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This immensely important topic touches at least three themes: one is Pindar’s place in literary history, the second is the real nature of Callimachus’ literary ambition, and the third is the literary tradition that reached the Romans from Alexandria.

Pindar’s Muse has often found herself in uncongenial company. The difficulties of his supposedly sublime language and of a dialect which scholars like to term “Doric,” the allusiveness, the apparently casual and inconsequential interjections, the datedness of the athletic ideal—all these features have secured his poems entry to a literary limbo which they have shared with dreary official manifestos or rhapsodic gush. Readers of Lebrun or Tennyson will understand the point.¹

A recent study has argued that a truer appreciation of Pindar’s art associates the odes with the spirit of Comus, carnival.² A victory was an occasion for family and civic rejoicing. Pindar’s patrons had done something public. Their reward was public recognition. In Greek society, this recognition took predetermined forms. It is on these forms that Pindar built. He spells this out quite clearly by his


continual use of the ζων- root. In particular, the programmatic declaration in Olympian 3 (vv. 4–9) unites both komic and verbal aspects of the poet's art as the most immediately recoverable parts of the garland that constitutes his song.

Laughter may be uncomfortably close to tears. The art of our age has made us familiar with the melancholy clown (Picasso, Rouault). Franz Dornseiff speaks of Pindar, along with Job, and another “comic” author, Dante, as one of the “great outsiders” of civilization.\(^3\)

If this is true, it is apparent that it is simply another way of saying that Pindar felt the isolation imposed on any artist with particular sensitivity, and Dornseiff's list is proof that, though prophets may lack honor, they do not lack influence. In Pindar's case however there has been a tendency to associate what has been seen as his outsider status with a belief in his marginal relevance to the mainstream of Greek poetry, and this in turn implies that from the broad current of the European tradition he is hardly visible.\(^4\)

Such a view could be shown to be wrong by a simple enumeration of references to Pindar in later centuries. Callimachus tried to revive precisely the Pindaric epinician. Virgil and Horace imitated him. The Augustan elegists borrowed from his imagery. St. Gregory Nazianzen still remembers a tag.\(^5\) But the essence of Pindaric influence does not lie in externals. Pindar is important because, with consummate genius, he exploited the personal art of the lyric at the beginning of a period when the person was becoming all-important. He has classical rank because he canonized a class.

This argument is contradicted by the widely held modern notion that Pindar, with Simonides and Bacchylides, represents a style of public, choral lyric in the fifth century which must be sharply distinguished from the older private and personal monody of poets like Sappho and Alcaeus. Horace perhaps lends color to some such distinction. His master is Alcaeus, while Pindar stands at the unattain-

\(^3\) Pindaros Stil (Berlin 1921), p. 73.


\(^5\) For Pindar and Gregory Nazianzen see Auth. Pal. VIII. 220. At Auth. Pal. IX. 175 Palladas sells both Pindar and Callimachus. The two are associated again by Tertullian, de Corona 7. When the first modern edition of Pindar appeared at Venice in 1513, the two poets were again bound together. Cf. Milton's “Those magnifick Odes and Hymns, wherein Pindarous and Callimachus are in most things worthy . . .” (The Reason of Church Government urg'd against Prelaty, 1641).
able limit. But, even in Horace, the distinction is not to be pressed. Horace does in fact pindarize, and Alcaeus cannot be so private if he serves as a model for the Roman freedman’s son promoted to vatic dignity. In the context of more general literary history, if it is foolish to ignore the conventions that overlie the supposedly private feelings of Sappho, it is equally foolish to concentrate on the conventions found in Pindar to the exclusion of the private feelings which may be supposed in him also. A man looks at life differently from a woman, but that is hardly the basis for a demarcation between two types of lyric. All these poets took pre-literary forms and interpreted them in literature.

Pindar has been dismissed as no great thinker, even though his vocabulary at least shows traces of the revolution taking place in his day. Study shows that a number of themes constantly recur in the odes: god and man; achievement and idleness; individual, family, city; light and darkness; fame and obscurity; poet and posterity; time and eternity. This is no token of intellectual poverty. Some of the greatest writers have composed essentially the same work all their lives. But it is the token of polar thinking, and polar thinking is the hallmark of “pathetic” structure. Here lies the secret of Pindar’s classical supremacy. Because he was an observer at the feast, because he clung to a belief in the testing value of action rather than wordy debate, because his art was threatened with extinction by social and other changes, his poetry received an emotional impulse which drove it to the heights, and paradoxically made it the vehicle of the very individualism it sought to combat.

The tendency of the human heart to oscillate between contrasting extremes under emotional stress scarcely needs confirmation. At a

6 The “personal” beginning to every kind of poetry is always what F. Schleiermacher calls its Keimentschluss: Pindar’s Art (above, note 2), pp. 13 and 17. Obviously the distinction between monody and chorody, whatever its intrinsic worth, had no influence on the formation of the Alexandrian canon of “Pindarus novemque lyrici.” N. S. Greenbaum remarks in Yazyk drevnegrecheskoy khorovoy lyriki (Pindar) (Kishinev 1973), p. 92, that the language of Pindar’s epinicians in particular seems to make more use of Aeolic elements than his other poems, i.e. it latches onto the so-called personal tradition.

certain stage of oscillation, a phenomenon occurs which has been
variously described as a *catharsis*, a *Durchbruch* or “breakthrough,” a
“leap into another dimension.” The characteristic feature of the
agitated and antithetical language in which all this finds expression is
its desire to communicate feeling rather than the bald information
that would satisfy cold curiosity. Such speech is in a hurry (*Semper ad
eventum festinat* in Horace’s phrase). What it says therefore will be
selected as well as polarized; just enough will be expressed to lead up
to the breakthrough, which will also be a break-off. The poet will
leave his emotionally charged picture before our imagination as he
draws out in *gnomai* its religious significance, as he perhaps begins to
speak of his own role or that of his patrons. The explanation is that,
once he has established the effect that he sought, he can confidently
leave his audience to elaborate its details, indeed he must allow
something for them to do in this way if they are to be involved with his
poetry. A “bitty,” staccato, impressionistic manner, far from being a
defect, is absolutely basic to this type of writing.

The leap into another dimension will not however be a simple
matter of interrupting the flow of narrative. It is a term that applies to
many levels of lyric art. At a very minor level it explains, for example,
why Pindar personifies abstractions, or speaks of one sense in
language appropriate to another. At a major level, it explains the
poet’s interest in both myth and music.

Myth is the shaky ladder by which the human climbs into eternity.
Pindar’s use of this device, shared with Plato, has often been appreci-
ated but perhaps less often understood. Myth is for him not only
decoration, and not only amusement. It is the evocation of a uni-
versally valid though only partially apprehended order, with which the
temporal is briefly and incongruously united. This in itself makes the
*Grundgedanke* of burning significance in those odes that contain a
myth. Why this myth? And why, within the penumbra of incommen-
surability, these details?

Music is the means that raises the spoken word beyond itself into a
dimension where emotion can enjoy untrammelled range. Under the
pressure of emotion we repeat ourselves, since we are not primarily
communicating what happened, but rather the intensity of our
feelings about it. It is why repetition is music’s most characteristic
procedure, and why Pindar writes strophes.

---

8 A technique well described with respect to *Nemean 1* by L. Illig, *Zur Form der

9 Cf. Theophrastus, quoted by Demetrius, *De Eloc.* 226: Callimachus fr. 57 Pf. (now
attributed to the “Victoria Berenices”).
An analysis which forgets that in Pindar the word constantly breaks through to more than spoken resonance, and doubly so where it may have been reinforced by some special effect in the music or the dance, can be no analysis at all.\textsuperscript{10} The poetry in fact consists basically of these two polarities: masses of words are deployed and articulated by an emotionally loaded traffic baton, the poet’s lyre or flute. These words occur in the order of pathetic discourse, and acquire a further pathos from being sung.\textsuperscript{11}

No list of similarities therefore between one ode and another, whether by the same poet or someone else, can really answer the problem posed by each unique poem. The structuralist effort to find an archetypal pattern in the epinicians is legitimate. But, like all this neo-Kantianism, it runs the risk of misunderstanding its founder’s doctrine. Kant believed in the epistemological function of the categories, but he also believed that, unfertilized by contact with the schemes, the categories must remain barren shells. In the tension between the universal and the particular is where the poetry lies.\textsuperscript{12}

If we had the kind of conductor’s score that Pindar prepared, it would have contained his text, plus musical annotation, plus marks of expression, dynamics and rhythm to be a guide to the presenters. Within a given ode, certain words would enjoy a particular prominence. Thematically interlaced, they would in themselves be a many-hued garland for their recipient. But they would by no means exhaust the significance of their poem. That rich context of symbol and music, image and echo, narrative and reflection, sobriety and laughter forever eludes the straining ear.

In the history of any art, tradition is an ambiguous word. Brahms is indebted to Beethoven and Bach. But who could deduce the work of any one of these masters from a study of the other two? Who could expect to find in later literature an exact replica of Pindar? But who would argue from that absence to complete absence?

Commentators both ancient and modern have been impressed by


\textsuperscript{11} The musical resonance of the poems, now lost (but not wholly), is especially attested by O. 3. 8 and P. 1. 2–4.

\textsuperscript{12} This is where “topos” criticism is particularly defective. What interests us can never be merely what Pindar shares with others, but rather what makes him a unique poet, and each ode a unique poem. See the article by Yu. Tynianov in \textit{Théorie de la littérature}, ed. T. Todorov (Paris 1965), pp. 120–37, “De l’évolution littéraire.”
Pindar’s apparent kinship with the epideictic orator.13 A far more impressive case might be made out for his resemblance to Plato.14 His relevance to poetry after his time would be this: at the moment when blandly naive, “objective” narrative technique, whether on mythical or historical themes, was becoming impossible, he offered the pattern for an emotionally charged, pathetic structure, which could support all the weight and balance of the poet’s own personality. To a poetry that could no longer expect musical accompaniment, he showed how to find the lyrical overbalance into the transrational, and in particular he showed this extra dimension to the sophisticated epic.

This makes the study of Pindar’s myths crucial. They are not ragged specimens of inconsequential tale-telling by a poet whose chief interests lay elsewhere. They are not incidental to literary history. They exhibit on the contrary the classical form of what is so often supposed to be post- or even anti-classical.

This was already forgotten in antiquity. The eleventh Pythian, for example, addressed by Pindar to a Theban victor, is a peculiarly interesting case.15 What can the bloody tale of Agamemnon’s murder by his wife, who is in turn murdered by her own son, have to do with a victory in the boys’ footrace? “He has elaborated the encomium well enough,” remarks an ancient dominie drily, “but after that his digression is quite inappropriate to the occasion.”16

This is a good example of the overlaying of the living response to Pindar’s real tradition by rhetorical catchwords, not least in its failure to understand how Pindar uses the word encomium himself. What indeed in the first Olympian has the sin of Tantalus to do with Hiero’s victory? What an unfortunate note to strike in a poem of celebration, and how much the poet appears conscious of his and our embarrassment! The way out of that “embarrassment,” which is of course simply a poetic feint, lies in understanding that Pindar’s art is essentially one of antithesis. Tantalus and Pelops are juxtaposed

because life is a matter of choices, and the Tantalus myth is altered, not because Pindar really cares to censor the current version (which he presupposes), but because the version he substitutes gives him the chance to point his moral more sharply. Is there a similar juxtaposition of opposites in the eleventh Pythian?

There is. The murder of Agamemnon and the priestess bride of Apollo whom he has forced to serve his lust is linked with the destruction of Troy by the very periphrasis used for Cassandra, Δωδεκάδα κόρας Πριάμου (19). Both city and king are ultimately destroyed by sisters, Clytaemnestra and Helen. Private mischief has public consequences. It is a truth evident in the roughly contemporary second Pythian (30 ff.), and of which the civic body needs continual reminding.

But all individual action is not necessarily mischief. As in the first Olympian, there is a choice. Clytaemnestra and Helen, the wicked sisters, have brothers, Castor and Polydeuces, models of deferential self-sacrifice, as the ode emphasizes. Their mutual devotion leads them by turns to the shrine on earth where they receive the prayers of their community, and to Olympus. The blind self-seeking of Clytaemnestra led only to the shadowy shore of Acheron.

Once the essentially pathetic structure of Pindar’s version of the strenger Satz is grasped, this ode no longer assumes a place apart in the poet’s achievement. It can be predicted that he is going to use the excuse provided by the need for an exordium, whose actual contents may be quite elastic, to establish a series of motifs, in essence to deploy a number of words, some of which will be taken up again and developed as the poem proceeds. These motifs, recognized by their repetition, are what in essence the poem is about: they form its Grundgedanke.

They will depend for their effect on antithesis. At the opening of the eleventh Pythian, motifs are presented of daughters of Thebes, fair women rewarded by divine status; of Heracles; of Apollo and his prophets; of Harmony, Law and Justice; of a family proving its worth yet again by a noble deed performed for the general glory.

The myth then shatters all this with rude dissonance. A father’s hearth is no longer honored. Instead, a father is butchered (πατρόφαν, 14; πατρόξ, 17), and only a nurse keeps her upright mind. Daughters of Thebes sang in honor of the god; the daughter of Priam is slain (κόρα, 1; κόραν, 19). Family quarrels, family misdeeds were at the root of the trouble and, when great families go down in this way, the whole community loses an ideal of behavior. The heroines (7) of Thebes are in sharp contrast with the dying hero (31) Agamemnon.
The Theban shrine of Apollo and its prophetic priests are offset by the μάντις χόρα (33: cf. χόρα, 1; μαντίων, 6) whose death is directly attributed to Agamemnon and associated with the rape of Troy, fired for Helen and so robbed of its delicacy. Orestes is rescued (we return to the beginning of the story) only to continue its bloody pattern.

Taking back the introduction in this way, negating its values, the mythical narrative (“paramyth”) cannot simply be concerned to tell a tale. Far from being ragged, it has an extremely formal structure (φονευμένου, 17; φοναίς, 37), which makes it all the more surprising that its central section should be occupied, not by narrative at all, but by two rhetorical questions and the poet’s reflection on them. What were Clytaemnestra’s motives for her denial of all wifely pity to her husband? Was it the slaughter of Iphigenia by the Euripus, far from her homeland, which stung her to rouse her heavy anger? The Euripus was famous in antiquity for flowing two ways, and this story too has a double application. Agamemnon’s Trojan foray began with the slaughter of his child. It ended with the slaughter of Priam’s child (made into his symbolic last act). Agamemnon’s dead daughter led to dead Priam, to dead Agamemnon and to Priam’s dead daughter. Iphigenia/Cassandra; Agamemnon/Priam; Helen/Clytaemnestra; Castor/Polydeuces; and, it may be added, Thebes/Troy/Amyclae: the carnival motif of pairs and doubles seems particularly visible in this ode, as indeed it will be in the whole later narrative tradition, and not least in the Aeneid.

The second question too has a double relevance. Was it Clytaemnestra’s nightly couchings that inspired her, asks the poet. But in this context Clytaemnestra was hardly the only wife to be led astray by an adulterer. Her sister Helen, who will be mentioned shortly, was just as bad, and in his reflections Pindar himself generalizes Clytaemnestra’s sin in a way which has puzzled commentators who have not understood either the essential ambiguity of the undifferentiated primitive, or the paradigmatic nature of his story.

What is interesting about both questions is that they provoke a social answer (πολιττα, 28) from the poet. When greatness decays, he begins, envious meanness is noisy. The line that says this in the second epode (ο δὲ χαμηλὰ πνέων ἀφαντὸν βρέμει, 3018) contrasts with τρίτον ἐπι στέφανον πατρίως βαλὼν in the first (v. 14), with τὰ μὲν <ἐν>
of obscuring rumor blasts all these aspirations.

Those who believe that Victorianism was discovered in the age of Victoria will be surprised to note how clearly Pindar links this kind of moral looseness with the decline of a civic ideal. The great chieftain's family troubles, his eye for a pretty girl, are matters which nowadays would call from an "official biographer" for a discreet reticence. Like Apollonius Rhodius, like Homer and Virgil, but not we may suppose like the authors of the cyclic, pseudo-Homeric propaganda epic favored by the Telchines, the poet Pindar boldly thrusts the problem of sex and heroism before the attention of his audience. He is not ill-bred or salacious enough to pry into the bedroom for scandal's sake. But he is concerned to point out that such offenses affect more than the offenders. In stripping the homes of the Trojans of their delicacy, Agamemnon particularizes his deadly act on Cassandra. This is the barest realism. But the Trojans themselves had been fired over Helen.\(^\text{19}\) The mutual interplay of personal and public sin, of Eros and Ares, prevents any convenient escape into historians' generalities. It is the lesson of the \textit{Aeneid}'s fourth book.

Once the universal relevance of the myth is understood in this way—it teaches that lust is the expense of spirit in a waste of shame—there is no need to look for those detailed allegorical applications which so intrigued older commentators. Immorality upsets public order. Horace will repeat the theme. Both Greek and Roman poet were addressing their own communities. In this sense, both are writing "personal" poetry.\(^\text{20}\)

Aware of the harsh home-truths he has been dispensing, the poet concludes his lesson when he has still almost half his poem to write. Putting into play a comic \textit{ego}, he pretends to have been led astray from the proper path. This is exactly that "Alexandrian," self-conscious aspect of his poetry which showed itself as early as the tenth \textit{Pythian} \(^\text{21}\) convention which gives notice of being convention, art which knows it is artifice. Has Pindar taken the wrong turning at a crossroads (v. 38)? He is the polar counterpart of Heracles (v. 3), who took the right one \(^\text{22}\) Has his skiff been blown off course (vv. 39–40)?

\(^\text{19}\) Retaining the transmitted \textit{πυρωθέντω} at v. 33.
\(^\text{20}\) Pindar is \textit{διός ἐν κοινῷ σταλέις}, \textit{O.} 13. 49.
\(^\text{21}\) Vv. 51 ff.; \textit{Pindar's Art}, pp. 43–44, 81–82.
\(^\text{22}\) Modern scholarship on the ancient motif of the "two ways" is listed in \textit{Bibliographie zur Antiken Bildersprache}, ed. V. Pöschl and others (Heidelberg 1964), p. 584. The idea of a morally dividing \textit{τρύόδος} was, for example, important to the Pythagoreans: E. R.
It is the polar counterpart of all those ships guided aright by Castor and Polydeuces (vv. 61–62).23 The very phrases in which the poet asserts his predicament cement the two halves of his poem firmly together. Like the Euripus, they flow both back and forth.

As in the first Olympian, though at greater length, the last part of the poem draws together and personalizes the themes presented more largely in his introduction and myth. The family of the victor Thrasydaeus is contrasted with the Atreidae: its fire is one of glory (v. 45: cf. 33), its gossip (πολυφάτων, v. 47: cf. κακολόγοι, 28) one of praise. But the admonitory note creeps back again as the poet, using the “preacher’s I” to identify himself with his young patron, prays for contentment with what is possible and devotion to the common weal. Here, he takes up the reflections of the myth on prosperity, jealousy and the city quite openly, and develops his thought with the help of an antithesis between the political concepts of ἴσος and ὀδος (v. 55). In the first Olympian, Pelops had to accept his mortality before he could find the only real immortality permissible for a man. In this ode, though both Agamemnon and the victor reach the same dark bound of death (ἀκτὰν παρ’ εὐσκυν, 21; μέλανα δ’ ἀν’ ἐσχατιάν, 5624), one will surely find a fairer fame.

From this challenging reflection Pindar leaps back into the realm of myth, this time not to the cruel bloodiness of the Atreidae, but to the world of gracious loveliness invoked as the ode began. A stronger note is sounded now, as heroes replace heroines, as the self-sacrificial Castor and Polydeuces replace their murderous and lustful sisters. The surly, muttered gossip of the jealous is drowned by the everlasting music of the poet’s song, bestowed upon those who have deserved it.

The nature of the “personal” element in Pindar’s epinicians is now more visible. The poet does not of course keep a diary in verse. What he says is conditioned by traditional forms of social etiquette and expectations. But how he deploys his material is determined by his personal attitudes and responses. We may guess that, in an ode

---

Dodds, Plato, Gorgias (Oxford 1959), p. 375. It may have become associated with Heracles in some early ξανάβλησως of the type used by Virgil in Aeneid VI: cf. partes ubi se via fundit in ambas, 540. Pindar himself seems already to have developed this theme: Snell-Maehler, Pindar, Pars II (1975), pp. 109–10 on Threnos VII. However, J. Alpers, Hercules in Bivia (diss. Göttingen 1912), argues that the motif was not known before Prodicus (p. 9).

23 The Dioscuri appear as saviors of mariners as early as Hym. Hom. XXXIII. 7 ff.: cf. Snell-Maehler, op. cit., p. 5 on Isth. fr. 6c.

24 A. Turyu’s text (repr. Oxford 1952) has been followed at v. 56.
addressed by a Theban to a Theban victor at a time of national crisis, these feelings were more than usually engaged. The demand for Solonian moderation in civic affairs is inherited by the poet, shared by him with other moderates in his city, and at the same time part of his personal outlook. The terms “subjective” and “objective” become, on this analysis, rather inapposite. What is important is the unique amalgam.

If the story that Pindar studied under Lasus of Hermione in late sixth-century Athens is true, he may have picked up his Solonian wisdom in the city of its origin. His teacher seems to have been interested in the kind of literary experiment critics label as “decadent.” The early twelfth Pythian, the only surviving tribute to a non-athletic victor, paid homage to the civilizing influence of art (τέχνη, v. 6) with the aid of vocabulary (λεπτοῦ, v. 25) and ideas (εὐθεία, v. 22) which anticipate those of Alexandria, and in it Athene was prominent. Were in fact these two great centers of Greek culture closer than has been thought? Did the Alexandrians set Pindar at the head of their lyric canon not only because of the force of his genius, but because they saw in him the outline of a poetic which they were eager to make their own?

Roman Alexandrianizing poets were fond of claiming to be “first,” of using what scholars call “primus-language.” Pindar uses such language too, of Athene and Terpander, but also of himself. The fourth Pythian looks like a virtuoso effort to make lyric outdo epic. At the climax of its myth (vv. 241 ff.), the poet speaks of the difficulties of gaining the golden fleece even after Aeetes’ challenge had been met:

And at once the wondrous child of the sun told of the shining fleece, and where the sword blows of Phrixus had stretched it out. He was hoping that this toil at least would baffle. For it lay in a thicket, and

26 At least according to Rehm in RE 12: 1, col. 888: “Der Hymnus auf Demeter schloss den Buchstaben σ aus, Athen. IX 467a, X 455c, XIV 624e. . . .” We may compare the asigmatic Odyssey of Tryphiodorus and other Byzantine Virtuosenstücke mentioned by A. Lesky, A History of Greek Literature (Eng. tr. J. Willis and C. de Heer, London 1966), pp. 815–16.
clung to the savage jaws of a serpent that in bulk and length outdid a fifty-oared ship finished by blows of iron tools.

The suspense is complete, and the double reference to sword blows and iron blows (vv. 242, 246) guides our imagination towards the expected contest, in which the personified fleece, clinging to the serpent’s jaws, seems itself destined to be an adversary.

This is exactly the critical moment chosen by Pindar to frustrate expectation. Instead of giving an account of the heroic struggle, he blandly digresses to talk about his art:

It is long for me to travel along the cart road, for time presses, and I know a short path: to many others I am a leader in the poet’s craft.

The Alexandrian terms of this remark (μαχρά, ᾲμαξίτων, βοσχύν, πολλοίς, σωφίας) would, in Callimachus, provoke irritation. But what we must see is that the breakaway, which is also a breakthrough into another dimension, is itself exactly the short path of which the poet is speaking. While we are impatiently waiting to hear what happened between Jason and the serpent, we reconstruct the story for ourselves. We do the poet’s job for him, presumably to our own satisfaction, and so, when he resumes, he can be content with the baldest of remarks, can indeed displace the narrative emphasis from the struggle, which is dismissed in the single word κτείνε (v. 249), to its aftermath:

He slew the fierce-eyed, spangle-backed snake with arts, O Arcesilas, and stole Medea with herself, the murderess of Pelias, and they plunged into the waters of Ocean and the Red Sea, into the tribe of Lemnian women, murderers of men.

