

PROPERTIUS 1.1: OLD AND NEW SOLUTIONS*

MAXWELL HARDY
University of Oxford
maxwell.hardy@trinity.ox.ac.uk

RESUMEN

Se intenta resolver tres problemas textuales e interpretativos del primer poema de Propertio: 3 *constantis ... fastus* (leg. *constanti ... fastu*), 12 *ille uidere* (leg. *comminus ipse*), 24 *ducere* (leg. *uertere*).

PALABRAS CLAVE

Propertio; conjeturas; crítica textual.

SUMMARY

An attempt is made to resolve three problems of text and interpretation in the first poem of Propertius: 3 *constantis ... fastus* (leg. *constanti ... fastu*), 12 *ille uidere* (leg. *comminus ipse*), 24 *ducere* (leg. *uertere*).

KEYWORDS

Propertius; conjectures; textual criticism.

Fecha de recepción: 03/02/2022

Fecha de aceptación y versión definitiva: 09/05/2022

Few poems have been so carefully scrutinised as that which opens the *Monobiblos* of Propertius.¹ Few poems merit scrutiny so fastidious and sustained. Yet for all the attention which critics have lavished upon it, there is still a certain amount of Prop. 1.1 which in our latest editions is questionably printed or understood, and much that Propertius did write is either confined to the apparatus

*I am grateful to the anonymous referees of *Exemplaria Classica* for their helpful comments and criticisms.

¹ Individual articles which have tackled problems of text and interpretation in Prop. 1.1 are multitudinous: A.E. Housman, "Emendationes Propertianae", *JPh* 16, 1888, 1-35, at 16-35 (= J. Diggle-F.R.D. Goodyear, eds., *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, Cambridge 1972, I, 1-54, at 40-54); W. Steidle, "Das Motiv der Lebenswahl bei Tibull und Propertius", *WSt* 75, 1962, 100-140, at 114-18; W. Hering, "Quid haec elegia sibi velit, non ita facile dictu. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Propertius 1,1", *Philologus* 114, 1970, 98-117; F. Cairns, "Some Observations on Propertius 1.1", *CQ* 24, 1974, 94-110; F. Ahl, "Propertius 1, 1", *WSt* 87, 1974, 80-98; W.W. Batstone, "Amor Improbis, felix qui, and tardus Apollo: the *Monobiblos* and the *Georgics*", *CPh* 87, 1992, 287-302; J. Booth, "Problems and Programmatics in Propertius 1.1", *Hermes* 129, 2001, 63-74; J. Booth "Nostra Venus, vacuus amor and the ending of Propertius 1.1: double trouble?", *Mnemosyne* 54, 2001, 339-45; H.H. Gardner, "Taming the *velox puella*: temporal propriety in Propertius 1.1", *Phoenix* 65, 2011, 100-24; A. Cafagna, "Properzio 1, 1: critica del testo e interpretazione", *BollClass* 35, 2014, 5-47.

or lost in the labyrinth of Smyth's repertory. This paper aims to recover a handful of these forgotten solutions, or where no satisfactory answer has been proposed, to defend a new one.

For each passage discussed I give the text of G. Liberman's *Cynthia: Monobiblos de Sextus Propertius*.² The apparatus is based on that of Heyworth's *OCT*, to which I have added some conjectures from Smyth's *Index*, and occasionally from Giardina's 2010 edition.³

1.1.1-4

Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis,
 contactum nullis ante cupidinibus.
 tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus
 et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus.

3 lumina Ω : lumine ç

Of v. 3 it once was said, that “[a]mong all the four thousand verses of the poet, there is not a sounder or simpler than this.”⁴ Doubts may be had. *constantis fastus* is usually taken as a genitive of quality or description dependent upon *lumina*: “It was then that Love lowered my eyes of constant pride.”⁵ But “the genitive of description *constantis fastus* is a very bold usage”, says Heyworth, “in that *fastus* is transferred to a part of the body and falsified by the action of the verb”. Though Heyworth himself and all other modern editors print the reading of the MSS, yet the latter of these audacities to my mind presents a problem of graver moment than many hitherto have realised. It is generally acknowledged that the so-called “genitius qualitatis cum epitheto” found its original purpose in describing inherent and inalienable qualities of things, in contradistinction to the “ablatus qualitatis cum epitheto”, which tended to be used when transitory

² G. Liberman (ed.), *Cynthia: Monobiblos de Sextus Propertius*, Huelva 2021

³ S.J. Heyworth (ed.), *Sexti Propertii elegos critico apparatu instruit et editit S. J. H.*, Oxford 2007; W.R. Smyth, *Thesaurus Criticus ad Sexti Propertii Textum*, Amsterdam 1970; G. Giardina, ed., *Propertio. Elegie*, Pisa-Roma 2010². I have not been able to take account of P. Fedeli, ed., *Propertio. Elegie*, Vol. 1, *Libri I-II*, Torino 2021.

⁴ Housman, “Emendationes”, 17 (= *Classical Papers* 1.42).

