

PROPERTIUS 4.5.19–21

<i>†</i> exorabat opus uerbis ceu blanda perure	19
saxosamque ferat sedula culpa uiam	20
si te Eoa dorozantum iuuat aurea ripa†	21

19 perure NFL : peruret PT || 21 dorozantum NT : de roantium FP :
derorantium L

Although most scholars consider verses 19–21 to be beyond repair,¹ John Morgan and Michael Reeve,² George P. Goold, Allan Kershaw, Stephen J. Heyworth and Giancarlo Giardina have added new proposals to the enormous bulk of conjectures already recorded in Smyth's *Thesaurus*.³ In the following, I will claim that all hypotheses that have been put forth up to now fail to do justice to Propertius' linguistic and / or metrical practice, and I will provide arguments in support of a reconstruction which, though involving the mutual transposition of verses 19 and 21, remains basically

1) See e.g. H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber (eds.), *The Elegies of Propertius*, Oxford 1933, 130, 352; P. Fedeli (ed.), *Propertio: Elegie. Libro IV*, Bari 1965, 158–9; H.-C. Günther, *The Fourth Book*, in: H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, Leiden / Boston 2006, 373 n. 103; G. Hutchinson (ed.), *Propertius: Elegies. Book IV*, Cambridge 2006, 142–3. I use S. J. Heyworth's sigla (ed., *Sexti Propertii Elegos*, Oxford 2007; *Cynthia: a Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford 2007) to designate the main manuscripts available for this passage, viz. N, F, L, P, T (= 113 in R. Hanslik [ed.], *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, Leipzig 1979, and v in J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Toronto / Buffalo / London 1984). The cover letter ζ may refer to any (set of) later manuscript(s).

2) As reported in G. P. Goold, *Problems in Editing Propertius*, in: J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*, New York 1989, 102–3.

3) See W. R. Smyth, *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*, Leiden 1970, 143–4; G. P. Goold, *Noctes Propertianae*, HSCPh 71, 1967, 81–4; id. (ed.), *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, Mass. / London 1990, 394; A. Kershaw, *Propertius 4,5,19–20*, *Latomus* 57, 1998, 105–8; S. J. Heyworth, *Textual Notes on Propertius 4.3, 4.4, 4.5*, in: S. M. Braund and R. Mayer (eds.), *Amor: Roma. Love & Latin Literature: eleven essays (and one poem) by former research students presented to E. J. Kenney on his seventy-fifth birthday*, Cambridge 1999, 87–90; id. (ed., above, n. 1) 165; id., *Cynthia* (above, n. 1) 454; G. Giardina (ed.), *Propertio: Elegie*, Rome 2005, 352–3.

‘conservative’ in that it generally sticks to the ‘ductus litterarum’ and does not assume any lacuna in the paradosis.

1. *The overall structure of Elegy 4.5*

Before coming to the details, it is useful to say a word about the overall structure of the poem.⁴

The first and last four lines are curses against the bawd (*lena*) Acanthis, and thus express wishes of Ego’s that bear on possible future states of affairs. In verses 1–4, which deal with the torments Ego wants Acanthis to suffer after her death, the main-clause verbs are in the present subjunctive (*obducat, sentiat, sedeant, terreat*); in verses 75–78, where Ego attempts to ward off any possible return of the (now dead) bawd, the first couplet contains two present subjunctive forms (*sit, urgeat*), and the second couplet two main-clause verbs in the present imperative: *caedite* (ς), *addite*.

In verses 5–12, Ego uses various indicative (future *poterit*) and subjunctive forms (present *uelit*, imperfect *cogeret* and *diluerentur*, perfect *mouerit*) to describe all those evil spells Acanthis would be able to cast on persons or things. By contrast, verses 13–8 focus on cases where she really exercised her noxious practice, and thus turn to the perfect indicative (*eruit, consuluit, lēgit*) in the main clauses.⁵ In particular, verses 17–8 tell us how the bawd aimed at damaging Ego’s health and person: she plotted with *striges* to suck his blood, i. e. to make him sexually impotent, and collected *hippomanes*, a secretion from the genitalia of a pregnant mare, to exert some magic against him, probably by inducing pathological arousal in the potential lovers of his girl-friend.⁶

4) See D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, Cambridge 1956, 239–44; Goold, *Noctes* (above, n. 3) 81–2; id. (above, n. 2) 97–8; G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford 1968, 543–5; M. Hubbard, *Propertius*, London 1974, 137–42.

5) As pointed out by Fedeli (above, n. 1) 157 and L. Richardson, Jr. (ed.), *Propertius: Elegies I–IV*, Norman 1976, 442, *posset ut* (ς, et NFLPT) depends on *eruit*: the bawd works sympathetic magic (see also A.-M. Tupet, *La magie dans la poésie latine. I. Des origines à la fin du règne d’Auguste*, Paris 1976, 374–6).

6) On magically inflicted impotence, see e. g. Tib. 1.5.39–44; Ov. Am. 3.7; Petr. 129, 134 (Shackleton Bailey [above, n. 4]; Fedeli [above, n. 1]; Tupet [above, n. 5] 376–7; K. S. Myers, *The Poet and the Procureess: the Lena in Latin Love Elegy*,

The imperfect indicative *exorabat* (verse 19), if not corrupt, introduces a long sequence of directly reported advices of the bawd that ends at verse 62 and begins somewhere before verse 22. Verse 63 indicates that those pieces of advice were given to Ego's girl-friend, which makes us wonder how this part of the poem connects to the previous description of Acanthis' behavior (verses 13–8). Sure, both her evil spells and her utterances did endanger Ego's life and love; but the chronology of her actions escapes logic as long as we try to read the elegy in naïvely realistic terms.

Things get even worse when the text abruptly shifts to the infamous death and funeral of the bawd (verses 65–74), as witnessed by Ego (verse 67: *uidi ego . . .*). No clue in the preceding context allows us to understand why Ego was near Acanthis on that occasion, and how he could describe her awful talents in potential terms (verses 5–12) while knowing, in fact, that she had passed away.

2. *Previous proposals*

Let us now have a look at the various attempts that were made to detect some meaningful content in verses 19–21.

JRS 86, 1996, 8). Shackleton Bailey supposes that Acanthis uses *hippomanes* to cause Ego to fall in love with another girl; but, in such a case, she would be ill-advised to make him impotent (see L. P. Wilkinson, *Two Passages in Propertius*, CR n.s. 17, 1967, 137; Heyworth, Cynthia [above, n. 1] 453). For the negative vision poets have of *hippomanes*, see Verg. G. 3.266–83; Tib. 2.4.55–8; Ov. Am. 1.8.8, Med. 38; Juv. 6.133 (Tupet [above, n. 5] 79–81, 345–6, 383; J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 1996, 41, 77, 277–8). Propertius directly imitates Verg. G. 3.282–3, where *nouercae* may allude to Phaedra (see Prop. 2.1.51–2 with *nouercae* [...] *Phaedrae*, 4.5.5 with *nouerca* in 4.5.10; Tupet [above, n. 5] 354–5; T. D. Papanghelis, *Propertius: a Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death*, Cambridge 1987, 28–31, 43–4; P. Fedeli [ed.], *Properzio: Elegie. Libro II*, Cambridge 2005, 88–9; pace Heyworth, Cynthia [above, n. 1] 112). It should be clear that my interpretation commits me to rejecting the hypothesis that “the lover rather than the *lena* is employing sympathetic magic” (K. O'Neill, *Symbolism and Sympathetic Magic in Propertius 4.5*, CJ 94, 1998, 76).

2.1. Verses 19–20

As far as I know, nobody has ever questioned the claim that Acanthis' speech, or a section of it, begins with verse 21. It follows that the preceding couplet has generally been considered as a discourse unit, and that most editors and commentators view it as a comparative utterance "A *ceu* B", where B should divide into two conjuncts, the second of which coincides with verse 20. One may surmise that medieval scribes interpreted this distich as a typically monkish mixture of cynism and moralizing: "She preached by using these words: 'Inflame [male desires] as if you were a sweet person; and let your obstinate debauchery bring you [torments comparable to] the Way of the Cross' ". Obviously, Propertius cannot have aimed at expressing such content.

2.1.1. Some Renaissance manuscripts substitute *talpa* (ς) or *lymphā* (ς) for *culpa*. The former emendation led Rossberg and Palmer to correct *ferat* into *forat*; the latter, adopted by Wakker and Waardenburgh, was sometimes replaced with *gutta* on palaeographical grounds (Jacob, Baehrens).⁷ In contrast to *talpa*, both *lymphā* and *gutta* can combine with *forat*, *ferit*, *terit* or *terat*. In such hypotheses, the bawd's words have a persuasive power that compares with the slow sapping of a mole (*talpa*) or, somewhat more plausibly, of a (running or dropping) water.⁸ Palmer extended the animal simile to the first conjunct of the comparative clause by substituting *blatta* for *blanda*; this bold conjecture was given a complete form by Havet, Hosius and Goold: *blatta papyrum/-on*.⁹ Generally, however, *perure* has been maintained or corrected into a more or less similar verbal form: *pererrat* (Wakker, Waardenburgh), *perarat* (Hanslik, though this form does not scan), *terebrat*

7) See A. E. Housman, *Classical Papers*, ed. by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Good-year, Cambridge 1972, 38, 328–9; L. Havet, *Notes critiques sur Properce*, Paris 1916, 119–20; E. Pasoli (ed.), *Sesto Properzio: il Libro Quarto delle Elegie*, Bologna 2¹⁹⁶⁷, 102; Giardina (above, n. 3).

8) See Housman (above, n. 7); R. Maltby (ed.), *Tibullus: Elegies*, Leeds 2002, 221; Fedeli (above, n. 6) 715, and T. Riesenweber, *Uneigentliches Sprechen und Bildermischung in den Elegien des Properz*, Berlin 2007, 51, who quote *Lucr.* 1.313, 4.1286–7; *Tib.* 1.4.18; *Prop.* 2.25.15–6; *Ov. Ars* 1.473–4, *Pont.* 1.1.70, 2.7.39–40, 4.10.15.

9) Havet (above, n. 7); C. Hosius (ed.), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, Leipzig 1922, 139; Goold, *Noctes* (above, n. 3) 83–4; id. (ed., above, n. 3).

(Palmer), etc. – Housman’s *perinde* being another important exception.¹⁰

It has been repeatedly noticed that *ceu* does not belong to the elegiac lexicon.¹¹ Indeed, this connective does not occur in Propertius, Tibullus or the Tibullian Corpus; and save for one example from the *Amores* that explicitly points to epic diction, Ovid uses it in the *Metamorphoses* only.¹² I am thus inclined to disagree with those authors (e.g. Tränkle, Goold) who do not want to suspect *ceu*, all the more so since three easy corrections are available: *seu* (ς); Housman’s *heu* (*heu* > *eheu* > *cheu* > *ceu*; see *eheu* for *heu* in Hor. Epod. 15.23);¹³ Butler and Barber’s *tu* (*tu* > *eu* > *ceu*).¹⁴ Moreover, the similes one has to postulate in order to maintain a comparative structure are, to say the least, “ingenious rather than convincing” (Butler and Barber) and “awkward rather than elegant” (Heyworth).¹⁵ First, no mole could ever sap a “rocky way” (*saxosam* [...] *uiam*), and Goold’s *suffossam* definitely looks like a desperate way out; second, unless *lympa* (most implausibly) refers to torrential waves, the wearing away of stone by (running or dropping) water is so gentle and so slow that it cannot relevantly characterize the persuasive and brisk efficiency of Acanthis’ speech, as described in verse 63 (see 3.3.1, below).¹⁶

2.1.2. Richmond’s otherwise disastrous edition should be credited with containing the first really innovative reconstruction since the Renaissance times:

10) Hanslik (above, n. 1) 168, Housman (above, n. 7); see Smyth (above, n. 3) for the details.

11) O. L. Richmond (ed.), *Sexti Propertii quae supersunt opera*, Cambridge 1928, 352; B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter: ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Lund 1945, 26, 89; G. Luck, *Das Acanthisgedicht des Propertius*, *Hermes* 83, 1955, 433 n. 4.

12) *Ov. Am.* 3.9.25–6; *Met.* 1.135, 1.420, 3.79, 4.222, 5.509, 9.78, 9.170, 14.825, 15.303.

13) F. Villeneuve (ed.), *Horace: Odes et Épodes*, Paris 1946, 223.

14) H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Propertius und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Wiesbaden 1960, 47; Goold, *Noctes* (above, n. 3) 83; Housman (above, n. 7); P. J. Enk, *Ad Propertii carmina commentarius criticus*, Zutphen 1911, 320; Butler and Barber (above, n. 1).

15) Butler and Barber (above, n. 1); Heyworth (above, n. 3) 87–8.

16) Butler and Barber (above, n. 1); Goold, *Noctes* (above, n. 3) 83–4; id. (ed., above, n. 3).

*exorabat: “opus uerbis: uice blanda perure,
fac scissamque ferat sedula culpa uicem.
[...]”*

The corruption of *uicem* into *uiam* is highly plausible: see *uias* (F) instead of *uices* in Prop. 1.15.30 and *vices* instead of *uias* in Verg. G. 1.418 and Prop. 1.8.30 (ς); the same holds for the shift *uice* > *ceu*. In order to vindicate the correlation *uice* [...] *uicem*, Richmond quotes a passage from Statius:

*nec pudor iste tibi: quid enim terrisque poloque
parendi sine lege manet? uice cincta reguntur,
alternisque premunt. [...]* (Stat. Silv. 3.3.48–50)

in which, however, the two ablatives *uice* and *alternis* (sc. *uicibus*) modify their respective verbs in the same way. Though *fac scissamque* [...] *uicem* looks similar to *faceret scissas* [...] *genas* (Prop. 2.18.6) or *fac* [...] *resciso* [...] *sinu* (Prop. 3.8.8), *scissam* [...] *uicem* is “past understanding” (Butler and Barber) and *sedula culpa* proves semantically odd.¹⁷ Augustan poetry only applies *sedulus* to humans or human-like entities, e. g. bees (Tib. 2.1.49–50, Ov. Met. 13.928) or the disturbing moon of Prop. 1.3.32 (see 4.2.3, below); and when, in spite of its basically positive value (see Prop. 2.18.10), *sedulus* occasionally acquires negative overtones (Prop. 1.3.32; Tib. 2.4.42; Ov. Ars 3.699), it refers to the intrusive behavior of a busybody, and not to some indeterminate misdeed.¹⁸

2.1.3. Kershaw’s proposal directly derives from Richmond and from Butler and Barber:¹⁹

17) See Richmond (above, n. 11) and Butler and Barber (above, n. 1). On the confusions in Prop. 1.15.30, Verg. G. 1.418 and Prop. 1.8.30: Housman (ed.), *M. Manilii Astronomicum. Liber Primus*, Cambridge 2nd 1937, 18; P. Fedeli (ed.), *Sesto Propertio: il Primo Libro delle Elegie*, Florence 1980, 47; Heyworth (ed., above, n. 1) xlvi. On Prop. 2.18.6: Fedeli (above, n. 6) 529.

