

variety of critics.⁷ Of these restorations Baehrens' *i puer en* (2.12.18), and Heinsius' *respon-di en* (4.8.81) are the only ones to fit a pattern of elegiac usage.⁸

In short, if Propertius' MSS. have, in general, not served him well, his critics, in this particular, have served him less so.⁹

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

⁷ I note the following 1.19.22; 2.12.18; 2.29.30; 3.13.47; 3.16.1; 4.1.81; 4.1.87; 4.1.116; 4.6.40; 4.8.81; 4.9.36; 4.9.70; 4.11.32; 4.11.97.

⁸ Again, I do not suggest that these emendations are correct simply because they accord with usage.

⁹ I thank the editors and anonymous referee for helpful criticisms and suggestions.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF SENECA'S *PHOENISSAE*¹

In me arma et ignes uertite, in me omnis ruat
una iuuentus quaeque ab Inachio uenit 444
animosa muro quaeque Thebana ferox
descendit arce: ciuis atque hostis simul...

444 unam E: una A

E's 'unam' is the reading favoured by all modern editors. Either reading is possible in terms of sense and metre, and the choice is not an easy one. The attraction of 'unam' is obvious and consists in the stress which it lays on Jocasta's isolation and vulnerability in the face of 'omnis...iuuentus'. The appeal of 'una' is a little more subtle. It emphasises the coming together of the youth, whether Argive or Theban, in common cause against the aged Jocasta. It is ironical that the two fiercely opposed sides are urged to come together not against a mutual foe but against a defenceless old woman. And even more ironical is the notion of the brothers' uniting to kill their mother: from the beginning of the play they have been portrayed as uncompromisingly hostile to each other; now, bent on the impious act of fratricide, they are envisaged as acting together for the first time, but only to accomplish an equally great or even greater impiety – matricide. The reading of A is attractive not only because of the characteristic irony which it expresses, but also because it heralds the even stronger expression of the same notion in 445 with 'ciuis atque hostis simul...'. One may note also that 'omnis ruat / una' appears to be an echo of Vergil's 'una omnes ruere' (*Aen.* 8.689).

University of the Witwatersrand

MARICA FRANK

¹ The text followed, except at the point under discussion, is that of O. Zwierlein, *OCT* 1986.

KAI FOR ET

The late Sir Roger Mynors, in a letter to Sebastiano Timpanaro quoted in the latter's *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome, 1978), p. 543 n. 15, states that he had wondered 'whether it might be a habit of Latin writers, when they were putting only one or two "parollette" between two pieces of Greek', to use Greek rather than Latin: he invents as an example 'ἦθος καὶ πάθος where logic demanded ἦθος et πάθος'. The answer is that they sometimes did: the present paper will concentrate on the type instantiated by his imaginary example, the use of καὶ for et. I do not claim to have recorded every case, but those I have observed are the following.