⁵ F.A. Paley, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina*, London 1872², 3; Housman, “Emendationes”, 17-18 (= *Classical Papers* 1.41); H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Oxford 1933, 154; P.J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Liber I (Monobiblos)*, Amsterdam 1946, 5; P. Fedeli, *Sesto Propertio. Il Primo Libro delle Elegie*, Florence 1980, 66; S.J. Heyworth, *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford 2007, 3; A. Cafagna, *Dal contesto alla costituzione del testo. Il I libro delle elegie di Propertio*, Nordhausen 2016, 15-18. It is noted by W.A. Camps, *Propertius: Elegies Book I*, Cambridge 1961, 42, that *constantis ... fastus* could be taken a possessive genitive, “the notion of ‘pride’ being half-personified” (= “forced my stubborn pride to lower its eyes”), but this makes for an unduly complicated metaphor. Liberman (*Cynthia*, 68) wonders if a synchysis of ownership is meant, *constantis lumina fastus* = *constantem luminum fastum*, “the unwavering pride of my gaze”; but if anything *constantis* should go with *lumina*, “staring eyes”.

properties wanted describing.⁶ In time the distinction became less marked; but so far as I can see in the verse of the Latin elegists, the genitive of quality appears largely to retain its original and proper function. Such instances as I can find in Ovid's *Amores* all contain references to inherent qualities or permanent conditions: 1.15.20 *animosique Accius oris*, 2.7.15 *auritus miserandae sortis asellus*, 2.7.20 *sordida contemptae sortis amica*, 3.5.30 *herbae fertioris humum*.⁷ In Tibullus there are no instances of the construction, and in Propertius just two besides *constantis ... fastus* appear in the index to Fedeli's Teubner,⁸ of which only the former may be construed uncontroversially as such: 2.13.24 *plebei paruae funeris exsequiae*, "the humble rites of a common funeral", and 3.13.8 *cinnamon et multi †pastor† odoris Arabs*, where *multi ... odoris* seems rather to depend on whatever noun *pastor* has ousted (cf. *OLD* s.u. *odor* 3). It is possible that by *constantis deiecit lumina fastus* Propertius simply meant that his eyes, as they were lowered, were thereby disembarassed of their pride, as if the genitive of quality were but a simple epithet: "Love humbled my *proud* eyes." While that interpretation may well be possible, it must be owned that of all the constructions which Propertius could have used to convey this sense of change, the genitive of quality is probably the least natural choice among them. The idea of continuity in *constantis* ("persistent", i.e. "staring") only aggravates the problem. Add to this the fact that *fastus* is attributed to a part of Propertius' body, not himself, a curiosity which no commentator seems to answer with a parallel, and suspicion of the text mounts higher.

According to Smyth's *Index*, Marcilius and Gebhard proposed to remove the genitive of quality by writing *lumine* for *lumina*, and to take *constantis fastus* as the accusative plural object of *deiecit*: "then love lowered the persistent pride from my gaze."⁹ Heyworth considers this solution in his commentary, but rejects it for the sound reason that "eyes" in Latin are normally designated by the plural of *lumen*, not the singular.¹⁰ An alternative suggestion, in my view greatly underestimated, is Burman's *constanti ... fastu*; a conjecture which, strange to say, no longer finds a place for itself even in the app. critt. of modern editions.¹¹ Possibly that is because Burman did not interpret his discovery in the right way: he supplied *Cynthia* as the subject of *deiecit* and took *constanti fastu* as an

⁶ H. Pinkster, *Oxford Latin Syntax*, Vol. 1: *The Simple Clause*, Oxford 2015, 1002-5; Hoffman-Szantyr *Synt.* 67-71. For a fuller account of this history, see E. Vandvik, *Genitivus und Ablativus qualitatis im Latein*, Oslo 1942.

⁷ For the genitive of quality as a subject complement, cf. *Ou. am.* 1.9.13 *ingenii est experientis amor*, 1.12.28 *auspicii numerus non erat ipse boni*, 1.15.2 *ingeniique uocas carmen inertis opus*.

⁸ P. Fedeli, ed., *Sextus Propertius. Elegiarum Libri IV*, München-Leipzig 1994², 313.

⁹ Smyth, *Thesaurus Criticus*, 3.

¹⁰ Heyworth, *Cynthia*, 3.

