclusions from these random comments? Perhaps we can.

I. They may confirm the impression that the indirect tradition is more likely to preserve what Propertius wrote than the extant MSS. See notes on 2.1.58; 3a.23-4; 3.20.5-6.

II. They may reveal a source of errors that has been described before: the tendency of scribes (or perhaps just one early copyist?) to assimilate the ending of a word in the first half of line (usually a pentameter) to the ending of a word at its very end. This tendency introduces rhymes probably not intended by the poet who, of course, uses the device often enough.

It appears that quite a few lines can be emended by removing ‘false correspondences’, if I may use the expression. When I saw that H., following Lachmann’s hint, (see *C.*, pp. 23; 67; 303; 469) paid careful attention to this phenomenon, I decided to go through the whole *Corpus*, concentrating on
such cases. Actually, some of Rossberg’s conjectures (1877) indicate that he was also aware of this source of errors. H.’s own list includes: 1.5.20 exclusum... domum (ω : domo Heins.; see Lachmann’s note ad loc.); 11.15 amota (N alii : amoto P S alii) ... custode puella; 2.13.6 Ismarias (N a. c. : Ismara N² alii) arte feras; 2.25.26; 4.2.44. He cites further examples from Virgil and Silius Italicus and for Ovid’s Amores refers to G. W. Most, in C. Deroux (ed.), Studies in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist. (Bruxelles 1979), 365. In Ov. Ib. 525 utque lyrae vates fertur perisse severae, B. W. Häuptli (1996), 279 explains severae as a case of ‘enallage’, but we should probably read severus.

A systematic search has yielded (besides the cases dealt with above which are: 1.5.12; 6.22; 12.16; 20.14; 2.22b.44; 3.2.7; 6.22; 12.28) the following passages: 2.7.16 magnus (ω : magni Schneidewin) Castoris iret equus; 2.12.18 alio traice tela tuo (ω : loco N rec. : tua vel puer Itali); 27. 7 rursus et objectum + fletus+ caput esse tumultu[m] where the dative ending was restored by the Itali; 3.8.2 (possibly); 17.12 (possibly); 18.34 ab humana cessit in astra via (ω : vice Baehrens, better than humano [Henry] or humanis [Barber], I think); 21.12 pares (ω : pari Heins., very good) ducite sorte vices; 4.1.36 Fidenas longa (-e ω) erat isse vias (ω : vita Itali); 3.34 (uncertain); 5.34 puros ... deos (L P alii : dies N alii); 11.94 caelibis ad curas nec vacet ulla vias (N : via F L P alii : dies Santen). Even if I have missed a few instances, the tendency has become pretty clear, I hope.

But it also happens that we may have to restore the ‘rhyming effect’ by conjecture. Take, e. g., 2.6.20 nutritus durae (Itali : duro ω), Romule, lacte lupae. What F. says about ‘hypallage’ is hardly relevant, and the passage he cites, 4.4.54 (quem)... nutrit inhumanae inhumanae dura papilla lupae proves the opposite. See H., C., p. 135 who however prints duro in his OCT. Lac durum would have to be ice-cream or cheese. Another such case 2.31.8 quattuor artifices (Broekhus. : -is ω), vivida signa, boves where G. accepts the conjecture while H. follows the MSS. In 4.3.8 munitus (ω : -o cod. Berol. Lat. 500, Beroaldus ex coni.) + hericus+ hostis equo all recent editors accept the change.

It also happens that an ending in the first half of a line influences the ending of the last word, as in 2.16.29 (see above).

III. H. (C., pp. 213; 218; 248; 390; 471; 506) deals with the so-called enclosed apposition, also known as Schema Cornelianum, a stylistic device which is often misunderstood in this paradosis. This has been noticed, e.g., by Lemaire in his Paris edition (1832), on 3.21.27. Among the passages investigated above, the following seem to be affected by this particular form of misunderstanding: 1.13.24; 2.29.25; 3.19.22; 4.7.58; 64. H. acknowledges the following cases: 1.16.8 exclusis[is] signa iacere faces where exclusis was emended in the Itali; one could place exclusi signa between commata; 11.30 Baiae, crimen amoris, aquae; 2.3.14 geminae, sidera nostra, faces; 24.12 manibus dura frigus habere pila where H. accepts my proposal duram
... pilam; 25.1 unica nata meo pulcherrima cura dolori where H. (pp. 217-8), following Goold, prints Phillimore’s Cynthia for unica; 29.3 pueri mihi turba minuta (-i Heins.); 31.8 (see above); 3.3.31 volucres, mea turba, columbae (reminiscent of Verg. ecl. 1, 57); 19.22 (see above); 4.1.12 pellitos habuit, rustica corda, Patres; 7.64 (see above); 9.3 venit ad invictos, pecoro-sa Palatia, montis; 11.15 vos, vada lenta, paludes (where H., C., pp. 506-7 adopts Butrica’s Acherontis for paludes). H. refers to J. B. Solodow’s valuable paper in: HSCP 90, 1985, 129-53 to which he adds (p. 248) a few more examples.

IV. The first and last words of a line are often corrupt.
V. Forms of deus are introduced into the text by mistake.