18) Goold, *Noctes* (above, n. 3) 83; F. Cairns, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge 1979, 104; R. J. Baker (ed.), *Propertius I*, Warminster 2000, 81; Maltby (above, n. 8) 210.

19) Kershaw (above, n. 3).

*exorare opus est: uerbis ceu blanda perure
faxo iamque ferat sedula cura uirum.*

Like Richmond, Kershaw understands *opus (est)* as expressing a need or necessity, and construes the present subjunctive *ferat* with a form of causative *facio*. The emendation *cura* (which goes back to Butler and Barber) is a neat improvement on Richmond not only at the palaeographical level – see *culpa* (AFP) for *cura* in Prop. 1.8.1 and *curba* for *cara* confused with *cura* in Ps.-Tib. [Lygd.] 3.3.32 – but also from a semantic viewpoint: the collocation *sedula cura*, apparently based on such formulas as *sedula curret* (Tib. 1.5.33) or *sedulus curo* (Hor. Carm. 1.38.6), occurs in later texts.²⁰ As a comparative clause, *ceu blanda* sounds rather strange: Butler and Barber's *tu blanda* would combine more naturally with *perure* while creating a clearer contrast between the two conjuncts. Moreover, Kershaw's *faxo* (which does not belong to the elegiac lexicon: no occurrence in Propertius, Tibullus or the Tibullian Corpus; two examples in Ov. Met. 3.271, 12.594) is inferior to Richmond's and Butler and Barber's *fac* (see e. g. Prop. 4.4.66, 4.5.34, 4.11.68); and the overall meaning of the couplet seems somewhat paradoxical: if the girl succeeds in inflaming (*perure*) male desires, what additional help could she get from the bawd?

In order to justify the infinitival form *exorare*, Kershaw assumes the omission of *est* to have triggered the adaptation to *exorabat* for purely metrical reasons. But the disappearance of the imperfect indicative deprives the poem of both its syntactic cohesion and its semantic coherence, so that Kershaw has to posit a lacuna before verse 19. While other authors have assumed a lacunose paradosis, no consensus exists as to the nature and extent of the missing portions: Guyet (1575–1655) eliminated verses 19 and 20, and considered verse 21 as part of a new elegy, the beginning of which was lost; Richardson, Kershaw, and Heyworth think it possible that verses 19 and 20 originally belonged to different coup-

²⁰ On Prop. 1.8.1 and Ps.-Tib. [Lygd.] 3.3.32, see Hanslik (above, n. 1) 13 and F. Navarro Antolín (ed.), Lygdamus: Corpus Tibullianum III.1–6. Lygdami Elegiarum Liber, Leiden / New York / Cologne 1996, 60. Examples of *sedula cura*: Col. 8.1.3; Auson. Parent. 4.22; Com. prof. Praef. 3; Paul. Nol. Carm. 14.121, 21.664; Cassiod. Inst. 1 (De Octateucho) p. 1111^b Migne (see TLL, s. v., 1462,29–30).

lets.²¹ Obviously, any set of conjectures that avoids the untestable hypothesis of a lacuna should be preferred as soon as it provides us with a satisfactory solution.

2.2. Verse 21

Verse 21 confronts us with three metrical quandaries.

2.2.1. Given that, in Propertius as in many other poets, the various forms of the adjective *Eous* receive a bacchiac scansion in verse-final position only (Prop. 2.3.43, 4.6.81; cf. e.g. Catul. 11.3), *Eoa* should be interpreted either (i) as a molossus, i.e. as an ablative construed with *ripa*, or (ii) as a palimbacchius, i.e. as a singular nominative, perhaps construed with (*aurea*) *ripa*, or a plural neuter in the nominative or accusative case.²² If *Eoa* is a molossus, then one has to correct the beginning of the verse. Indeed, ‘Hilberg’s bridge’ absolutely prohibits a diaeresis associated with a second foot which is both undivided and spondaic; this metrical constraint rules out Morgan’s *si te Eoa chrysolithus iuuat aurea ripa* and Heyworth’s *si te Eoa lecta lapis iuuat aurea ripa*.²³ Relying on James Willis’s observation that, in Propertius, verse-internal forms

21) Smyth (above, n.3); Richardson (above, n.5) 130, 442–3; Kershaw (above, n.3); Heyworth (above, n.3) 88; id. (ed., above, n.1) 165.

22) Molossus: Richardson (above, n.5) 442–3; Goold (above, n.2); id. (ed., above, n.3); Heyworth (above, n.3) 89–90; id. (ed., above, n.1) 165; id., Cynthia (above, n.1) 454. Palimbacchius (singular nominative): Housman (above, n.7) 38, 249; Fedeli (above, n.1).

23) See Goold (above, n.2) on Morgan’s conjecture; Heyworth (above, n.3) 90; id. (ed., above, n.1) 165; id., Cynthia (above, n.1) 454. On ‘Hilberg’s bridge’, see F. Cupaiuolo, *Un capitolo sull’esametro latino: parole e finale dattiliche o spondaiche*, Naples 1963, 60–1; L. De Neubourg, *La base métrique de la localisation des mots dans l’hexamètre latin*, Brussels 1986, 114–6; M. Dominicy, *Amphiaros dans l’élégie II,34 de Propertius*, RPh 81, 2007, 55; M. Dominicy and M. Nasta, *Métrique accentuelle et métrique quantitative*, Langue Française 99, 1993, 91; Dominicy and Nasta, *Towards a Universal Definition of the Caesura*, in: J.-L. Aroui and A. Arleo (eds.), *Towards a Typology of Poetic Forms*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, to appear; V. Viparelli Santangelo, *L’esametro di Propertius: rapporti con Callimaco*, Naples 1986, 24–6, 52–3. Heyworth’s reference to Prop. 3.6.25 (Cynthia [above, n.1] 454) is irrelevant, since this verse has a dactylic second foot (like 2.3.11 and 2.24.19; at 1.11.7, 2.29.3, 2.29.14 and 3.23.13 it is doubtful whether a true word-boundary separates *nescio* from following *quis, quot, quas, quae*).

of *Eous* always end at the third (penthemimeral) strong position,²⁴ Goold (after Michael Reeve) and Heyworth envisage a word order alteration, so as to obtain an original reading *chrysolithus (lecta lapis) si te Eoa ...*; a similar collocation of *si* and an elided personal pronoun appears in Prop. 2.15.19 and 2.24.15.²⁵ But the palimbacchiac scansion of *Eoa* should not be considered impossible: Lucan (7.442, 8.208, 8.311, 9.917) and Claudian (Carm. 5.105, 5.161) use it, maybe under the influence of Propertius whom they both imitate on several occasions.²⁶

2.2.2. If *Eoa* is a palimbacchius, the long word *dorozantum* (NT) or *derorantum* (L) creates a metrical infelicity. This stems from the fact that, under such a hypothesis, the line combines a trochaic division of the second foot with the absence of any verse-medial – i. e. penthemimeral or trochaic – caesura, and with a hepthemimeral caesura. Virgil has fifteen hexameters of this kind, Propertius and Manilius each five.²⁷ In ten examples,²⁸ there is an elision of a word-final long vowel before a word-initial vowel belonging to a heavy syllable at the third (penthemimeral) strong position; except in Verg. A. 12.678, the second (molossic or choriambic) word involved in the elision is a (pseudo-)morphological compound whose internal analysis would provide the line with

24) See 1.15.7, 1.16.24, 2.3.44, 2.18.8, 3.13.15, 4.3.10. However, molossic forms of *Eous* may also end at the second (trihemimeral) strong position: see e. g. Verg. G. 2.115, A. 1.489; Ov. Ars 1.202, Fast. 1.140, Pont. 4.9.112; Ps.-Tib. [Lygd.] 3.2.24; Luc. 8.213; Sil. 2.101; Stat. Theb. 6.60, 8.238.

25) See also J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le monosyllabe dans l'hexamètre latin: essai de métrique verbale*, Paris 1964, 252 n. 2, 254; J. Soubiran, *L'élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966, 415.

26) See P. J. Enk (ed.), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber I (Monobiblos)*, Leiden 1946, I, 60–1, 71–4.

27) On Virgil: De Neubourg (above, n. 23) 92–7; E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI*, Stuttgart 1957, 430–1; L. Nougaret, *Traité de métrique latine classique*, Paris 1948, 32; on Propertius: M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse: a Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius & Ovid*, Cambridge 1951, 7–8; on Manilius: Housman (above, n. 17) 5.

28) Verg. G. 2.476: *fero ingenti*; G. 3.217: *quidem illecebris*; A. 1.418: *uiam in-terea*; A. 2.167: *sacram effigiem*; A. 6.336: *aquā inuoluens*; A. 6.607: *facem attollens*; A. 9.237: *locum insidiis*; A. 12.678: *manum Aeneae*; Prop. 2.8.31: *fugā abstractos* (J. K. Newman, *Augustan Propertius: the Recapitulation of a Genre*, Hildesheim / Zürich / New York 1997, 439); Prop. 4.8.83: *locum externae* (see A. 9.237). On this type of verse, see also Soubiran (above, n. 25) 442–7.

a verse-medial (trochaic or penthemimeral) caesura. In six examples,²⁹ the trochaic division of the second foot follows an enclitic monosyllable, so that a trihemimeral division remains possible; in addition, the (pseudo-)morphological analysis of *super-cilium*, *Neo-ptolemus* (Νεο-πτόλεμος), *sacer-dotes*, and perhaps *Sagitt-ari*, would again provide the line with a penthemimeral caesura.³⁰ In nine examples,³¹ the trochaic division of the second foot precedes a grammatical monosyllable that belongs to the same prosodic phrase as the following word; in all these cases too, the molossic or choriambic word admits a (pseudo-)morphological analysis that provides the line with a verse-medial (trochaic or penthemimeral) caesura.³² It thus turns out that all Propertian examples involve a molossic or choriambic word beginning with a (pseudo-)prefix. These results make it impossible to maintain or to posit, after palimbacchiac *Eoa*, a word with the metrical template $\cup - \cup -$; which eliminates not only the otherwise dubious *dorozantum* or *derorantum*, but also Jacob's *Doryxenium*, Unger's *Domazanum*, Housman's *zmaragdorum*, *topazontum* or *topazorum*, Postgate's *Topazitum*, Richmond's *Zmaragditum*, as well as any formally equivalent conjecture.

2.2.3. Editors and commentators have also failed to notice that the sequence *te Eoa* probably gives rise to another metrical oddity. The Propertian corpus contains 21 verses where a monosyllabic pronoun is involved in an elision or prodelision.³³ These

29) Verg. Ecl. 8.35: *hirsutumque supercilium*; A. 2.263: *Pelidesque Neoptolemus*; A. 2.549: *degeneremque Neoptolemum*; Man. 1.47: *delectique sacerdotes*; Man. 1.691: *extremamque Sagittari*; Man. 5.458: *tutorisue supercilium* (see Ecl. 8.35).

30) See R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991, 408, 537, 538; O'Hara (above, n. 6) 132–3; M. Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford 1997, 90, 105 n. 113.

31) Verg. A. 6.480: *Parthenopaesus et Adrasti*; A. 10.256: *tantum effatus et in-terea*; A. 10.877: *tantum effatus et infestā*; A. 10.900: *hostis amare quid increpitas*; Prop. 3.14.7: *puluerulentaque ad extremas*; 4.7.5: *cum mihi somnus ab exsequiis*; 4.8.63: *Cynthia gaudet in exuuiis*; Man. 1.350: *et finitur in Andromeda*; Man. 2.171: *ut Capricornus et intentum*.

32) On *A-drasti* = ἄ-δραστος, see Paschalis (above, n. 30) 346 and Dominicy (above, n. 23) 64.