The climaxing apostrophe to Arcesilas follows the static description of the serpent. Only the emphatic verbs opening their clauses (κτείνε, κλέψεν) are provided to trigger our imaginations here. The rest is baffling. Slew it with arts? But whose? Stole Medea with herself? Murderess of Pelias? And how did they get away from Aeetes and his pursuing minions? The central deed of the entire Argonaut adventure is wrapped in obscurity and foreboding (φονόν, 250; ἄνδροφόνον, 252). Is this Red Sea perhaps red with blood?

In a brilliant passage L. Dissen long ago set out the differences

28 The τινα at v. 247 is presumably pregnant rather than diffusive, as in the examples noted in Pindar’s Art, p. 48.
29 N. 6, 53–54 (where Pindar follows the cart track) is only in apparent contradiction: ἔχων μελέταν is a crucial qualification, used by Pindar to escape from the trite story.
between the narrative technique of the fourth Pythian and that of conventional epic. Pindar’s aim in the myth is to glorify Jason, not to trace the details of a familiar story:

Neque enim res et facta ipsorum causa narrat, sed propter id quod docere vult, et movet non multitudine rerum, sed gravitate.

Dissen is also interested in Pindar’s use of antithesis:

Mox in oratione publica Iasonis ne de dignitate admirabili dicam, affectus plenus est locus, ubi iuvenis narrat ut olim eum infantem timore tyranni in fascis extulerint quasi mortuum e domo paterna inter eiulatum feminarum. Et observa in fine orationis haec ponit, ut olim accuraeos relinquant in animis audientium; post quae discedit continuo ad hos ipsos tam diu non visos parentes. Lamque huic tristi praeteritarum rerum memoriae oppositum, ut par, sed laetitia paternae domus et cognatorum undique accelerantium, conviviumque per sex dies continuatum; sunt etiam in epica poesi oppositiones plurimae, ut par, sed lyrica in ea re ars est ingeniosior.

Opposition, what Dornseiff was later to call Pindar’s polare Ausdrucksweise, is a basic feature of pathetic structure, as defined by Eisenstein.

The selectivity of this allusive style, which has its own interest in aetia, permits us to see Pindar as the master of an art already Alexandrian. He lends to Callimachus both images and attitude. It is Pindar who prides himself on his own originality, and who rejects the schoenus-length of his predecessors’ song (Dithyramb II, p. 74, Snell–Maehler):

\[ \text{Porin mēn ἔσπε σχοινοτένεια τ' ἀοιδα} \]
\[ \text{διαφυαμβῶν} \]
\[ \text{και τὸ σὰν κιβδήλον ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπὸ στομάτων, . . .} \]

This public literary argumentation has a long history, but in particular it anticipates the Preface to Callimachus’ Aetia (vv. 17–18): \[ \text{έλλετε Βασιλινῆς ὄλον γένος' αὐθὶ δὲ τέχνη} \]
\[ \text{χρίνετε, μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίν'} \]

30 Pindari Carmina (Gothae et Erfordiae 1830), I, pp. LIV ff. The quotations are from pp. LVII and LVII–LVIII.

31 It is part of the comic agon, developed, for example, in the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes’ Frogs. Pindar’s older Theban contemporary Corinna wrote a poem about two contending mountains: Page, PMG 65+. Later it became the troubadours’ tenzone and was even taken up by Dante into the Purgatorio (canto 24): cf. the Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi.

32 Pindar’s rejection of length is also demonstrated by O. 13. 41–42 and 98; P. 4. 247 ff.; P 8. 29–30; N. 4. 33 and 71; N. 10. 19; I. 1. 60 ff.; fr. 140b.12.
This anticipation must condition our understanding of *Paean* VIIb, printed by Snell–Maehler as:

\[ \text{τελεσθήσαντ' ὅμοιος,} \]
\[ \text{Ὀμήρου [δὲ μὴ τοὺς κατ' ἀμαξίτων} \]
\[ \text{λόντες, ἀ[ VLC T Aς ἔλοτριας ἀν' ἔποιος,} \ldots \]

At line 12 here, the restoration ἀλλ' contradicts the sense. Pindar cannot urge the avoidance of Homer’s worn cart track, and then go on to recommend his chorus to travel on others’ horses, especially if at vv. 13–14 he told them they have their own chariot. The δὲ restored in v. 11 is quite superfluous, and the imperative in v. 10 is uncertain. If the syntax of the expression in verse 10 triggered the negative ὦ rather than μή, verses 11–12 may have read:

\[ \text{Ὀμήρου [μὲν ὦ τοὺς κατ' ἀμαξίτων} \]
\[ \text{λόντες, ὅ[ VLC T Aς ἔλοτριας ἀν' ἔποιος,} \ldots \]

With this, the supplement proposed in Snell–Maehler:

\[ \text{ἔπει αὖ[ VLC T οι ἐς π]τανόν ἄμια} \]
\[ \text{Μοῦσα[ VLC ίον ἄνεβα[ VLC μεν.} \ldots \]

coheres very well, and reminds the reader not only of *Aetia*-preface 25 ff. but also of Propertius’ great programmatic elegy at the beginning of Book III, written under the auspices of Callimachus and Philetas, but under the patronage of Apollo and Bacchus.³³

II

Callimachus concerned himself directly with the myth on which the fourth *Pythian* is based in his *Iamboi* (fr. 198 Pf.), where he related the victory of Polycles of Aegina in the *Hydrophoria*, founded in memory of the Argonauts who once landed on that island in search of water. In this instance, it seems plausible to say that he was giving an example of what Aristophanes calls “reduction,” in a play which shows how much “Alexandrian” vocabulary was current in Athens a century after Pindar had been there.³⁴ In an age suspicious of bombast, in which poet and musician had parted company, Callima-

³³ Cf. O. 9, 80–81: εἶναν ἑὕρησατέος ἀναγείσθαι / πρόσφωλον ἐν Μοῦσιν δίφως \ldots
At O. 6, 85–86 water and weaving images are combined: cf. Prop. III. 1. 5–6. Propertius restores the sense of public pomp and pride to imagery he ultimately inherits from Pindar (water drinking, chariot riding and so on), but significantly without abandoning his claim to be the Roman Callimachus.

³⁴ *Frogs* 941. M. Puebla Piwonka, *Lucilins und Callimachos* (Frankfurt 1949), pp. 323 ff., gives a sympathetic appreciation of what may have been Callimachus’ purpose.
chus still apparently thought that the epinician was relevant. He was perhaps aided by the reflection that the comic spirit of such poetry favored this lightening of its load.

But the epinician also made its appearance in the Aelia, perhaps at the start of the third book. The Nemean victory of Queen Berenice was celebrated in an elegy of suitably Pindaric abruptness, adorned with a myth narrating the foundation of the games. Since this myth contained a section called by modern scholars "Muscipula," "The Mousetrap," evidently a certain wit was manifest in its treatment. So too was a novelty reminiscent of the first Olympian.

There was also another elegiac epinician, honoring the victory at the Isthmus of Sosibius. Its date is uncertain, but if this Sosibius was already active in the early years of the third century, it could be that Callimachus actually began his poetic career by experimenting with this type of poetry, perhaps as a means of securing the attention of a powerful patron. He certainly shows awareness of the Pindaric manner (fr. 384. 37–39 Pf.):

\[
\text{'Andres fil' o'd deiosantes edoxamen hid voasa}
\text{炯 an Gammai koumon agoni xorof}
\text{'Arxiloxou nikaion efymion' . . .}
\]

The masterful use of alliteration and assonance, and the emphatic position of 'Arxiloxou, are proof of the poet's genius.

Pindaric too is the emphasis on witness (loc. cit. 48–49): 38

\[
\text{xei(a ge muh iodon autoc, o pard podi katheto Neilo}
\text{neiastw, Kaoyn eis epitikemos ala . . .}
\]

Here the victor evidently proceeded in komic fashion as far as the mouth of the Nile to make an offering in the temple of Zeus Casius.

But, although we can see how carefully Callimachus studied the epinician style, both in its mannerisms and in its origins (e.g. its association with the dead, fr. 384. 30 Pf. 39), these imitations are too

35 The text given in Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons, edd., Supplementum Hellenisticum (Berlin–New York 1983), nos. 254–69, pp. 100 ff., is also discussed by Parsons in Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 25 (1977), pp. 1 ff.; cf. especially p. 46. Parsons' suggestion that this epinician elegy at the start of Book III stood in some sort of correlation with the Cona Berenices at the end of Book IV tallies with the sidereal language of N. 2. 11–12. After all, where was the Nemean lion to be seen?
36 See Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, op. cit., p. 134 ad v. 33 on p. 103, owh oez edeowov: "ex his conicia, Callimachum fabulam novam miram commemorare, immo novissimam."
37 Cf. O. 9. 1, 'Arxiloxou; 4, xowmazonti.
38 Pindar's Art. p. 6, note 11.
39 Cf. O. M. Freudenberg, Mif i Literatura Drevnosti (Moscow 1978), pp. 54 ff.
fragmentary to allow any very reliable conclusions about structure. If
the poet chose to echo Pindar in his programmatic utterances
however, we may perhaps look further in his poetry, following a hint
already thrown out by Dornseiff. The first *Hymn* is particularly
instructive. Pindar’s imagination was often triggered by a pun, and
the second *Olympian* may be inspired by the proper name Rhea,
“flowing.” But so may this *Hymn*. This might explain, for example,
the extraordinary digression at vv. 18 ff., in which the poet’s imagina-
tion flashes back to some primeval Greek desert landscape, when the
great rivers of later days were still hidden in the bowels of the earth.
Rhea’s Moses-like gesture (vv. 30–31) in bringing forth water from
the rock parallels her bringing forth of baby Zeus (τόξον, v. 16; τένε, v. 29). In this celebration
of the komic theme of parturition and birth,
Zeus’ first nurse, Neda, is fittingly commemorated by a stream (vv.
37–41).

The hymn is eventually manipulated more obviously in favor of a
*laudandus*. Ptolemy. The king has indeed already been hinted at in v. 3
(δινασπόλον: cf. vv. 82–83). The pre-eminence accorded to the god
by his elders (60 ff.), as it were the Diadochoi of Cronus, mirrors that
 accorded to his earthly counterpart. It was not the chance of the lot,
but merit, which determined the excellence of both.

But can Ptolemy only resemble Zeus when Zeus is no longer an
infant? Can the myth of Zeus’ birth, the token of water and fertility
that were to transform Azenis into pastoral Arcadia, be
“irrelevant” to the encomium, to use the language of Pindar’s ancient
critics? It is in fact Pindar’s art which teaches us to look further in
Callimachus.

The importance of water in Egypt needs no emphasis. From time
immemorial the Pharaohs, whose successors the Ptolemies were, had
been lords of the Nile and displayed the symbols of that office. If
Rhea’s gesture reminds the modern reader of Moses at Meribah, it
must be remembered that, according to one tradition, Moses was
“learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.” The birth of baby Zeus

---

40 *Pindars Stil*, p. 85; cf. *Die archaische Mythenerzählung* (Berlin–Leipzig 1933), pp. 74 ff. and especially p. 77: “Seine (i.e. Callimachus’) Hymnen müssen neu behandelt
werden auf ihre Beziehungen zur Chorlyrik.”

41 *Pindar’s Art*, pp. 166, 176.


43 NT Acts 7:22. Moses’ name is Egyptian. A modern commentary on the Bible
tentatively suggests that it could have been Ḫērōs-mosis, “Osiris is born”: cf. Ra-meses,
signalled abundance of water for Arcadia. Could not the birth of Ptolemy signal the same for Egypt? Could not the divine child foreshadow the grown champion, exactly as in the first Nemean?\footnote{Pindar’s Art, p. 72.} Thus the first part of Callimachus’ Hymn would have a connection both with traditional motifs, and, in this particular instance, with the yearnings of the Greek Alexandrian community, locked in its flat and arid prison.\footnote{The spirit of the Arcadian pastoral and its idealized landscape is already lurking in the background to all this. Ptolemy I’s invention of Sarapis (= Osiris / Apis), whose cult image looked like Zeus (H. Idris Bell, Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt, Liverpool 1953, p. 19), may also be an influence at work in Callimachus’ poem. Pindar had already hinted at the equation Zeus / king: Pindar’s Art, pp. 128 and 230. He had also described the huge god whose moving feet caused the flooding of the Nile (fr. 282), a passage that looks like a reminiscence of the Egyptian colossal statues of Rameses II at Abu Simbel.}

But, like Pindar before him, Callimachus is not content with even this degree of double-entendre. In the first Olympian, a fiction may be observed which calls into question its own status.\footnote{Pindar’s Art, p. 160.} Callimachus shares Pindar’s self-consciousness. He asks at the start of Hymn I: “Which of the two, father, have told lies?” (v. 7). “The Cretans are always liars!” (v. 8): a tag from Epimenides is enough to settle the question. But poetic lies become important again later in the poem. “Ancient bards were not at all truthful” (v. 60). The old story of the division of earth, sky and underworld by lot must be rejected as silly. “May I tell lies that are likely to persuade the ear of my listener!” (v. 65 ψευδοίμην; cf. ἐψευσάντο, v. 7). The poet is opening himself to the charge that persuasion rather than truth is his aim.\footnote{A debate still alive as late as Petrarch’s doctrine of poetic veritas: Africa ix. 90 ff.} Such sophisticated art does not mind. It is consistent with this legerdemain that, although it is Zeus’ deeds which give him superiority (v. 66), the poet refuses, in this hymn to Zeus, to sing of them (v. 92). Evidently they have been sufficiently replaced by what we have heard of the deeds of Ptolemy. Pindar, using δαιδάλλω in the first Olympian both of the false stories he ostensibly rejects and of his own art (vv. 29 and 105), had pointed the way to this ambivalence.

“Ra is born”: see La Sagrada Escritura, 1, Pentateuco, Director Juan Leal S. J. (Madrid 1967), p. 312. Osiris was eventually identified with the Nile god Hapi: H. Bonnet, Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte (Berlin 1952), p. 528. Moses’ striking of the rock to produce water (OT Exodus 17:2 ff., Numbers 20:2 ff.: for the gesture see E. R. Dodds on Euripides, Bacchae 704–05, and Apollonius Rhodius, Argon. IV. 1446) is on both occasions associated with the Israelites’ desire for Egyptian comforts. His response may have been to prove that, like Osiris (see Bonnet’s illustration), he too could pour out water from a rocky cave.
The lyrical balance of the first *Hymn* may be seen from this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vv.</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Prooimion: Zeus' immortality</td>
<td>9 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>His birth. Rhea’s search for water</td>
<td>18 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-36</td>
<td>Water found. Neda receives the child</td>
<td>9 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-54</td>
<td>Rhea’s thanks. Zeus in Crete</td>
<td>18 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>Zeus' privileges</td>
<td>5 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>Poetic fictions</td>
<td>5 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>Zeus' attributes</td>
<td>5 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-75</td>
<td>His choice of kings</td>
<td>6 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-90</td>
<td>Privileges of kings, especially of Ptolemy</td>
<td>15 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-96</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>6 lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Pindar, the exponent of the αὐστηρὰ ἀρμονία, the individual words counted. For Callimachus, in this first *Hymn*, it seems that syllables were important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vv.</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>143 scanned syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>285 scanned syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-36</td>
<td>143 scanned syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-54</td>
<td>285 scanned syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-75</td>
<td>339 scanned syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-96</td>
<td>337 scanned syllables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is even possible that the poet, like Pindar, set important proper names at significant intervals. Between Ζῆ (v. 7) and Ἄεί (v. 10) 53 syllables may be counted, exactly the same number as between Ἄεί (v. 10) and Ἄείς (v. 13). This Ἄείς is then separated by 118 syllables from Ἄεί (v. 21), and this Ἄεί is followed 116 syllables later by Ἄεί (v. 28). Between μῦ (= Rhea, v. 35) and Ζῆ (v. 43) stand 117 syllables. Between Ζῆ (v. 46) and Κόνος (v. 53) stand another 117 syllables. 119 syllables divide this Κόνος from Κόνιός (v. 61).

We could perhaps already have guessed that in this art, with its word-play, its repetitions, its euphony, in short all the tricks of the Gorgianic, but also carnival, repertoire, numerical balances, whether of line or longer verse paragraph, would make themselves felt to the inner ear, and that this felt responson would evoke, for both Callimachus and his later admirers whether in Greece or Rome, the atmosphere of music. This constitutes one of the most vivid parts of the Pindaric legacy.

To understand the role of the carnival already in Pindar is to see that even Callimachus' sixth *Hymn* is in a similar tradition. Like Tantalus, Eryxichthon breaks the rules of social etiquette, and is
appropriately punished by becoming a castout from society, his appetite perpetually unsatisfied. The myth, with its roots in popular folktale, is linked with the main narrative by what at the time of mention looks like a picturesque detail (v. 6)—a typically Pindaric device. The worshippers paradoxically celebrate the feast of the goddess of earth and grain by fasting, as she herself fasted when in sorrowful search for her daughter. Callimachus ultimately refuses to tell this painful story (v. 17), after he has carefully reminded us of its details, exactly as Pindar refuses to tell the traditional story of Tantalus and Pelops after reminding us of its details (O. 1. 52–53). Erysichthon, who thought he could intrude on nature as appetite dictated, becomes the parody of his own lusts, forced to decline the very good cheer he fancied he was going to enjoy. Eventually, a king’s son, he sits begging at the crossroads. There is a religious truth underlying all the humor.

Distances between certain references to Demeter bear some relationship, provided we return to Pindar’s method of word count and omit μέν, δέ, τε, γε, καί. Whether this more Dorically flavored poem inspired a return to an older technique is uncertain:

Δάματερ (v. 2) + 42 words gives Δαμάτερα (v. 8)
θεά (v. 29) + 42 words gives Δάματος (v. 36).

The contrast between piety and impiety is made by the Pindaric means of repeated language, in which distances between words also seem to play a part. The goddess did not eat (ἐδεξ, v. 12) and luckless Erysichthon ate more than he wished (ἐδοντι, v. 89). The same point is made with another repeated verb at vv. 16 and 108 (φάγεξ / ἔφαγεν). The following intervals between words of eating are notable:

ἐδεξ (v. 12) + 24 words gives φάγεξ (v. 16)
βόσκε (v. 104) + 24 words gives ἔφαγεν (v. 108).

Compare:

εὐλατίναν (v. 84) + 24 words gives ἡσθίε (v. 88).

In the poet’s pious prayer, βόας (v. 136) echoes βῶν (v. 108; cf. βόας, v. 20, βοῦβοσοστις, v. 102). Erysichthon, by trespassing onto forbidden territory, is condemned to persist fruitlessly in his offense, like Ugolino in Dante’s Inferno, also part of an instructive comedy. His original sin of greed (δαιτες . . . αἶν . . . ἄμαρφεας ἀξό, vv. 54–55) becomes his essence. The repetition of δαις from v. 54 at vv. 63

48 Pindar’s Art, p. 157, note 22.
and 69 and at the very end of the myth (v. 115) hammers home the lesson.

Although the text of the poem is damaged, it is possible to discern at least an outline of symmetry as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. 1–23 Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| vv. 1–6 Start of procession | 6 lines  
| vv. 7–9 Hesperus | 3 lines  
| vv. 10–12 Demeter’s hardships | 3 lines  
| vv. 13–16 Her wanderings | 4 lines  
| vv. 17–23 Her gifts to men | 7 lines  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vv. 24–115 Myth of Erysichthon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| vv. 24–30 Demeter’s grove | 7 lines  
| vv. 31–36 Erysichthon’s onset | 6 lines  
| vv. 37–39 The poplar | 3 lines  
| vv. 40–45 Demeter’s intervention | 6 lines  
| vv. 46–49 Her speech | 4 lines  
| vv. 50–55 Erysichthon’s reply | 6 lines  
| vv. 56–58 Demeter’s reaction | 3 lines  
| vv. 59–64 Her sentence | 6 lines  
| vv. 65–67 Erysichthon’s sickness | 3 lines  
| vv. 68–71 His symptoms | 4 lines  
| vv. 72–75 His parents’ embarrassment | 4 lines  
| vv. 76–82 His mother’s excuses | 7 lines  
| vv. 83–86 Further excuses | 4 lines  
| vv. 87–93 Plight of Erysichthon | 7 lines  
| vv. 94–97 Family grief | 4 lines  
| vv. 98–110 Prayer of Triopas | 13 lines  
| vv. 111–115 Final fate of Erysichthon | 5 lines  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vv. 116–138 Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| vv. 116–117 The poet’s prayer | 2 lines  
| vv. 118–127 Instruction and assurance | 10 lines  
| vv. 128–133 More instructions | 6 lines  
| vv. 134–138 Final prayer | 5 lines  

|  
| In this scheme, verses 116–17 have been taken as marking the beginning of the conclusion, and not as the end of the myth (as in Pfeiffer). The analogy with Pindaric mannerisms in these lines, such as the use of the first person pronoun (ἔμου... ἔμοι), the renewed invocation of the laudanda, and the prayer, shows that in reality we have a typically Pindaric "second praise." This may prove that the |  

---

epinician, as Hermann conjectured, originated in the hymn to the
gods, and therefore that Pindar sometimes rather awkwardly adapted
it to the praise of human victors. But it may also prove, in an age when
the distinction between the human and the divine was becoming all
too often blurred, that Callimachus took the tricks of the epinician
and adapted them to the hymn, and this is where the novelty and
piquancy of his achievement may lie.

III

What the Romans took from Greek Alexandria therefore requires far
more careful definition than has been customary. They took in the
first place an art that was komic, carnivalized, that dislocated experi-
ence and expectation in order to estrange perception. This explains
the importance of Laevius' multi-faceted Erotopaegnia, and earlier of
the extraordinary medley presented by the satires of Lucilius. It also
explains the continuing relevance of Pindar, to Virgil, to Horace, to
Propertius, but even, in an earlier generation, to Catullus. Statius still
adVERTISES his Pindaric studies. Like the author of the eleventh
Pythian, Ovid still sails a poetic skiff.50

But the most powerful impulse given by Pindar was paradoxically
towards epic. In the fourth Pythian Pindar deployed an ambition
consciously epic in its scope. But even the eleventh Pythian, its myth
ringed, questioning, metamorphosing, could hold a lesson for Virgil-
ian narrative technique. The Alexandrians, so often thought to have
been interested only in Kleinkunst, in fact communicated a new epic
impulse to their Roman disciples, setting it for reasons of their own
under the patronage of the Boeotian poet, Hesiod. The Ascræan
Georgics, which also pay homage to Pindar in precisely one of their
most ambitious and yet most Alexandrian passages, the proem to
Book III, were the essential preparation for the Aeneid. These matters
of complex literary inheritance have been discussed more fully
elsewhere.51
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50 Cf. Curtius, Europäische Literatur etc. (above, note 27), pp. 136 ff. The motif is
eventually picked up by Dante.
1986).
While preparing a critical edition of Diogenes Laertius for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, I have collated recently the *Gnomologium Vaticanum Epicureum* as preserved in cod. Vat. gr. 1950, saec. XIV, fol.401\textsuperscript{v}-404\textsuperscript{v}. The Vatican collection of the aphorisms of Epicurus was first published by Karl Wotke (in 1888), then by Peter Von der Mühll (Teubner, 1922), followed by Cyril Bailey (Oxford, 1926), Graziano Arrighetti (Turin, 1960; 1973), and finally by Jean Bollack (Paris, 1975).\textsuperscript{1}

On this occasion, I shall limit myself to trying to solve an old problem—the corrupt text of the last two aphorisms of the collection (Nos. 80 and 81). I think aphorism No. 80 should read as follows (printed here correctly for the first time):

\begin{quote}
Νέω πρώτη σωτηρίας μοίρα τής ἡλικίας τής τήρησις καὶ φυλακῆ τῶν πάντα μολυνόντων κατά τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς οἰστροδεῖς.
\end{quote}

For a young man the best means of preserving his well-being is to watch over his youth and to guard against whatever defiles (stains or spoils) everything because of "the maddening desires."