¹¹ P. Burman, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, Utrecht 1780, 5 n. 3. The same conjecture was chanced upon by A. Palmer, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, Dublin 1880, iv. He assigns it also to Paley, but as I have not discovered it in Paley's edition (*Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina*), he may have meant to attribute it to Burman.

instrumental ablative: “Cynthia lowered my eyes *with* her unwavering pride.” Not quite: *constanti fastu* is an ablative of separation dependent on the *de-* of *deiecit*: “Then Love lowered my eyes *from* their unwavering pride.” The source argument of a three-place verb compounded of *iacio* and a separative preverb is usually a prepositional phrase, but occasionally in classical prose and often in classical poetry a bare ablative is used, especially “when [such verbs] are used in a non-literal sense and the source argument is more abstract”.¹² In this instance both qualifications are met: *deiecit* is used both literally (“lowered”) and non-literally (“separated”), and the source argument, *fastu*, is an abstract noun. Examples of *deicere* + bare ablative source argument are common when the verb bears the meaning “to deprive of” (= *TLL* [Gudeman] 5.1.400.42-51: “aliquem de loco quolibet demouere, aliqua re priuare”; *OLD* s.u. 10 “To force to withdraw [from an attitude, purpose, etc.]”). Gudeman in the *TLL* lists a great variety of examples in this connection: compare for instance Verg. *Aen.* 3.317 *te deiectam coniuge tanto*, “deprived of a great husband”, Sil. 10.380 *spe deiectus iuuenis*, “a youth deprived of hope”, Sen. *Her. f.* 110 *me ... mente deiectam mea*, “cast out of my own mind”, and Tac. *ann.* 13.46 *deicitur familiaritate sueta*, “he is excluded from his usual intimacy”. An example of *deicio* controlled by an abstract noun (such as *Amor* here) is furnished by Senecan prose (*dial.* 5.1.2): *alios pudor coepto deiecit, alios mora*, “some were turned from their course by shame, others by procrastination”. And for a parallel to the finite use of *deicio* + simple ablative, compare Stat. *Theb.* 5.177-8 *noctem deiecit Olympo / Iuppiter*, “Jupiter cast night down from Olympus”. Propertius combines the simple ablative in a similar way with *tollo* + *lumina* in 2.30.9-10 *excubat ille acer custos et tollere numquam / te patietur humo lumina capta semel*, “he keeps vigil like a sentry and never suffers you to raise your eyes, once captivated, from the ground”. This spatial sense of *deicere* seems better to reflect the metaphor of the Meleager epigram, in which the poet’s *fastus* begins life “upon his brow”, and then is knocked off and trodden upon: τὸ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀφρύσι κείνο φρύαγμα / σκηπτροφόρου σοφίας ἠνίδε ποσὶ πατῶ, “See how I tread under foot the arrogance of sceptred wisdom that sat on his brow” (*AP* 12.101.3-4 = Meleager 103.3-4 GP).¹³ The difference is that, whereas in Meleager’s epigram the poet’s pride is parted from his eyes, in Propertius’ the eyes are parted from his pride. *deiecit* in this sense may even echo καθεῖλεν of the epigram’s final couplet (not often cited by Propertian commentators):¹⁴

¹² Pinkster, *Oxford Latin Syntax*, 179. A far bolder use of the simple ablative with a two-place verb of motion is supplied by Prop. 1.4.1-2 *quid mihi tam multas laudando, Basse, puellas / mutatum domina cogis abire mea?* On this Pinkster, *Oxford Latin Syntax*, 127 comments ‘NB—highly unusual’.

¹³ W.R. Paton, tr., *The Greek Anthology*, vol. 12, Cambridge, MA, 1918, 333.

¹⁴ The credit for connecting these two poems I believe goes to F. Jacobs, *Animadversiones in Epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae secundum ordinem analectorum Brunckii*, Leipzig 1798, vol. 1. Pars prior, 56-7.

τῷ δ', ὅσον ἀμπνεύσας, τὸδ' ἔφην· “Φίλε κοῦρε, τί θαμβεῖς;
καυτὸν ἀπ' Οὐλύμπου Ζῆνα καθεῖλεν Ἴερωσ.”

“Dear boy, why do you wonder? Love himself *took down* Zeus from Olympus.” In the case of Prop. 1.1.3, the commonness of such phrases as *deiecit ocellos* (Ou. *her.* 11.35), *deiecit uultum* (Verg. *Aen.* 3.320), and *ipsa deiectos gerit / uultus pudore* (Sen. *Tr.* 1137-8) suggests that Propertius with characteristic ingenuity is combining two expressions in one: that of the lover “lowering” his gaze, and that of “parting” said gaze from its proud aspect.

The source of the corruption *constanti fastu* → *constantis fastus* is easily discovered. *constantis* is an error either of anticipation owing to the *-tis* of *impositis* directly below it (the two words are almost exactly aligned in modern texts), or of perseveration owing to *nullis* above; *fastus* for *fastu* either followed by assimilation or is itself due to *pedibus* at the end of v. 4 or *Cupidinibus* at the end of v. 2.¹⁵ The homoeoteleuton of *mihi constanti* is unobjectionable: cf. Ou. *am.* 1.4.70 *cras mihi constanti uoce dedisse nega*, App. Verg. *Ciris* 282 *aut mihi praesenti peperissem uulnere letum*, Stat. *silu.* 2.1.189-90 *quid mihi gaudenti proles Cyllenia uirga / nuntiat*, in all of which the participle is ablative. Notice that if the MS readings are retained, it would mean that Propertius concluded the first and second hemiepes of three consecutive verses with what are, visually speaking, the same terminations (*-is* and *-us*); a further oddity that seems not to have been noticed.¹⁶

1.1.11-14

nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,

<.....>

.....>

ibat et hirsutas †ille uidere† feras;

ille etiam Hylaei percussus uulnere rami

saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit.