33) Prop. 2.11.1: *de te alii*; 2.15.19: *me ulterius*; 2.18.19: *tu etiam*; 2.19.1: *me inuito*; 2.20.11: *te ego et aeratas*; 2.20.22: *me et*; 2.20.27: *me una*; 2.21.7: *te ille*; 2.21.8: *se inuito*; 2.24.15: *me ista*; 2.24.31: *se in*; 2.24.39: *me iniuria*; 2.25.9: *me ab amore*; 2.26.1: *te in*; 2.26.25: *se odisse*; 2.29.21: *me iniecto*; 3.7.2: *te immaturum*; 3.9.59: *te est*;

lines conform to regularities that *te Eoa*, if maintained, would systematically violate. Indeed, the pronoun normally precedes a pyrrhic sequence or a heavy grammatical monosyllable or monosyllabic prefix, the few (five) exceptions belonging to the second Book; when the elision involves *me*, *te* or *se* before a word-initial (short or long) *e*, this tendency becomes a rule. It follows that we should dismiss or modify all those versions that conserve *te Eoa* – including Goold’s and Heyworth’s reconstructions, Giardina’s *si te Eoa ex obryza inuat aurea rete*, as well as Renaissance proposals like *si te Eoa inuat ...* (ς) which could seem supported by parallel verse beginnings (3.22.5: *si te forte inua(n)t ...*; 4.2.5: *haec me(a) turba inuat ...*).³⁴

3.17.19: *te et*; 3.24.19: *me in*; 4.8.73: *me ignoscere* (see Platnauer [above, n. 27] 74–8; Hellegouarc’h [above, n. 25] 254–5; Soubiran [above, n. 25] 414–20). In 2.29.21, most editors print *atque ita mi* (Canter, *me NFLPT*) *iniecto dixerunt* (F, *duxerunt NLPT*) *rursus amictu*, which is both metrically suspect (see Platnauer; Soubiran 405, 416, 419; Heyworth, Cynthia [above, n. 1] 240) and unnecessary. First, the *pueri* have been said to be nude in verse 7, so that the ablative absolute applies to them, and not to Ego as usually assumed. In fact, a comparison with 1.3.10 suggests that they are slave-boys that drunken Ego has taken for Cupids (R. I. V. Hodge and R. A. Buttimore [eds.], *The ‘Monobiblos’ of Propertius: an account of the first book of Propertius consisting of a text, translation, and critical essay on each poem*, Cambridge / Ipswich 1977, 90); consequently, their nudity, and their subsequent dressing, should not be interpreted in realistic terms. Second, *ita* can acquire a referentially anaphoric reading (Williams [above, n. 4] 775; Fedeli [above, n. 6] 830) where it qualifies the way the *pueri* escorted (*duxerunt*) Ego back home (*rursus*). Third, the (perhaps illusory) direct speech of the following verse does not require any introducing verb (pace Fedeli and Heyworth, Cynthia [above, n. 1] 241). At 2.32.5, the vulgate reads – \simeq *te Herculeum deportant esseda Tibur*, with *cur tua* (Baehrens), *cur aut* (L. Mueller [ed.], *Catulli Tibulli Propertii Propertii carmina ...*, Leipzig 1885, xxxii, 57), *cur ita* (Richmond [above, n. 11] 244) or *aut cur* (Fedeli [above, n. 6] 893) in the first foot; but this is surely wrong: the manuscripts bear *curua te* (N) or *cur uatem* (FLPT), which points to *cur autem* (ς); *deporto* does not belong to the lexicon of Augustan poetry (see TLL, s. v. 587,34–6) and *te portant* (Heinsius) is an easy correction (see e. g. *tenere > te tenere > detenere* [N] in 2.30.26 and, conversely, *det/i,e/nuisse > te tenuisse* [ς] in 3.2.2; Hanslik [above, n. 1] 91, 104); the potential unwanted elision of *te* before *esseda* accounts for the marked word order *te portant* after the penthemimeral caesura (M. Dominicy, *De la métrique verbale à l’établissement du texte. Sur trois vers de Propertius* [IV,3,51; IV,7,85; IV,10,31], LEC 75, 2007, 238–43).

34) See Giardina (above, n. 3) and A. Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung*, Munich / Leipzig 2001, 239, 247. Heyworth’s apparatus (ed., above, n. 1) 165 mentions – dubitanter – a correction of his (*sine*) that solves this problem (see also id., Cynthia [above, n. 1] 258). Yet, *sine Eoa ...* keeps violating Hilberg’s bridge and *chrysolithus (lecta lapis) sine Eoa ...* is metrically suspect (see n. 37).

One can salvage Goold's and Heyworth's emendations by moving *Eoa* to the front of the line, so as to obtain *Eoa si chrysolithus (lecta lapis) iuuat aurea ripa*. But the discrepancy between the resulting text and the actual paradosis then turns out to be so important that we had better renounce to the very idea that verse 21 might refer to gems. Anyway, Morgan's and Goold's *chrysolithus* makes *aurea* redundant while leaving the ablative *Eoa* [...] *ripa* unaccounted for; and though Latin literature contains examples of feminine *chrysolithus* or *lapis* (see TLL, s.vv.), no undisputable evidence allows us to believe that such a use belonged to Propertius' language: in Prop. 2.16.44, a feminine *chrysolithos* would require *quos* to be corrupt, and *lapis* is masculine in the passage that supports Heyworth's conjecture (*lapis Eoa lectus in unda*, [Sen.] Her. O. 662).³⁵

As for Giardina's *si te Eoa ex obryza iuuat aurea rete*, it combines the unwanted elision *te Eoa* with another unmetrical feature (which would also mar *Eoa si chrysolithus*...). Indeed, Propertian diction does not allow a molossic or choriambic word to occur before the hepthemimeral caesura and after a spondaic second foot if there is no elision at the third (penthemimeral) position. To put it the other way, we find hexameters with a dactylic second foot followed by a molossic or choriambic word, and with or without elision at the penthemimeral position,³⁶ and (in Book 2 only) hexameters with a spondaic second foot followed by a molossic or choriambic word, and with elision at the penthemimeral position,³⁷ but no line similar to Giardina's one. In addition, the feminine nominative *rete* (or possibly *retis*) that Giardina has to posit in order to account for dactylic *aurea*³⁸ is not independently attested.

35) See Heyworth (above, n. 3) 89–90; Fedeli (above, n. 6) 500.

36) Prop. 1.8.25, 1.9.1, 1.19.25 (see De Neubourg [above, n. 23] 121 on *inter nos*), 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.6.37, 2.8.31 (see n. 28), 2.9.9, 2.15.33, 2.15.51, 2.16.7, 2.18.19, 2.22.41, 2.30.13, 2.33.7, 2.34.33, 3.6.39, 3.9.1, 3.14.7 (see n. 31), 3.21.7, 3.21.17, 3.23.21, 4.3.3, 4.5.7, 4.7.5 (see n. 31), 4.8.63 (see n. 31), 4.8.83 (see n. 28).

37) Prop. 2.6.29, 2.14.3, 2.15.19 (see n. 33), 2.17.11, 2.23.3, 2.24.7, 2.24.23, 2.25.43. No such verse contains a trochaic word after the second (trihemimeral) strong position, and when the first word involved in the elision is spondaic, it ends in an enclitic (2.23.3, 2.24.23, 2.25.43) and / or precedes a (pseudo-)prefix (2.24.7, 2.24.23); which leads me to cast doubt on the metricality of *chrysolithus (lecta lapis) siue Eoa*... (see n. 34).

38) In Giardina's reconstruction, the final vowel of *Eoa* has a prosodically hidden quantity, since elegiac meter allows the elision of a long *-a* before a heavy

3. *A new solution*

At this point of the discussion, I think it only fair to say that no insightful reconstruction can be grounded on the hypothesis that verses 19–20 form a discourse unit, and that the bawd's speech, or a section of it, begins with verse 21. Let us now try to have a fresh look at the problem by examining each line separately.

3.1. *Verse 19*

Butler and Barber have the following to say about the first two words of verse 19: “Even if *exorabat opus* were a credible phrase (which it is not) there is no entreaty present in the injunctions of Acanthis”.³⁹ Those who agree with Butler and Barber in not considering *exorabat opus* a “credible phrase” may suspect *opus* only, *exorabat* only, or both.

3.1.1. If *exorabat* is authentic, it should refer to a speech act (consisting in the discourse reported afterwards) by means of which the speaker attempts or manages to get the hearer to bring about a certain state of affairs; this state of affairs may be described either by a subordinate clause or by an accusative noun phrase (see TLL, s. v.). In such a perspective, *exorabat opes* is an easy correction, independently supported by a parallel example of Ovid:⁴⁰

[...] *dea sum auxiliaris, opemque*
exorata fero. [...] (Ov. Met. 9.699–700)

However, no element in the subsequent direct speech, or in the whole poem, alludes to the greed of Acanthis, who turns out to live and die in abject poverty.⁴¹ Given that *exoro* can be used without

grammatical monosyllable or monosyllabic prefix; see Prop. 2.32.40 (*suppositā excipiens*) and Platnauer (above, n. 27) 75.

39) Butler and Barber (above, n. 1).

40) Heyworth (above, n. 3) 88; id., Cynthia (above, n. 1) 165.

41) See K. J. Gutzwiller, *The Lover and the Lena: Propertius 4.5*, Ramus 14, 1985, 106–7.

any explicit mention of the state of affairs aimed at or obtained (see TLL, s. v. 1584,65–82; e. g. Sen. Phoen. 496, Sen. Dial. (Ir.) 4.33.4, Quint. Inst. 11.1.52, Apul. Met. 9.29.2), *opus* might also result from the corruption of a nominative form that would designate the speaker herself, viz. Giardina's *anus*.⁴² This word can easily have shifted to *onus*, which alternates with *opus* in Prop. 3.1.22, Ov. Am. 3.3.40 and Sen. Phoen. 568.⁴³ Yet, I think *opus* should be maintained on the basis of another Propertian use of this item:

*sed uobis facile est uerba et componere fraudes:
hoc unum didicit femina semper opus.*

(Prop. 2.9.31–2)

This couplet aptly summarizes what Acanthis is aiming at, viz. that the girl be learnt to deceive men with the help of words or other artful tricks. If *opus* conveys such a contextually grounded meaning, then it does not function as an internal object (as assumed by the TLL and Rothstein); nor does it refer to the bawd's (supposedly successful) activity (as assumed by Pasoli). In addition, by focusing on the girl's misdemeanour, *opus* will automatically make the reader think of a possible sexual reading.⁴⁴

3.1.2. In order to maintain *opus*, many editors and commentators chose to correct *exorabat* into *exornabat* (ς) or *exercebat*.⁴⁵

42) In fact, Giardina (above, n. 3) prints *te exorabat anus*, which again gives rise to unmetricality, since elegiac diction does not allow the elision of a verse-initial monosyllable (see Norden [above, n. 27] 458; Soubiran [above, n. 25] 405, 412–20, 616, 633; Dominicy [above, n. 23] 54–55). The same blunder appears in Giardina's ([above, n. 3] 52, 126, 354) rewriting of Prop. 1.8.20: *te accipiat* ...; 2.9.15: *cum illi* ...; 4.5.44: *cum utitur* ...

43) See Hanslik (above, n. 1) 103; A. Ramírez de Verger (ed.), P. Ovidius Naso: *Carmina amatoria*, Munich / Leipzig 2003, 103; J. Viansino (ed.), L. Annaei Senecae *Hercules furens*. Troades. Phoenissae. Medea. Phaedra, Turin ²1968, 182. In Sen. Phaed. 882, Bothe corrected the vulgate *anus* into *opus* (Viansino 303). In Prop. 3.1.22 and Ov. Am. 3.3.40 (E. Baeza, J. A. Estévez and A. Ramírez de Verger, *The Amores of Ovid in the Fragmentum Trevirense*, ExClass 9, 2005, 78), *onus* also alternates with *honus* or *honus*.

44) TLL, s. v. 1588,31–3; M. Rothstein (ed.), *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*, Berlin, ²1920–4, II, 263; Pasoli (above, n. 7) 103. On the use of *opus* for designating intercourse, see J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore ²1991, 57, 154, 157.

45) Housman (above, n. 7) and Enk (above, n. 14) opt for *exercebat*.

While *exoro* belongs to Propertius' lexicon (see 3.18.23, 4.11.4; *exorabilis* in 2.30.11), *exorno* does not seem to be attested in Augustan poetry.⁴⁶ Although *exercebat* does not run against similar objections (see Prop. 1.1.33, 3.3.34, 3.14.3), two reasons lead me to conserve the paradosis. First, neither *exornabat* nor *exercebat* allow us to provide *opus* with the contextual meaning I have just characterized. Second, Butler and Barber's remark that "there is no entreaty present in the injunctions of Acanthis" proves semantically naïve if we confront it both with Speech Act Theory⁴⁷ and the data gathered s. v. in the TLL.

When referring to a simple entreaty (i. e. to a directive illocutionary act or a deliberative discourse act), *exoro* does not carry any implication that the addressee actually brought about, or will actually bring about, the state of affairs the speaker wants him/her to realize; the TLL deals with this use in section II. *c. vi preces fundendi* (s. v. 1587,66–1589,40). Frequently, however, *exoro* refers to a perlocutionary act, entailing thus that the corresponding illocutionary or discourse act was or will be satisfied, i. e. that it caused or will cause the addressee to bring about the state of af-

46) R. O. A. M. Lyne (ed.), *Ciris: a Poem attributed to Vergil*, Cambridge 1978, 161.

47) In Speech Act Theory, a directive illocutionary act (e. g. the lieutenant saying "Attention!") or a deliberative discourse act (e. g. a speech given by a political leader during an electoral campaign) aims at getting the addressee to bring about some state of affairs. The satisfaction of a directive or deliberative act entails the performance, by the speaker, of a perlocutionary act. Illocutionary and discourse acts may be successfully performed without being satisfied, but successful perlocutionary acts are necessarily satisfied: an order may be given without being obeyed, but if it is obeyed, the speaker has successfully performed the perlocutionary act that consists in linguistically compelling the addressee to bring about some state of affairs, and the addressee has brought about the state of affairs in hand. For further information, see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, ed. by J. O. Urmson, Oxford 1962; M. Dominicy, *Epideictic Rhetoric and the Representation of Human Decision and Choice*, in: K. Korta and J. Garmendia (eds.), *Meaning, Intentions, and Argumentation*, Stanford 2008, 179–207; M. Kissine, *Locutionary, Illocutionary, Perlocutionary*, *Language and Linguistic Compass* 2, 2008, 1189–1202; J. R. Searle, *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge 1969; Searle and D. Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, Cambridge 1985; Vanderveken, *Meaning and Speech Acts*, Cambridge 1990–1, 2 vols.; id., *Illocutionary Logic and Discourse Typology*, *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 55/216, 2001, 243–55; id., *Success, Satisfaction and Truth in Speech Acts and Formal Semantics*, in: S. Davis and B. S. Gillon (eds.), *Semantics: a Reader*, Oxford 2005, 710–34.

fairs in hand; the TLL deals with this use in section I. *praep. ex vim quasi perfectivam exercente* [...] subsection B. *usu artiore* (s. v. 1586,49–1587,65). When *exoro* is interpreted in perlocutionary terms, the emphasis is put on the causal efficiency of the act, rather than on the way the agent achieved his / her aim. Consequently, perlocutionary *exoro* also applies to effective causal processes that do not involve any entreaty, which paves the way for those non-literal uses where a causation takes place without involving any verbal behavior, nor even any real agent; this corresponds, in the TLL, to section I. *praep. ex vim quasi perfectivam exercente* [...] subsection A. *usu laxiore* (s. v. 1584,59–1586,49). In order to characterize the perlocutionary reading and the nonverbal causation reading, ancient lexicographers usually glossed *exoro* as *impetro* (TLL, s. v. 1584,31–8). For instance, *exorare deos* can mean either “entreat the gods (to do something)” (illocutionary or discourse act), as in Mart. 11.60.9, or “get the gods to do what one wants them to do” (perlocutionary act), as in Ov. Tr. 2.22. Similarly, *exorat pacem diuum* means “entreats the gods for benevolence” (illocutionary or discourse act) in Verg. A. 3.370, while *nondum pace numinum exorata* means “still not having obtained the gods’ benevolence” (perlocutionary act and / or non-verbal causation) in Amm. 23.5.4.