On fol.404\textsuperscript{v} of V, our aphorism opens with a ν.ω, which can hardly

be anything else but νέω, “for a young man.” There are two more instances of an Epicurean ethical aphorism opening with Νέος without the article. Aphorism No. 17 from our collection reads: Οὐ νέος μακαριστός, ἀλλὰ γέρων βεβιωκός καλὸς. And a similar aphorism by Metrodorus Epicureus (ap. Stobaeus II. 31. 67 Wachsmuth) reads: Νέος ἐν πολυτέλει βρώμαι καὶ ποτός ἐτι δὲ ἄφροδισιὸς ἀναστροφόμενος λέληθεν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ θέρει τὴν χ λαίναν κατατρίβον.

Consequently, the reading νέω seems to me to be as safe as it is palaeographically possible. Wotke, however, saw in the manuscript a P..ω (“P..ω soll V[aticanus] geben”), Von der Mühll, F.:ω (“prima littera aut Π aut Ρ fuisse videtur”), and Bollack, P..ω. They then engaged in improbable conjectures. Wotke and Bailey adopted W. von Hartel’s έστιν, while Von der Mühll printed γεννᾶω and conjectured γνησίω. But Konstantin Horna (in 1931) correctly suggested νέω, and Arrighetti adopted it. In brief, the readings of Wotke, Von der Mühll, Bailey and Bollack are wrong.

The second word of our aphorism is a clear πρώτη. It was printed by Wotke (Bailey and Bollack), but omitted by Von der Mühll, Horna, and Arrighetti. Probably they relied upon the misleading entry in Wotke’s apparatus criticus, which reads: “Εστιν πρώτη] P..ω soll V geben : verb. Η[artel]; man könnte auch Παμπρώτη vermuten.” But in fact V has: ν.ω πρώτη. The expression, ἡ πρώτη μοίρα, moreover, is of significance. It means, “the first role,” “the best way,” “the safest means.”

Finally, the closing picturesque expression of our aphorism—αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι αἱ οἰστρώθεις—is a deliberate reminiscence of Plato on the part of Epicurus (Tim. 91 b 6; Laws V, 734 a 4).³

Now, this vivid Platonic metaphor—“the gadfly-like desires,” which sting man to madness, converting him into an irrational animal—may help us to solve the other textual problem at the end of our collection. Perhaps a similar poetic picturesque expression is hiding in the corruption of aphorism 81. I would like to suggest the following reading of this aphorism.

Οὐ λύει τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ταραχῆν οὔδε τὴν ἀδιάλογον ἀπογενναχαράν οὔτε πλούτος ὑπάρχων ὁ μέγιστος σοῦ ἢ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τιμῆ καὶ περιβλεψις οὔτε ἄλλο τι τῶν παρὰ τάς οἰκίας <ἀπλ>έτους αἰτίας.

The disturbance of the soul cannot be dispelled nor the genuine joy be created either by the possession of the greatest wealth, or by the esteem and admiration one may enjoy in the eyes of the populace, or by

² Wiener Studien 49 (1931), 34.
³ As, e.g., Bollack (p. 560) had pointed out.
anything else deriving from the wretched unlimited motives (or causes of desires).

For the suggested οἰζυφάς <ἀπλ>έτους the manuscript seems to offer, ἀξυφ. ἐτους. Wotke read ἀξυφίστους, Von der Mühll, ἀξυφ.ο(ἔ?)τους, and Bollack, ἀξ. φ.στους. Now, in view of the fact that our scribe wrote in aphorism No. 2, ἀθάνατος, for the correct, ὁ θάνατος, I would think that ἀξυφ. ὁ could be none other than the poetic expression, οἰζυφάς, "wretched, toilsome, dreary, or trouble-causing." As for the ἐτους, I think it is lacunose, being the ending of another attribute of the keyword, at αἰτία, "the motives or causes of desires." The manuscript abounds in similar—two to three letters long—lacunae. For example, in aphorism No. 14 the word ἀσ ( = κύριος) is missing (extant in Stobaeus); in aphorism No. 43 φείδε . . . is a sure φείδε<σύτα> (from Demosthenes 24. 172); in aphorism No. 55 our scribe offers το γένος for the correct το γε<γο>νός (Usener); in aphorism No. 63 he writes καθάριος for the correct καθαριό<της> (Von der Mühll); in aphorism No. 67 he omits <μη> after the word το πράγμα (Usener), and so on.

Consequently, the suggested supplement, <ἀπλ>έτους for the transmitted ἐτους, seems to be in accord with the scribe’s practice. ἀπλέτους is a suitable poetic synonym for Epicurus’ key terms ἀπειρός and ἀόριστος, when applied to the motives or causes of desires, as is the case with our aphorism. Its sense is “boundless, unlimited, immense,” with the overtone, “excessive, and thus harmful.” Consider these similar expressions of Epicurus: Aphorism No. 8 from our collection ( = Ratæ sententiae, No. 15), Ὅ τῆς φύσεως πλούτος καὶ ὀρισται καὶ εὐπόριστος ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ τῶν κενῶν δοξῶν εἰς ἀπειρόν ἐκπίπτει; Aphorism No. 63, ὁ δὲ ἀγοριστικῶν ἐκπίπτων; Aphorism No. 59, Ἀπλίστον οὐ γαστήρ, ὄστερ οἱ πόλλοι φανον, ἀλλὰ ἡ δόξα ψευδής ὑπὲρ τοῦ <τῆς> γαστρος ἀγοριστον πληρώματος; Ratæ Sententiae No. 10, τὸ πέρας τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν; No. 20, Ἡ μὲν σὰρξ ἅπελαβε τὰ πέρατα τῆς ἡδονῆς ἀπειρα. . . . The idea of “unlimited and excessive desires” is also clearly expressed in the word συνείροντες of Epicurus’ Letter to Menoeceus 132, Ὄδ γὰρ πότι καὶ κόμοι συνείροντος οὐδ’ ἀπολαύσεις παῖδων καὶ γυναικῶν οὐδ’ ἱχθυών καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁσα φέρει πολυτελῆς τράπεζα τὸν Ἑών γενναί βιόν. . . . The word implies, “continuous pleasures, night after night.”

For the suggested reading, παρὰ τὰς οἰζυφάς <ἀπλ>έτους αἰτίας, scholars usually follow Usener’s emendation, παρὰ τὰς ἀδιόριστους αἰτίας. So did Wotke, Bailey, Arrighetti and others. This reading, however, does not find support in the manuscript. Incidentally, ἀδιόριστος would mean, “undefined, indefinite, loose,” and not
“unlimited, boundless.” That is why I find Bailey’s commentary on the text, τῶν παρὰ τὰς ἀδιωρόστους αἰτίας, unconvincing; it reads: “lit. ‘things connected with unlimited causes’, i.e. causes of unlimited desire, such as there is for wealth, honour, power, &c.”

One final note on the sense of παρὰ here. Contrary to Bollack’s recent comment, “il est préférable de faire παρὰ signifier au delà de, en dehors de . . .”, I think that παρὰ with accusative usually means in Epicurus, “owing to, due to, depending on.” Compare, e.g., Letter to Pythocles I, τὴν τε ἀφάνιαν τούτων γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὰς ἀντικειμένας ταύτας αἰτίας; or Ratae Sententiae No. 29, αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι αἱ παρὰ κενήν δόξαν γινόμεναι; and especially No. 30, . . . παρὰ κενήν δόξαν αὑταί (αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι) γίνονται, καὶ οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν φύσιν οὐ διαχέονται ἄλλα παρὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κενοδοξίαν.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

4 Op. cit. (above, note 1), pp. 119 and 388.—The conjecture suggested by Emil Thomas, Hermes 27 (1892), 35, ἀδιωρόστους, “worauf man sich nicht stützen kann,” “unreliable,” is palaeographically even less likely (in addition to the fact that this word is documented nowhere).

Indirect Questions in Old Latin: Syntactic and Pragmatic Factors Conditioning Modal Shift

LAURENCE STEPHENS

1. Introduction

In Old Latin the original indicative of a direct question is not universally shifted into the subjunctive to form an indirect question. Sometimes modal shift occurs, e.g. Pl. Merc. 103, vosmet videte quam mihi valide placuerit, and sometimes it does not, e.g. Pl. Pseud. 18, facem me certiorem quando adveturus sis. Can particular conditions be discerned that favor modal shift? Are there rules governing modal shift in Old Latin, or is it in a stage of more or less free variation? Scholars such as Bennett,\(^1\) Lindsay,\(^2\) and Woodcock\(^3\) seem to suggest the latter view when they claim that both the indicative and the subjunctive are found side by side in indirect questions depending on the same main verb. Six or seven cases are commonly cited: Pl. Amph. 17; Cist. 57; Most. 199 and 969; Pers. 515; Ter. Andr. 650; and Hecyr. 873–74. All of these cases have been disputed, notably by Becker\(^4\) and Gaffiot.\(^5\) Gaffiot’s interpretation of

---

\(^4\) E. Becker, *De syntaxi interrogationum oblqvarum apud priscos scriptores Latinos*, Studemunds Studien 1 (1873), pp. 113–314.
the indicatives at Pl. Amph. 17, Most. 969 and Pers. 515 as relative clauses seems rather forced but raises an important methodological point. Interrogative pronouns are distinct from relatives only in some cases. Any preliminary analysis of the use of the indicative must be limited to forms that are clearly interrogative. At Pl. Cist. 57 velis is most likely not an instance of modal shift, but a potential subjunctive used like velim. (Cist. 57 belongs to Class 1a discussed below in section 2.) This raises another methodological point: any preliminary analysis of modal shift must be limited to subjunctives that cannot be ascribed to independent uses in direct questions. The remaining cases of indicatives occurring alongside subjunctives have been analyzed as independent exclamations or direct questions. I agree with Bräunlich\(^6\) that these interpretations seem rather unnatural, and I do not wish to argue that modal shift in Old Latin is governed by absolute and categorical rules and that there is no variation. Rather, we should remember that there are about two thousand potentially dependent interrogative clauses in Old Latin, and these six or seven cases should be assessed in the light of the regularities and tendencies which obtain in that large corpus.\(^7\)

Wackernagel\(^8\) suggested that Old Latin modal shift was a gradient phenomenon, depending on the degree of dependency of the interrogative clause: "je dezidierter . . . das Abhängigkeitsverhältnis ist, um so eher der Konjunktiv gebraucht wird." Wackernagel, however, did not specify how the Abhängigkeitsverhältnis is to be assessed: is it syntactic, semantic, or somehow pragmatic and stylistic, or a combination of some or all of such factors? Some twenty years before Wackernagel, Delbrück\(^9\) reached exactly the opposite conclusion. Pointing to apparently contrasting pairs such as Pl. Truc. 499, vide quis loquitur tam propingue. (an example belonging to Class 1 discussed in section 2), and Pl. Amph. 787, vide sis signi quid siet, (an example belonging to Class 2 discussed in section 2), Delbrück asked:

Wie erklärt sich diese Anwendung des Subjunktivs? Aus der Natur des Abhängigkeitsverhältnisses kann sie nicht folgen, denn bei demselben

---

\(^6\) A. F. Bräunlich, "The Indicative Indirect Question in Latin" (diss., Chicago 1929), pp. xx, 16–17, 34.

\(^7\) From data supplied by Bennett (Syntax of Early Latin), I calculate that only 19% of the ca. 1064 clearly dependent word questions in Old Latin are unshifted. This proportion is sufficiently small to suggest that it is the retention of the indicative, and not modal shift, that is the more restricted variant.

\(^8\) J. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax I (Basel 1926), p. 243.

\(^9\) B. Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen 3 (Strassburg 1900).
Verhältnis zeigen sich ja auch Indikative; auch nicht aus der Natur des Modus, denn sonst würde dieselbe Anwendung sich, wohl auch, in den verwandten Sprachen finden.

Since there was, in his opinion, no synchronic regularity in Old Latin modal shift, Delbrück concluded that scholars should concentrate on the historical linguistic processes through which modal shift arose in Latin. I hope to show in this article that just the reverse research strategy is the productive one: by formulating a more adequate synchronic account we will be able to discover new aspects of the diachronic processes involved in the development of modal shift.\(^\text{10}\)

The only comprehensive study of Old Latin modal shift is that of Eduard Becker.\(^\text{11}\) This work is an essential starting point for any study, and my paper is clearly much indebted to it. Becker’s work, however, is marred by a tendency to emend away examples that do not fit his arguments, and it is difficult to say to what extent he succeeded in developing an explicit, consistent, and systematic theory. For such a theory we must turn to Haiim Rosén’s recent study.\(^\text{12}\)

Rosén advances the hypothesis that: “it takes a verb of inquiry (or response to an inquiry . . .) to cause modal shift.”\(^\text{13}\) The full set of conditions disjunctively sufficient for Old Latin modal shift as proposed by Rosén can be organized into four classes and these arranged to reflect increasing generalization of the domain of modal shift, with clear diachronic implications, which, however, Rosén does not discuss: (1) the verb of the main clause expresses an inquiry, e.g. rogo at Pl. Pers. 635, die Pl. Bacch. 555, narra Ter. Eun. 562; (2) a response to an inquiry, e.g. dixi Pl. Curc. 608. scio Pl. Capt. 1007; (3) reception of a response to an inquiry, e.g. audivi Pl. Amph. 745, ex hoc . . . scio Pl. Capt. 295; (4) ignorance or uncertainty, even when no desire to know is expressed, e.g. nescire passim, interrogative verbs of knowing, e.g. Pl. Poen. 1121, verbs of knowing when dependent on an expression of causation or intent, e.g. Pl. As. 140, memorare as causative of neminisse. However, as will emerge from my presentation of the data in section 2, Rosén’s theory is not only incapable of explaining the full range of variability in the philological record, but is also simply contradicted in

\(^{10}\) Bräulich (above, note 6), xvii–xxviii, provides a useful discussion of scholarship on the question up to 1920.

\(^{11}\) De syntaxi interrogationium obliwarum (above, note 4).


\(^{13}\) Rosén, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
2. Preliminary data analysis

The work of Becker and Rosén has shown that an adequate account of the factors that condition modal shift must consider the utterance involving the question (henceforth Q-clause) and its associated verb in relation to the speech situation portrayed and to its discourse function. Of the various criteria that have been employed for classification, the following appear to be the most useful for a preliminary organization of the data: (1) In what sort of utterance is the Q-clause involved?—inquiry, exclamation, command, etc.; (2) If in an inquiry, is the speaker inquiring about the Q-clause or about its associated verb? (3) If the inquiry is about the Q-clause, does the speaker want an immediate answer? (4) If a command, what is the addressee commanded to do?—find out, inquire about, make a statement about or simply consider the Q-clause; (5) Is the topic of the Q-clause either established in the discourse or present in the speech situation? (6) What is the syntactic status of the verb associated with the Q-clause?

In what follows, the major classes of verb plus Q-clause that result from these criteria are given brief labels. These labels are intended not as complete, formal definitions, but as approximate, descriptive mnemonics. Tables 1–4 provide representative examples in addition to those cited in the text. Table 1 provides examples of Q-clauses associated with verba videndi, Table 2 verba sciendi, Table 3 verba dicendi, and Table 4 verba rogandi. In any one class only a few examples can be given of often scores of similar cases.

2.1. Class 1a: simple inquiries.

The simplest type of utterance involving a Q-clause and associated verb is the class of inquiries made by the speaker concerning the Q-clause to which he wants an immediate answer and in which the topic of the Q-clause is present or established in the discourse. A good example of this class is Pl. Truc. 499, cited by Delbrück and quoted in section 1. It comes from the beginning of Act II, scene vi. Strato-phanes has just entered and given a speech. Phronæmis asks the question of her maid Astaphium, who answers in the following lines. Here vide introduces a simple inquiry to which Phronæmis expects an immediate answer. The topic of the question is obviously present

---

Class 1:
Pl. Rud. 948 Gr. eloquen quid id est? Tr. vide num quasiam consequitur prope nos.
Pl. True. 499–500 Ph. vide quis loquitur tam proximum. As. miles, mea Phronesium/tibi adest Strato-panches.
Pl. Cas. 377–78 tene sortem tibi./ vide quid scriptum.
Pl. Rud. 1002–03 vide sis quos ab arbitratu nos vis facere. Gr. viduli arbitratu.

Class 4:
Pl. Miles 536 vide sitne istae vostra intus.
Pl. Capt. 292 proinde aliis ut credat vide.
Ter. And. 385 ex ea re quid fiat vide.

Class 7:
Ter. Heu. 78 audin quid dicam, Scirte?
Pl. Pseud. 1296–97 non vides me/ut madide maedam?
Ter. Heaut. 1013 non vides quan-
tum mali ex ea re excitae?

Class 2:
Pl. Most. 309 vide tali ubi sint.
Pl. Amph. 787–88 So. vide sis signi quid siet./ne posterius in me culpam conferas.

Class 5a:
Pl. Epid. 81–82 quo in loco haec res sit vides/Epidice:
Ter. Heaut. 555 quae sit ei(s)aetas vides;
Pl. Rud. 573 at vides me ornatus ut sim vestimentis uvidis:

Class 8a:
Pl. Most. 887 vide ut fastidit simia!
Ter. Eun. 919 vide ut otiosus it!

Class 8b:
Pl. Stich. 410 videte, quaeso, quid post-test pecunia:
Ter. Phorm. 358 vide avaritia quid facit!

Class 3:
Pl. Most. 681 videndumst primum utrum eae velintne an non velint.
Ter. Heaut. 557–58 de istoc, quom usu' venerit./videbimus quid opu' sit.

Class 6:
Pl. Curc. 188 viden ut misere mollunt? nequeunt complecti satis.
Pl. Miles 1045 viden tu ignavom ut sese infert?
Ter. Eun. 1037 audin tu, hic quid ait?

Class 9:
Pl. Merit. 103 vosmet videte quam mihi valide placuerit:
Ter. And. 825 vide quam iniquo' sis prae studio:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 3:</td>
<td>Pl. <em>Miles</em> 345–46 volo scire utrum egon id quod vidi viderim/an illic faciat. Ter. <em>Ad.</em> 555 scire equidem volo quot mihi sint domini:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. verba dicendi

Class 1a:
Pl. Trin. 562–63 dic sodes mihi,/ quid hic est locutus tecum?
Ter. Phorm. 748 eho dic mihi quid rei tibist cum familia hac unde exis?
Pl. Aul. 777 sat habeo. age nunc loquere quid vis.
Ter. Andr. 389 cedo quid iurgabit tecum hic?
Pl. Pers. 215–16 hoc mi expedi./quo agis?

Class 1b:
Pl. Bacch. 555 dic modo hominem qui sit:
Pl. Rud. 1163 loquere matris nomen hic quid in securicula siet.
Ter. Eun. 562 narra istuc quaeo quid sit.
Pl. As. 27–28 proinde actutum istuc quid sit quod scire expetis/elo-
quere:

Class 1c:
Pl. Men. 639 quin dicis quid sit?
Pl. Pers. 281 dicsne mi ubi sit Toxi-
lus?

Class 1d:
Ter. Hec. 698 redduc uxorem aut quam ob rem non opu' sit cedo.
Pl. Rud. 628 quin tu ergo omitte genua et quid sit mi expedi
cf. 1d'; Pl. Pers. 664 quid id est
ergo? eloquere actutum atque in-
dica.

Class 5a:
Pl. Rud. 478 nam haec litteratast,
ceps cantat quoia sit.
Pl. Merc. 940 dico quid eo adven-
erim,
Pl. Cist. 549–51 dico ei quo pacto
eam ab hippodromo viderim/erilem
nostram filiam sustollere. extimuit
 tum ille.

Class 10:
Pl. Most. 1150 dicio is quo pacto
tuo' te servos ludificaverit:
Pl. Most. 1136 loquere nunc quid
feceir:
Ter. Eun. 970 tu isti narra om-
ne[m] ordine[m] ut factum siet.
Table 4. *verba rogandi*

**Class 1a:**
Pl. *Amph.* 438 quis ego sum saltem, si non sum Sosia? te interrogo.

**Class 1b:**
Pl. *Pers.* 635 at ego patriam te rogo quae sit tua.
Pl. *Trin.* 873–74 Lesbonicum hic adulescentem quaero in his regionibus/ubi habitet,

**Class 2:**
Pl. *Poen.* 1008 roga numquid opus sit.
Pl. *Curc.* 601 rogita unde istunc habeat anulum.

**Class 3:**
Pl. *Amph.* 1015–16 nunc domum ibo atque ex uxore hanc rem pergam exquirere/quis fuerit
Pl. *Capt.* 951–52 interibi ego ex hac statua verberea volo/erogitare meo minore quid sit factum filio.
Pl. *Bacch.* 189 rogabis me ubi sit:
Pl. *Truc.* 650–51 interrogo/quid eum velit

**Class 4:**
Ter. *Heaut.* 943–44 illum hoc rogito simul/quam ob rem id faciam.
Pl. *Cist.* 502 ab, quae re ubi iuri iurando tuo sit satias supsidi:
at hand to the speakers. In all cases of imperative forms of *videre* used in this way, even when the literal meaning of seeing is not involved, as at *Rud*. 1002 in Table 1, modal shift regularly does not occur in the Q-clause. As Tables 2–4 show, imperative verbs of saying, first person present tense verbs of asking, and expressions such as *scire volo* and *fac sciam* are also used to introduce such simple inquiries. This fact proves that the distinction between *verba videndi, sciendi, dicendi*, and *rogandi* is not relevant to the conditioning of modal shift.

Subclass 1b: simple inquiries with prolepsis.

Subclass 1b is identical to 1a simple inquiries, except that the sentences in 1b all show prolepsis (or *anticipatio*). The subject of the Q-clause has been removed from the Q-clause and turned into an accusative dependent on the associated verb. Modal shift regularly applies in subclass 1b irrespective of the type of associated verb.

Subclass 1c: double inquiries.

In subclass 1c the speaker is still making an inquiry about the Q-clause to which he wants an immediate answer, but he is also asking whether his addressee will answer the question simultaneously being asked. Modal shift regularly occurs in subclass 1c.

Subclass 1d: conjoined inquiries.

In subclass 1d the imperative verb of saying is syntactically connected by a conjunction with another imperative which is not a verb of saying. Modal shift regularly applies in subclass 1d. But for future reference note 1d' in Table 3 where two verbs of saying are coordinated and there is no modal shift in the Q-clause.

Subclass 1e: subordinated inquiries.

In subclass 1e the verb of saying continues to introduce a question the speaker wishes to be answered, but the verb is part of a final clause. Modal shift regularly occurs in subclass 1e.

2.2. Class 2: inquiries about Q-clauses with topics not present.

Class 2 differs from class 1a simple inquiries in that the topic of the Q-clause is not immediately present, so that the person questioned cannot give an immediate response. This is obvious when there are two imperatives “go and see” as at Ter. *Heaut*. 871 in Table 1, but it is also the case when only *vide* occurs, as at Pl. *Most*. 309, where Philematium tells the slave to get dice, which, of course, are not on stage. Pl. *Amph*. 787, cited by Delbrück, belongs to this class. Imperative verbs of asking can also be used this way, and a related usage is found when the speaker intends to turn the attention of the addressee to the question he is about to ask, as at *Rud*. 1148 with the future
imperative, in Table 3. Note that Daemones actually calls for an answer from Palaestra four lines later at 1153: *loquere nunciam, puella.* *Volo scire* is used exactly the same way at Pl. *Truc.* 779 in Table 2; Callicles only commands a response nine lines later: *loquere tu.* Modal shift regularly applies in class 2.