12 ille uidere Ω : ille ferire ζ : saepe uidere ζ : comminus ille Palmer || 13

Hylaei ζ : psilli Ω : Phyllei Hertzberg : Rhoeci Schubert : Silui Cairns |

uulnere N : arbore A : uerbere Baehrens

“Palmer’s *comminus ille* removes the rare infinitive of purpose, and within the limits of the couplet fits as well as any conjecture, but it leaves the repetition of *ille*, and the corruption is not palaeographically straightforward.”¹⁷ Heyworth

¹⁵ This type of error occurs also at Tib. 1.1.28, where *riuum* is corrupted to *riuos* owing to *aestiuos* immediately above it.

¹⁶ The only other solution to the ‘genitive problem’ that I can think of is to take *constantis fastus* as accusative plural and *lumina* as a Greek accusative of respect with *mihi*: “then Love cast down the persistent pride in my eyes.” But that seems highly unlikely given the established sense of *deicere lumina*, “to lower one’s eyes”.

¹⁷ Heyworth, *Cynthia*, 6.

considers the iteration of *ille* as an argument against *comminus*, but he prints *ille* twice anyway, so this cannot have been a very serious objection. Goold opts for Courtney's *rursus in hirsutas ibat et ille feras*, Giardina favours Burman's *agitare*, Luck in his *Lucubrationes* advocates for Baehrens' *ciere*, Heyworth himself prints *ferire* of the recentiores.¹⁸ I do not think it would be a controversial thing to say that none of these infinitives clearly bears the stamp of truth, least of all one so cacophonous as *ferire*.¹⁹ In Courtney's conjecture, *et* and *in* are the wrong way round (cf. *Ou. am.* 1.7.26 *et ualui poenam fortis in ipse meam*) and the corruption is not much less violent than Palmer's own (and bizarrely explained: Courtney assumes that <*in hirsu*> was lost, not <*rursus in*>, and that in consequence of that loss *rursutas* was then emended by a scribe back to *hirsutas*).²⁰ The same palaeographical considerations urged against *comminus* are thrown out the window by advocates of *agitare*, *ferire* and *ciere*, none of which looks anything much like *uidere*, nor has any a parallel so apt and pertinent as Palmer's in *Prop.* 2.19.22 *aut celer agrestis comminus ire sues* and *Ou. fast.* 5.175-6 *in apros / audet et hirsutas comminus ire leas*.²¹ To these add *Mart.* 14.31.2 *hic brevis ingentem comminus ibit aprum* and *Stat. Theb.* 4.323 *dum premis obnixo uenabula comminus apro*; and for *comminus + ire*, compare *Prop.* 3.1.26 *comminus isse*, *Verg. Aen.* 10.453-4 *ire / comminus*, [*Ou.*] *hal.* 52 *comminus ire*, *Stat. Theb.* 2.5 11*comminus ire*, 8.529 *comminus ire*, 9.343-4 *ibat / comminus*, 12.13 *comminus ire*, and *Sil.* 5.560 *comminus ire*. True, how *uidere* came to *comminus* cannot be explained by an appeal to their graphical likeness; but not all errors can be explained in that way. (It would be a most remarkable circumstance if every corruption in an author's MSS bore an exact or even passing resemblance to the word from which it was corrupted.)

It is a stranger problem to account for the origin of *psilli* in v. 13. *Hylaei* is evidently the word we want (cf. *Ou. ars* 2.191), and virtually every editor of Propertius prints just this. Yet how *hylaei* came to *psilli* has continued to trouble sceptics. C. Schubert therefore proposes to read *Rhoeci* (another centaur), F. Cairns *Silui* (*Hylaeus* in Latin skin).²² Neither of these however looks very much

¹⁸ G.P. Goold, "Paralipomena Propertiana", *HSCP* 94, 1992, 287-320, at 288; G. Luck, "Lucubrationes Propertianae", *ExClass* 14, 2010, 43-87, at 45-6.

¹⁹ Why the cacemphaton would not be in Propertius' style is explained by K. Lachmann, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina*, Leipzig 1816, 4-5.

²⁰ E. Courtney, "The structure of Propertius book I and some textual consequences", *Phoenix* 22, 1968, 250-8, at 255-6. The anonymous referee wonders if the word-order in Ovid compensates for the trajectory of *in*; and indeed the essential difference between these lines is that, in Ovid *in* has nowhere else to go, whereas in Propertius it could stand before *hirsutas*, even if it meant trajecting *et* all the way into the second hemiepes.