In order to further illustrate the perlocutionary use and the non-verbal causation use, let us consider the following two examples:

*bac longum florens animi morumque iuuenta,
Iliacos aequare senes, et uincere persta
quos pater Elysió, genetrix quos detulit annos:
hoc illi duras exorauere sorores,
hoc quae, te sub teste, situm fugitura tacentem
ardua magnanimi reuirescit gloria Blaesi.*
(Stat. Silv. 2.3.72–7)

facta merent odium, facies exorat amorem
(Ov. Am. 3.11b.11)

In Statius, the addressee will live a long time because his father and mother, as well as the glory of the late Blaesus (celebrated by the

addressee), have swayed the Parcae:⁴⁸ the repeated accusative noun phrase *hoc* refers to the state of affairs produced; whereas the addressee's parents may have performed an illocutionary or discourse act, no action of Blaesus, be it verbal or not, has triggered the causation at work. In Ovid, the girl's beauty inspires men with love (i. e. causes them to love her); again, the accusative noun phrase refers to the state of affairs produced, while no action, be it verbal or not, comes to trigger the causation at work.

Propertius could clearly use *exoro* with a perlocutionary value:

*cum semel infernas intrarunt funera leges,
non exorato stant adamante uiae.
te licet orantem fuscae deus audiat aulae
nempe tuas lacrimas litora surda bibent.*

(Prop. 4.11.3–6)

Verse 5 shows that, in this passage (as in Amm. 23.5.4, but in contrast to Ov. Met. 9.700), the participial form does not apply to an entity that has simply (not) been entreated for something, but to an entity that is known (not) to have been got to do what the people in question tried to obtain, and thus has proved (in)accessible to their attempt – so that *non exorato* stands here for a contextually determined *inexorabili*, as happens in Ov. Met. 7.591.⁴⁹

If we turn back to verse 19 with all these data in mind, we can provide *exorabat opus* with a plausible perlocutionary interpretation: through the simple force of her words, without any entreating, Acanthis was able to cause the girl to play fast and loose with men; this is confirmed by verse 63 (see 2.1.1, above and 3.3.1, be-

48) According to the TLL, s. v. 1988,39–40 and Shackleton Bailey (ed.), Statius: *Silvae*, Cambridge, Mass. / London 2003, 143, *exorauere* refers to a simple illocutionary or discourse act (“beg”), while J. H. Mozley (ed.), Statius I, Cambridge, Mass. / London 1928, 113, and H. Frère and H. J. Izaac (eds.), *Stace: Silves. Tome I (Livres I–III)*, Paris 1944, 75 clearly opt for a perlocutionary and nonverbal causation reading (“win”, “obtain”) which is much more natural in an encomiastic context.

49) I fail to understand why Goold (ed., above, n. 3) 438, Paralipomena Propertiana, HSCPh 94, 1992, 317, Hutchinson (above, n. 1) 55, and Heyworth (ed., above, n. 1) 186, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 503 choose to print Fruter's *exorando* in Prop. 4.11.4. See TLL, s. v. 1585,16–20; Fedeli (above, n. 1) 245.

low). The accusative noun phrase *opus* thus refers to the state of affairs the bawd was creating. Given that her discourse proved to have such a magical power, the ablative *uerbis* probably echoes Tib. 1.5.43–4:⁵⁰

*non facit hoc uerbis, facie tenerisque lacertis
deuouet et flauis nostra puella comis.*

(Tib. 1.5.43–4)

3.1.3. Among the last three words of the line, *blanda* seems the most secure; but nothing requires it to be a singular feminine form, as usually assumed. Indeed, the awkwardness of intransitive *perure* disappears if we correct it into *per ora* (cf. verse-final *grata per arma* in Prop. 3.8.29). From a palaeographical viewpoint, a corruption *per ora* > *perure* looks most plausible: the influence of *corabat* induced some scribe to read *perora* as an imperative (cf. *causa perorata est* in Prop. 4.11.99); the subsequent drift to *perure* stemmed both from trivial confusions of letters and from the semantic oddity of *perora* in this context. The prepositional phrase *per ora* occurs twice in Propertius.⁵¹ In the first example (3.13.12), it is best rendered by “in full view of” (TLL, s. v. 1087,33–42); in the second one (Prop. 4.9.10), it substitutes for the common expression *per os* “through one’s mouth” (see e. g. Lucr. 3.122; TLL, s. v. 1077,1–5), due to the reference to Cacus’ teratological body. In the epic diction, *per ora* typically applies to different individuals

50) Since Tib. 1.5 is one of the main sources of our elegy (Günther [above, n. 1] 373), this parallel provides a reason for conserving *uerbis* in both poems (Maltby [above, n. 8] 252; pace Günther, *Tibullus ludens*, *Eikasmos* 5, 1994, 262 n. 58); such a use of *uerba* also occurs in Verg. G. 3.283 = 2.129 and Hor. Ep. 1.1.34. The etymological word-play on *facio* and *facies*, present in Tib. 1.5.43 and Ov. Am. 3.11b.11 (see Günther, *ibid.*; Maltby, *ibid.*; id. [above, n. 30] 219), emphasizes the causal power of the entity at work. Goold’s *tenebris* (for *uerbis*) would not be irrelevant in this context (pace Heyworth), but Propertius always locates forms of *tenebrae* in hexameter-final position (2.20.17, 2.26.55, 3.15.17, 3.16.5, 4.9.91), thus with a bacchiac scansion; anapaestic *tenebris* is a questionable correction both in 2.6.31 for *terris* (Fontein) and in 4.11.15 for *noctes*. See Goold, *Noctes* (above, n. 3) 84–5; id., On Editing Propertius, in: N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch’s Eightieth Birthday*, London 1988, 37; id. (ed., above, n. 3) 394, 440; Heyworth, *Cynthia* (above, n. 1) 136, 506; id. (above, n. 3) 87.

51) For a third, conjectural, example, see M. Dominicy, *L’élégie III, 22 de Propertius*, AC, forthcoming, where the corrupt paradosis of 3.22.15 is corrected into *etsi qua aura egit uisenda per ora Caystri*.

(TLL, s. v. 1080,60–8); but *per ora* can also constitute an elevated variant of *per os*: like other poets, Propertius frequently resorts to *ora* for designating one visage, head or mouth only.⁵²

The TLL, s. v. 2038,79–2039,45 lists numerous collocations of *blandus* with terms referring to speech or organs of speech: see e. g. Ov. Ars 1.701 (*blanda uoce*) and Val. Fl. 8.63 (*blanda poscit me pabula lingua*) which clearly imitates Prop. 4.8.7.⁵³ A stock-epithet of *meretrices* (Pl. Men. 261–2; Cic. N. D. 1.27.77; Ov. Am. 1.15.19–20; Sen. Con. 1.2.2, 1.2.12; Juv. 6.125), *blandus* easily applies to deceitful or harmful discourse (Publ. Sent. 252; Pompon. Com. 164).⁵⁴ Moreover, its combination with *ora* appears in other poetic texts:

et ora dammis blanda praebebunt lupi
(Sen. Phaed. 572)

blanda Cupidinei cur non amet ora Labyrtae
(Mart. 7.87.9)

Seneca's example involves deceit and harm, while Martial's one confirms that *blanda* [...] *ora* can apply to one individual only. Since, except for 3.15.14, Propertius' uses of *in ora* (2.1.2, 3.1.24, 3.9.32) and *per ora* (3.13.12, 4.9.10) are clear imitations of Ennius or Virgil,⁵⁵ we may reasonably assume *blanda per ora* to be an in-

52) See Prop. 1.6.16, 2.1.2, 2.9.10, 2.30.18, 2.33.11, 3.3.5, 3.3.52, 3.7.56, 3.8.6, 3.15.14, 3.15.38, 3.22.8, 4.1.93, 4.6.1, 4.7.10, 4.8.64, 4.9.21.

53) Enk (above, n. 26) I, 59.

54) See Housman (above, n. 7); Kershaw (above, n. 1); Prop. 1.9.30, 1.15.42, 1.20.42, 2.19.4, 3.23.17–18. This disposes with Goold's (Noctes [above, n. 3] 83) objection to *blanda*: "there is nothing bland about the bawd's speech, a stark exhortation to a mercenary life".

55) Enn. Var. 18 Vahlen (Cic. Tusc. 1.14.34); Verg. G. 3.9, A. 10.790, 11.296, 12.235; also Man. 2.897, 2.916. On Prop. 2.1.2, 3.1.24 and 3.9.32, see W. Wimmel, Kallimachos in Rom: die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit, Wiesbaden 1960, 40, 218; F. Quadlbauer, Properz 3,1, Philologus 112, 1968, 110–1; P. Fedeli (ed.), Properzio: il Libro Terzo delle Elegie, Bari 1985, 73–4, 320–1; id. (above, n. 6) 44–5; A. Álvarez Hernández, La poética de Propertio: autobiografía artística del "Calímaco romano", Assisi 1997, 93, 107, 134–5, 177, 209. In Prop. 3.13.11–2, we find an echo of both Sal. Jug. 31.10 and Verg. A. 1.46–7, already imitated in Prop. 2.2.5–6; see M. Rothstein, Properz und Virgil, Hermes 24, 1889, 32; Richardson (above, n. 5) 219; Fedeli, *ibid.*, 422–3; id. (above, n. 6) 113–4; Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 115. For Prop. 4.9.10, see Cacus' episode in Verg. A. 8.193–267.

tertextual clue pointing to one or another of those poets; I will show that the evidence available clearly favors Virgil.

3.1.4. Once we accept *blanda per ora*, the only option left for correcting *ceu* is Housman's *heu*. This pathetic particle does not sound strange in a line that emphasizes the magical power of Acanthis' harmful words; moreover, the use of *heu* after the hept-hemimeral caesura is another Virgilian feature (G. 4.498; A. 11.273, 12.452), also imitated in Sil. 6.65 and Val. Fl. 3.562, 4.371.

3.2. Verse 20

3.2.1. In verse 20, *turba* (ζ) is a very plausible substitute for *culpa*: *turba* frequently alternates with *c*-initial words; see e. g. *turba* (LPζ) instead of *cumba* in Prop. 3.3.22 (under the influence of verse 24), *cura* (ζ) instead of *turba* in Prop. 3.3.31, and *turba* (ζ) instead of *corda* in Prop. 4.1.12.⁵⁶ Once *turba* is corrupted into *curba*, it can easily merge with *curua*, *culba*, *culpa*.⁵⁷ Moreover, the collocation *sedula turba* undoubtedly belongs to elegiac diction (Tib. 1.4.80; Ov. Rem. 182).

3.2.2. Since the imperative *perure* as well as any similar subjunctive form have been ruled out, we may assume *ferat* to stem from an originally indicative form, viz. *terit* (Wakker, Waardenburgh) or *ferit* (Jacob). Both verbs can combine with *saxosam* [...] *uiam* if *turba* refers to a crowd of passers-by (as e. g. in Prop. 4.2.5, 4.2.56; Mart. 10.12.10); but I think *ferit* should be preferred for two

56) Butler and Barber (above, n. 1); Heyworth (above, n. 3); Hanslik (above, n. 1) 107; Butrica (above, n. 1) 123.

57) See the alternations *culpa-cura* in Prop. 1.8.1 and *curba-cura-cara* in Ps.-Tib. [Lygd.] 3.3.32 (already mentioned in 2.1.3, above); the corruption *cur ea sunt* > *curba sunt* > *curuascunt* in Lucr. 3.482 (J. Martin [ed.], T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri sex, Leipzig ⁵1963, 104); *uerba* for *uerpa* in Catul. 28.12 (W. Eisenhut [ed.], Catulli Veronensis Liber, Leipzig 1983, 19); *saepe* for *saene* in Prop. 2.25.12 (Hanslik [above, n. 1] 79); and the list of *u-p* confusions provided by Housman (above, n. 7) 102. The apparently strange alternation between *turba* and *musa* in Ov. Am. 3.15.19 (M. L. West, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts, Stuttgart 1973, 145; Ramírez de Verger [above, n. 43] 140) follows from a similar process: *turba* = *curba* = *curua* (iiiiia) = *musa*.

reasons. First, *ferit* would imply repetition over a rather long period of time.⁵⁸ Second, *turba* and *saxosus* usually convey the notion of a noise; which provides *ferit* with a straightforward motivation. The auditory suggestions of *turba* (*turba sonans* in Verg. A. 3.233, 6.753 and 12.248) are confirmed by the ancient etymologizing ἀπὸ τοῦ θορυβείν;⁵⁹ they originate in the morphological relationship of *turba* with *turbo* (see Prop. 1.3.17 and the striking echoes in 4.8.1–2, 4.8.58–60). Those of *saxosus*, though stemming from everyday experience, appear in Virgil's poetic language as connotations automatically triggered by the literary use of the term.⁶⁰ A similar conclusion holds for *saxa* (and occasionally *saxum* or *saxeus*); interestingly enough, Propertius imitates this feature of Virgil's diction in three passages.⁶¹ Moreover, he frequently associates *uia* with sounds and noises.⁶² If the line evokes a busy crowd passing down a stone-paved street, one expects part of the noise perceived to be produced by human feet and animal hooves (see *Amazonidum* [...] *turba* in Prop. 3.14.13–14). This hypothesis provides *ferit* with a strong semantic motivation.⁶³

58) Compare with Prop. 2.25.15–7, 2.25.26, 3.18.22 and with the use of *contero* in Prop. 1.7.9, 2.1.46, 2.23.15.