2.3. Class 3: question descriptions.

In class 3 the speaker is not addressing the Q-clause to a second person in order to obtain an answer; rather he is describing a question he has already asked or one that he will ask or find out about at a later time. With the second person indicative verbs of asking, the speaker is describing or presenting his addressee as asking a question. Class 3 regularly has modal shift.

2.4. Class 4: commands to inquire or find out.

In class 4 the speaker is not asking a question to obtain an answer at all, but is directing a second person to find out or to consider something for the second person’s sake. This is particularly clear in the whole interchange between Periplectomenus and Sceledrus at Pl. *Mil.* 535–37:

```
Pe. vin scire plane? Sc. cupio. Pe. abi intro ad vos domum.
continuo, vide sitne istaec vostra intus. Sc. licet,
pulchre admonuisti.
```

Modal shift regularly occurs in class 4.

2.5. Class 5: statements.

Subclass 5a consists of simple declarative statements: no question is being asked, no command given. Modal shift regularly occurs in class 5a.¹⁵

Subclass 5b consists entirely of the first person singular, present indicative *scio* immediately preceding the Q-clause. In these sentences *scio* is neither syntactically coordinated nor subordinated; it is never qualified or intensified, nor is it used in contrast with *nescio* or other verbs of ignorance and doubting. So far as the discourse function of subclass 5b utterances is concerned, it differs from 5a in that they are all anticipations of a second person’s words, sometimes forestalling an objection as at *Aul.* 174. Additional examples with the indicative are: Pl. *Bacch.* 78 and *Mil.* 36. Modal shift *usually* does not occur in subclass 5b in Plautus, but note *Epid.* 577 in Table 2 with modal shift. In Terence and later authors, however, subclass 5b seems always to have modal shift, and thus is merged with 5a.

¹⁵ See the apparatus criticus at *Ter. Ad.* 996.
2.6. Class 6: exclamations about present topics introduced by interrogative forms.

In class 6 we have the interrogative forms *viden* and *scin*, but here it is not used in an inquiry, i.e. the speaker is not asking whether a second person actually does see or know what the topic of the Q-clause refers to. In fact with *viden* the topic of the Q-clause is present at hand in the action on stage. Furthermore the Q-clause functions as an exclamation. This is particularly clear in Palinurus’s exclamation at Pl. *Curc.* 186-88 in Table 1. (He completes his exclamation with the sentence *nequeunt complecti satis.*) Modal shift does not occur in class 6.

2.7. Class 7: inquiries about the associated verb.

Class 7 differs from class 6 in that the speaker is actually inquiring whether a second person sees or knows. There are apparently no cases with the form *viden*, but *non vide* is common, as is *scin*. We can compare the similar use of *audin* as at Ter. *Hec.* 78 in Table 1: Scirtus is not on stage, but in the house, and Parmeno is genuinely inquiring if Scirtus has heard what he ordered him to do. Modal shift regularly occurs in class 7.

2.8. Class 8: exclamations about present topics introduced by imperative forms.

In class 8 we have imperative rather than interrogative verb forms. As in class 6 the Q-clause may be an exclamation regarding something on stage (8a) or a topic already described in discourse (8b). A good example of 8b is Pl. *Stich.* 410 in Table 1, where Epignomus had just described how his financial success had got him back in the good graces of his father-in-law Antipho. Modal shift does not occur in class 8.

2.9. Class 9: presentations of new topics.

In class 9 the topic of the Q-clause is not already established in discourse. For example, at Ter. *Andr.* 825 in Table 1 Chremes spells out what he means by *quam iniquo sis* in his following remarks to Simo. Modal shift regularly occurs in class 9.

2.10. Class 10: commands to make statements.

Finally in class 10 the speaker commands a second person to tell something to a third person or persons. Modal shift regularly occurs in class 10.

3. Preliminary Generalizations

To summarize the results of section 2, modal shift regularly does not apply to class 1a simple inquiries, class 5b *scio* anticipations, class 6 exclamations about present topics introduced by interrogative forms,
and class 8 exclamations about present topics introduced by imperative forms. In all the other classes modal shift regularly applies. A number of preliminary generalizations concerning regularities in modal shift emerge from the foregoing classificatory scheme: (1) Modal shift always applies to Q-clauses associated with third person and non-interrogative second person indicative verb forms; (2) When the topic of the Q-clause is not present or already introduced into the discourse, modal shift regularly applies, regardless of the associated verb form; and (3) When the associated verb is involved in certain syntactic relations, for example subordinated in a final clause, coordinated with imperatives of verbs other than *verba dicendi*, or governing a proleptic object, modal shift regularly applies to the Q-clause, regardless of the status of the utterance or other criteria. These generalizations and the very fact that the cases with modal shift could be separated from the cases without it on the bases of externally defined criteria show that there must be some coherent and substantive principles at work. It remains to determine what is directly relevant and what is redundant and how factors of syntactic structure may interact with function in discourse to condition modal shift.

4. Considerations of Speech Act Theory

Since it has been established that Old Latin modal shift is conditioned by speech situation and discourse function (i.e. conditioned by pragmatic factors) as well as by syntactic factors, it is reasonable to investigate the relevance of the theory of speech acts as developed by J. L. Austin and popularized by J. R. Searle.\(^\text{16}\) It is obvious that in actual discourse a speaker does far more than merely make statements: he can promise, cajole, advise, warn, introduce new topics, order, request, exclaim, ask questions, and so on. In fact, the sort of acts just indicated are varieties of one of three simultaneous acts involved in speaking. Austin distinguished “locutionary acts,” the making of an utterance, from “illocutionary acts,” the acts performed simply by making an utterance (asking, promising, exclaiming, etc.), and both of these from “perlocutionary acts,” the results intended by

---

making an utterance, such as obtaining an answer. I shall argue that it is the illocutionary status of the verb associated with the Q-clause that is crucially involved in determining whether modal shift takes place.

There is a distinction to be drawn between linguistic form and structure on the one hand and the use of that structure in discourse on the other. As noted in the descriptions of class 6 exclamations introduced by interrogative forms and class 7 inquiries about the associated verb (in which that verb is, of course, also interrogative in form), not every use of an interrogative form such as scin or audin involves the illocutionary act of questioning. In English, if we say at the dinner table “Could you pass me the salt?” we are making a request, not asking a question. From the perlocutionary point of view, we intend to get the person to pass the salt, not to answer yes or no. The actual illocutionary force is that of a request; the grammatical form determines only the incidental illocutionary force. Such indirect speech acts are, of course, associated with considerations of politeness and the tone that the speaker wishes to adopt.17 Similarly in an utterance such as rogo, quid est, rogo does not make a statement; it is part of the illocutionary act of asking the question; it is a performative verb. Performative verbs can serve to make the illocutionary force or an utterance explicit. When they do, they are always first person, primary tense (and, interestingly, in English never progressive in aspect). Performative verbs need not be overtly present. Quid est? also has the illocutionary force of a question. Quid est? is a primary performative; rogo quid est an explicit performative. If primary and explicit performatives are not completely identical in meaning, they are nevertheless very similar. In fact performative verbs resemble in a number of ways what are called parenthetical verbs used in making statements. In the utterance “John will be here at eight o’clock, I think” the words “I think” are, as Urmson says, “Used to modify or weaken the claim to truth implied by a simple assertion.”18 They do not serve to describe the speaker’s act of cognition. Similarly in the utterance “I ask you, what would you have done?” the performative verb “ask” makes explicit the illocutionary force—perhaps indicating

17 In general an indirect speech act can be performed by stating or questioning one of the felicity conditions on an explicit speech act: see D. Gordon and G. Lakoff, “Conversational postulates,” Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (Chicago 1971), 63–84. This principle seems to be a language (culture) universal; see P. Brown and S. Levinson, “Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena,” in E. Goody, Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction (Cambridge 1978), 56–311.

I am asking a real question, not just posing a rhetorical one. Such performative verbs can be characterized as modulations of the illocutionary force of the utterance in which they appear. The important point is that verbs can be illocutionary modulations only when they partake of at least the same general illocutionary force as the rest of the utterance would in their absence. We can see this very clearly when we contrast an utterance like “I asked you what you would have done.” This is a report, a description of the speech act of questioning; it is not itself a question, and “asked” is not an illocutionary modulation of the Q-clause. For future reference it is interesting to note that Lyons has suggested that “it is . . . possible that the surface structure status of a performative main verb should be accounted for by a grammatical rule which operates on two juxtaposed, or paratactically associated, clauses, neither of which is subordinate to the other.”19

It will be remembered that the failure of modal shift was restricted to just the following classes: 1a (simple inquiries), 5b (seio anticipations), 6 (exclamations about present topics introduced by interrogative forms), and 8 (exclamations introduced by imperative forms). All of these classes share a common characteristic. The verb associated with the Q-clause partakes of the same illocutionary force as the Q-clause could have by itself. This status of the associated verb is most obvious for the first person, present tense indicative verbs of asking of class 1a. Interrogo at Pl. Amph. 438 and rogo at Pseud. 971 in Table 4 are (in spite of Lindsay’s punctuation) typical first person, present tense forms used as direct performative verbs in explicit performative utterances. The relevance of the illocutionary status of the associated verb is established by the minimal contrast provided by the morphologically identical forms interrogo and rogo as used in class 3 question descriptions, where modal shift occurs. At Pl. Cap. 509 and Truc. 650 neither rogo nor interrogo can be performatives, for both are historical presents used to narrate previous acts of questioning. The illocutionary force of these utterances is constative, i.e. they are statements, not questions. Consequently rogo and interrogo cannot here be illocutionary modulations of the Q-clause (or its unshifted form). Unlike rogo and interrogo, the verbs of saying, seeing, and knowing of class 1a are not simple, direct performatives. They are all imperative forms (or involving volo, expeto and the like), but their illocutionary force is not that of a command or request to do anything more than what is implicit already in the act of asking a question. This fact enables us to

19 Lyons (above, note 16), p. 782.
explain why the questions of class 1a simple inquiries are all restricted
to topics that are immediately present. A genuine question cannot be
felicitously asked of a person who could not reasonably be assumed to
know the answer. If the topic were not present or known to the
addressee, this condition of felicity would not be met, and, as a result,
the imperatives would not introduce questions, but necessarily be
actual commands to see or observe. Such, of course, is precisely the
status of the imperatives in class 2 inquiries about topics not present
where modal shift regularly applies. Thus class 2 provides another
minimal contrast with class 1a that confirms the hypothesis that it is
the status of the associated verb as an illocutionary modulation that
blocks modal shift.

Class 6 (exclamations about present topics introduced by interroga-
tive forms) and class 8 (similar exclamations introduced by imperative
forms) show a parallel relationship between their verbs and the
associated Q-clauses. In these utterances, unlike those of class 1a
(simple inquiries), the Q-clause does not partake of the illocutionary
force of questioning; rather these utterances are exclamations or
presentations of discourse topics. We have already seen that the
interrogatives in class 6 are used indirectly and that they are equiva-
lent in illocutionary force to the imperatives of class 8. Now the act of
making an exclamation or presenting a topic in discourse necessarily
involves bringing the topic to the attention of the addressee. There is
no additional illocutionary force to *viden* and *vide* in classes 6 and 8;
they are not autonomous commands or questions. This fact allows us
to explain why, just as in class 1a simple inquiries, the topic of the Q-
clauses in classes 6 and 8 concerns matters present on stage or
established in discourse. One of the conditions for the felicity of a
simple exclamation is that the addressee can reasonably be assumed to
know what it is that is being exclaimed about. This condition is not
met in class 9, and, consequently, the imperatives in 9 have the
illocutionary force of a command to pay attention or consider
something new. Thus a minimal contrast parallel to that between class
1a simple inquiries about present topics and class 2 inquiries about
absent topics obtains between classes 6 and 8 on the one hand and
class 9 on the other.

The status of the associated verb as an actual command and not an
illocutionary modulation of the Q-clause is obvious also in class 10
(commands to make statements). Here the imperatives of the verbs of
saying are genuine commands to tell or describe something to a third
person. The imperatives of verbs of asking of class 4 (commands to
inquire or find out) are exactly parallel.
The relation of the imperatives of verbs of asking in class 2 (inquiries about topics not present) to those same forms in class 4 is instructive. In class 2 the addressee is ordered to ask a question of a third party with the perlocutionary intent that he inform the speaker; in class 4 the speaker has no such perlocutionary object in mind. Since modal shift is obligatory in both classes, it is clear that perlocutionary differences are not relevant to modal shift. This fact permits us to unite the interrogative verbs of saying of class 1c, where the speaker actually wants an answer to the question implicit in the Q-clause, with the interrogative forms of verbs of seeing of class 7, where there is no inquiry implicit in the utterance. The illocutionary force of the associated verb in both classes is interrogative, but in respect to the second person action of the verb, not only that of the Q-clause. Thus these interrogatives cannot be illocutionary modulations.

Of the ten major classes, only class 5 (statements) remains to be discussed. In class 5a the associated verb has constative illocutionary force, i.e. it is making a statement. Consequently, these verbs cannot be modulations, since making a statement cannot be done by asking a question. Furthermore, we can unite class 3 question descriptions with class 5a statements all as constative utterances.

Class 5b (scio anticipations) requires some discussion. This class constitutes a special sort of speech act. The illocutionary force of scio is not constative as in 5a. The speaker is not really asserting his knowledge; rather, he is anticipating the second person's next remarks or forestalling objections. This distinction emerges in the contrast between Pl. Men. 764a, which is clearly a class 5a constative utterance, and Pl. Aul. 174 or Stich. 112. The same anticipatory force of scio is also found when the verb is not associated with a Q-clause, as at Pl. Merc. 164 ff., where Charinus interrupts Acanthio. Note that scio is followed by oratio recta.

Ac. immo es—Ch. scio iam, miserum dices tu. Ac. dixi ego tacens.

Thus in class 5b, scio is also a modulation of the utterance's illocutionary force. The relationship between scio and its associated Q-clause in class 5b is parallel to that between scin and its associated Q-clause in class 6. This parallelism is particularly clear in the case of echo-retorts such as Pl. Poen. 1318. Consequently the two classes may be united, at least for Plautus. It is important, however, to point out that class 5b does not exist in Terence as a block to modal shift. At Ter. Heaut. 626 ff. Chremes is clearly anticipating what his wife Sostrata is about to say concerning her child, yet the interruption shows modal shift:
So. Meministin me ess(e) gravidam et mihi te maxumo opere edicere, si puellam parerem, nolle tolli? Ch. scio quid feceris: sustulisti.

In fact, already in Plautus there is probably variation in modal shift in these anticipatory utterances, since Pl. Epid. 577 in Table 2, which has modal shift, seems fairly certainly to belong to class 5b. Thus in class 5b we have evidence for syntactic change in progress in Plautus that is already complete in Terence.

To summarize: in all cases where modal shift fails to apply, the verb associated with the Q-clause is a modulation of the illocutionary force that the Q-clause would have if used independently. This rule allows us to explain why failure of modal shift is found only in association with primary tense verb forms in the first person and the imperative or interrogative form having indirect illocutionary force; it is only in these forms that verbs can be used as illocutionary modulations of a Q-clause.

5. Grammatical Conditioning of Modal Shift

We must now consider whether there is any purely grammatical conditioning of modal shift in addition to the conditioning determined by the illocutionary status of the associated verb. The subclasses 1b (inquiries with prolepsis), 1c (double inquiries), 1d (conjoined inquiries), and 1e (subordinated inquiries) were initially grouped together with 1a (simple inquiries) on the basis of shared perlocutionary force and distinguished in syntactic terms. We have seen, however, that perlocutionary force is irrelevant to modal shift, and further that class 1c modal shift can be explained by the actual illocutionary force of the associated verb. Furthermore, the contrast of Pl. Pers. 664 at 1d′ in Table 3 (without modal shift) shows that the syntactic structure of coordinated imperatives is not sufficient by itself to entail modal shift. Rather, in 1d′ the two imperatives eloquere actatum alque indica are pleonastic; both of them have the same illocutionary force and are equally modulations. Thus 1d′ can be united with class 1a (simple inquiries). In subclass 1d itself, however, the imperative verb of saying is coordinated with an imperative that expresses a genuine command, for example redduc uxorem. Thus these imperative verbs of saying also express actual commands to speak. As a result subclass 1d can be united with class 2 (inquiries about topics not present), where the imperatives also have the illocutionary force of actual commands. We come closer to genuine syntactic conditioning in subclass 1e, but only in the sense that a verb subordinated in a final clause cannot have
the sort of illocutionary force required if it is to be a modulation of the utterance as a whole.

This leaves us with subclass 1b (inquiries with prolepsis of the subject of the Q-clause). The utterances in class 1b do not seem to differ from those of 1a from the point of view of speech act theory: they all involve acts of questioning. This is quite clear when we compare Pistoclerus's question to Mnesilochus at Pl. *Bacch.* 555, *dic modo hominem qui sit*, with his question at *Bacch.* 553 also addressed to Mnesilochus, and having exactly the same force, *opsecro hercle loquere, quis is est?* The only difference between these sentences is that the one at *Bacch.* 555 shows prolepsis, or *anticipatio;* the subject of the Q-clause, *homo,* has been moved out of the Q-clause and made the object of the associated verb. At *Bacch.* 553, on the other hand, the pronoun *is* remains within the Q-clause as its subject. Prolepsis is described in modern generative grammar as the transformation called Raising to Object. In analyzing the syntactic conditions on modal shift we must be careful to distinguish similar surface syntactic structures which do not result from Raising to Object. For example at Pl. *Pseud.* 261 *noscere saltem hunc quis est* cannot be a case of prolepsis, since *noscere* is not used absolutely by Plautus, and consequently there is no modal shift. It is not entirely certain that modal shift is obligatory with prolepsis in the sense of Raising to Object, cf. Pl. *Pseud.* 1184 *chlamydem hanc commemora quanti conductast. Commemorare,* however, differs from *dicere* in the senses in which it can take a direct object, so that it would be possible to argue that Pl. *Pseud.* 1184 is not a genuine case of prolepsis. A categorical distinction should probably not be insisted on, and variation in modal shift might be expected in cases where either syntactic analysis is possible.

While prolepsis (in the sense of Raising to Object) appears to be a purely syntactic factor that conditions modal shift in Old Latin, the association between these two syntactic processes may have been pragmatic in origin. Prolepsis is typically a topicalizing transformation, i.e. it is typically used to highlight the noun phrase topic of discourse by moving it to an earlier, more exposed position. This function can be seen quite clearly at Pl. *Trin.* 871 ff. The Sycophanta has been knocking on the door of the *senex* Charmides. Charmides steps out and asks him

*quid, adulescens, quaeris? quid vis? quid istas pultas?*

and the Sycophanta finally answers with the sentence

*Lesbonicum hic adulescentem quaero in his regionibus ubi habitet.*
The prolepsis of *Lesbionicum* immediately introduces the topic of the inquiry. The Sycophanta’s utterance can be regarded as a complex speech act: a statement in answer to Charmides’ question, the introduction of a topic (obviously unknown) to Charmides, and finally a question about that topic. Such an utterance satisfies, on several counts, the conditions we have already established as sufficient to cause modal shift. Since a large number of utterances showing prolepsis would be involved in topic introduction and would, therefore, already require modal shift, the characteristic conditions for analogical extension would be established: modal shift could be readily generalized to other utterances showing prolepsis, probably along a scale of discourse saliency, leading to modal shift in cases such as Pl. *Bacch.* 555. Pl. *Pseud.* 1184, just discussed, could be taken as evidence for this hypothesis of a hierarchy of saliency. At Pl. *Pseud.* 1184 the topic is present in the discourse situation—*chlamydem hanc*—so that this utterance meets the illocutionary criteria sufficient to block modal shift.

Having formulated the hypothesis that modal shift is blocked by the status of the associated verb as an illocutionary modulation, we can see that where modal shift fails to apply we do not have in fact indirect questions in the sense of *oratio obliqua* at all, but rather genuine speech acts of questioning, exclaiming, and so on. On the other hand, where the associated verb is not an illocutionary modulation of the Q-clause, the clause really is an indirect question, exclamation, etc. Accordingly we can formulate a rule that brings Old Latin closer to Classical Latin than has been previously appreciated: in Old Latin modal shift is obligatory in all indirect questions. On this approach Old and Classical Latin differ not in the syntax of indirect questions, but in the definition of what constitutes indirect questions. In Old Latin indirect question status is defined pragmatically in terms of the illocutionary status of the associated verb; in Classical Latin it is generally defined in terms of the surface syntactic structure.

We can see that more was involved in the evolution of the syntax of indirect questions out of paratactic structures than a purely syntactic process of generalization from deliberative questions. The evolution was conditioned by pragmatic, speech act factors, and already by the time of Plautus we see the beginnings of the stage that will lead to the situation in Classical Latin. In Old Latin a substantial number of all Q-clauses associated with verbs were already subject to modal shift, whether for reasons of illocutionary status or for the syntactic reason of prolepsis. A re-analysis of the conditioning factors as syntactic was the next step. We have seen evidence of two areas in which this re-
analysis began. Regular modal shift in subclass 1b inquiries with prolepsis introduced a purely syntactic condition. Modal shift was then generalized proceeding through similar syntactic structures such as those produced by Equi-NP Deletion. The second area is the restricted class of scio plus Q-clause anticipations of class 5b. This subclass was open to interpretation as declarative sentences like 5a and the extension of modal shift further encouraged by the overwhelming frequency of modal shift in Q-clauses associated with all other occurrences of forms of scire.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Caesar’s Bibracte Narrative
and the Aims of Caesarian Style
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The distinctive characteristics of Caesarian prose style are widely if imperfectly known, but Caesar’s merits as a stylist are still argued. Paradoxically, much of the debate has as its origin the domination of our standards of good Latinity and good prose style by Cicero, who himself praised the style of Caesar’s commentarii in a well-known passage from the Brutus (§262). Whether Cicero is being disingenuous in this passage is debatable,¹ but the fact remains that Cicero commended the prose style of the political enemy over whose assassination he later gloated unashamedly. The Brutus passage does not seem to be ironic;² and the fact that Cicero’s praise of Caesarian style does not appear to follow from the dictates he lays down regarding good historical style may be attributed to the generic differences between history and commentarii.³

Until recently Caesarian prose style has fared less well at the hands of modern critics than it did at the hands of Caesar’s contemporary enemies. For example, Nettleship prefaces his harsh condemnation of


² But see P. T. Eden, “Caesar’s Style: Inheritance versus Intelligence,” Glotta 40 (1962), pp. 74–117, esp. pp. 74 ff., on the possibility that Cicero is referring ruefully to the reception accorded his own commentarii.

³ Not even Livy fulfilled the demands Cicero made upon historical style (in, for example, De or. 2.51–64); but most literary manifestos are more honored in the breach. See T. J. Luce, Livy. The Composition of His History (Princeton 1977), pp. 181 ff.
Caesar both as an individual and as a stylist with the assertion (impossible to prove) that “while much of Cicero’s writing has come down to us in its most finished shape, nothing of Caesar’s remains but his most carelessly written work.” He continues:

It must be pointed out that Cicero’s success was not due merely to his having mastered the laws of prose rhythm, nor merely to his general power as a stylist. His mind was of the poetical and imaginative order, while Caesar’s, manly, sound, and robust, was without a touch of poetry. Strength of passion Caesar has, but no imagination.4

It is a truism that Caesar was not a Ciceronian, but too many critical evaluations of Caesarian style issue from canons of taste that are basically Ciceronian, with predictable results. For example, although he avoids the more extreme Ciceronian prejudices of Nettleship, J. J. Schlicher, in his otherwise excellent analysis of Caesarian style, taxes the first book of the Bellum Gallicum with being over-precise and argumentative, with using an old-fashioned mode of expression, and with being not yet adapted to a narrative technique.5 Such a view of Caesarian prose style presupposes (although Schlicher does not say so) a sort of stylistic evolution that moved ineluctably from the old annalists to Ciceronian periodicity, with Caesar—at least in BG I—certainly looking to the past, perhaps ruefully looking forward to a stylistic future he was not yet capable of fitting into. This is an assumption hard to credit in the case of one of the leading orators of the late Republic, but it is the assumption, I think, that lies at the heart of most Tulliocentric analyses of Caesar’s prose style.