²¹ The hypothesis that *ferire* fell out before *feras* requires hardly less pleading in its behalf than Housman's explanation of how *uidere* came from *comminus*. If we are going to assume that a word dropped out, why not go the full length and print the option best supported by external evidence?

²² C. Schubert, "Zu Properz I 1, 13", *Philologus* 154, 2010, 344-7; F. Cairns, "Propertius 1,1,13", *Philologus* 158, 2014, 192-6.

more like *psilli* than *Hylaei* (whence the *p*?), and the double elision of *ille etiam Hylaei*, which both emendators quietly urge as an argument against the traditional reading, is a complete non-issue: cf. 2.8.29 *ille etiam abrepta*, 2.10.25 *nondum etiam Ascraei*, 2.28.61 *redde etiam excubias*, 2.34.35 *atque etiam ut Phrygio*. Says Schubert: “Eine paläographische Erklärung, wie es zur Korruptel *psilli* aus *Hylaei* / *ilei* kam, fällt allerdings nicht leicht und wurde meines Wissens bislang noch nicht versucht.”²³ Housman offered such an explanation: “*Hylaei*, written *ilei*, was changed to *illi*: now the confusion of *ille* with *ipse* is perpetual, as 2.4.17 (27) *ille* NV *ipse* DF, 3.21.6 *ille* DV *ipse* FN [...] I imagine then that *illi* stood here in some ancestor of our MSS, that a reader emended it from another MS thus

ille etiam illi^{ps} percussus uulnere rami

and that the next copyist misunderstanding the correction inserted the letters *ps* in a wrong place and gave us *psilli*.”²⁴ For my part I am taken by the idea that *-ps-* is a misplaced correction, but not that it came into our text by collation of another MS in which *Hylaei* itself had come all the way to *ipsi*, which seems to me a hypothesis that could be simplified. We have a surfeit of *ille*'s in vv. 12 and 13;²⁵ we have what looks like a mislaid attempt at correcting *illi/ilei* to *ipsi* in v. 13. I am surprised that no one before me has made the connection: this *-ps-* is a true correction not of *ilei* to *ipsi*, but of one of these two superfluous instances of *ille*. This modification of Housman's theory requires only two steps to be valid: for one scribe to err by writing *ille* for *ipse*, correcting his mistake thus:

*ibat et hirsutas ille^{ps} uidere feras.
ille etiam ilei percussus uulnere rami.*²⁶

And for another to mistake which *ille/illi* was meant, plopping it in front of *ilei/illi* in the verse below (13). As the former *ille* has the lesser point of the two (Milanion being the subject throughout vv. 11-12), that is the one which probably ought to be corrected to *ipse* (though I grant the second might be palaeographically easier).²⁷ This confusion, as Housman notes, is perpetual, and

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Housman, “Emendationes”, 22-3 (= *Classical Papers* 1.45). For the corruption to *ilei*, cf. Prop. 1.8a.26 *hylaeis* Ω : *eleis* ζ and Stat. *Theb.* 8.507 *hyllum* P : *illum* ω.

²⁵ Doubt of *ille* in v. 12 is expressed also by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, Cambridge 1956, 3. Where *ille* and its oblique forms are repeated in consecutive verses with the same referent, the effect is invariably anaphoric; cf. 1.2.23-4, 5.7-8, 11-12, 9.25-6, 13.31-2, 14.17-19, 2.23.5-6, 45-6, and 4.5.37-8.

²⁶ If the correction was not so neat as I have suggested, *-ps-* may have been floating around somewhere in the margin, with the result that where it ought to go could have been more opaque to a scribe than my diagram suggests.

²⁷ *ille etiam* after *modo* ... *modo* is supported by Verg. *Aen.* 11.650-3 *nunc ... nunc ... illa etiam*; cf. Heyworth, *Cynthia*, 7.

ipse could well have come to *ille* by anticipation of *ille* or *illi/ilei* right below it. The sense moreover is much improved with *ipse*: “and went head-to-head *himself* with wild beasts” gives far greater point than a merely resumptive “and *that man*”. That the correction *-ps-* could have attached itself to the wrong *ille/illi* is well conceivable, and a great deal simpler than Housman’s explanation of how *ilei* came to *psilli* by way of another manuscript. For *ipse* with Palmer’s *comminus*, cf. Lucr. 4.407 *comminus ipse*, Stat. *Theb.* 8.11 *comminus ipsa*, 11.330 *comminus ipsi*, and 12.565 *comminus ipsae*.

1.1.21-24

en agedum dominae mentem conuertite nostrae,
 et facite illa meo palleat ore magis!
 tunc ego crediderim †uobis et sidera et amnes†
 posse Cytinaeis ducere carminibus.