59) Maltby (above, n. 30) 626.

60) See Verg. Ecl. 5.84; G. 4.370; Rothstein (above, n. 44) II, 263. For a clear imitation of this use, see Stat. Theb. 4.801–2.

61) Verg. G. 1.109–10, 1.473–9, 3.239, 4.49–50; A. 1.200–2, 2.307–8, 3.432, 3.554–77, 5.201–7, 5.866, 6.171–5, 6.550–1, 7.567, 7.586–90, 8.209–50, 9.709–16, 9.808–11, 11.296–9 (with *per ora* [...] *turbata*), 12.591–2, 12.921–3; Prop. 1.18.31–2, 4.4.9–10, 4.8.17–9 (1.18.21 and 1.18.31 obviously echo Ecl. 1.5; see Fedeli [above, n. 17] 438).

62) Prop. 3.10.26, 3.18.4, 4.7.4 (to be compared with 3.16.25–6); see also Verg. A. 1.422. Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 4) 194–5 and Fedeli (above, n. 55) 548 claim that 3.18.4 only refers to the noise produced by the traffic on the road; but as pointed out by Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 382, the intertextual link to Verg. G. 2.161–4 clearly favors an allusion to the beating of waves.

63) See Verg. G. 3.499–500; Tib. 2.5.85; Ov. Fast. 1.506; Germ. Arat. 464–5 (TLL, s. v. 510,60–72). [Sen.] Her. O. 1924–6 and Stat. Theb. 6.401 are imitations of Verg. G. 3.499–500 and Germ. Arat. 465; another potential example: Sen. Tro. 13 with transmitted *ferit* (Viansino [above, n. 43] 83).

3.3. *The arguments for a transposition*

If reconstructed this way, verse 20 cannot form a coherent couplet with verse 19. Instead of postulating a lacuna, I suggest to mutually transpose 19 and 21, so as to get the following sequence: 21–20–19–22 (see Appendix and Figure 1). Since *placet* in 23 may receive an implicit grammatical object (see Prop. 2.23.14, 3.6.24), we only need a slight correction at the beginning of 22 (*si* for *et*) to obtain a perfect transition from 19 to the bawd's speech.⁶⁴ Under this hypothesis, the verse order transmitted by all extant manuscripts partly stems from a syntactic mistake: some scribe failed to notice the ἀπό κοινοῦ use of *placet* in 22–3 and therefore wanted to create a straight connection between 21 and 22 by construing *quae* [...] *aqua* as the second grammatical subject of *inuat* – which logically led him to replace *si* with *et*. At that time, verse 21 was so deeply altered that one could associate it semantically with 22 – more on this in 3.4.

3.3.1. In order to make sense of verse 20 and the imperfect *exorabat* in 19, we first have to take a decision about the contextual import of this inflectional marking. According to Hubbard, *exorabat* can be interpreted either as a “general” imperfect – i. e. with a habitual reading (“She used to . . .”) – or as a “narrative tense” that conveys an anaphorical reference to the time at which the previously recounted events took place (“She was . . .ing”).⁶⁵ In my view, the habitual reading should be dismissed.

On the one hand, the habitual reading rules out the (quite natural) hypothesis that *exorabat* might introduce the direct report of a speech produced by Acanthis in a specific setting; on the other hand, the use of *nec* in verses 41 and 49 prevents us from viewing this section of the poem as an inarticulate accumulation of pieces of advice given on different occasions. So the only option left, if *exorabat* is habitual, consists in assuming, rather counterintuitively, that we are provided either with a synthetic reconstruction of various utterances of the bawd, or with a model of the lectures she

64) For other examples, in Propertius, of a sequence of verses that directly reports speech or thought, and begins with a pentameter, see 2.29.8–9, 2.29.12–20, 3.23.12–4, 4.6.80–4.

65) Hubbard (above, n. 4) 137–8.

would give on courtesan life each time she had to persuade Ego's girl friend to indulge (or keep indulging) in debauchery.

Hubbard also points out that the preference for the habitual reading strongly constrains the interpretation of verses 63–4, as well as the range of possible emendations in the pentameter:⁶⁶

His animos nostrae dum uersat Acanthis amicae, 63
per tenues ossa sunt numerata cutes. 64

It is well-known that late and medieval scribes tolerated the unmetrical lengthening of a short vowel (especially of a short *-a*) in hemistich-final position; a comparable corruption appears in 2.13.25: *sat mea sit magna si tres sint pompa libelli*. It follows that *ossa* should be supplemented with additional material, and maybe transposed. Most modern editors and commentators replace the plural *tenues* [...] *cutes* with the singular *tenuem* [...] *cutem*.⁶⁷ Indeed, plural forms of *cutis* only appear in later writers and in specific contexts: reference to skins of animals, hybrids or monsters, to skinning or torture; purely physiological aspects of the human body, considered from a medical or Christian perspective.⁶⁸ Furthermore, the collocation with *per* ("through") deprives the plural of any semantic motivation. If corrected into *per tenuem ossa* ..., the first hemistich of verse 64 has to end either in an iamb or in a sequence of two heavy monosyllables, the first of which should begin in a vowel.⁶⁹ Palmer printed *suam*; Jacob opted for *mibi*, which gives rise to ambiguity since the dative can be agentive or denote the possessor and person concerned.⁷⁰ Barber's *a me* or Giardina's *meam* eliminate this disturbing hesitation.⁷¹

66) See Smyth (above, n. 3) 145 for the details. I assume *animus* (NLPT) to be a corruption of *animos* (see 3.15.5–6, 3.17.2).

67) See, in particular, Housman (above, n. 7) 1118–20; Fedeli (above, n. 1) 167.

68) See TLL, s. v. 1578,24–7. Reference to skins of animals, hybrids or monsters, to skinning or torture: Mela 2.14; Plin. Nat. 6.200.1, 7.2.12, 11.45.128; Arnob. Nat. 2.77; Sol. 15.3, 56.12; Amm. 23.6.80, 31.2.14; Vict. Vit. 2.25, 3.25. Purely physiological aspects of the human body from a medical perspective: Chiron 220, 669, 707; Isid. Orig. 4.8.4; from a Christian perspective: Tert. Cult. fem. 1.9.3, Resurr. 7.6, 32.5; Arnob. Nat. 3.13, 4.23; Gaudent. Serm. 17.25; Ps.-Prosp. [Quoduultdeus] Prom. 2.36.82; Iren. 5.15.1.

69) Platnauer (above, n. 27) 23.

70) J. S. Phillimore, *Sexti Properti carmina*, Oxford 21907, Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 4) 243 and Fedeli (above, n. 1) 32, 167 follow Palmer, while Jacob's *mibi*

While the narrative reading of *exorabat* does not prevent verse 64 from describing the bawd's repulsive appearance, the habitual reading requires it to apply to Ego, and thus selects *meam* or non-agentive *mibi* among the various corrections available. But the authors who adopt this last hypothesis systematically neglect the strain it puts on the use of present *uersat* (with *dum*) or perfect *sunt numerata*. If *exorabat* is narrative and introduces the direct report of a speech produced on a specific occasion, *uersat* is 'historical' and the pentameter conveys a hyperbolic description of Ego's mental and / or bodily state; it follows that *sunt numerata* should be arbitrarily endowed with an unexpressed modal value.⁷² If *exorabat* is habitual and introduces a synthesis or model of Acanthis' verbal behavior, *sunt numerata* characterizes in literal terms the final outcome of a long-term process, so that the temporal reference of (*dum*) *uersat* should – quite unnaturally – cover a wide interval. In the passage from Ovid that is generally quoted in support of an Ego-centered interpretation of the pentameter, the surrounding context clearly alludes to the passing of time:

*Nam neque sunt uires, nec qui color esse solebat:
uix habeo tenuem, quae tegat ossa, cutem.*

(Ov. Tr. 4.6.41–2)

Notice, in addition, that the 'historical' interpretation of (*dum*) *uersat* is underlined by a twofold contrast: *dum uernat* (59: temporal reference to a wide interval of months or years) versus *dum uersat* (63); *uidi ego* (61: about a visual experience of Acanthis' that

is adopted by: Housman (above, n. 7) 1118–20; Richmond (above, n. 11) 355; Butler and Barber (above, n. 1) 132, 354–5; Tränkle (above, n. 14) 117; W. A. Camps (ed.), Propertius: Elegies. Book IV, Cambridge 1965, 26, 102–103; Pasoli (above, n. 7) 67–68, 106–7; Hubbard (above, n. 4) 138; Goold (above, n. 2) 97–8; id. (ed., above, n. 3) 398–9; Heyworth (ed., above, n. 1) 167; id., Cynthia (above, n. 1) 596.

71) E. A. Barber (ed.), Sexti Properti Carmina, Oxford 21960, 148 (see also Hanslik [above, n. 1] 170; Hutchinson [above, n. 1] 41, 149–50); Giardina (above, n. 3) 356.

72) See e.g. Goold (ed., above, n. 3) 399: "With Acanthis thus working on my sweetheart's mind, the bones could be counted through my shrunken skin"; Giardina (above, n. 3) 357: "Per tutto il tempo in cui Acantide si lavorava la mente della mia amante, mi si sarebbero potute contare le ossa attraverso la mia pelle assottigliata"; Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 596: "While Acanthis worked over the mind of my girl with these precepts, my bones could be counted through my thin skin".

was likely to recur, possibly during years) versus *uidi ego* (67: about Ego's short-time and unique perception of the bawd's death).

One can even question the consensus of most recent editors and commentators about the unacceptability of *tenuēs* [...] *cutes*. After all, the negative overtones of *cutes* will prove welcome as soon as verse 64, by applying to Acanthis, both express Ego's repulsion for her and remind us of her capacity of metamorphosing into a wolf (verse 14). Mueller's⁷³ palmary conjecture *ossa inter tenuēs* makes it possible to maintain the plural, while providing us with a plausible account of the corruption process. Due to the elision and the vicinity of *tenuēs*, *inter* first reduced to *ter* (see e. g. *illum tergeminae* for *illum inter geminae* in Ps.-Tib. [Pan. Mess.] 3.7.70);⁷⁴ the final paradosis results both from the replacement of *ter* with *per* for semantic reasons, and from a frustrated attempt to restore meter by moving *ossa* to the hemistich-final position. Interestingly enough, we can put forth a similar account for verse 2.13.25, quoted above, provided we adopt Belling's emendation *sit mea magna satis*:⁷⁵ a scribe who confused verse-initial *sit* with *sat* ended writing *sat mea magna sit*; again, the transposition of *magna* was triggered by a frustrated attempt to regain metricality.

3.3.2. In view of the preceding evidence, we may take it for granted that *exorabat* is a narrative imperfect. But it does not seem possible for it to refer anaphorically to the point of time corresponding to present *ferit*, which could hardly acquire a 'historical' value. Consequently, we are led to think that the anaphorical link 'jumps over' verses 21–20 so as to connect *exorabat* with the perfects *eruit*, *consuluit* and *lęgit* of verses 15–8.

In order to capture the role of such a marked discourse structure, I will assume that verse 20 describes the noise of the street at daybreak, when people resume their journey or work. If this interpretive frame is correct, we can expect verse 21 to share the same temporal reference. Since the wrongdoings of witches like Acanthis typically take place during the night (verse 14: *nocturno*), the

73) Mueller (above, n.33) xliii, 104.

74) H. Tränkle (ed.), Appendix Tibulliana, Berlin / New York 1990, 39.

75) Smyth (above, n.3) 48.

abrupt succession of perfect and present indicative forms probably underlines the twofold contrast between night and morning, and between the corresponding affects of fear and relief.

3.4. Verse 21

If 20 refers to morning noise, it would be very natural for the modified version of 21 to deal with daybreak light. Furthermore, any sensible emendation should account for the corruption process that came to produce the fanciful word *dorozantum*.

3.4.1. In the main manuscripts, *dorozantum* (NT) alternates with *derorantum* (L) and *de rorantum* (FP). Since the copyists of L, F and P could hardly err on the prosody of *de(-)*, we are entitled to infer that they (incorrectly) scanned *Eoa* as an anapaestic ablative modifying *ripā*, with postposed *de* in FP.⁷⁶ Consequently, they had to construe *aurea* with *concha* (“oyster”, “shell”) used ἀπό κοινοῦ and metonymically – so that *concha* might refer to pearls coming “from the Eastern shore” of the Red Sea or the Persian Gulf in verse 21,⁷⁷ and to purple in verse 22. As for (*de*)*rorantum*, the only option left was to understand it as a plural genitive of *rorans* or **derorans*. This hypothesis led scribes of later manuscripts to shift to the singular accusative by writing *deroratum* (ς), but this masculine form of **deroro* implied a reference to Ego that did not agree with the overall interpretation of the passage. The obvious solution, both semantically and palaeographically, was *derorantem* (ς), which Beroaldo glossed as “capiti auri roramenta respergentem”, presumably on the basis of Prop. 2.22.9–10.⁷⁸ At that stage, the literal translation of verses 21–2 sounded as follows: “If, in order to sparkle [with gems and delicate fabrics], you are fond of the luminous pearl [coming] from the Eastern shore [of the Red Sea,

76) Even if the anapaestic scansion could apply to *Eoa*, this occurrence of a molossic word after a spondaic second foot would still give rise to unmetricality (see 2.2.3, above).

77) See Prop. 1.8.39, 1.14.12, 2.22.10, 3.4.2, 3.13.6 and numerous parallel passages in other authors (Housman [above, n. 7] 249; Fedeli [above, n. 17] 227, 328; id. [above, n. 6] 634; Navarro Antolín [above, n. 20] 221–6; J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores. A Commentary on Book Two*, Leeds 1998, 240).

78) See Rose (above, n. 34) 331; Fedeli (above, n. 6) 633–4.

the Persian Gulf] and of the proud purple lying beneath the Tyrian waters”; such an association of pearls with purple was topical in Latin literature (see n. 77).