Even a fairly strict reliance upon empirical analysis of Caesar’s style does not render one immune from Ciceronian prejudices: even P. T. Eden, despite his attempts to stand upon empirically firm ground in his analysis of Caesar’s stylistic debt to the annalists, falls prey to his own preference for Cicero:

The style and syntax of Caesar, or at any rate that immense number of stylistic and syntactic practices he shares with Cicero, have long since been consecrated as paradigms. They have become the standards to which the Latinity of others, Roman jurists no less than modern students, is explicitly or implicitly referred. This canonical status is no doubt entirely justifiable . . . [my italics].6

6 Eden, op. cit., p. 74.
This is not to say, however, that Eden's critique is without merit. The great strengths of Eden's analysis are, first, his attempt at a sort of "empirical fair-mindedness" and, second, his constant recognition that, in comparing the literary remains of Caesar and Cicero, one is comparing (at least) two very different literary genres. Eden's analysis of Caesar and the meager remains of the old annalists leads him to a conclusion that is probably correct and, interestingly, almost directly opposed to Nettleship's: "[T]he early annalist manner is generally dry and monotonous, but it does carry with it an undeniable impression of passionless objectivity. This suited Caesar's needs exactly: he would be his own most detached judge and expositor."7 Eden therefore sees in Caesar's style the result of a conscious choice: the avoidance of obvious exornatio and the suppression of extreme rhetorical flourishes were means to an end, as was the text of the work itself. This is a fair conclusion, so far as it goes: it treats Caesar as an artist rather than as a self-serving political hack; but beyond that, Eden does not give Caesar's early prose style much credit when compared to the capabilities of the "comprehensive Livian period." For example, in dealing with Caesar's tendency to repeat key words and phrases (about which I shall have something to say later), Eden says:

Caesar is notoriously guilty of such close repetitions [as BG 1. 49. 1–3] . . . [T]he repetition is due neither to carelessness nor to a desire for accuracy, but occurs simply because Caesar took no pains to avoid it. In fact here we glimpse the basic substratum of Caesar's annalistic style, running directly from writers like Calpurnius Piso, outcrops of which continue to manifest themselves up to the end of Caesar's work.8

The metaphor is instructive (to say nothing of phrases like "notoriously guilty"): by Eden's standards, the BG contains boulders of clumsiness that lurk beneath its otherwise almost featureless surface, "outcrops" of uncouth repetition that make it hard for the reader to plough through. While Cicero would no doubt have appreciated the agricultural metaphor, it does not jibe well with Eden's conclusion (quoted above, note 7); moreover, such criticisms, at their worst, tempt the uncritical reader to dismiss Caesar (at least in the early books of the BG) as little more than a slavish though effective follower of an outmoded, pre-Ciceronian style; at its best, Eden's view of Caesarian style gives the impression that Caesar either had a tin ear or, worse, was indifferent to the sound of his writing.

What is needed is an analysis of Caesarian style that takes account

---

7 Eden, op. cit., p. 94.
8 Eden, op. cit., p. 83.
both of the appeal of the annalists for Caesar and of the aims Caesar had in bucking the trend in Latinity represented by Cicero. If we take it as given that Caesar was not incapable of something resembling the "comprehensive Livian period" even in the early books of the BG, we must answer the question what the effect of Caesar's stylistic choice was—even if we agree with Eden as to its purpose. W. Richter and, more recently, H. C. Gotoff have begun to address this point. Richter observes that Caesar's aim is to make motives, assumptions and consequences understandable as a logical complex which presents Caesar "als kritischen Beobachter eines Kampfverlaufes. . . . [D]ie Kunst des Darstellers spiegelt den Meister der Befehlstechnik."

Correct as this analysis is—and Richter, to his credit, uses BG I in this passage—the observation derives not from Caesar's prose style per se: Richter does not show how, for example, Cicero (had he been so minded) could not have taken the same material and achieved the same result in his own fashion. Gotoff, on the other hand, treats the nuts and bolts of Caesarian style in much detail, analyzing the complex subtlety and flexibility Caesar achieves even in the early books of the BG. But nearly all of Gotoff's examples are drawn from the second and fourth books of the BG, and most are comparatively short passages—on the order of one or two sentences. Significantly, the two examples he chooses from BG I illustrate the purpose behind a lack of balance between an ablative absolute phrase and the main clause of the sentence (I. 41) and periodicity of a sort not often associated with Caesar (I. 6). In short, Gotoff has shown both what is Caesarian about Caesar and the style's artistic capabilities.

I propose to take the methods of Richter and Gotoff and apply them to a longer, continuous passage of early Caesarian prose: Caesar's account of his fight with the Helvetians at Bibracte (BG I. 23 ff.). This engagement, fought in 58 B.C., was Caesar's first major battle as commander in Gaul and, as he saw it, his victory broke the back of a dangerous invasion that could have jeopardized Roman control of the province. In this narrative Caesar faced the difficult task of describing a personal triumph and an historically pivotal battle

10 H. C. Gotoff, loc. cit.: the author also remarks (p. 4, note 14) on the "carefully controlled rhetorical ornamentation and ethopoiia that makes Book I perhaps the least typical part of the Caesarian corpus."
11 S. Reinach, "Les communiqués de César" (Revue de philologie 39, 1915), pp. 29–49, raises the possibility that Caesar's campaign against the Helvetians was a "picked" fight and that the Helvetic migration actually proved no threat to Roman interests. See also Richter, op. cit., ch. 4, §4.a, "Der Ausbruch des Helvetierkrieges," pp. 102–16.
in terms that would enhance his dignitas but at the same time give as
little offense as possible to those at Rome who already viewed his
command with mistrust and apprehension. Thus Caesar was obvi-
ously concerned with the impression his account would make at
home, and we should probably believe that he was pulled in different
directions by aims that would appear, on the surface at least, mutually
exclusive. There are also curiosities of style in this passage that seem
to be flaws when they are considered in the light of Ciceronian
"norms." Perhaps the most immediately obvious example is the
repetition of certain verbs and their derivatives: iacio (six times), mitto
(nine times) and fero (five times)—and all within the space of about
two-and-a-half Oxford pages. But we must not judge these repeti-
tions and other stylistic "quirks" too harshly, especially if (1) our
standard of what constitutes a quirk is based upon Cicero and (2) we
fail to look for a possible reason for Caesar's having written as he did.
That Caesar was trying in his account of Bibracte to enhance his
public image will, I think, be granted without argument. What I seek
to prove, and what will provoke argument, is that Caesar's Bibracte
narrative succeeds as a work of prose art.

Postridie eius diei, quod omnino biduum supererat cum exercitui
frumentum metiri oporteret, et quod a Bibracte, oppido Aeduorum
longe maximo et copiosissimo, non amplius milibus passuum xviii
aberat, rei frumentariae prospiciendum existimavit: iter ab Helvetiis
avertit ac Bibracte ire contendit. Ea res per fugitivos L. Aemili.
decurionis equitum Gallorum, hostibus nuntiatur. Helvetii, seu quod
timore perceptissimi Romanos discedere a se existimarent, eo magis quod
pride superioribus locis occupatis proelium non commisissent, sive eo
quo re frumentaria intercludi posse confiderent, commutato consiliii
atque itinere converso nostros a novissimo agmine insequi ac laciesere
coeperunt. (23, 1–3)

At the beginning of his Bibracte narrative, Caesar immediately
makes a distinction between the Roman strategy and that of the

12 Caelius reported to Cicero in June, 51, some of the rumors circulating in Rome
concerning Caesar's campaign (Ad fam. VIII. 1. 4). While commentaries or dispatches
by the commander probably would not have won over Caesar's harshest critics in the
senate and elsewhere, they would have helped to allay the sort of fears that Caelius
mentions.

13 All references to the BG in this paper are to the Oxford Classical Text of Du
Pontet.

14 Though it is well known that Cicero wrote a commentarius about his own actions
against the conspiracy of Catiline which he himself thought needed stylistic "touching
up."
Helvetians. It was (and is) a none-too-glamorous fact of military life that an army must be provisioned while it is in the field. The first concern Caesar faces as a commander is the insurance of an adequate food supply for his forces. Logically, reasonably, he keeps his logistics in mind (23. 1) and breaks off his pursuit of the enemy before putting himself at a potentially dangerous disadvantage. The construction of 23. 1 reflects the commander’s ratio: an ablative of time for temporal accuracy and transition from the previous sentence, followed by a balanced pair of quod clauses, followed by another balanced pair of main clauses in asyndeton. Such balancing is a conscious effect, of course, and its purpose is to reveal to the reader at once the options that lay open to Caesar as a commander and the logical, most prudent course of action given the circumstances. What the reader is supposed to think is that no other course of action lay open to Caesar which would not have jeopardized the success of the mission.

The logical and likely suppositions of 23. 1 are continued to 23. 2, a short, smoothly-flowing period that shifts the reader’s focus from the Roman point of view to that of the Helvetians. Despite the change in perspective, 23. 3 reinforces the idea of Caesar’s providentia signified in 23. 1. In 23. 3 we have yet another straightforward periodic sentence whose structure is, like that of 23. 1, built around a complex of quod clauses. The period begins with an explicit statement of the subject, Helvetii (necessary because the sentence begins in asyndeton and the subject of the prior sentence was ea res); next comes a pair of explanatory quod clauses (the first of which is expanded by an additional quod clause15) which give the most likely possibilities to account for the sudden change in the enemy plan; after the quod clauses comes a pair of ablatives absolute, and finally the main clause, for which we have been waiting from the start.

Thus we see that in 23. 1–3 Caesar sets forth in well-balanced sentences the state of affairs just prior to the battle (whose preliminary skirmishes are described in 23. 4). Like any good commander Caesar takes stock of his own situation and tries to account for that of the enemy. We should note, however, that despite the fact that the intelligence controlling the presentation and the activities described in 23. 1–3 is unmistakably Caesar’s, Caesar is nowhere named in §23. Significantly, he is not named until 24. 1, where the emphasis shifts from the strategic to the tactical, from planning on a grand, rational (and somewhat impersonal) scale to planning on a smaller scale that

15 Contrast 23. 1, where the quod clauses are more equally balanced.
allows for greater, more detailed analysis of personal motives and actions.

Postquam id animum advertit, copias suas Caesar in proximum collem subducit; equitatumque qui sustineret hostium impetum misit. Ipse interim in colle medio triplicem aciem instruxit legionum quattuor veteranorum [ita uti supra]; sed in summō iugo duas legiones quas in Gallia citeriore proxime consipserat et omnia auxilia collocatī, ac totum montem hominibus complerit, et interea sarcinas in unum locum conferret, et eum ab eis qui in superiore acie constiterant muniri iussit. Helvetii cum omnibus suis carris secuti impedimenta in unum locum contulerunt; ipsi confertissima acie, reiecto nostro equitatu, phalanget facta sub primam nostram aciem successerunt. (24. 1–4)

In 23. 1–3 the reader is invited to survey the strategic situation and to make of it what he will; by contrast, in 24. 1–3 we see Caesar's tactical response to a new and perhaps unexpected situation: the Helvetians decide to fight. The Roman commander is here at his most decisive (subducit/misit/instruxit/iussit); the impression of his decisiveness is heightened by the (corresponding) tetracolon of passive infinitives in 24. 3 (collocari/compleri/conferri/muniri), all depending upon the final iussit. Quick action is required; the enemy whom Caesar has earlier (§22) failed to engage is now ready for a fight, and the smoothly flowing syntax of 24. 1–3 reflects the speed with which Caesar prepares to give battle; it also reflects the ease with which Caesar changes his plans to take advantage of an unexpected situation. 24. 1 is short and ultimately periodic (due to the postponement of misit); 24. 2 differs from its predecessor in the middle position (!) of its main verb (instruxit). The third sentence, 24. 3, is longer by almost a third than the first two taken together, and its periodicity is the more noticeable for the tetracolon of passive infinitives all waiting upon iussit, as noted above. The writing is as lucid as Caesar's tactics are conventional: high ground has always been advantageous in battle.16 But in this part of the BG Caesar is concerned with more than a matter of conventional tactics: he is keeping in mind both what the enemy might be thinking about the Roman willingness to fight (see 23. 3), and the tactics the enemy might be expected to use once the

16 M. Rambaud, L'art de la déformation historique dans les commentaires de César (Paris 1953), p. 41, quotes Jullian's observation that Caesar followed monotonously conventional tactics as a matter of habit. Rambaud rightly comments: “L'éminent historien n'avait pas songé que les manoeuvres dont il reproche à César la monotonie sont des nécessités militaires de tous les temps.”
battle is joined. Here again we are reminded of Caesar’s *providentia*, which is further emphasized when (24. 4) the Helvetians virtually doom their brave effort in advance by forming a phalanx for a difficult uphill charge. 24. 4 is in effect a brief recapitulation of the previous sentences, for the Helvetians carry out what must have been a universal pre-battle maneuver before forming their phalanx; thus, in the first half of 24. 4 Caesar can afford to be brief. His brevity continues in the last half of the sentence, where the preliminary skirmishes of the engagement are rendered with simple compactness in ablatives absolute. 24. 4 is also noteworthy for the occurrence of a verb formed from *iacio*, in the ablative absolute *reieto nostro equitatu*. As noted above, forms of *iacio* are repeated six more times from 24. 4 to 27. 2; though such repetitions may appear dull or at least bewildering, they are artfully used in this narrative and emphasize in the end the personal nature of Caesar’s triumph.

Caesar primum suo, deinde omnium ex conspectu remotis equis, ut aequato omnium periculo sper fugae tollerat, cohortatus suos proelium commisit. Milites e loco superiore pilis missis facile hostium phalangem perfregerunt. Ea disiecta, gladiis dextris in eos impetum fecerunt. Gallis magno ad pugnam erat impedimento quod pluribus eorum scuti uno actu pilorum transfixis et colligatis, cum ferrum se inflexisset, neque evellere neque sinistra impedita satis commodum pugnare poterant; multi ut diu iactato brachio praeparent scutum manu emittere et nudo corpore pugnare. Tandem vulneribus defessi et pedem referre et, quod mons suberat circiter mille passuum, eo se recipere coeperunt. (25. 1–5)

If our gaze is progressively narrowed from the strategic to the tactical in §§23 and 24, we find that at 25. 1 we are invited to consider Caesar’s personal bravery in the face of battle. By sending away his own horse as well as those of his staff, Caesar shows his willingness to undergo the same risks that his legionaries will face. Beginning here at 25. 1, we note several repetitions of verb forms already noted: *commisit* (25. 1), *missis* (25. 2), *disiecta* (*ibid.*). 25. 1 is periodic, though brief; 25. 2 (printed rightly as two separate sentences in modern texts) communicates most of the violence of the battle in ablatives absolute, with the outcome of the engagement given alliteratively in the main clause (*phalangem perfregerunt*). The syntax of these first three sentences (25. 1–2) is simple and, again, smooth-flowing; but when in 25. 3–4 Caesar shifts our gaze to the Helvetians, the syntax suddenly changes: the periodic, easy-going syntax of the prior sentences is abandoned as the main clause of 25. 3 comes first with *magno* in a mild hyperbaton. There follows yet another *quod* clause (the sixth since 23.
1) that is periodic in nature (ablative absolute—cum clause—correlated pair of infinitives [the second of which is expanded with its own ablative absolute] depending upon poterant); 25. 4 is a result clause with ut in hyperbaton. Where the syntax of 25. 1–2 clearly reflects the relative ease with which the Romans beat back the Helvetian phalanx, that of 25. 3–4 reflects the confusion brought upon the enemy by Caesar’s tactics. Thus the commander’s ratio and providentia of §24 are vindicated in 25. 5.

Capto monte et sucedentibus nostris, Boii et Tulingi, qui hominum milibus circumstiterunt, ex itinere nostros latere apertos circumvenere, et id conspicati Helvetii, qui in montem sese receperant, rursus instare et proelium redintegrare coeperunt. Romani conversa signa bipertitio intulerunt: prima et secunda acies, ut victis ac summotis resisteret; tertia, ut venientis sustineret.

Ita ancipiti proelio diu atque acriter pugnatum est. Diutius cum sustinere nostrorum impetus non possent, alteri se, ut coeperant, in montem receperunt, alteri ad impedimenta et carros suos se contulerunt. Nam hoc toto proelio, cum ab hora septima ad vesperum pugnatum sit, aversum hostem videre nemo potuit. (25. 6 – 26. 2)

There is, however, an unexpected turn of events when the Boii and Tulingi counterattack and throw the Romans into some confusion. If there is a point in the Bibracte narrative where Caesar tacitly admits to a lapse in his preparations, this is it. In order to preserve his victory Caesar must split his triple battle line, thus weakening his forces. Though Caesar does not say so forthrightly (the battle was merely anceps), there was a grave danger that, with his lines weakened thus and split up, the Helvetians could easily have broken through, had it proved possible for them to reform their phalanx (though whether they could in fact have reformed it depends upon how many of them had lost their shields [cf. 25. 1–5]; a phalanx lacking in shields is a decidedly inferior fighting force). The syntax of 25. 6–7 reflects this changed state of affairs: where the actions of the enemy are earlier described in choppy, starting-and-stopping ablatives absolute and subordinate clauses (see especially 25. 3 ff.), now we have the Helvetian action described in smooth, parallel, periodic sentences (depending upon circumvenere and coeperunt, respectively), and the Roman side is described in abrupt, choppy phrases (25. 7).

Thus Caesar’s syntax reflects the ebb and flow of the battle even before 26. 1 sums up in words what the reader intuitively felt to be the case before. In 26. 2 Caesar pays an ungrudging compliment to his gallant enemy; the reader, perhaps, does not see at first that in noting
the enemy’s stubborn, almost fanatical bravery Caesar calls attention to that of his own soldiers, and to his ability to change tactics quickly, when the situation demands it.

Ad multam noctem etiam ad impedimenta pugnatum est, propertea quod pro vallo carros obiecerant, et e loco superiore in nostros venientis tela coiciebant, et non nulli inter carros rotasque mataras ac tragulas subiciebant nostrosque vulnerabant. Diu cum esset pugnatum, impedimentis castrisque nostri potiti sunt. Ibi Orgetorigis filia atque unus e filiis captus est. Ex eo proelio circiter hominum milia cxxx superfuerunt, eaque tota nocte continenter ierunt: nullam partem noctis itinere intermisso in finis Lingonum die quarto pervenerunt, cum et propter vulnera militum et propter sepulturam occisorum nostri triduum morati eos sequi non potuissent. Caesar ad Lingonas litteras nuntiosque misit, ne eos frumento neve alia re iuvarent: qui si iuvissent, se eodem loco quo Helvetios habiturum. Ipse triduo intermisso cum omnibus copiis eos sequi coepit.

Helvetii omnium rerum inopia adducti legatos de deditione ad eum miserunt. (26. 3 – 27. 1)

It is now (26. 3) dark, and the battle rages still around the Helvetian baggage train, but with an ironic reversal of roles. Where before (25. 2–3) the Romans had used high ground to advantage in breaking the initial charge of the Helvetian phalanx, the Helvetians now use high ground to advantage in putting up stiff resistance to an uphill Roman attack. In 26. 3 there are three more repetitions of forms of *iacio*: the Gauls *pro vallo carros obiecerant*; they *tela coiciebant* at the advancing Romans; finally they *inter carros rotasque mataras ac tragulas subiciebant nostrosque vulnerabant*—the first of only two mentions Caesar makes of Roman casualties. Another fierce fight ensues before the Romans finally capture the baggage train and put to flight those of the enemy who are able to escape.

The syntax of 26. 1–4 is simple and straightforward but repetitive in the extreme. Not only do we have the three recurrences of derivatives of *iacio* mentioned above, but we also see several repetitions of other words: *diui/diuitis* (26. 1 bis, 26. 4), forms of *pugno* (the impersonal passive forms subsuming most of the violence in these paragraphs, 26. 1, 2, 3, 4), and *impedimenta* (26. 1, 3, 4). The repeated vocabulary and the short, abrupt syntax are reflective of the exhaustion on both sides after so many hours of what must have been a nasty fight; thus, the forthright statement in 26. 5b that the Romans were too tired to pursue the Helvetians without several days of rest is anticipated syntactically in 26. 1–4. At the same time, it is indicative of the completeness of the Roman victory that the Helvetians are

17 The other mention is in 26. 5.
compelled to flee for four days straight, nullam partem noctis itinere intermesso (26. 5), while the Romans rest and nurse their wounded. In the description of the aftermath of the battle there is one further repeated verb that is significant: as just noted, the Helvetians flee both day and night; Caesar, on the other hand, litteras nuntiosque misit to the Lingones and then ipse triduo intermisse follows with his army (26. 6), in stark contrast to the necessary haste of the enemy. Finally, balancing the litteras nuntiosque misit of 26. 6, the Helvetii . . . legatos de deditone ad eum miserunt (27. 1).

Qui cum eum in itinere convenissent seque ad pedes proiectissent suppliciterque locuti flentes pacem petissent, atque eos in eo loco quod essent suum adventum expectare iussisset, paruerunt. (27. 2)

The final surrender of the Helvetians takes place in 27. 2. The sentence is refreshingly periodic after so long a stretch of short, choppy sentences and phrases; it eloquently emphasizes the triumph of Roman arms and, more importantly, of the Roman commander (Caesar is mentioned, directly or indirectly, four times in 27. 2; contrast this with the relative scarcity of Caesar’s self-references in the early portions of the narrative). 27. 2 begins with a resumptive relative—a construction that Caesar allows himself at only one other part of the Bibracte narrative—\(^{18}\) and goes immediately into a cum clause with yet another tetracolon of verbs. This cum clause is worth examining closely, for the first three verbs it controls form a tricolon whose subject is Helvetii (convenissent/proiectissent/petissent); the fourth verb (iussisset) has as its subject Caesar. Immediately after the fourth verb of the cum clause the sentence comes to a definitive end, as does the battle itself, with the verb every commander would like to use of his foes: paruerunt. Of course this sentence is unbalanced, with the shortest of main clauses weighing in against a ponderous, complicated cum clause; but the syntax—and it is straightforward syntax—reflects the discomfiture of the Helvetians, just as choppy, non-periodic syntax reflected the ebb and flow of battle earlier in the narrative. Also, the placement of paruerunt makes the sentence ultimately periodic.

The personal nature of Caesar’s triumph is emphasized in a subtler way, too, by the seventh and last repetition of a derivative of iacio (in the cum clause). The enemy who a few days earlier had thrown together wagons as a wall, and thrown volleys of spears and wounded many Roman soldiers (26. 3), now throw themselves at Caesar’s feet to beg for peace. Thus Caesar, as noted, emphasizes the personal nature of his victory, but at the same time the precautions he takes to ensure

---

\(^{18}\) The other resumptive relative is found in 26. 6 (qui si iussissent . . .). Eden (op. cit., p. 87) complains of a “plethora of resumptive pronouns and adverbs” in Caesar.
that the Helvetic homeland remain free of migrating Germans (28. 4 ff.) emphasize his continued devotion to the constitutional responsibilities of his office.