23 amnes Ω : umbras *Jeuerus* | et (*del. Morgan*) manes et sidera uobis Hous-
 man || 24 Cytinaeis *Hertzberg* : Cytalinis Ω

Housman’s arguments against *amnes ducere* scarcely need rehearsing.²⁸ The Roman poets nowhere else employ this phrase to describe the inversion of nature’s laws, for the simple reason that, in common Roman parlance, to *ducere* an *amnem* (or *flumen*, *fluuium*, *riuum*) invariably means “to divert water into a channel for the purpose of irrigation”.²⁹ As Housman says: “A man would no more dream of invoking incantations to *amnes ducere* than to shave his chin or cook his dinner; and when this every-day work of the farmer is coupled with the ‘sidera ducere’ of the magician, the absurdity is doubled.” The only way out of the problem is to suppose, as W. Clausen supposed, that Propertius is here attempting a very bold experiment in the use of zeugma.³⁰ Upon this theory, *ducere* goes with *sidera*, and some such verb as *sistere* or *uertere* with *amnes*. Housman however had pre-empted this defence by pointing out that the order of the words was not, as it would have to be, *et amnes et sidera ducere*, but rather *et sidera et amnes ducere*, and so “retreat in that direction is cut off”.³¹ I think this objection is weightier than it may seem. Out of all the hundreds of zeugmata employed by the Latin poets and prose-writers, there are very few in which the operative verb is placed nearest the noun to which it does not properly belong, and most of them that are so placed may be considered as playing upon conventional pairs of words.³²

²⁸ Housman, “Emendationes”, 27-30 (= *Classical Papers* 1.48-50).

²⁹ Cf. Verg. *georg.* 1.106 *satis fluuium inducit*, Ou. *rem.* 194 *riuos ducere*, App. Verg. *mor.* 70 *cultis* (Heyne: *cura codd.*) *inducere* (Kayachev: *summittere codd.*) *riuos*.

³⁰ W. Clausen, review of P.J. Enk, *Sex. Properti Elegiarum Liber Secundus, Pars Prior, Prolegomena et Textum continens*, Leiden 1962, *AJPh* 86, 1965, 95-101, at 98 n. 6.

³¹ Housman, “Emendationes”, 29 (= *Classical Papers* 1.49).

³² The cause of this aversion is fairly clear in the case of zeugma of accident or inflexion, although some examples of this are found in prose: T. Ruddiman, *Grammaticae Latinae Institutiones*,

A.S. Bell supplies the following examples: Tac. *ann.* 2.29.2 *manus ac supplices uoces ad Tiberium tendens* (cf. Val. Fl. 7.269-70 *has ego uoces [...] hasque manus [...] tendo*), 3.28.3 *quis usi pace et principe fruere[mur]*, Verg. *Aen.* 4.427 *cineres manesue reuelli* (where Pease prefers to take *manes* as meaning “corpse” [OLD s.u. 2], with Dido “allowing for either the cremation or inhumation of Anchises”), 4.99-100 *quin potius pacem aeternam pactosque hymenaeos / exercemus*, and 8.260-1 *angit inhaerens / elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur*.³³ The important thing in each of these examples is the complete absence of any doubt that the operative verb goes unnaturally with the nearest noun: one cannot literally *tendere a uocem*, *frui a principe*, or *exercere hymenaeos*. But as *ducere amnes* is itself a perfectly intelligible expression (“to divert water into an irrigation channel”), the conditions for this type of zeugma are not met.³⁴ The reader is not prompted to fill the semantic gap by supplying another verb to *amnes*, as in, for instance, Tib. 1.4.65-6 *quem referent Musae, uiuet, dum robora tellus, / dum caelum stellae, dum uehet amnis aquas* (where *feret* or *habebit* must be supplied to *robora tellus*), for there is no gap to fill. The addition of *Cytinaeis ... carminibus* to *ducere* does nothing to allay the difficulty: all this does is convert “to irrigate” into “to irrigate by means of magic song”, a locution scarcely less absurd.

Goold accepts Housman’s arguments and emendation, albeit with Morgan’s deletion of the first *et* (though this conjunction is needed to make valid Housman’s explanation of the error), *manes et sidera uobis*; Heyworth accepts them too, but for palaeographical reasons prefers Jeverus’ *umbras*. Housman’s solution requires a considerable amount of graphical fiddling to make work—not a reason to reject it outright of course, but not a point in its favour either. Yet Jeverus’ emendation, though recently defended by A. Cafagna,³⁵ is impossible for the very same reason that *amnes ducere* itself is impossible. For *ducere umbras* too has an established meaning, “to cast a shadow”: Lucr. 4.136-7 *nam saepe Gigantum / ora uolare uidentur et umbram ducere late*, “for often the heads of giants appear to soar and cast their shadow far”; or when it takes an indirect object, “to shade”: Verg. *ecl.* 5.40 *inducite fontibus umbram*, 9.20 *uiridi fontis induceret umbra*, Hor. *serm.* 1.5.9-10 *iam nox inducere terris / umbras ... parabat*, Ou. *met.* 11.549 *et inducta piceis e nubibus umbra*. In other words, by writing *et sidera et umbras ... ducere*,

Edinburgh 1778¹⁰, 85, is able to cite Suet. *Cal.* 13.1 *sic imperium adeptus populum Romanum, uel dicam humanum genus, uoti compotem*, Sall. *Iug.* 49.5 *cum natura loci, tum dolo, ipsi atque signa militaria obscurati*, and Liu. 1.32.13 *ego populusque Romanus populis Priscorum Latinorum hominibusque Priscis Latinis bellum indico facioque* (a solemn formula).