Though most of this amounts to sheer nonsense, I think we owe at least one crucial insight to Renaissance scholars. Indeed, the occurrence of some form of *roro* perfectly fits in with my earlier assumption that verse 21 deals with daybreak light – all the more so since the verb belongs to Propertius’ lexicon.⁷⁹ Since the confusion between the *-em* and *-um* endings is palaeographically trivial, *rorantem* appears as a plausible candidate.⁸⁰ But we cannot maintain it before the hephthemimeral caesura: as shown in 2.2.2 above, Propertian meter does not allow a trochaic division of the second foot to be followed by a monosyllable and a molossic (or choriambic) word unless this word begins with a (pseudo-)prefix. My guess is that the original reading *rorat* appeared between the penthemimeral and the hephthemimeral caesura, as in 4.1.123, and that some scribe altered it into *rorantem* (possibly from a misspelling *rorāt* interpreted as *rorant* or *rorans*) because he applied it to Ego: after all, given all the evil spells Acanthis has supposedly been casting on Ego, it would be only too natural for him to sweat or weep.⁸¹

Obviously, *rorat* needs a noun to combine with, since we cannot expect *Eoa*, *rorat* and *aurea* to be jointly predicated of *ripa* (or whatever it stands for). Feminine *dies* (“light”) will do the job.⁸² Propertius uses *dies* with undeterminate gender to refer to daylight in 4.6.85–6 and he toys with the two semantic values of feminine *dies* in the following passage:

79) Prop. 3.2.8 (*rorantes*), 4.1.123 (*rorat*). See also *roridus* in 2.30.26 and 4.4.48; *ros* in 2.26.2; *roscidus* in 1.20.36.

80) See e.g. *custodem* (LP₅) for *custodum* in Prop. 3.8.13 (Hanslik [above, n. 1] 117), and *pastorem* for *pastorum* in Prop. 4.2.39 (M. Dominicy, Notes critiques sur l’*élégie* IV, 2 de Properce, Latomus, forthcoming).

81) For *roro* = “drip”, see Prop. 3.2.8; for *roro* (literally or metaphorically) applied to weeping, see Lucr. 2.977, 3.469; Ov. Met. 13.621–2, Fast. 3.402–3; Man. 5.564 (Housman [ed.], M. Manili Astronomicon. Liber Quintus, Philadelphia / London / Toronto 1930, 73); Ciris 253 (Lyne [above, n. 46] 206); Pervig. Ven. 15–21 and Fulg. Myth. 1.11 (L. Catlow [ed.], Pervigilium Veneris, Brussels 1980, 64, 67–8). On the possible negative overtones of *rorat* in Prop. 4.1.123, see J. B. Debrohun, Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy, Ann Arbor 2003, 108–9.

82) See e.g. Verg. A. 5.42; Ov. Ep. 19.122, Met. 5.444; Man. 3.187; Luc. 7.787; Sen. Her. F. 586; Sil. 6.452, 8.192; Val. Fl. 1.505, 1.655, 1.843–4, 3.257–8, 4.730; Stat. Theb. 1.200–1, 5.479, 12.99.

*nec sic caelestem flagrans amor Herculis Heben
sensit in Oetaeis gaudia prima iugis.
una dies omnes potuit praecurrere amantes;
nam tibi non tepidas subdidit illa faces.*

(Prop. 1.13.23–6)

Verses 23–4 conflate Hercules' agony on his pyre with the first sexual joys of his (literally) burning love for Hebe;⁸³ this symbolic equation, which allows us to maintain *in* (verse 24), relies on the tradition that links Oeta to either sunset (and death) or sunrise (and birth).⁸⁴ Consequently, the initial collocation *una dies* in verse 25 refers both to a particular day (as in Lucr. 3.898–9, which deals with death) and to a uniquely luminous and warm sunrise (or sexual arousal) that parallels splendidly with the flames of Hercules' pyre (or with the potency of any other lover). The second reading accounts not only for the relevance of the following *nam* clause, but also for the word-play on *praecurrere*, which can be interpreted as “surpass” if applied to the day in question, or as “to run ahead of cycle” if metonymically applied to an exceptional rising sun.⁸⁵

The resulting sequence *Eoa dies rorat* (> *rorantem*) meets the constraints of meter while providing us with a plausible input for the corruption process: from *dies rorantem* one easily derives *dororantem* > *dororantum* > *dorozantum*; *dies* may have been spelt *dis* (see *requis* for *requies* in Lucr. 6.931),⁸⁶ and the shift from *dur-* to *dor-* was surely favored by the subsequent groups *-or-* and *aur-*.

3.4.2. Since the alteration of *rorat* into *rorantem* required *iuuat* to mean “help”, we may assume that *iuuat* itself is corrupt, and stands for a verbal form that did not license such an interpretative move, in that it described some aspect of daybreak light. By correcting *iuuat* into *micat*, we get a sequence of predicates (*Eoa dies rorat micat*) that looks coherent. Moreover, the confusion be-

83) Hodge and Buttimore (above, n. 33) 158–9; Papangelis (above, n. 6) 58–60; Riesenweber (above, n. 8) 133.

84) See Catul. 62.7; Verg. Ecl. 8.31; Ciris 349–50 (Lyne [above, n. 46] 250–1); Culex 203; Sen. Her. F. 132–3; [Sen.] Her. O. 861–2, 1438–46; Sil. 6.452–3.

85) See TLL, s. v. 516, 75–81; Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 19.

86) Martin (above, n. 57) 266.

tween *iuuat* and *micat* does not run against any palaeographical objection.⁸⁷

3.4.3. From all this it follows that the corrupt reading *iuuat* only came to mean “pleases to” after *dies rorantem* had given *dororantum*. Since Renaissance times, editors and commentators hold it that *Dorozantum*, if authentic, should refer to an Eastern place or people called *Dorozantes* (“*Indiae populi*” for Beroaldo).⁸⁸ This seems retrospectively obvious to anybody who tries to find some meaningful content in the text transmitted by F, L and P. But, in my view, the real story was different. Late and medieval Latin used feminine *-um* forms in the nominative case for designating certain cities or regions;⁸⁹ this results from the previous existence of feminine accusatives like *Byzantium*, *Ilium*, *Lugdunum*, *Saguntum*, *Sirmium*, . . .⁹⁰ and from the fact that, in most cases, the construction in hand could be interpreted as involving the ellipsis of *urbs*, *ciuitas* or *prouincia*. Thus, *Dororantum*, or N and T’s *Dorozantum*, probably functioned as the grammatical subject of *iuuat* while being modified both by *aurea* and by the ablative of quality *Eoa* [. . .] *ripa*. The (incorrect) anapaestic scansion of *Eoa* went hand in hand with the semantic motivation of *doro{r,z}antum* by *aurea*, which endowed this fancied proper name with a dispondaic scansion subsequently maintained in *de(-)rorantum* and its derivatives (see

87) See e.g. *inimica* for *minuta* in Catul. 25.12 (Eisenhut [above, n. 57] 18); *iurauisset* (F) for *minuisset* in Prop. 2.13.47, *minis* (F) for *uiuus* in Prop. 2.15.36, *micant* (F) for *uincant* in Prop. 4.5.27 and *mica* (F) for *unca* in Prop. 4.10.44 (Housman [above, n. 7] 261; Hanslik [above, n. 1] 59, 63, 168, 188); *iure-mire* for *uirum* in Petr. 119.27 and *missa* for *iussa* in Petr. 123.190 (A. Ernout [ed.], *Pétrone: le Satiricon*, Paris ⁸1974, 136, 143).

88) Rose (above, n. 34) 331.

89) See e.g. Oros. Hist. 3.13.2: *Byzantium*; F. Glorie et al. (eds.), *Itineraria et alia geographica* (Corpus Christianorum. Series latina 175), Turnhout 1965, 361 (7th Century): *Ariminum*, 368 (9–10th Century): *Beneuentum*; J. A. Estévez Sola (ed.), *Chronica Naierensis* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 71a), Turnhout 1995, 25 (12th Century): *Toletum*; T. van de Loo (ed.), Conradus de Mure: *Fabularius* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 210), Turnhout 2006, 363 (13th Century): *Mediolanum*; J. Fernández Valverde (ed.), Roderic Ximenii de Rada *Breviarium Historie Catholice* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 72a,b), Turnhout 1992–3 (13th Century), 357: *Bizancium*, 442: *Arminium*, *Beneuentum*.

90) Eutr. 6.6.3: *Byzantium*; Amm. 22.8.3: *Ilium*; Amm. 16.11.4: *Lugdunum*; Sil. 2.105: *Saguntum*; Amm. 29.6.7: *Sirmium*. See F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Berlin / Leipzig 1892–1905, I, 946–8.

3.4.1, above). In other words, the scribe who, relying on the topical association of pearls with purple, transposed 21 before 22 understood this new couplet as follows: “If you are fond of golden Doro{r,z}antum with its Eastern shore and of the proud purple lying beneath the Tyrian waters”.

3.4.4. The semantic mutation of *iuuat* also accounts, in part, for the metrically suspect opening *si te Eoa*, which I think should be corrected into *hic Eoa*, with temporal *hic*. Manuscripts exhibit frequent hesitations between *hic*, *sic* and *sit*.⁹¹ A copyist faced with such a sequence as *stutoa* was likely to read it as *sic Coa*, *sit Coa*, *sic Eoa* or *sit Eoa*; indeed, the various forms of *Cous* and *Eous* frequently mix up⁹² and the use of *Coae* in verse 23 surely favored such a confusion. Not only did *si te Eoa* remedy (for the scribes, at least) the metrical infelicity of *sit Eoa* while ruling out any confusion with *Coa*; it also made grammatically explicit the semantic relation between *iuuat* and Acanthis’ addressee.

3.4.5. As I have reconstructed it, verse 21 cannot end with *ripa*. What we need is a word that *aurea* can modify both in the original text (with *micat* as the verb predicate) and in the corrupt states of the line as long as *iuuat* keeps meaning “helps” – a word, in addition, for which *ripa* will substitute naturally once *dies rorantem* has been altered into *doro{r,z}antum*. I bet on *rima*, a Propertian item (see 1.16.27, 4.1.146; *rimosus* in 2.17.16) that can refer to a fissure or a slit, and metonymically to a ray. The corruption *rima* > *riua* > *ripa* is palaeographically trivial; among Housman’s examples of *u-p* confusions (see n. 57), one finds *riuis* for *ripis* (Hor. Epod. 2.25).⁹³ From a cognitive viewpoint, the shift from *rima-riua* to *ripa* appears all the more plausible since verse 20 ends with *uiam*: shores (*ripa*), brooks (*riuus*) and streets (*uia*) are topographical entities that exhibit a ‘ribbonal’ form similar to that of fissures, slits or rays (*rima*).⁹⁴

91) See e.g. Prop. 3.15.1, 4.9.74 (Hanslik [above, n. 1] 132, 186); 1.22.6, 2.25.45 (Hanslik [above, n. 1] 36, 81); 2.25.40, 3.6.2 (Hanslik [above, n. 1] 80, 112).

92) See Prop. 1.15.7, 2.18.8, 3.1.1, 4.2.23 (Hanslik [above, n. 1] 24, 67, 102; Butrica [above, n. 1] 72, 75–76; Richmond [above, n. 1] 338).

93) Villeneuve (above, n. 13) 202.

94) On the cognitive status of “ribbonal” entities, see A. Herskovits, Language, Spatial Cognition, and Vision, in: O. Stock (ed.), Spatial and Temporal

4. Context and Intertexts

Figure 2 summarizes the whole corruption process which, in my opinion, affected verse 21 up to the few Renaissance conjectures that have proven relevant to my inquiry, and the Appendix shows the definitive edition and translation which I have arrived at for the passage in hand.⁹⁵

Let us now have a closer look at the role played by verses 21–20–19 within the overall structure and progression of the poem, and at the poetic significance of couplet 21–20.

4.1. Propertius' singular treatment of a dream experience

When read as a purely realistic piece of narrative, verses 17–18–21–20–19 look incoherent. But this impression vanishes if we assume that the potential or actual wrongdoings referred to in verses 5–18, the directly reported speech, and the death and funeral of the bawd, all belong to a nightmare, and that verses 21–20 deal with Ego's return to consciousness (see Figure 1). Suppose that, after having a nightmare the content of which is partially described in verses 13–8, Ego wakes up and perceives both daylight and the morning noise of the street. At that point, Ego begins to remember that, in his nightmare, Acanthis was also speaking, and his recollection extends to the detail of the bawd's speech and to the subsequent dreamt episodes; in other words, the anaphorical reference

Reasoning, Dordrecht / Boston / London 1997, 155–202 and L. Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume I: Concept Structuring Systems*, Cambridge, Mass. / London 2000, 177–254.

95) Contrary to Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 453, I see no reason for pondering about *consuluitque striges* (verse 17). It is true that this verbal configuration (attested e.g. in Hor. S. 1.2.71: *uelatumque stola, mea cum conferbuit ira*) is not paralleled in Augustan elegy. But Propertius' diction (at least in his last two books) freely tolerates a metrically light syllable before a word-initial *s* + oral consonant group: see 3.11.53, 3.11.67, 3.19.21, 4.1.41, 4.4.48 (Platnauer [above, n.27] 62–3). I also maintain the double genitive *Eurypyli* [...] *minervae* in verse 23; see Fedeli (above, n. 6) 770 and Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, CQ 39, 1945, 120, who fail to mention 1.13.9, 2.24.11 and 3.9.54; and my reconstruction of 2.34.39: *non aut Amphiarei prosint tibi fata quadrigae* (above, n. 23). Finally, I analyze *hippomanes fetae* [...] *equae* as the grammatical object of *legit*, and *semina* as an inserted one-word apposition (see 1.16.8, 1.19.10, 1.19.13).

conveyed by *exorabat* does not provide a link to a real-world anchoring, but to the inner (confused) chronology of the dream.

This interpretation accounts not only for the blatantly unrealistic flavor of the elegy, but also for its apparent contradictions (see 1, above). In Ego's nightmare, Acanthis is alive when she acts (non-verbally or verbally) in order to harm him; his (later reported) vision of her death does not involve any questioning about the other (previously reported) dream episodes, nor any spatial proximity between him and her. Nor is it necessary that, in the chronology of the nightmare, Acanthis' speech, death and funeral should follow the wrongdoings of verses 13–8; indeed, Ego's final curse (verses 75–8) strongly suggests that, in his imagination, the bawd or her ghost could come back to torment him again.