It cannot be denied that there is personal propaganda in Caesar’s account of his battle at Bibracte, but the self-glorification takes the form of irresistibly logical examples of Caesarian providentia and ratio put at the disposal of the Roman state. This has the effect of making any praise of the commander seem merited but unsought; the reader is led to agreement by the narrative’s lucidity and by its author’s forthrightness, which are in turn effects (as Eden saw) vouchedf by the absence of obvious rhetorical exornatio.

While it is right to search out Caesar’s debts to the old annalists, and to examine his prose style as it developed and was influenced by the changing standards of the day, it is not right to regard the early books of the BG merely as dry, rigid experiments undertaken by Caesar on the path to his development of a more serviceable prose style. Instead, these early writings should probably be regarded as the culmination of the old annalistic genre—a style which it behooved Caesar to adopt but which he was not forced into following uncritically. Indeed, one should ask what became of the “comprehensive Livian period” after Livy: the severities and plainness of an Atticist style must have jibed well with the old, purely Roman style of the annalists; the unadorned, choppy, yet subtly effective style of Caesar commended itself to the enemies of Ciceronianism¹⁹ and might well have had as much influence upon apologists for the principate as Cicero had upon adherents of republicanism. But if the style and content per se of Caesar’s Bibracte narrative tell us anything about Roman prose, it is that descriptive subtlety and the achievement of a difficult rhetorical goal did not always require a Cicero. When we incorrectly and unreasonably exclude the early books of the BG from consideration as anything other than examples of narrative primitiveness pure and simple, we fall into a Caesarian trap—no less than the Helvetians did.²⁰

Southwest Missouri State University


²⁰ An early version of this paper was read before the Missouri Classics Association in Columbia, MO, to which audience I should like to express my appreciation. Thanks are due also to Professor H. C. Gotoff and to Professor Curtis Lawrence, who kindly read through earlier drafts. The appearance of their names here does not necessarily imply that they agree with the contents of my argument; of course, I alone am responsible for any errors that remain.
Commentators have previously noted that Vergil's description of the boxing match between Dares and Entellus (Aen. 5. 362–484) frequently echoes the details and language of Apollonius Rhodius' account of Polydeuces' fight with Amycus (Argonautica 2. 30–97); already in late antiquity, Servius ad Aen. 5. 426 emphasized (not without exaggeration) the extent of Vergil's borrowing from the Argonautica in this episode: est autem hic totus locus de Apollonio translatus. It has not been noted, however, how remarkably Vergil actualizes Apollonius' description of Amycus as βουτύπος οἶα (2. 91) when he has Entellus slay the bull he had won, nor has anyone considered the implications of Vergil's allusions to his Alexandrian model. Vergil describes the boxing match in rich ethical tones, and in the present argument I aim to demonstrate that he did not use Apollonius in merely a decorative or conventional manner, but for clearly chosen thematic purposes. While one level of the story, supported by references to the Homeric boxing matches in Il. 23. 651 ff. and Od. 18. 1 ff., consistently makes Entellus a figure of noble restraint, the allusions to Apollonius create an antithetical pattern, linking him with the ogre Amycus. This deliberate paradox stresses a theme which surfaces repeatedly in the Aeneid—that the corrupting forces of anger and violence take hold easily and in unexpected places, and that responsible people must constantly labor to subdue them.

1 R. D. Williams, P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus (Oxford 1960), provides the most thorough collection of parallels to Apollonius (and Homer as well); most of the parallels discussed in this paper are noted by Williams.
The beginning of the episode tends to raise the expectation that we will have a simple story of an arrogant Dares confronting the noble older competitor, Entellus, and most commentators, in fact, have interpreted the whole of the narrative from this perspective. Dares rushes into the contest without hesitation and demands that Aeneas give him the prize and not keep him waiting, *quae finis standi? quo me decet usque teneri?* (5. 384). Entellus does not rush to the fight, and his initial reluctance is in contrast with his opponent’s rude boldness, *improbus iste / exsultat* (5. 397–98). Vergil carefully selects and adapts elements from the match of Epeios and Euryalos in *Il. 23. 651–99* and that of Odysseus and Iros, *Od. 18. 1–107*, to reinforce the motif of the triumph of reason over rashness. Homer’s Epeios had jumped to the contest, grasping the first prize (23. 664–67), threatening to crush any man who dared oppose him, and turned his boast into reality, knocking his opponent senseless. Dares resembles Epeios insofar as he comes boldly to the match and grasps the horn of the bull offered as the prize (5. 368, 382), but the outcome of Vergil’s fight is exactly the opposite of that which Homer’s contest leads us to expect. Whereas Epeios’ opponent leaves the ring badly injured (23. 696–99), in *Aen. 5. 468–70*, it is not Dares’ opponent who exits so ingloriously, but bold Dares himself: *genua aegra trahentem / iactantemque utroque caput crassumque cruorem / ore iectantem mixtosque in sanguine dentes*. Even in the world of sport, Vergil rejects willful belligerence, and reverses his Iliadic model to articulate this theme. It is appropriate that Entellus gain some of the resonances of Odysseus, for that Homeric hero is also an older man, and is similarly reluctant to fight at first, but once involved proves a formidable pugilist: Vergil’s allusion invokes a figure whose initial patience and self-control reflect


3 Williams, op. cit. (above note 1), p. 118, saw in the phrase *effert ora* (5. 368–69) a gesture of “arrogant defiance”; J. Conington, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (London 1884), pp. 365–66, however, claimed that Vergil merely meant *effert caput*, and a similar interpretation appears in W. M. Lindsay, *Classical Quarterly* 25 (1931), 144–45, which discusses Donatus’ commentary on Ter. *Hec. 33, pugilum gloria*.  

4 One should also note that in *Il. 23. 681–82* Diomedes must pressure Euryalos to challenge Dares; similarly Acestes has to persuade Entellus to fight (5. 387). The reluctant Euryalos loses, the reluctant Entellus wins. See the discussion of F. Klingner, *Vergil* (Zurich 1967), p. 474.
upon Entellus in a complementary way. So like Odysseus before his fight with the bullying Iros (Od. 18. 1–107), Entellus strips for the contest and reveals his strong limbs: ϕαύνε δὲ μηροίς / καλούς τε μεγάλους τε, φάνεν δὲ οἱ εὐφέρες ὦμοι / στήθεαι τε στυβαροί τε βραχίονες (18. 67–69), magnus membrorum artus, magna ossa lacertosque / exuit (5. 422–23). The selection of boxing gloves, moreover, shows Entellus giving up the personal advantage of using his deadly caestus, and in so doing renouncing the wanton destruction these gloves cause. Dares is dumbfounded (5. 406) and frightened (5. 420) when he sees the caestus of Eryx, which Entellus throws into the contest area, and shrinks away from these murderously weighted weapons, terga boum plumbo insuto ferroque rigebant (5. 405); Entellus, however, readily offers to use equal and less threatening thongs. Vergil anachronistically makes the caestus which Roman pugilists commonly wore in his own day part of an older era, that of Herakles and Eryx, in order to allow the characters, led by Entellus, to demonstrate their enlightenment in abandoning the savage customs they have inherited.

Many other details in the passage, however, suggest that both the characterizations and the ethical issues are more complex. In the extensive allusions to Apollonius’ boxing match Vergil refuses to equate Entellus with the valiant demigod Polydeuces and Dares with the hideous aggressor Amycus: instead he subtly but thoroughly clothes Entellus with the trappings of Amycus, and Dares with those of Polydeuces. We learn that Dares once defeated and killed a boxer from Amycus’ people, as Polydeuces had done to king Amycus himself (5. 371–74). Coming to their boxing contest, Dares, like Polydeuces, exercises his arms (though not without a great amount of


6 On Greek boxing gloves and the Roman caestus cf. J. Jühner, Über antike Turngeräte, Abhandlungen des archaeologisch-epigraphischen Seminarens der Universität Wien 12 (Vienna 1896), pp. 65–95; E. N. Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals (London 1910), pp. 402–11. One realizes at once by looking at the boxers depicted on the mosaics from the Baths of Caracalla (now in the Vatican Museum)—to name one of several archaeological monuments which show the Roman caestus—that Vergil is not exaggerating when he speaks of lead and iron in the gloves.

7 E. N. Gardiner, op. cit. (above, note 6), pp. 431–32, attributes this anachronism to Vergil’s “Roman ideas,” namely, that “murder and bloodshed are the very essence of a fight. Therefore, as the heroes of the past excelled the men of today in physical strength, they must have excelled them in the bloodiness of their fights and the murderous brutality of their weapons.” This seems to be a serious misevaluation of Vergil. For a discussion of the possible thematic purposes of anachronisms in the Aeneid, cf. F. H. Sandbach, Proceedings of the Virgil Society 77 (1965–66), 26–38.
show), a precaution that neither Entellus nor Amycus takes: πῆλε δὲ χεῖρας / πειρᾶζον . . . / οὗ μᾶν αὐτ’ Ἀμυκὸς πειρήσατο (2. 45–48), ostenditque uemos latos alternae iacta / braechia pretendens et verberat ictibus auras (5. 376–77). Dares further resembles Polydeuces in testing his opponent’s tactics: ἀπηνέα δ’ αἵρε νοίσας / πυγμαχίην, ἢ κάρτος ἀάτος ἦ τε χερείων (2. 76–77), nunc hos, nunc illos aditus, omnemque pererrat / arte locum et variis adulsitibus inritus urget (5. 441–42), while Amycus and Entellus stand motionless (Arg. 2. 78 and Aen. 5. 437 ff.). Turning now to Entellus, one notes that, like Amycus, he wears a double cloak: ἐρεμνὴν δίπτυχα λόσπην (2. 32), duplicem . . . amictum (5. 421). Both figures attempt a knockout blow from above and fail (Arg. 2. 90–92; Aen. 5. 443–45):

ένθα δ’ ἔπειτ’ Ἀμυκὸς μὲν ἔπ’ ἀκροτάτοιαν ἀερθείς
bouτύπος οία πόδεως τανύσατο, κἀδε βαρεῖαν
χεῦρ’ ἐπὶ οἱ πέλεμμεν, ὅ δ’ ἀύσσοντος υπέστη . . .
ostendit dextram insurgens Entellus et alte
extulit, ille icturn venientem a vertice velox
praevidit celerique elapsus corpore cessit: . . .

Finally, Entellus pursues Dares round the area of competition as the ogre chased Polydeuces: ὦς ὄγε Τυνδαίον φοβέων ἐπετ’ οὖδέ μυν εἶνα / δηθύνειν . . . (2. 74–75), praecepitēmique Daren ardens agit . . . / nec mora nec requies (5. 456 ff.). By the end of the fight, Entellus is caught up in the emotions of the match and becomes totally enraged and savage, saevire animis . . . acerbis (5. 462), and he leaves the bout an arrogant victor superans . . . superbus (5. 473).

A catalogue of places where Vergil’s allusion to a literary model substantially affects the reader’s appreciation or even understanding of the passage would be very long.8 Many of the correspondences between Entellus and Amycus are subtle features of behavior and

dress, but the pattern is consistent and obviously deliberate, a clear sign that Vergil has a point to make: his paradoxical use of figures from the Argonautica highlights the corrupting effects that violence works upon Entellus.

The episode concludes with an emphatic rejection of uncontrolled violence. The enraged Entellus has begun to show a strong affinity to the figure of Amycus, but when the fight becomes too heated, Aeneas intercedes and stops it, and, restrained by Aeneas, Entellus reverses this process of assimilation to the ogre. Whereas Amycus tried to strike Polydeuces, rising like an ox-slayer (βουτύπος οἶα, 2. 91), now Entellus with a blow of his fist slays the bull given to him as a prize, offering it as a better victim to honor Eryx than the death of his human opponent (5. 483–84):

    hanc tibi, Eryx, meliorem animam pro morte Daretis
    persolvo

Some commentators have seen sarcasm in Entellus' words, though this seems unsuited to the context. Whether or not they are sarcastic, however, the substitution of an animal for a human victim shows the restoration of balanced and judicious behavior where previously the affinity that Entellus had shown for Amycus demonstrated that the descent to savagery is an ever-present danger.\(^9\)

Wellesley and Cologne

\(^9\) We should also note that earlier in this episode the story of Eryx, Entellus' boxing master, changes from a tale of just punishment to one of pathos. In other mythological accounts, Eryx covets Herakles' cattle or abuses strangers (cf. Serv. ad Aen. 1. 570; Apollod. 2. 5. 10): here he is honored and acknowledged as the germanus of Aeneas (5. 412, cf. 5. 23–24), and his fatal encounter with Herakles is called tristem (5. 411).

\(^10\) James Henry, Aeneidea III (Dublin 1881), p. 121, argues that Entellus' words are "the brutal scoff of the conqueror", that "the Romans were not so delicate and refined as to say, or to think, it was better to spare the human being and kill the beast." Conington, \(op.\, cit.\) (above, note 3), p. 377, concurs, while Williams, \(op.\, cit.\) (above, note 1), pp. 135–36, refuses to decide whether Entellus' words show humanity or brutal sarcasm. In my opinion, the context heavily favors a demonstration of humanity—avoiding promiscuous destruction of human life is a serious issue throughout the episode—and certainly Vergil was sufficiently delicate and refined to hold the sentiments that Henry finds unthinkable in Rome.

\(^11\) Sadly, the civilized values of this episode do not ultimately triumph. Later the offerings will not be vicarious animals, but human beings; in 11. 81 ff. Aeneas arranges human sacrifices for Pallas' funeral. In 12. 296, moreover, when fighting disturbs the truce, Messapus' words recall the boxer's dedication of the bull, but in a grim and exaggerated reversal, for Messapus describes the Roman whom he slays on the altar as \textit{melior magnis data victima divis}. The restraint of the boxing contest is gone, and instead Messapus observes the fatal wound with the taunt heard in the Roman arena when a gladiator fell, \textit{hoc habeo} (cf. Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v. habeo 16.d, which cites in addition to this passage Ter. An. 56, Sen. Ag. 901, Pl. Mos. 715).
The Lover Reflected in the *Exemplum*:
A Study of Propertius 1. 3 and 2. 6

FRANCIS M. DUNN

A mythology reflects its region. Here
In Connecticut, we never lived in a time
When mythology was possible—but if we had—
That raises the question of the image's truth.
The image must be of the nature of its creator.
It is the nature of its creator increased,
Heightened. It is he, anew, in a freshened youth
And it is he in the substance of his region,
Wood of his forests and stone out of his fields
Or from under his mountains.

Wallace Stevens

Like every other aspect of his poetry, Propertius’ use of mythology has been widely debated. The frequency and variety with which mythological allusions occur in the elegies raise a number of ques-


2 A useful summary of the bibliography from 1838 to 1965 is given by Godo Lieberg in “Die Mythologie des Properz in der Forschung und die Idealisierung Cynthias,” *Rheinisches Museum* 112 (1969), 311–47 (=Lieberg 1969). The works cited are divided according to their view of Propertius’ use of myth: Gruppe (1838), Denne-Baron (1850), Benda (1928), Schanz–Hosius (1935) and Rostagni (1956) are negative; Haupt (1876), Plessis (1884), Rothstein (1898), La Penna (1951), Desideri (1958) and Luck (1961) are mixed; and Hertzberg (1843), Heinze (1918), Schöne (1911), Allen (1939), Alfonsi (1945), Boyancé (1953), Kömel (1957), Grimal (1963) and Boucher (1965) are favorable. More recent studies include Macleod (1974), Sullivan (1976), La Penna (1977), Lechi (1979), Lyne (1980), Verstraete (1980), Bollo Testa (1981) and Whitaker (1983). Full references will be given below when these works are cited.

3 A catalogue of all the occurrences and the ways in which they are introduced is given by Wilhelm Schöne in *De Propertii ratione fabulas adhibendi* (Leipzig 1911).
tions: for example, how much does the use of myth owe to the influence of Greek literature, and how far did it become a vehicle for Augustan propaganda? But the question most often raised, and to which this paper will give a partial answer, concerns the role which mythology plays within the poems. In general, critics have given three types of answers, namely, (a) that references to mythology provide ornament and coloring; (b) that they bestow authority and a sense of truth; and (c) that they are formal poetic devices. These categories are not mutually exclusive, nor do critics of Propertius always favor one interpretation over the others. Yet much of the discussion concerning mythology in Propertius seems to center on the opposition between (a) and (b). Thus Gruppe (1838) regarded myth as “ein fremder Zierath und völlig außerlicher Schmuck,” while Hertzberg (1843) opposed such a view and emphasized the poet’s literal acceptance of mythology. More recently, Allen (1962) opposed the view of mythology as decorative when he argued for its role in bestowing authority:

In primitive societies it is a function of myth to provide authoritative sanction for custom and belief. In an advanced society it may remain as

catalogue of important occurrences in Greek and Latin poetry is given by H. V. Canter in “The mythological paradigm in Greek and Latin poetry,” American Journal of Philology 54 (1933), 201–24.


5 See Maria Luisa Angrisani, Proporzio tra politica e mitologia (Quaderni della Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale 15, Rome 1974).

6 Bovancé 1956 (n. 4), for example, regards myth as an ornamental element, “une surcharge d’érudition,” which is appropriated by the poet as a formal device and “permet au contraire au poète de mieux exprimer sa personnalité” (p. 193).

7 Thus J. P. Sullivan (Propertius: A critical introduction [Cambridge 1976]) defines the three functions of mythology in poetry as narrative, symbolic and ornamental. Sullivan suggests that Propertius usually uses myth symbolically, but often lapses into excessive use of myth as ornament (pp. 132–33).

8 O. F. Gruppe, Die römische Elegie. Leipzig 1838 (the citation is from Lieberg 1969 [n. 2], p. 312).


10 “N]on vanae sunt et essangues figurae, sed quae sanctorum somniorum et deorum immortalium fide satis roboris atque nervorum accipiant,” Hertzberg (n. 9), vol. 1, p. 77.

11 Immediately before the passage quoted below he says “The question which requires consideration is this: Is mythology simply a decorative and ennobling element or is it an essential part of his poetry?”
a body of universally respected truth, establishing the validity of the fundamental assumptions upon which the ordering of society is based. . . . Since Propertius, like Cicero, regarded myth as symbolically true, as providing known and accepted examplification [sic] of known and accepted principles, he found in myth a means of expressing universal and absolute truth, a standard of validity more real than any single and isolated experience.\textsuperscript{12}

Lyne (1980) in his turn reacted against this emphasis on the truth-value of myth\textsuperscript{13} by presenting a new statement of its ornamental function:

It was untruth rather than absolute truth: attractive fiction to brighten the tedious truth of house walls and everyday lives. The myths opened on to a fabulous world: a world of fabulae, where beings more beautiful, attractive, or terrible than real beings lived lives out of this world; a romantic world, in a defined sense.\textsuperscript{14}

The opposition between these two interpretations\textsuperscript{15} is most clearly expressed by the contrast between the "universal truth" of Allen and the "untruth" of Lyne. Yet however much they differ concerning the truth or untruth of the mythical world, both agree in one important respect. Both interpretations regard this mythical world as external to the poem, and as giving to the poem (which is otherwise complete) a greater degree of validity. In one case this is the validity of universal truth, and in the other the validity of romantic fantasy; but in both interpretations this mythical world provides an objective standard shared by the poet and the reader, a common ground to which the poet can appeal to give his poem greater depth and authority.

The third approach to this question follows a different tack altogether. In fact the issue of the truth of the mythical world becomes irrelevant if we regard it as a formal device, as simply a means of poetic expression. Rothstein (1989) argued that in his use of


\textsuperscript{13} A few lines before the passage quoted below he says “[Classical myths] did not offer a ‘means of expressing universal and absolute truth,’ as some scholars think,” quoting the same passage in Allen.


\textsuperscript{15} Both Hertzberg (note 9 above) and Allen (note 12 above) suggest that our choice must be one or the other. View (a) is represented also by S. Desideri in “Il preziosismo mitologico di Properzio,” \emph{Giornale Italiano di Filologia} 11 (1958), 327–36. View (b) is argued also by Luck, p. 122 (Georg Luck, \emph{The Latin Love-Elegy}, 2nd ed., London 1969), and Grimal, p. 195: “il finit par découvrir la valeur divine, ontologique, de l'amour” (Pierre Grimal, \emph{L'Amour à Rome}, Paris 1979).
mythology Propertius "zeigt . . . sich gerade darin als der eigentliche Vollender der Dichtungsgattung," and concluded:

es ist ein wichtiger und bezeichnender Unterschied zwischen der modernen Erotik und der des Properz, dass diese vorwiegend durch die als belebt und mitempfindend vorgestellte Natur, die des Properz durch Erinnerung an Schöpfungen der Kunst den Kreis ihrer Darstellung zu erweitern sucht.16

This view of mythology as an element of poetic technique was developed more fully by Alfonso (1945)17 and Boucher (1965),18 resulting, as Lieberg observes, in "eine radikale Umwertung."19 Indeed recent studies on mythology in Propertius20 tend to follow the procedure announced by Whitaker: "In general I shall simply take for granted that mythological exempla are an integral part of the elegists' poems. My central concern will be rather the manner in which each of the elegists employs myth."21 The emphasis of these studies varies considerably, from a rhetorical (Lechi22) to a statistical approach (Bollo Testa23), yet all are reacting against the view, implicit in the previous interpretations, that mythology is something external to the poem.24 The result is a shift towards the other extreme:25

16 Max Rothstein, Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius (Berlin 1898), p. xxxvi.
17 Luigi Alfonso, L'elegia di Properzio (Pubblicazioni dell'Univ. Cattolica del S. Cuore, n.s. 7, Milan 1945) (=Alfonso 1945).
20 For example Verstraete begins: "As has been better recognized by critics over the last few decades, Propertius uses his images and illustrations from the world of myth as a real and often brilliantly imaginative reflection of the multiple permutations of his experience," p. 259 in B. C. Verstraete, "Propertius' use of myth in Book Two," Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History, vol. 2, ed. by Carl Deroux (Collection Latomus 168, Brussels 1980), pp. 259–68.
24 Thus Bollo Testa (n. 23): "l'uso del mito in Properzio . . . non è infatti un elemento estraneo, giustapposto, ma nasce e si muove con il mutare dell'ispirazione" (p. 141), and Whitaker (n. 21): "mythology is by no means something extraneous to Roman love-elegy, but is on the contrary very closely bound up with both its main purposes and essential elements of its style" (p. 14). Compare also Kolmel, p. 3 (Bernward Kolmel, Die Funktion des Mythologischen in der Dichtung des Properz, Diss. Heidelberg 1957), Macleod, p. 82 (C. W. Macleod, "A use of myth in ancient poetry," Classical Quarterly 24 [1974], 82–93), and Verstraete (n. 20), p. 261.
25 This is clearest in Bollo Testa (n. 23) and Whitaker (n. 21), whose discussions center on the various formal relations between myth and context.
mythology is viewed simply as one of many formal devices by which
the poet's meaning is expressed. Rather than a source of truth or a
source of untruth, it is a neutral medium which the poet may exploit
as he pleases. The myth conveys this larger meaning, but has no
meaning, no independent function of its own.

As was noted above, these three interpretations are not mutually
exclusive. It would be astonishing if they were, and surprising if in
using myth as form (that is, in using it as a poetic device) Propertius
did not also make full use of its content (namely its power to convey
authority and coloring). Although Boucher is primarily interested in
mythology as a means of expression, he notes that this expression
must be indirect, since the world of myth also has a life of its own:

La mythologie constitue un autre monde riche et complexe où se
trouvent des êtres connus, caractérisés par leurs aventures, constitués
en personnages qui ont une réalité propre: elle fournit à l'élegiaque un
moyen d'expression indirecte.