³³ A.S. Bell, *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction: Studies in Numbers and Figures*, London 1923, 307. A.S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Cambridge, MA, 1935, 354. One commonly alleged example, Val. Fl. 8.68 *iamque manus Colchis crinemque intenderat astris*, is probably corrupt (*uimen* Koestlin).

³⁴ Cf. Heyworth, *Cynthia*, 9 n. 8.

³⁵ Cafagna, *Dal contesto alla costituzione del testo*, 54–5.

Jeverus has simply replaced one idiomatic phrase incompatible with the context with another idiomatic phrase equally incompatible with the context.³⁶

“*amnes sistere, amnes uertere*, come over and over again: *amnes ducere* never”, Housman.³⁷ “One might write *sistere* or *uertere* for *ducere*, but it seems better to assail *amnes*, which introduces a disconnected element”, Heyworth.³⁸ If we cut out their dealings with rivers by expunging *amnes*, only the drawing down of the moon (19), the resurrection of the dead (20), and some unspecified activity involving the stars and constellations (23) would be left to the witches’ charge; and thus a common and expected feature of such descriptions would be rendered oddly absent. Replacing a reference to the inversion or halting of rivers (*amnes*) with a reference to psychagogia (*umbras*) is implausible for another reason, namely that Propertius has already defined the witches’ existence by the power of necromancy in vv. 19-20. Having there invoked *uos quibus ... labor in magicis ossa piare focis*, “you whose office it is to appease bones in magic fires”,³⁹ it would be very odd of the poet here to turn around and say, “only if you change my mistress’ mind will I believe you capable of that feat by which I have defined you”. If *amnes* and *sidera* are sound, yet the sense of the couplet is not, our only recourse is to find another verb with which to replace *ducere*.

Three considerations make *uertere* a highly effective instrument for this purpose. In the first place, it entirely removes the need for zeugma between *sidera* and *amnes*. We learn that rivers may be turned upon themselves with magic from Tib. 1.2.46 *fluminis haec rapidi carmine uertit iter*; from Virgil we learn that stars may too: *Aen.* 4.487-9 *haec se carminibus promittit ... sistere aquam fluuiis et uertere sidera retro*.⁴⁰ Secondly, Propertius is asking these witches to render the mind of Cynthia as more kindly disposed to his affections by, as he says, “changing it” (21 *mentem conuertite*). It would therefore be very apt of him to say that only once they have “changed” (*conuertite*) the mind of his mistress will he believe in their power to “change” (*uertere*) the course of stars and rivers.⁴¹ Finally, the error

³⁶ The only way out that I can see is to take *ducere umbras* as referring to the witches’ power of convoking or dispersing clouds at will (cf. *Ou. am.* 1.8.9, Tib. 1.2.51). But *umbras* is a word too vague to instantly suggest ‘cloud cover’, so I doubt this explanation is correct.

³⁷ Housman, “Emendationes”, 28 (= *Classical Papers* 1.49).

³⁸ Heyworth, *Cynthia*, 9.

³⁹ Even if Heyworth’s *ossa* is not accepted (though to me it seems a necessary and well-paralleled solution, better than *busta*, which surely is incompatible with *focis*, and much better than *fata*, which is too imprecise), necromancy, as the only common magical feat left out of description, must be the topic of this pentameter.

⁴⁰ The relevant parallels from Housman’s long list of witches’ dealings with rivers, besides Tib. 1.2.46, are *Ou. am.* 2.1.25-6 *carmine dissiliunt abruptis faucibus angues / inque suos fontes uersa recurrit aqua* and *Sen. Med.* 760-2 *cantu meo ... uiolenta Phasis uertit in fontem uada*. A gargantuan number of further parallels will be found in A.S. Pease, ed., *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Cambridge, MA, 1935, 401-6.

⁴¹ The repetition of a compound verb (*conuertite*) in its simplex form (*uertere*) may be thought a fault of style, but as in this instance a rhetorical point is served, viz. connecting the reversal of Cynthia’s mind to the reversal of rivers and stars, the *adnominatio* is justified.

of *ducere* for *ūtere* (*uertere*), is graphically plausible in a way that Housman and Jeverus' conjectures are not. The very same mistake happens to occur at Claud. *carm.* 26.538, where *ducere* is given by two MSS in error for *uertere*,⁴² and the reverse process is commonly attested: at Ou. *met.* 6.107 *reducere* is corrupted by at least one MS into *reuertere*, at Luc. 6.330 *condixit* is corrupted by some MSS to *conduxit* and by others to *conuertit*, and at Claud. *carm.* 8.245 *duceret* is corrupted by one MS directly into *uerteret*.⁴³ Here it is also possible that *ducere* arose by a scribe's recollection of *deductae ... lunae* in v. 19, if the intrinsic likeness of *ducere* to *ūtere* was not already enough of a prompt to error.