If this interpretation of Propertius' poem is correct, he really created a "sophisticated structure, with a dramatic soliloquy enshrining the report of a dramatic moment".⁹⁶ Except for verses 21–20, the whole material embedded between the initial and final curses (verses 1–4, 75–78) deals with dreamt episodes; verses 19, 22–62 are devoted to reporting the bawd's speech, while two sections of an almost equal length (verses 5–18, 63–74) describe non-verbal actions or events – with, in each case, a crescendo to a horrifying climax (see Figure 1). A similar (though simpler) composition can be found in Ps.-Tib. [Lygd.] 3.4, where the first (verses 1–16) and final (verses 82–96) sections aim at exorcizing the dream narrated in the central part (verses 17–81).⁹⁷ In both poems, most of the verses (68 out of a total of 78 in Propertius; 58 out of a total of 96 in Lygdamus) convey dreamt contents, and most of these lines (41 in Propertius; 38 in Lygdamus) directly report a speech of the appearing entity.⁹⁸ Given Lygdamus' heavy dependence on Propertius, one may reasonably assume that he proved sensitive to the mirror-image structure of elegy 4.5 and – more important for us – that he was able to detect its oniric dimension.

96) Hubbard (above, n. 4) 137.

97) Both Tränkle (above, n. 74) 104–106 and C. Walde, *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung*, Leipzig 2001, 248–50 fail to characterize this structural feature adequately; for a more insightful analysis, see Navarro Antolín (above, n. 20) 258–59.

98) The quotation of 1.2.1–2 in 4.5.55–6 may be considered authentic. Either Acanthis utters this distich or it intrudes into the dreamt content: it frequently happens that a piece of discourse one knows from real life occurs in a dream.

By attributing both non-verbal actions and speech acts to Acanthis, Propertius conforms to well-known standards of the dream topos; equally typical are the bawd's capacity of metamorphosing into an animal (verse 14), and her hybrid or monstrous aspect in verse 64 (see 3.3.1 above).⁹⁹ The fact that Ego, when waking up, perceives light and noises – and will be subjectively inclined to consider his awakening as an effect, rather than a cause, of this perceptual state – agrees with our everyday experience of dreaming, and with its literary description: see e.g. Verg. A. 2.298–302, where the mention of Aeneas' return to consciousness (*excitior somno*) follows a four-verse description of the cries and noises triggered by the final assault on Troy.

But Propertius' treatment of Ego's dream also includes singular features that can be related to recurring, and more general properties of his poetic diction.

4.1.1. The transitions between the various parts of the poem exhibit the haphazard abruptness that characterizes the succession of dreamt episodes¹⁰⁰ or the shift from a nightmare to a relieving return to consciousness. This is but a rendering of familiar things. The very complexity of Propertius' composition stems from the fact that the dreamt content is reported in two very different ways. Verses 5–18, which correspond to a real-world interval where Ego is sleeping, provide us with a 'free indirect' representation of a part of Ego's nightmare. At that stage, the text is 'dramatic' in that it does not make any distinction between the 'event time' of the dream (i. e. the chronology of Acanthis' actions in the nightmare) and Ego's 'viewpoint time' (i. e. the chronology of the mental states he entertains about those actions), so that the perfects *consuluit* and *lēgit* are given a purely resultative value (hence my use of the present perfect in the English translation; see Appendix). This internal perspective also applies to Ego's perceptual experiences of the morning light and noises: as long as he is sleeping or awakening, he cannot but 'show' us what he is dreaming or perceiving. By contrast, verses 22–74 recount a part of the nightmare from an external perspective: since Ego is not sleeping anymore, his narration results from a recollection. As a consequence, the text makes a distinction between

99) Walde (above, n. 97) 447–8, 450–1.

100) See Walde (above, n. 97) 240 n. 3 on 2.26.

the event time of the dream (i. e. the chronology of Acanthis' speech acts, death and funeral) and Ego's viewpoint time, which now corresponds to the real-world utterance time: Ego believes, and asserts, that, in his nightmare, the bawd was speaking (*exorabat*) and that he saw her dying (*uidi ego*, verse 67) – compare with 2.26.1 (*uidi . . .*) and Lucr. 4.453–61.¹⁰¹ Instead of 'showing' us what he is dreaming, he now 'tells' us what he was dreaming.¹⁰²

Such alternations between an internal and an external perspective occur in other Propertian elegies, though most instances are unfortunately emended away by editors and commentators. Consider e. g. the following couplets:¹⁰³

*quare ne tibi sit mirum me quaerere uiles:
parcius infamant; num tibi causa leuis?
(et modo pauonis caudae flabella superbae
et manibus dura frigus habere pila,
et cupit iratum talos me poscere eburnos
quaeque nitent Sacra uilia dona Via)
a peream si me ista mouent dispendia! sed me
fallaci dominae iam pudet esse iocum.*

(Prop. 2.24.9–16)

101) Walde (above, n. 97) 242, 451.

102) On the mutually related concepts of "dramatization" and "showing", as opposed to "telling", see Williams (above, n. 4) 413–7, 471–9, 782; id., *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*, New Haven / London 1980, 31; also Newman (above, n. 28) 184–7.

103) Other examples: 1.1.11–2 (*nam modo . . .*: Milanion's viewpoint time coincides with an event time in the past); 1.3.29–30 (*ne qua tibi insolitos portarent uisa timores / neue quis inuitam cogeret esse suam*: in the hexameter, Ego's fear bears on a propositional content that pertains to his own representation of the world; in the pentameter, he does not fear that Cynthia may be raped, but that she may dream that some man is raping her); 1.11.3–4 (*et modo . . .*: Cynthia's viewpoint time); 2.12.11 (*ante ferit quoniam tuti quam cernimus hostem: tuti* reflects the viewpoint of those Love strikes, before they take notice of him; cf. 1.15.42); 2.22.11–2 (Ego's viewpoint time coincides with an event time in the past); 2.24.46 (*et modo*: Medea's viewpoint time coincides with an event time in the past); 2.32.23–28 (a dialogue between Cynthia and Ego, with 28 applying to Ego); 3.8.3–4 (transmitted *cur* can be maintained if Ego's viewpoint time coincides with the event time in the past); 3.14.9–16 (*nunc . . . , et modo . . .*); 3.15.11 (*uero* reflects Dirce's viewpoint); 3.18.13–4 (*aut modo . . .*: Ego's viewpoint time coincides with an event time in the past); 4.1 (two directly reported speeches without any explicit introduction). For a misguided approach to the function of *modo* in such contexts, see M. Dominicy, *Les premières attestations de modo au sens de nunc*, AC 43, 1974, 267–303.

Contrary to the context that surrounds them, the two distichs introduced by *et modo* (“and now”) report, from Ego’s internal perspective, the attitude of an extravagant prostitute, and thus express Ego’s reaction to it: again, these verses do not make any distinction between the event time and the viewpoint time, as shown by the use of present *cupit*. The apparent contradiction between this ‘free indirect’ segment and verse 15 disappears as soon as one realizes that the assertion produced takes place at a viewpoint and utterance time that remains unconnected to the temporal location of the experience ‘shown’ in the four preceding lines.

4.1.2. The disruptive role verses 21–20 play within the overall development of the poem (see Figure 1) is emphasized by temporal *hic* (referring to the time at which Ego wakes up) and the three historical presents *rorat*, *micat* and *ferit*, that contrast with the perfect and imperfect forms of the preceding two couplets. Such a succession of a first discourse segment with past tense(s), and a second one containing *hic* with present(s), occurs in Virgil (see A. 5.519–23, 10.342–61) and in Prop. 2.29.3–11, where the construction of verse 3 imitates a typical feature of Virgil’s diction.¹⁰⁴

Other poems of Propertius exhibit similar brutal breakpoints – though, again, editors and commentators frequently emend away this marked feature, or mitigate it by introducing an internal division. Elegies 1.8 and 2.26 are obvious examples.¹⁰⁵

The first 26 verses of 1.8 are interpretable, in a first stage, as a directly reported speech addressed to Cynthia; but verse 27 reads *hic erat! hic iurata manet! rumpantur iniqui!* Housman¹⁰⁶ ridiculed this paradox in a famous jest: “Of course she was, or not a word of lines 1–26 could have been written”. Yet, *hic erat* makes perfect sense if the preceding section, where event time and viewpoint time coincide, does not ‘show’ us a speech uttered by Ego, but a thought

104) See TLL, s. v. 2766, 20–3.46–50; Fedeli (above, n. 6) 821, 825; M. Dominicy, Propertius 3.1.27, *Mnemosyne* 62, 2009, 417–431.

105) See also 2.13 (*quandocumque igitur*, verse 17); 2.18 (*nunc* ..., verse 23); 2.22 (*aut si es dura* ..., verse 43); 2.28 (*deficiunt* [...] *rhombi*, verse 35); 2.29 (*mane erat* ..., verse 23; see n. 33); 2.30 (with *nunc tu dura paras* ... in verse 19); 2.33 (*non audis* ..., verse 23); 4.1 (see n. 103). See Williams (above, n. 4) 414–5; id. (above, n. 102) 122–53; Hubbard (above, n. 4) 47–58.

106) Housman (above, n. 7) 284, 633.

content entertained by him: in such a hypothesis, Ego simply turns back to reality in verse 27.

In 2.26, the first 20 verses narrate a shipwreck nightmare by making a clear distinction between event time and viewpoint time (verse 1: *uidi* ...; see 4.1.1, above); fear eventually wakes up Ego (verse 20), as probably happens in 4.5, where his perception of light and noises may well result from, rather than cause, his awakening (see 4.1.1, above). Verse 21 (*nunc* ...) initiates the direct report of a speech or thought of Ego that occurs in real time without connecting in any natural way to the content of the dream. Only later does the topic of sea travelling and shipwreck reappear, as if triggered by a recollection of the nightmare.¹⁰⁷

4.2. The poetic significance of couplet 21–20

4.2.1. The double homoeoteleuton¹⁰⁸ *rorat micat aurea rima*, and the mirror-image structure Subject Noun Phrase + Third-Person form + Third-Person form + Subject Noun Phrase, may look very marked at first sight. Yet, Propertius' elegies contain 22 verses with two homoeoteleuta between adjacent words,¹⁰⁹ and 24 verses with a homoeoteleuton between adjacent verb forms. Most examples involving two verbs exhibit an infinitive preceded by another infinitive (eleven occurrences) or by an imperative (four occurrences).¹¹⁰ But we also find nine combinations of singular Third-

107) Walde (above, n. 97) 239–43.

108) My definition of a homoeoteleuton is less restricted than Shackleton Bailey's (Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1994, 1), which requires the two relevant syllables to be heavy. Anyway, Shackleton Bailey's data for Propertius (81–6) prove quite inaccurate, since he missed twelve examples that conform to his own criteria: 1.2.26, 1.19.5 (unless *noster* is corrected into *nostris*), 2.16.55, 2.18.6, 2.24.9, 2.29.23, 2.32.13, 2.34.78, 4.2.32, 4.8.74, 4.11.59, 4.11.66.

109) Prop. 1.2.26, 1.5.31, 1.8.26, 1.10.24, 2.3.4, 2.8.20, 2.10.10, 2.16.42, 2.18.6, 2.20.22, 2.25.4, 2.28.28, 2.32.28, 3.6.24, 3.6.35, 3.8.24, 3.10.30, 4.1.80, 4.7.42, 4.8.30, 4.10.47, 4.11.6. We could add to this list 3.9.52 (with the manuscript reading *crescet*), 4.2.53 (with *labentes*; see Heyworth [ed., above, n. 1] *liv* and Dominicy [above, n. 104]), and all the examples where the two pairs end in short *-a* (see e.g. 2.8.11, 2.12.22, 4.3.30), not to mention verses with repeated words or phrases (see e.g. 2.3.27, 2.3.44, 2.16.2).

110) Prop. 1.9.22, 2.3.1, 2.26.4, 2.34.28, 2.34.62, 3.3.4, 3.4.22, 3.6.4, 3.6.22, 3.11.42, 4.2.6; 1.15.26, 2.29.22, 3.11.8, 3.25.18.

Person forms;¹¹¹ two examples (2.16.42, 3.6.24) have a double homoeoteleuton, and one of them (4.5.9) occurs in the close vicinity of verse 21. Notice, in addition, the mirror-image structure in 3.7.35–6 (*haud ulla carina / consenuit, fallit portus*) and 4.5.9 (*illa uelit, poterit magnes*), with the verbs ending at the second (trihemimeral) and third (penthemimeral) strong position, respectively. A similar distribution appears in Prop. 2.12.13 (see n. 111) and 4.7.35. In both cases, the first verb form ends at the penthemimeral position; examples involving the hephthemimeral caesura, as in verse 21, are found in Virgil (Ecl. 10.41, with the homoeoteleuton *legeret, cantaret*; G. 3.506–8; A. 12.333–5) and in Culex 265–7 (with the homoeoteleuton *manet, manet et*).

4.2.2. The clause *Eoa dies rorat* and the adjective *aurea* indirectly point to the name *Aurora* by recalling two parallel couplets (2.18.3–4: *Aurora* [...] *Eoa*; 3.13.15–6: *Eois* [...] *Aurora*). Furthermore, Latin literature documents a lot of word-plays that establish an etymological link between *Eous*, *Aurora* (= *Eorora* for Isidore) and *roro*, *aura* or *aurum*.¹¹² Even if the metaphorical link between dew and tears does not appear here (contrary to what happens in Ov. Met. 13.621–2, Fast. 3.402–3), we can provide *rorat* with an active value according to which daybreak light brings dew in the same way as stars do.¹¹³ But the two parallel occurrences of *roro* in Propertius (3.2.8, 4.1.123) rather favor a middle value. In this hypothesis, the *dies* either drips with, or flows like, dew; the ‘flowing’ interpretation (see Lucr. 2.977: *lacrimis rorantibus*) would rely on the cognitively salient metaphor that assimilates light to water.