In reading a given elegy we must take into account all three kinds of
interpretation. I intend to show in the following sections of this paper that one of
the ways in which myth becomes an important means of expression
for Propertius is by an original and rather surprising manipulation of
its other role as an objective standard of truth. Rather than referring
to an independent and external world, and thus providing added
color or authority, it refers instead to the subjective experience of the
lover. In the first poem we will look at (1. 3), a series of mythical
exempla purports to describe the poet's mistress, but instead de-
scribes the situation and feelings of the lover. In the second poem (2.
6) a similar series of exempla seems to introduce a condemnation of
the poet's mistress, but reveals instead the conflicting feelings of the
lover. In both cases mythology is not a neutral poetic device, but
achieves its effect by reversing the objective function which it so often
performs. That "other world" of absolute truth and of fantasy is seen
to be no more than a revelation of the lover's experience, and this lack
of an objective standard, this subjective solipsism, contributes to the
intensity of Propertius' poetry.

26 He concludes: "La mythologie constitue ainsi un moyen privilégié de composer
27 Boucher (n. 18), p. 240.
28 For an interesting historical explanation of this complex quality of myth in
Roman poetry, see H. Dörrie, "Sinn und Funktion des Mythos in der griechischen und
römischen Dichtung," Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften [Geisteswiss.]
Vorträge G 230 (Opladen 1978).
This specific subjective use of exempla is quite different from the general function of mythology in portraying personal experience. The latter is “subjective” only in the most general sense of the term—in that the elegy as a whole, and the use of myth within the elegy, are concerned with representing the feelings and experiences of the lover. The use of exempla which I will describe is a very specific—and surprising—technique. The mythological comparisons fail or fall short in their basic referential function of alluding to a separate mythological world. By referring instead to the lover’s own feelings (1. 3), or by denying the reference they purport to make (2. 6), these exempla are subjective in the specific sense that their reference is to the speaker’s own frame of mind, and not to a separate mythical world.

Finally, it will be noted that the exempla which begin 2. 6, and are discussed below, are not mythological but historical. However, (1) I will argue that the women in these exempla belong more to legend than to history, and (2) my concern here and in what follows is not with the nature of mythology per se, but with the ways in which the poet refers to the mythological world. Exempla which refer to fabled women of the past are therefore equally illustrative of the poet’s manner and technique.

One of the ways Propertius uses mythology to portray his own feelings and experiences is by reversing the objective relation it

29 Kölmel (n. 24), for example, is using the more general sense of the term when he concludes that Propertius “bemächtigte sich des Exempels . . . um sie für seine subjektive Dichtung zum stilistischen Gesetz zu erheben” (p. 44). Likewise Fedeli is referring to the general portrayal of emotions when he observes that in Catullus, as in Propertius, “il mito non è sempre trattato in modo ‘oggettivo,’ alla maniera alessandrina: in lui compare già il nuovo modo di sentirla che sarà tipico della poesia elegica” (Paolo Fedeli, “Properzio 1. 3. Interpretazione e proposte sull’origine dell’elegia latina,” Museum Helveticum 31 (1974), 23–41 [=Fedeli 1974], p. 39).

30 The nature of this mythical world is not important to my argument, only the fact that the reader assumes it to exist. Interpretations (a) and (b), as I have represented them, are two extremes in a spectrum of possible views.

31 The exemplum is one of many means by which a poet makes reference to myth. Kölmel (n. 24) identifies three types of reference: paroemia, auxesis and apodeixis (pp. 46–107); and La Penna presents a similar division into paradigm, analogy and antithesis (Antonio La Penna, L’integrazione difficile. Un profilo di Properzio [Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi 297. Turin 1977], p. 205). A much more detailed division into ten categories is proposed by Bollo Testa (n. 23), p. 143. The term “exemplum” is used with considerable imprecision, and Lechi (n. 22) proposes to define it more clearly by distinguishing between “exemplum” and “comparison” (pp. 84–85). According to this distinction, the opening passages of 1.3 and 2.6 should both be called comparisons rather than exempla, but I will continue to use the familiar term.
usually establishes. This subjective use of exempla is a highly sophisticated technique, and it creates an almost obsessive concern with the subjective nature of experience; in both these respects mythology in Propertius is indeed the image of its creator.

I

To illustrate Propertius' use of exempla we will turn first to elegy 1.3, which begins with the famous series of mythological comparisons (1.3.1–8):

Qualis Thesea iacuit cedente carina
  languida desertis Cnosia litoribus;
  qualis et accubuit primo Cepheia sommo
  libera iam duris cotibus Andromede;
  nec minus assiduis Edonis fessa choreis
  qualis in herboso concidit Apidano:
  tali visa mihi mollem spirare quietem
  Cynthia non certis nixa caput manibus . . .

This is a highly suggestive way to begin a poem. Not only is the setting of the poem left undefined, but the reference of the exempla is postponed. The three mythical vignettes are introduced as similes (with repeated qualis), but the point of connection is not established until afterwards in line 7 (talis). The result is that for a brief moment


34 Thus E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), p. 43. Compare Klingner (n. 33), p. 437.

these vignettes are suspended, free of context, until the comparison is made with the real woman Cynthia. Commentators have aptly noted the “idyllic beauty”\(^\text{36}\) of this scene, a beauty which is shattered by the following couplet (9–10):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ebria cum multo traherem vestigia Baccho,} \\
\text{et quaterent sera nocte facem pueri.}
\end{align*}
\]

The speaker drags his drunken footsteps into the narrative as if he were dragging muddy boots across a carpet. This rude awakening\(^\text{37}\) anticipates a later one when the sleeping Cynthia wakes up: “The idyllic vision wakes, and not only wakes but talks, and not only talks but nags.”\(^\text{38}\) Much of the poem centers on this contrast between the subjective vision of the drunken lover and the objective reality of Cynthia.\(^\text{39}\) It is important to note that this contrast is enacted rather than described; we view the sleeping Cynthia through the eyes of the drunken lover, and are brought back to our senses just as rudely as he.

This subjective vision is first developed in the opening exempla. We realize (although not until line 9 or 10) that this scene of idyllic beauty is not so much a description of the way Cynthia is, as an impression of the way she \textit{seems} to the drunken lover.\(^\text{40}\) The simile is


\(^{37}\) Thus Allen (n. 12), p. 133: “the realistic character who burst in upon the sleeping girl,” and compare Lyne, p. 69 (R.O.A.M. Lyne, “Propertius and Cynthia: Elegy 1.3,” \textit{Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society} 196 [1970], 60–78 [=Lyne 1970]). Curran (n. 35), p. 198, notes the complementary shifts in tone (as the language becomes more natural) and in attitude (as the speaker reflects upon his own situation).

\(^{38}\) Hubbard (n. 36), p. 21.

\(^{39}\) Allen (n. 12), pp. 133–34, reverses this contrast, taking myth as objective and the narrative as subjective (as noted by Curran [n. 35], p. 189, note 1). The contrast is internalized by Lieberg 1961 (in psychological terms as an inner conflict, [n. 32], p. 324) and Harmon (as two aspects of the fantasy of the drunken lover, p. 161 in Daniel P. Harmon, “Myth and Fantasy in Propertius 1.3,” \textit{Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.} 104 [1974], 151–65), while it is externalized by Hering (as the different points of view of man and woman [n. 32], p. 77). The contrast between subjective vision and objective reality is more clearly stated by Curran (who regards it as ironic [n. 35], p. 189). Wlosok (who regards it as tragic [n. 36], p. 352) and Hubbard (who emphasizes “the otherness of lover and beloved” [n. 36], p. 22). According to Lyne 1970 this contrast is a romantic one, and is the general purpose of the poem (n. 37), p. 61.

\(^{40}\) This is well expressed by E. Reitzenstein (n. 33): “die drei Vergleiche . . . nicht objektiv vom Erzähler her, sondern aus dem Eindruck des Beschauers heraus gegeben werden, dessen Stimmung damit gezeichnet wird” (p. 44). Compare Wlosok
subjective, and its subjective nature is made explicit by the terms of the comparison (*talis visa mihi*),\(^{41}\) though at first we may not take these terms literally. But the simile is subjective in a much more important manner. As Curran observes, “the identification of Cynthia with the heroines entails a complementary identification of Propertius with the appropriate gods and heroes.”\(^{42}\) Thus in the first exemplum he “fancies himself Bacchus discovering Ariadne on Naxos after she has been abandoned by Theseus. . . . In the context of the second exemplum, Propertius would play Perseus to Cynthia’s Andromeda.”\(^{43}\) And in the third\(^{44}\) he is Pentheus\(^{45}\) spying upon a Maenad.\(^{46}\) In other

---


42 Curran (n. 35), p. 196. This identification is reinforced by the corresponding scenes in the visual arts (see below).


44 Curran (p. 197) will not draw the logical conclusion in the case of the third exemplum: “the ferocity and violence usually associated with the Maenads are discreetly suppressed. . . . Indeed, this exemplum at first seems to set the stage for that drama, so often played out in mythology, of a girl or nymph, alone and asleep in the country, who is discovered by a vigorous god or hero.” But the first exemplum manages to set just that stage without being so misleading. Curran would separate the lover’s fantasy of himself as a hero from his fear of Cynthia’s anger, but both are indissolubly present in the third example.

45 I call him Pentheus for the sake of discussion. The approaching male figures in the visual arts are anonymous satyrs, divinities or men (see note 55 below). In literature the most famous individual to look upon the sleeping Bacchantes was Pentheus, although the legend of Orpheus was similar in many respects (in Ovid *Met.* 11. 69 the Maenads are given the same epithet *Edonidas*). I am sure that Propertius had in mind both the Pentheus story and the anonymous painted figures.

46 Of these three identifications, the first is most generally acknowledged. While Lieberg 1961 (n. 32) argues that the role of the lover is implied in all three exempla (p. 316), Wlosok (n. 36) agrees that “der Dichter sieht sich selbst als erscheinenden Dionysos” (p. 342), but denies him a similar role in the second or third exemplum (pp. 335, 340). Wlosok, followed by Herling (n. 32), p. 51, goes on to conclude that the identities of the mythical figures are secondary: “Das bedeutet, dass die drei nicht als beliebige Heroinen fungieren, sondern dass die bezeichnete Situation zum Vergleich steht” (p. 334). The reason for beginning the poem with these exempla then becomes quite vague: “Dies alles ist mehr angedeutet als ausgesprochen” (p. 341). Of these three identifications, the first is also most significant later in the poem. Both Lieberg (p. 324) and Wlosok (p. 342) note the tension between the lover’s identification with Dionysos in
words, we have to take the point of comparison in an even more literal manner: Cynthia was *talis visa* to the speaker as Ariadne was to Bacchus, as Andromeda was to Perseus, and as the bacchante was to Pentheus. But each woman was not “looked upon” in the same way. Bacchus looked on Ariadne with desire, aroused by her beauty and vulnerability; Perseus looked on Andromeda with a mixture of desire and chivalrous solicitude; and Pentheus viewed the bacchante with conflicting emotions of prurience and fear. All these emotions are appropriate to Propertius as he comes upon the sleeping Cynthia, and the mythic exempla create not so much a description of Cynthia’s appearance as a specific suggestion of the lover’s feelings as he sees her.

My argument so far relies upon the distinction between the idiomatic (“is”) and literal (“seems”) meaning of the comparison (*talis visa mihi*), and the accompanying distinction between the idyllic descriptions of the sleeping women in the beginning of the poem, and the realistic intrusion of the lover which follows. In both cases we are forced to a reassessment of what has come before. But if the male figure is not mentioned as part of the exemplum (as on this interpretation he must not be), how are we made aware of his relevance? The verbal and thematic allusions within the poem will be discussed below; perhaps even more important are the allusions which the exempla make to the visual arts. Since the seminal articles by Birt and

---

the beginning of the poem, and Cynthia’s identification of him with Theseus at the end. This complex thematic conflict is much simplified by Grimal (n. 15): “Le sommeil mystique qui sépare Ariane des embrassements de Thésée et lui promet ceux de Dionysos, ravit le poète et l’inquiète à la fois. Lorsque Cynthie s’éveillera, sera-t-elle toujours sienne?” (pp. 194–95).

47 Compare the much-quoted observation of Hertzberg (n. 9): “Non θάμνεῖα mutatis similibus continent, sed variis visionibus dormientis Cynthiae imaginem ab omni parte illustrant. Solitudinem enim Ariadna significat,—optatam diu quietem Andromeda, profundum somnum Baccha toto corpore resoluta” (vol. 3, p. 13). As the second sentence makes clear, however, he is concerned only with external attributes. Bollo Testa (n. 23) restates this in more subjective terms: “Questi elementi tratti del mito, più di altri, riescono a visualizzare la scena offerta agli occhi di Properzio e a darci un’idea di ciò che egli percepì della quiete di Cinzia” (p. 140). As we will see, these perceptions can be defined more precisely.

48 Curran (n. 35) does not distinguish among them: the exempla describe a woman who “is recumbent, sleeping, abandoned, exhausted, possibly even making love, being rescued, drunk or hysterical, or in some similar state; we are given no inkling which, but are simply invited to contemplate this heroic world” (p. 190).

Keyssner, the part played by works of art in the beginning of this poem has been almost universally recognized. As Boucher observes, "les éléments plastiques sont des moyens d’expression et toute la pièce est nourrie de visions artistiques qui s’intègrent à une place précise dans la trame du récit." Thus the first exemplum recalls scenes in which Dionysus comes upon Ariadne sleeping by the shore, the second recalls scenes in which Perseus rescues Andromeda from the cliff, and the third recalls scenes in which a male figure approaches a Bacchante in a meadow. Each scene involves both a male and a


51 An exception is Hering (n. 32), who argues that since the exempla do not reproduce these painted scenes exactly (p. 51), their concern is only with the general situation: “Gegenstand der Vergleiche der ersten sechs Verse sind nicht die Personen des Mythos bzw. die Situationen” (p. 60).

52 Boucher (n. 18), p. 54.

53 An exhaustive catalogue is given by Keyssner (n. 50), pp. 174–75. There are three types of scenes: (A) Theseus leaving the sleeping Ariadne, (B) Dionysus approaching the sleeping Ariadne, and (C) the sleeping Ariadne alone. The third group consists only of statues; thus all painted versions show her with one (sometimes both) of these lovers. As Keyssner notes, the theme of sleep was “mit Theseus wie mit Dionysos in gleicher Weise verknüpft, so dass dem Künstler reiche Abwechslungs- und Entfaltungsmöglichkeit geboten war” (p. 173).

54 References are given by Keyssner (n. 50), p. 179; see also Wlosok (n. 36), pp. 334–35. Wall-paintings show either (A) Perseus chivalrously leading Andromeda away by the hand, or (B) the two lovers leaning together and looking at Medusa’s reflection in water. The first group is more common, and includes an example in which Perseus admires the beauty of Andromeda. Since Andromeda is not shown sleeping, there is much debate about Propertius’ model. Keyssner (p. 179) suggests that he has simply combined the Perseus scene with the common motif of a sleeping woman. Boucher (n. 18) argues that “Propertius fait ici allusion à une peinture que nous ne connaissons plus” (p. 54), and is followed by Lieberg 1961 (n. 32), p. 316, and Whitaker (n. 21), p. 91. Curran (n. 35), on the other hand, suggests that the scene is entirely original: “By using this word [accubuit] here, he boldly fuses the moment of Perseus’ discovery of Andromeda with the consummation of their marriage, ignoring the time Perseus had to spend in dealing with Andromeda’s suitors and kinsmen” (p. 197). He is followed in this view by Harmon (n. 39), p. 154. Cairns, on the other hand, argues that the scene is makeshift: “Propertius wanted three myths to make up the standard Alexandrian pattern. So he devised a third exemplum, that of Andromeda, which was in strict terms inadequate in comparison with the other two but which he placed between the other two in order to disguise its inadequacy” (p. 352 in Francis Cairns, “‘Tuo unidentifed Komoi of Propertius. 1.3 and 2.29,” Emerita 45 [1977], 325–53). For my own view see note 56 below.

55 References are given by Keyssner (n. 50), pp. 177–78, who cites also Ovid, Am. 1. 14. 20–22 (purpurae uacuit semissupina toro; / tum quoque erat neclecta decens, ut Thracia Bacche, / cum teneere in viridi gramine lausa uacet) and Plutarch 249 E–F. In painting the Bacchante is usually portrayed in lush surroundings, and is always observed by another figure, whose identity, however, often cannot be determined.
female figure; and the fact that Andromeda is typically shown awake rather than sleeping should remind us that the sleeping posture is not the only thing about Cynthia that arouses the lover’s interest. As Whitaker points out, it is the allusion to paintings which allows the poet to move from exempla of a sleeping woman to the approach of her lover: “By casting them [his mythological exempla] in a form which would immediately call to his audience’s mind certain well-known paintings, he is able to move on to a new theme—his own drunken amorous approach to his mistress—simply by drawing that audience’s attention to a further detail of the pictures he has evoked.” What I intend to show is that this introduction of a new theme is very subjective (in that it portrays the lover’s emotions, and not just his “drunken amorous approach”) and very specific (in that it delineates the varied aspects of these emotions).

In fact, the mythological examples which begin this poem may be described as subjective both in function and in manner. They are subjective in function (or content) in that the point of the comparison is not “is like” but “seems like.” Indeed their function is radically subjective in that although the exempla purport to describe an objective fact (“She is like”) they do not even describe an appearance (“She seems like”), but simply state a subjective impression (“I feel”) which no longer has any formal connection with the other term of the comparison.

The exempla are also subjective in manner (or form) in that they do not state a connection, but imply one. We have noted that the connection which does apply is that between the appearance of the sleeping woman, and the emotions which her appearance arouses. But we cannot know until at least line 9 or 10, when the drunken lover

56 As Klingner (n. 33) notes, the point of resemblance between the three episodes is the male figure’s “Liebesblick auf die Schöne” (p. 437). The gaze of love is an important theme, and is repeated in the exemplum of Argus and Io (Curran, n. 35, p. 201). However, the primary associations of the Perseus and Andromeda scene are chivalrous deeds rather than gazing or sleep (see also below), and this difference draws attention to the romantic associations of this episode. Although his emphasis is different, Lyne 1970 (n. 37) makes a similar argument: “the discrepancies between Cynthia’s and Andromeda’s situation, which have worried some commentators, are intentional and significant on a subtle level” (p. 68).

57 Whitaker (n. 21), p. 92. Compare the observations of Lyne 1970 (n. 37) that while in the exempla themselves “Propertius is concerned with the sleeping heroines as single figures” (p. 67), the “ominous omissions” of the male figures acquire importance later in the poem (pp. 67–68).

58 We could say that the subjective impression (desire) is caused by the objective appearance (beauty), but this would be an assertion of causality, not of similarity (qualis . . . talis).
stumbles on the scene, that this is the way in which we should understand the examples.\textsuperscript{59} There is a strong hint in the portrait of the bacchante,\textsuperscript{60} but even here we must wait until the third example. Thus the relevance of the mythic exempla is not given but must be reconstructed subjectively by the reader.

We have so far considered this passage as a unit, and have treated all three exempla as contributing to a single effect. But while their general function is the same, each vignette is different and each corresponds to a different complex of emotions. As a result the opening passage is more profoundly subjective in that it corresponds not to a single vision or fancy of the drunken lover, but to a dynamic series of emotions which he experiences upon seeing his mistress.\textsuperscript{61} Rather than an objective description of the lover's (subjective) state of mind, the series of varied emotions provides us with a subjective impression of his response to seeing her. In a paradoxical way this movement is also objective, in that it precisely anticipates the movement of the poem as a whole. The remainder of the poem falls into three sections:\textsuperscript{62} 11–20 where the lover approaches Cynthia impelled

\textsuperscript{59} The proper term for this is \textit{e sequentibus praecedentia}. Williams, p. 73 (Gordon Williams, \textit{Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry}, New Haven 1980), uses the term in connection with this passage, but only to describe thematic anticipation, such as the anticipation of Cynthia's anger by the figure of the bacchante.

\textsuperscript{60} The interest of the bacchante, ever since Euripides' \textit{Bacchae} (especially the first messenger's speech, 677–774), lay not so much in her appearance as in the chance that she might awake and attack her viewer. Propertius makes full use of this in the final section of the poem. Compare Luck (n. 15): "the Maenad suggests the outbreak . . . of which she is capable" (p. 122), and Lyne 1980 (n. 14), pp. 99–100.

\textsuperscript{61} Harmon (n. 39) describes as "unfortunate" the observation by Hertzberg that the three exempla do not form a climax (see note 47), and cites the continued acceptance of this view (p. 155 with note 18). He goes on to argue that the exempla form a trianel, with the "Maenad as the climactic member of the list" (p. 157), since her drunk and ecstatic condition is closest to that of the speaker himself. However, I find nothing which identifies the Maenad as his "\textit{altera}" (p. 165), especially given the sense of distance between the lovers (Wlosok, n. 36, p. 352). See below.

by desire, 21–33 where he gives her gifts and shows his concern, and 34–46 where she wakes up and sharply rebukes him. This movement of the poem from desire to solicitude to fear of assault is exactly paralleled by the opening exempla.63

Bacchus and Ariadne / lines 11–20. The principal emotion associated with the mythological scene is desire,64 perhaps (given the god’s nature) a drunken desire, but certainly desire mixed with admiration for her beauty. In the following scene the speaker is likewise impelled by desire, and in lines 15–16 has every intent of obeying his impulse. The similarities are in fact more specific. In the first case the god of wine and love comes upon a sleeping woman; in the second the drunken lover, compelled by Love and Wine (hac Amor hac Liber, 14), comes upon his sleeping mistress. In both cases we may also assume that the desire was heightened by the vulnerability of the sleeping woman. Furthermore, just as Dionysus usually approaches Ariadne with a thronging thiasos,65 the lover approaches his mistress accompanied by pueri (10) shaking torches like a thiasos66 or a crowd of Cupids.67 Finally, as Boucher observes,68 the substitution of Bacchus for vinum in line 9 (ebria cum multo trasrerem vestigia Baccho) emphasizes that the drunken lover is here playing the role of Dionysus discovering Ariadne. However in the myth the god will have his way, while the lover stops short, fearing his mistress’ anger, and is frozen, all eyes, like Argus watching Io.69

Perseus and Andromeda / lines 21–33. The principal emotion associated with this mythical scene is Perseus’ chivalrous concern for

move from distance to closeness (see esp. his diagram on p. 959). His analysis in many respects resembles that of Reitzenstein.

63 Coincidental support for this interpretation is given by Lyne’s division of the poem. His divisions closely correspond to my own (see previous note), and his descriptions of them suggest a similar progression of emotions: “A Real Temptation,” “'Tendresse' and Pathos,” “[The Real Cynthia]” (pp. 70, 72, 75).

64 Compare Catullus 64: 251–53 (volitatbat Iacchus . . . te quaerens, Ariadna, tuoque incensus amore) and Ellis’ note on the frequent portrayal of Dionysus, Eros and Ariadne in vase painting (p. 280, Robinson Ellis, A Commentary on Catullus, Oxford 1889). Wlosok (n. 36) notes: “Wie Dionysos ist Proberz vom Anblick der schönen Schläferin hingerissen und in Liebesleidenschaft zu ihr entflammt” (p. 342).

65 For examples in art, see Wlosok (n. 36), p. 337, note 4, and in literature compare Catullus 64: 252 f.: Iacchus / cum thiaso Satyrorum et Nysigenis Silenis.