1.1.31-34

uos remanete, quibus facili deus adnuit †aure†,
 sitis et in tuto semper amore pares.
 †in me† nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras
 et nullo uacuis tempore defit Amor.

31 aure] ore ζ : aura ζ || 33 in Ω : nam Heyworth | nostra Ω : saeua *Giardina*
 : dura *Francius* : maesta *Baehrens* : torua *Senger* : uestra *Richards* | me non
 nostra *Housman* | noctes Ω : uoces *Postgate*

Heyworth's *nam* has commended itself to fewer readers than might have been expected.⁴⁴ Liberman prefers not to print it, for that *nam* forms "un mot peu utile".⁴⁵ It may be agreed that *nam* performs a somewhat clearer service in the following four lines of *CIL* VI 21521 (= *CLE* 1109) (vv. 25-8):

'surge, refer matri, ne me noctesque diesque
 defleat ut maerens Attica mater Ityn.
nam me sancta *Venus* sedes non nosse silentum
 iussit et in caeli lucida templa tulit.'

"Arise, and tell my mother not to weep for me through nights and days, as the mourning Attic mother wept for Itys. For holy *Venus* has forbidden *me* to know the seats of the dead and has borne me into the shining temples of heaven." The poem to which these lines belong is an epitaph laden with allusions to classical poets, especially Ovid, Virgil and Lucretius. The excerpted passage forms part of a speech assigned to the dedicatee, one M. Lucceius Nepos, and delivered

⁴² See the apparatus of J.B. Hall, ed., *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, Leipzig 1985, 258, and cf. Ou. *her.* 7.152 *adducta]* *aduectas*.

⁴³ See P. Toribio, "Colación del Matritensis 3767: Ovidio, *Metamorfosis*", *ExClass* 13, 2009, 27-69, at 41; D.R. Shackleton Bailey, ed., *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Libri X*, Stuttgart 1988, 145; Hall, *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, 70.

⁴⁴ Proposed in S.J. Heyworth, "Notes on Propertius Books I and II", *CQ* 34, 1984, 394-405, at 396-7, *nam* is accepted by Goold, who prints it in his text, and by R.O.A.M. Lyne, "Introductory poems in Propertius: 1.1 and 2.12", *PCPhS* 44, 1999, 158-81, at 172 n. 37.

⁴⁵ Liberman, *Cynthia*, 79.

to the dedicator, one Sex. Onussanius. It may be a pure coincidence that the first hemistich of v. 27 bears a passing likeness to Prop. 1.1.33 as emended by Heyworth, but the abundance of literary allusions in the rest of the epitaph may suggest a closer relationship.⁴⁶ Verse 26 (quoted above) for instance rather resembles Prop. 3.10.10 *inrepet absumptum nec sua mater Ityn* (but cf. also *Ou. tr.* 2.1.390).⁴⁷ And just as in Prop. 1.1.31-4 *nam* follows an exhortation (31-2 *uos remanete ... sitis et in tuto semper amore pares*), so in *CIL* VI 21521 we find an imperative, *surge, refer matri*, followed by *nam me [...] Venus* in explanation: “tell my mother not to weep for me, for Venus has ensured that I will not go to Orcus.” There is a formal similarity here, syntactic as well as semantic, even if in Prop. 1.1 a further premise must be supplied (“for [if you do not, then you will be like] me, whom Venus harasses incessantly etc.”).

For the accusative of extent of time, into which *nam* converts *noctes ... amaras*, *Hor. carm.* 1.25.7 *longas pereunte noctes* is usually cited. J. Booth however objects that, while in Horace the temporal nature of the accusative is clear, here “the absence of *per* (uel sim.) with *noctes ... amaras* is keenly felt”.⁴⁸ It is not: cf. *Catull.* 6.6 *nam te non uiduas iacere noctes / nequiquam tacitum cubile clamat*, “For the bed, vainly dumb, cries aloud the fact that you are making love *through undeprived nights*”.

⁴⁶ A full list of classical allusions is given and examined by G. Bianchini, D. Bovet, G. Luca Gregori, “*CIL*, VI 21521 = 34137 (CLE 1109): Un sogno in forma poetica”, *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma: Serie II, Historia Antigua* 33, 2020, 213-32. For a commentary on the text with further bibliography, see E. Courtney, *Musa Lapidaria: A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions*, Atlanta 1995, 381-4.

⁴⁷ Prop. 1.1 is echoed in other epigraphic poems. For example, vv. 3-4 of *CIL* VI 29896 (= *CLE* 1175) *docta ... collibus hirsutas atque agitare feras* appear to echo Prop. 1.1.13 *ibat et hirsutas †ille uidere† feras*.

⁴⁸ Booth, “*Nostra Venus*”, 340.