111) Prop. 2.16.42, 2.30.25, 3.6.24, 3.7.36, 3.16.13, 3.20.23, 4.1.70, 4.3.50, 4.5.9. See also three cases with a near-homoeoteleuton: 2.12.13 (*manent, manet*, with the homoeoteleuton *manet et*), 2.22.37 (*teneat foueatque*), 2.30.13 (*licet accusent*).

112) Pac. 363 Ribbeck; Cic. Progn. 4.6–7; Var. Men. 121; Verg. G. 1.288, A. 9.111–2, 10.241–3; Ov. Met. 13.621–2, Fast. 3.402–3; el. in. Maec. 122–4; Val. Fl. 5.76. For the related word-play on *aura* and *aurum*, see Verg. A. 6.204 and Hor. Carm. 1.5.9–11 (Norden [above, n. 27] 192–3). For explicit etymologies, see Var. L. 5.24, 7.83; Serv. A. 6.204; Prisc. in G. L. 3.509.25–31; Isid. Orig. 5.31.14, 13.11.17; TLL, s. v., 1522, 64–78. More on this in Cairns (above, n. 18) 97–8; Maltby (above, n. 30) 67–9; O’Hara (above, n. 6) 167; Paschalis (above, n. 30) 169, 261, 299.

113) See Verg. G. 1.288. Later texts (Pervig. Ven. 15–21; Fulg. Myth. 1.11) combine this image with the metaphor that views dew as tears (see Catlow [above, n. 81] 64, 67–8).

4.2.3. The noun phrase *aurea rima* (“golden ray”) and its collocation with *micat* clearly derive from a famous passage of Virgil:¹¹⁴

*non secus atque olim tonitru cum rupta corusco
igne rima micans percurrit lumine nimbos.*

(Verg. A. 8.391–2)

This hypothesis is confirmed, if necessary, by two kinds of data. First, *micat* regularly combines with *aur-*, *or-* and *aer-* forms in Virgil.¹¹⁵ Second, a later imitation by Persius and a parallel passage in Propertius suggest that Ego sees daylight entering his room through a slit:

[...] *iam clarum mane fenestras
intrat et angustas extendit lumine rimas.* (Pers. 3.1–2)

*donec diuersas praecurrens luna fenestras,
luna moraturis sedula luminibus,
compositos leuibus radiis patefecit ocellos.*

(Prop. 1.3.31–3)

Persius’ phrasing is doubly reminiscent of Virgil (A. 3.151–2, 8.391–2) while also echoing Prop. 1.3.31–3 and Ov. Pont. 3.3.5. In Propertius, *diuersas fenestras* cannot simply refer to parted window shutters, as frequently assumed.¹¹⁶ Yet, contrary to what is claimed by Liberman, *diuersas* does not need any correction, since it qualifies the differently oriented rays produced by the moonlight

114) See Ausonius’ parodies in Cento 111 and Epigr. 87.6, also based on Juv. 3.97 (Adams [above, n. 44] 95).

115) From *aurum*: A. 10.134; from *auris*: G. 3.83; from *os*: G. 3.439 and A. 2.469, 12.101–2; from *aes*: A. 7.743 with a possible word-play between *aes* and *aer* (cf. Var. L. 7.83, Isid. Orig. 5.31.14, 13.11.17, 16.20.1; Maltby [above, n. 30] 14–5); see, furthermore, Verg. A. 1.90 and the imitation of A. 10.136 in Prop. 3.7.49. In Pervig. Ven. 15–20, we find the sequence *roris* [...] *aura* [...] *emicant (lacrimae)* [...] *umor* [...] *rorant*.

116) See e. g. Rothstein (above, n. 55) I, 80–1; Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 4) 13; E. Pasoli, In Properti Monobiblon commentationes, Bologna 1957, 25–6; G. Luck (ed.), Propertii et Tibulli carmina, Zürich 1964, 9; Fedeli (above, n. 17) 129; Goold (ed., above, n. 3) 53; Giardina (above, n. 3) 39; Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 19.

getting through the shutter slits;¹¹⁷ in a comparable way, Persius combines *rimas* both with *extendit* (literally predicated of the rays) and *angustas* (literally predicated of the slits). In Prop. 1.3.31 as in Prop. 1.13.25 (see 3.4.1, above), *praecurrens* semantically conflates a technical reading (“run ahead of cycle”) with an ordinary reading (“surpass”, hence “get over”): indeed, as underlined by *sedula* (“intrusive”, see 2.1.2, above), by *moraturis* (“disposed to linger”) and by the repetition *luna* [...] *luna*, Ego would have preferred the moonlight to appear later (or not to appear at all) and not to dawdle so long.¹¹⁸ By contrast, in Elegy 4.5 Ego views the coming of daybreak light and the busy (*sedula*) behavior of the passing crowd as welcome distractions; but, in both cases, the visual experience initiates a narrative turning point by coinciding with the awakening of the subject whose speech (Cynthia in 1.3), or thought contents (Ego in 4.5), will be reported afterwards.

4.2.4. In spite of their numerous intertextual pointers,¹¹⁹ verses 21–20 keep a strikingly Propertian touch. Gordon Williams

117) G. Liberman, Remarques sur le premier livre des Élégies de Propertius, RPh 76, 2002, 62. See a comparable use of *digesta* in 2.31.3 ([*porticus*] *tanta erat in speciem Poenis digesta columnis* “[the portico] looked divided in so many parts by the Punic columns”) and *partitos* in 4.9.10 (*per tria partitos qui dabat ora sonos* “[Cacus] produced noises that sounded divided by getting through his three mouths”; see 3.1.3). In 2.31.3, Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 4) 125, Luck (above, n. 116) 398, Hanslik (above, n. 1) 92, Goold (ed., above, n. 3) 226, Giardina (above, n. 3) 214 and Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 247 print Heinsius’ *in spatium* on the ground that classical writers would use *in speciem* with the sense “for show” only; but see Caes. Gal. 7.23.5: *in speciem uarietatemque*, “in terms of aspect and variety” (also Fedeli [above, n. 6] 875–6). In 4.9.10, Heyworth, Cynthia (above, n. 1) 485 suspects *partitos* which he deems “superfluous”; but the word captures a very precise feature of the auditory content; see n. 121.

118) I fail to understand why Housman (above, n. 7) 631, Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 4) 13, Pasoli (above, n. 116) 26 and Fedeli (above, n. 17) 129–130 think it necessary for *moraturis* and *sedula* to be linked conditionally (“which would otherwise have tarried, *nisi sedula fuisset*”). I thus translate verse 32 as follows: “the moon, that busybody whose rays (eyes) were disposed to linger” (after Richardson [above, n. 5] 155). For Hubbard (above, n. 4) 21, *moraturis* [...] *luminibus* refers to Cynthia’s eyes: the moon “plays ‘the busybody to eyes that would else have been laggard’ in sleep”; but, apart from creating an unwelcome pleonasm with *compositos* [...] *ocellos* (verse 33), this interpretation neglects the fact that Propertius implicitly compares the moon’s rays with Argus’ many eyes (verses 19–20).

119) Notice, by the way, that the intertextual links to the *Aeneid* prove incompatible with Luck’s (above, n. 11) and Fedeli’s (above, n. 1) xxvi hypothesis that

forged the expression “lack of visual imagery” in order to characterize Propertius’ distinctive proneness to supplement descriptions of perceptual experiences with semantic-encyclopaedic features.¹²⁰ Though I agree with Williams’s observations, I think his terminology may prove deceptive. Mental imagery applies to auditory percepts too;¹²¹ and most pieces of information encoded in our semantic-encyclopaedic memory can be, and in fact are, linked to ‘engrams’ constitutive of our perceptually-based episodic memory, and thus are likely to trigger recollections that involve our past perceptual experiences either of the referents in hand or of plastic (figurative) representations of them.¹²² It follows that, instead of speaking of a “lack”, we had better reformulate Williams’ insight by saying that Propertius systematically mixes up the content of singular (*hic et nunc*) perceptual experiences with conceptual encodings and experiential engrams retrieved from passive memory; so that what does matter is not so much the allegedly non-perceptual nature of those retrieved elements as their independence from the currently reported experience. The clause *Eoa dies rorat* is a case in point. The visual experience verse 21 attributes to Ego has a content for which *micat aurea rima* provides a complete and self-sufficient description; but *Eoa dies rorat* enriches this content by adding to it a complex network of semantic-encyclopaedic and episodic components that awakening Ego could not have access to through his simple perceptual contact with daybreak light at that very time and in those precise circumstances. In my definitive edition, the colon occurring between *Eoa dies rorat* and *micat aurea rima* aims at underlining this phenomenon. We do not find such a clear repartition of contents in verse 20, where except for

our elegy was written long before the other poems of Book 4; see also Tränkle (above, n. 14) 106 n. 2, 140–2; E. Lefèvre, *Propertius ludibundus: Elemente des Humors in seinen Elegien*, Heidelberg 1966, 100–8; K. O’Neill, *Ovid and Propertius: Reflexive Annotation in Amores 1.8*, *Mnemosyne* 52, 1999, 286–307.

120) See, in particular, Williams (above, n. 4) 781.

121) On the role of mental imagery in spatial cognition, see N. Block, *Mental Pictures and Cognitive Science*, *The Philosophical Review* 92, 1983, 499–541; on Propertius’ use of “auditory imagination”, see the insightful observations of Newman (above, n. 28) 414–6 and n. 117.

122) On the difference between the semantic-encyclopaedic memory and the episodic memory, see E. Tulving, *Episodic and Semantic Memory*, in: E. Tulving and W. Donaldson (eds.), *Organization of Memory*, New York / London 1972, 381–403; id., *Elements of Episodic Memory*, Oxford / New York 1983.

turba – which may apply to some indeterminate uproar, whatever may be its cause –¹²³ all lexical items encompass a large amount of retrieved information. This stems from the fact that, *ceteris paribus*, auditory perception more heavily relies on the inferential processing of its direct content.

5. *Epilogue*

When comparing Elegy 4.5 with its companion poem in Ovid (Am. 1.8), Williams claims that “Propertius takes a piece of traditional fantasy and treats it in the traditional way so that the reader is never under the slightest temptation to inquire whether any real experience lies behind it”.¹²⁴ My analysis of verses 21–20, and my general interpretation of the poem, conflict with this statement which, anyway, sounds all the more surprising since Williams emphasizes, in other sections of his book, Propertius’ inclination towards dramatized narratives that frequently put a high demand on the reader (see n. 102). True, Ovid’s elegy seems, at first sight, to stick to the temporal and causal sequencing of a specific event. But its (apparently) rational organization does not leave much room for a vivid rendering of a personal experience, as its major part is written from a third-person point of view.¹²⁵ In her implicit rejoinder to Williams, Hubbard¹²⁶ aptly notices that, in contrast to Ovid, Propertius makes all happen “in the mind of the lover” who “is in dialogue with himself”. This accounts for the fact that Acanthis’ speech “is completely devoid of sophistication”:¹²⁷ Propertius does not share Ovid’s interest in exhibiting a subtle piece of rhetoric. Nor does his elegy reduce to a static accumulation of stock-situations. It rather aims at acting on its reader, who should simulate the violent and changing mental states of Ego through brisk and unexpressed alternations of awareness and dream, of cursing and fear.¹²⁸

123) See Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 4) 140–1 on Prop. 3.3.24.

124) Williams (above, n. 4) 546.

125) See E. Courtney, *Three Poems of Propertius*, BICS 16, 1969, 83–6.

126) Hubbard (above, n. 4) 141–2.

127) Goold (above, n. 2) 107–8.

128) I am grateful to the editor and referees of RhM for their insightful reading and criticism of earlier versions of this paper.

Appendix: Reconstructed text and translation

<i>audax cantatae leges imponere lunae et sua nocturno fallere terga lupo, posset ut intentos astu caecare maritos</i>	15
<i>cornicum immeritas eruit ungue genas. consuluitque striges nostro de sanguine et in me hippomanes fetae semina legit equae!</i>	21
<i>hic Eoa dies rorat: micat aurea rima saxosamque ferit sedula turba uiam.</i>	20
<i>exorabat opus uerbis heu! blanda per ora: “si quae sub Tyria concha superbit aqua</i>	19
<i>Eurypylique placet Coae textura Mineruae [...]</i> ”	22

21 20 19 *ego* || 21 *hic ego* : si te NFLPT | *dies rorat ego* : dorozantium NT : de rorantium FP : derorantium L : deroratum ç : derorantem ç | *micat ego* : iuuat NFLPT | *rima ego* : ripa NFLPT || 20 *ferit Jacob* : ferat NFLPT | *turba ç* : culpa NFLPT || 19 *heu Housman* : ceu NFLPT | *per ora ego* : perure NFL : peruret PT || 22 *si ego* : et NFLPT

Daring to impose her law to the bewitched moon, / and to conceal her body by night under the appearance of a wolf, / she went so far, in order to blind suspicious husbands by trickery, (15) / as to enucleate with her nails the eyes of poor ravens. / She has plotted with vampires to suck my blood, and in order to harm me, / she has collected the seminal hippomanes of a pregnant mare! / But here comes the morning light, dripping with dew [flowing like water]: a golden ray is sparkling (21) / and a busy crowd is pounding on the stone-paved street. (20) / She was inspiring debauchery by the magic of words uttered, alas!, through a honeyed mouth: (19) / “If you are fond of the proud purple lying beneath the Tyrian waters (22) / and of Eurypylus’ weave of Coan wool-work / [...].”

Brussels

Marc Dominiczy

Figure 1: Overall structure of *Elegy* 4.5

First curse against Acanthis (1–4)	
“Free indirect” rendering of part of Ego’s nightmare (5–18)	Potential wrongdoings of Acanthis (5–12) Actual wrongdoings of Acanthis (13–18) Spells on / against Ego (17–18)
Ego turns back to consciousness (21–20)	
Ego’s narration of a part of his nightmare (19, 22–74)	Ego remembers that Acanthis was speaking (19) Acanthis’ speech (22–62) Acanthis’ death and funeral (63–74)
Second curse against Acanthis (75–78)	
	Climax
	Climax