68 Boucher (n. 18), p. 243.

69 The comparison comes unexpectedly (Lyne 1970, n. 37, pp. 70–71), and Argus’ amazement at the strange appearance of Io (ignotis cornibus) anticipates the lover’s amazement at Cynthia’s saecula (Hering, n. 32, p. 64).
Andromeda, or rather a mixture of concern and love.\textsuperscript{70} The emotions of the speaker in the second section are the same: he straightens her hair, gives her gifts, and fears for her well-being even in her dreams. In particular, the mythological scene in art is typified by romantic gestures, such as Perseus leading Andromeda by the hand, or the two lovers leaning together (see note 54 above), while the scene with Cynthia is filled with romantic gestures and tokens, such as placing the wreath on her forehead and offering her apples.\textsuperscript{71} Finally, Propertius’ treatment of the Andromeda myth is unusual in portraying the woman asleep.\textsuperscript{72} and this difference is emphasized by \textit{primo . . . somno} (3), the only mention of sleep in the series of exempla. In a similar manner the peculiar atmosphere of “hopeless tenderness”\textsuperscript{73} in the scene with Cynthia depends on the theme of sleep, both in the rejection of the lover’s gifts (\textit{ingrato . . . somno}, 25) and in his concern at her uneasy sleeping (27–30). Once again a chief difference is that Perseus is successful, while the gifts and concern of the lover are ineffective. As he lingers over her, he is interrupted and upstaged by the concern of the lingering moon (\textit{luna moraturis sedula luminibus}, 32).\textsuperscript{74}

Pentheus and Maenad / lines 34–46. The emotions of Pentheus when viewing the Maenads were a combination of prurient desire and fear at their savagery.\textsuperscript{75} The same combination of emotions is felt—

\textsuperscript{70} See especially Maiuri, p. 81 (“Like a knight-errant of the age of chivalry, Perseus saved the fair Andromeda from the jaws of a sea-monster, and a large picture dealing with this incident was found in the House of the Dioscuri”), and the plate on p. 79 (Amedeo Maiuri, \textit{Roman Painting}, trans. by Stuart Gilbert, Geneva 1953). Keyssner (n. 50) comments on the idyllic atmosphere: “Von einen Nachzittern schweren Erlebens ist in diesen Bild nichts zu spüren” (p. 179).

\textsuperscript{71} As Lyne 1970 (n. 37) notes, “in lines 21f. and 24ff., Propertius is not just giving presents to Cynthia, which he has brought back from the party, but is performing two conventional gestures of love” (p. 72). On the placing of a wreath, compare Giangrande, pp. 31–32 (G. Giangrande, “Los tópicos helenísticos en la elegía latina,” \textit{Emerita} 42 [1974], 1–36), and on the apples compare Enk’s note on line 24. Curran (n. 35) notes that “in describing the draping of the garlands and bestowal of other gifts upon an unresponsive recipient, Propertius introduces a subtle variation on the theme of the \textit{exclusus amator}” (p. 203). For an interesting interpretation of the entire elegy as a variation on this theme, see Cairns (n. 54).

\textsuperscript{72} See note 54 above.

\textsuperscript{73} Lyne 1970 (n. 37), p. 72.

\textsuperscript{74} Baker (n. 40) remarks upon “the attribution to a more or less personified moonlight of an attitude properly belonging to Propertius himself” (p. 246).

\textsuperscript{75} As of course in \textit{Bacchae} (note 60 above). Compare Wlosok (n. 36): “Damit ist darauf hingedeutet, dass ihre Erregung durch den Schlaf nur überdeckt ist und beim
throughout the poem—by the lover viewing Cynthia: he desires her intensely, yet fears her anger when awoken. This conflict is most clearly expressed in lines 17–18 in words that are equally suited to the mythological situation:

non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietem,  
expertae metuens iurgia saevitiae.

In this case, however, the whole poem corresponds in emotion to the scene of the Maenad, while the final passage depicts that savage outburst which the lover had been fearing.76 The fury of the woman when awakened corresponds to the fear of that fury in the mythological exemplum. Once more there is also a certain lack of correspondence. While in the mythological version the awakened Maenads destroy Pentheus, Cynthia’s violent outburst quickly subsides77 and the fierce Maenad becomes instead a Penelope waiting for Odysseus78 or an Ariadne abandoned by Theseus.79

The opening series of exempla is therefore dynamic in that it portrays a sequence of emotions from desire to solicitude to fear of assault, and it is profoundly subjective in that this anticipates the sequence of emotions experienced by the lover as he views his sleeping mistress. The series of exempla does not form a climax, just as the emotions associated with them are of equal importance. Nevertheless, there is a crescendo of tone, building towards the Maenad in one case, and Cynthia’s outburst in the other. Sechi observes “un crescendo di movimento nel succedersi di questi tre quadri, che si articolano su tre verbi: iacuit, accubuit, concidit.”80 But there is more to this progression. Just as the sleep of Ariadne is

Erwachen wieder losbrechen kann. Das ist der entscheidende Aspekt dieses mythologischen Beispiels” (p. 340).

76 A comparison of the woken Cynthia with the Maenad is made also by Curran (n. 35), p. 200, Wlosok (n. 36), p. 348 and Williams (n. 59), p. 72. Klingner (n. 33), p. 439, points out that Cynthia is quite unlike a Maenad at the end of her speech, but it is her initial outburst (tandem . . . improbe . . . ) which reveals the woman he had feared.

77 For the change in mood see E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), pp. 45–46 and Wlosok (n. 36), pp. 347–50. Giangrande (n. 71) ascribes this change to Propertius’ “Weiberpsychologie” (pp. 34–35). Lyne 1970 (n. 37), however, regards the speech as a sustained attack, with simply “a change of tactics” at the end (p. 76). Klingner (n. 33), on the other hand, regards the whole as a “sauute Klage” (p. 439).


contrasted with her earlier lament (*Thesea . . . carina, desertis litoribus*),\(^81\) that of Andromeda is contrasted with her earlier hardships (*libera iam duris cotibus*),\(^82\) and the sleep of the Bacchante is contrasted with her previous ecstasy (*assiduis . . . fessa choreis*) which at any moment may break forth again.\(^83\) This contrast, which is strongest in the third exemplum, is applied also to Cynthia in the following couplet, as she lies posed between sleeping and waking (*non certis . . . manibus*).\(^84\) The sections which follow likewise build towards the awakening of Cynthia, first in the lover’s fear of waking her (17–18),\(^85\) and then in his concern at her uneasy sleep (27–30).\(^86\) Her awakening in the final section of the poem both confirms this sequence and reinforces the similarity between Cynthia and the Maenad.

We began by observing that much of this elegy centers on the contrast between the subjective vision of the lover and the objective reality of Cynthia, a contrast which is expressed in part by the difference between the heroines in the exempla and the real Cynthia of the narrative. At the end of the poem, however, these distinctions become blurred. Cynthia seems to enter the mythical world: she resembles a Penelope or Ariadne,\(^87\) she sings to the lyre of Orpheus (*Orphea . . . lyrae, 42*), and is described in language which strongly resembles the opening exempla (*fessa, 42, deserta, 43*).\(^88\) In the case of the lover, there is a similar contrast between the heroic role implied in the exempla and the role he actually plays in the following sections of the poem. In the first two, the drunken lover fails where Dionysus and Perseus had succeeded; but in the third, the lover is spared where Pentheus and Orpheus were destroyed. This surprising reversal,\(^89\) by which the real situation of the lover is superior to that of the mythical figure implied in the exemplum, also blurs the contrast between the

---


82 Compare Wlosok (n. 36), p. 335.

83 See notes 60 and 75 above.

84 Compare Lyne 1970 (n. 37), pp. 68–69, and Williams (n. 59), p. 72. Curran (n. 35), on the other hand, suggests a contrast between this “imminent threat of movement” and “the heroines frozen like works of art” (p. 195).

85 Thus E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), p. 46.

86 Thus Wlosok (n. 36), p. 347.

87 See notes 78 and 79 above.


89 Such reversals are among the many hellenistic topoi in the poem noted by Giangrande (n. 71). For a broader study of Propertius’ models see Fedeli 1974 (n. 29).
two realms, and suggests that vision and reality may have more in common than we expected.90

The exempla which begin 1. 3 do not describe an objective situation so much as present the viewer's subjective impressions; they do this in such a way as to anticipate the development of the poem as a whole; and they finally reveal a surprising coincidence between their subjective and objective functions.91

II

Elegy 2. 692 begins with a series of exempla similar to that which begins 1. 3:

Non ita complebant Ephyraeae Laidos aedis,
ad cuius iacuit Graecia tota fores;
turba Menandreae fuerat nec Thaidos olim
 tanta, in qua populus lusit Erichthonius;
nec quae deletas potuit componere Thebas,
Phryne tam multis facta beata uiris.
quin etiam falsos fingis tibi saepe propinuos,
oscula nec desunt qui tibi iure ferant. (2. 6. 1–8)

90 Compare the observation of Bollo Testa (n. 23) that in this poem myth “assume una doppia funzione: spiega e condiziona insieme la realtà, le dà sue sembianze” (p. 140 note 7).

91 Thus the exempla combine—and blur—“subjective” and “objective” functions. For Kölmel (n. 24), however, the subjectivity of the exempla is absolute: “Nur undeutlich wird die schlafende Gestalt erhellt, . . . da, es ist Ariadne, das wohlbekannte, geliebte Bild! Der Trunkene erschrickt, schliesst die Augen, öffnet sie wieder: es ist Andromeda, nein, eine Bacchantin!” (p. 131). Kölmel is taking to an extreme the observation of Alfonsi 1953 (n. 40) that the unreality of the heroines owes something to the drunkenness of the lover (p. 246). Harmon (n. 39) goes further, and argues that the whole poem is a “drunken reverie” (p. 152). However, the only indication that the narrative is imagined is the absence of a phrase such as “to the couch” in line 9 (p. 152), while there is every indication that it describes an objective situation (compare note 37 above).

92 The bibliography for this poem is much smaller than for 1. 3. Apart from the commentators, the fullest discussions are in R. Reitzenstein, pp. 215–220 (R. Reitzenstein, “Properz-Studien,” Hermes 31 [1896], 185–220), Bovancé 1942, pp. 57–62 (Pierre Bovancé, “Surcharges de rédaction chez Properce,” Revue des Études Latines 20 [1942], 54–69) and Williams (n. 59), pp. 82–85. See also Copley, who discusses the symbolic use in this poem of the lover’s door (pp. 75–76 in Frank O. Copley. Exclusus Amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry. Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Assoc. 17. [Madison] 1956). I will refer to editions and commentators simply by name; for fuller references see Fedeli 1980 (n. 62), pp. 19–26 and Hanslik, p. xxiii (Rudolf Hanslik, Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV. Leipzig 1979). Citation of commentators is ad loc., unless otherwise indicated.
While the examples here are taken not from mythology but from history, it is no exaggeration to describe all three as legendary. Lais was immortalized in the painting of Apelles, Thais in the plays of Menander, and Phryne in the inscription of Alexander. The use of the Greek forms of their names (Laidos, Thaidos, Phryne) and of allusive geographical epithets (Ephyraeae, Eryichthonius) reinforces the impression that the poet is alluding not to a factual past but to a quasi-mythological realm. The resemblance to the beginning of 1. 3 goes further than this: both poems begin with a series of three exempla, each of which describes a legendary woman, and in both poems this opening passage, despite its function of providing a comparison with Cynthia, is somewhat detached from its context.

Let us look at this second feature more closely. In 2, 6 the connection of the examples with their context is severed completely: they form a single sentence, and at line 7 a new sentence begins with nothing to complete the terms of comparison (non ita . . .) introduced in the exempla. But if the examples are left dangling with respect to their context, there is also a lack of connection within them. The first (non ita complebant) lacks a definite subject, and if we supply one from the following line (Græcia tota) it does not agree in number. The second comparison is expressed in different terms (turba . . . fuerat nec . . . tanta), and is fragmented, postponing the term of comparison

93 A difference Rothstein considers exceptional, p. 179.
94 In the cases of Thais (Menandreæ, 3) and Phryne (deletus potuit componere Thebas, 5) the poet makes clear reference to this immortalization. Apelles is not mentioned, but Lais was best known by this portrait; see Enk. pp. 95–99.
95 The comparisons should therefore be regarded as mythical exempla rather than historical παράδειγματα. The latter were heavily favored by Latin prose writers; see Alewell (Karl Alewell, Über das rhetorische παράδειγμα. Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit, Leipzig 1913). On the distinction between mythical and historical comparisons see also Lechi (n. 22), pp. 86–87, whose definition of the latter (“avere lo status della res vera”) would not apply to the legendary women of this poem. This is not to deny the considerable difference in tone between these exempla and those of 1. 3, as is noted by Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17), p. 39.
96 Noted briefly by Williams (n. 59), p. 82. La Penna (n. 31) compares the beginning of 2. 14, which is similar to 2. 6 rhetorically, but is more “monumental” (p. 230).
97 Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17) notes that the use of myth, and especially of such series of two, three or four exempla, is more common in Book 2 (p. 45).
98 Verstraete (n. 20), pp. 264–65 (without making mention of this poem), notes that in Book 2 mythic exempla are more often introduced without explicit forms of comparison. Giardina proposes a lacuna after line 6 on the grounds that the comparison is not completed.
99 Compare Camps: “the subject is an unspecified ‘they,’ identified by the context as Lais’ admirers.”
(tanta) until the second line. In the third example the comparison is expressed in different terms again (tam multis facta beata viris), and the change of subject from the lovers to the woman (nec quae . . .) further weakens the connection with the preceding example. The effect of hesitancy and confusion is further heightened when the sentence breaks off, and the speaker begins anew with quin etiam.

This disconnectedness is not just syntactic. The couplet following the exempla, however paranoid in emphasis (falsos fingis . . . propinquos), allows us to infer the point of the comparison: the number of Cynthia’s lovers can be compared to that of the great legendary courtesans. The six lines which follow (9–14) elaborate on this paranoid fear, but do so in a manner which contradicts the preceding exempla: if he is jealous of everything (omnia me laedent) and asks her forgiveness (ignosce timori), then the suspicion implied by these exempla must simply be another of his delusions. The elegy’s opening statement (“Cynthia is worse than the greatest of prostitutes”) has been repudiated by the speaker himself; and it is because this statement is couched in figurative language (the exemplum), and because of its hesitancy and disconnectedness that this repudiation is possible. The exemplum is therefore subjective in that the statement which it conveys may not be true, but simply a delusion of the speaker. It does not describe the way things are, but the conflicting emotions with which he views them.

By contrast with the exempla in 1. 3, those in 2. 6 are ostensibly objective, and are only seen to be subjective in what follows. The comparison is objective in function (or content) since it asserts the fact of Cynthia’s immorality (“Cynthia is more unfaithful than A, B and C”). It remains objective in the following passage; the lover’s renunciation is not “Cynthia appears more unfaithful than A, B and C” but “It is not true that Cynthia is more unfaithful. . . .” It is not the comparison itself which is subjective, but the understanding of it: is it true or a delusion? which should we believe? The renunciation of the original comparison renders its function fundamentally subjective since we are uncertain whether there is any truth to it at all.

The comparison is also objective in manner (or form) since, although the syntax stops short of directly identifying Cynthia with the legendary courtesans, both terms of the comparison are given.

100 Williams (n. 59) likewise observes: “The apology (9–14) shifts blame away from Cynthia and consequently the women in the comparisons” (p. 83). But the implication of this is not (or not yet) that “man’s sexual lust is at fault” (p. 83); me tener in cunis et sine voce puer is the voice not of moral rectitude but of self-delusion.
However, after the comparison has been renounced by the speaker, and his contradictory statements have been left unreconciled, the reader must infer the emotional confusion which this represents. The conflict of utterances is an objective correlative to his conflict of emotions, and the latter must be completely supplied by the reader. There is no clear indication why we should understand this confusion in one way rather than another, rendering the manner of comparison also fundamentally subjective.

Elegy 2. 6 falls into four parts: three main sections (1–14, 15–24, 25–36) and a conclusion (37–42). Each part follows the pattern of veiled assertion followed by repudiation, replicating the structure of the opening passage. In the second section the veiled assertion is contained in the first couplet (15–16):

his olim, ut fama est, uitiis ad proelia uentum est,
his Troiana uides funera principiis;

It is assumed that we know the nature of the speaker’s complaint (his . . . uitiis, his . . . principiis), but these terms are unclear, and our uncertainty is only increased by the impersonal construction (ad proelia uentum est; compare the vague construction in line 1, noted above). Since wanton promiscuity is more of a “vice” than fearful jealousy, and since Helen, not Paris, was traditionally blamed for causing the Trojan War, we must infer that the couplet compares the promiscuity of Cynthia (his . . . uitiis) with that of Helen (his . . . principiis). But the following lines, although apparently continuing this theme (eadem dementia), directly contradict it. The veiled

101 Hertzberg (n. 9) gives a slightly different scheme: 1–22, 23–24, 25–36, and 37–42, with the first section falling into three parts: 1–8, 9–14 and 15–22 (vol. 3, pp. 103–04).

102 The contradiction can be removed if we follow Schöne (n. 3), who explains: “Vocibus igitur ‘his vitiis’ v.15 (quibus respondent verba ‘eadem dementia’ v.17) non amicae levitatem, sed virorum immodestiam poeta significat, quam ut explanet fabulas offert Paridis Helenam abducentis. Centaurorum Hippodamiam appetentium. Romanorum Sabinas rapientium. Iam vero hoc perspexit intelleges neque primo exemplo respici propria Cynthiae viitp neque ceteris omnino demonstrari morum perversitatem (sic Rothst. ad v.15 et 17), sed omnes fabulas pariter esse idoneas ad nimiam virorum licentiam confirmandam” (pp. 17–18). However, this interpretation (followed by Enk, Camps and Verstraete [n. 20], p. 264) does not explain how lines 15–16 could possibly suggest male lust when the myth itself, and the poem so far, both deal with female infidelity. The contradiction must therefore remain, although it may be accounted for in slightly different ways. Rothstein regards the movement from female infidelity to male lust as a broadening of the theme: “während man bei his vitiis noch an den Leichtsinn der Helena denken kann, der zu Cynthia’s jetzigem Verhalten die mythische Parallele bildet, hat sich hier die Vorstellung erweitert zu der allgemeinen Missachtung
condemnation of female immorality\textsuperscript{103} is superseded by an explicit condemnation of male immorality in the rapes of the Lapiths and the Sabines (17–21). The repudiation is direct (\textit{tu criminis auctor}) but outlandish (\textit{per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor}), as was the repudiation in the preceding section. The final couplet of this section\textsuperscript{104} anticipates the poem's conclusion by paradoxically\textsuperscript{105} combining these themes (23–24):

\begin{quote}
\textit{felix Admeti conjunx et lectus Vlixis,}
\textit{et quaecumque uiri femina limen amat!}
\end{quote}

One could argue either that Admetus and Ulysses were blessed in having faithful wives or that Alcestis and Penelope were blessed in having faithful husbands, but the couplet manages to combine both.\textsuperscript{106} Both of the myths in the first line, as well as the moral in the second line, could only support the first of these meanings, and the implication that the woman should be faithful. The couplet is made to bear the second meaning only because of the contradictory change of

der bestehenden Verbindungen, auch auf Seiten der Männer, und diese erweiterte Vorstellung leitet allmählich zu den politischen Betrachtungen über" (p. 181). The change from Helen to Paris as the culpable party, however, is a reversal rather than an expansion, and the exaggeration in 19–22 (see below) underlines this reversal. The technique is better explained by Bovancé 1942 (n. 92): "dans une première rédaction, qui correspondait à une première humeur du poète, ces baisers suspects étaient des baisers coupables: \textit{his vitii,} de telles fautes ont provoqué les grandes malheurs de la légende. Mais, à une seconde lecture, le poète a surtout songé au manque de certitude qui était le sien. Il n'y a là peut-être, s'est-il dit, qu'une apparence, que l'ombre d'une conduite fautive" (p. 58). "Il s'ensuit peut-être, dans l'expression, une légère incohérence au vers 16 avec le \textit{his vitii} qui nous oblige à nous ressouvenir du vers 6; mais la faute est bien rachetée par ce que le poème gagne de saveur, à mêler aux plaintes et aux accusations les retours sur lui-même" (p. 59). An explanation of this phenomenon as a rhetorical technique is given by Williams (n. 59), pp. 82–83. He calls this figure "arbitrary assertion of similarity," and gives his analysis a sound theoretical basis (see esp. Chapter 2), but does not explain the significance of this device in this poem.

\textsuperscript{103} Butler and Barber thus explain \textit{his vitii} as "Uncasity, not jealousy," but with no discussion.

\textsuperscript{104} Enk transposes these lines so that 23–24 follow after 25–26, but has not been followed by other editors. Butler and Barber agree that they "break the argument," while Bailey argues that "some of the transitions [in 23–42] are undeniably abrupt, but none taken singly is beyond defence" (D. R. Shackleton Bailey, \textit{Propertiana}, Cambridge 1956, p. 72).

\textsuperscript{105} R. Reitzenstein (n. 92) describes it somewhat differently: "Der Ausruf erleichtert dies Durchbrechen eines streng logischen Gedankenhaus" (p. 218), the purpose being to avoid offending his mistress (compare note 116 below).

\textsuperscript{106} A further contradiction between this view of the past as a better age, and the opposite view expressed in 15 ff., is noted by Schöne (n. 3), p. 65, and Rothstein (n. 16), p. 181.
subject (*felix . . quaecumque*); in the first line this change of subject involves a clever, almost outlandish, use of metonymy (*Admeti coniunx et lectus Vlixis*).\(^{107}\)

The third section begins and ends with a veiled reference to the immorality of women (25–26; 35–36):\(^{108}\)

```latex
\begin{align*}
&\text{templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis,} \\
&\quad \text{si cuiuis nuptae quidlibet esse licet?} \\
&\quad \ldots \\
&\text{sed non immerito ueluit aranea fanum} \\
&\quad \text{et mala desertos occupat herba deos.}
\end{align*}
```

In this section, as in the first, the condemnation of Cynthia and of female infidelity is “veiled” only insofar as it is couched in figural language, namely the rhetorical question and the metonymy of temples for morals. As before, this condemnation is repudiated and the responsibility placed instead\(^{109}\) on men and male immorality, in particular the painters of *obscenas tabellas* in houses. This shift is once more facilitated by the impersonal construction of the initial assertion (*quid opus, quidlibet esse licet*), and again the reversal is outlandish.\(^{110}\) Not only are neglect of the gods and the decline of morality due to the

---

\(^{107}\) Rothstein acknowledges “die Härte des Ausdrucks,” which he regards, however, as the result of a double metonymy by which Alcestis and Penelope are substituted for the morality of a bygone age: “Glücklich sind nicht die Personen, die genannt werden, sondern die ehelichen Verhältnisse, in denen sie leben.”

\(^{108}\) As will be clear from my discussion, I see no reason to alter the text by punctuating after *immerito*. Rothstein, Barber, Enk and Hanslik add an exclamation mark, while Camps prints the line without punctuation: “The point will then be that the gods’ temples are neglected with good reason because the gods have shown themselves indifferent to the conduct of men by not punishing and checking evil practices such as those indicated in 31–34.” But surely the blame is laid on women, not on the gods: spider-webs and weeds have overrun the temples because piety and chastity have disappeared. Williams (n. 59) also retains the line without punctuation, but without discussion (p. 83). For a further defense of the received text see Boyancé 1942 (n. 92), pp. 59–62, and compare the similar remarks of Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17), p. 30.

\(^{109}\) Compare Rothstein’s observation that the poet uses this moral discussion to veil his condemnation of Cynthia (note 111 below), and his similar observation that “der Dichter auch schon vorher (v.19) das Bestreben gezeigt hat, nach dem Urheber aller dieser Verirrungen zu suchen und ihn für sein persönliches Schicksal verantwortlich zu machen” (p. 183).

\(^{110}\) Boucher (n. 18) observes that “Properce est le seul élégiaque qui ait appliqué à la peinture le thème de θέμη τῆς ἑλετριάς, qui ait formulé des malédictions contre son inventeur” (p. 46), and this original use of the motif, together with “the abruptness with which the subject of erotic pictures is brought in” (Camps, p. 95), gives further emphasis to this reversal. The completeness of the reversal suggests that the poet is not simply embarking on a digression, as is suggested by Boyancé 1942 (n. 92), p. 62.
painting of dirty pictures, but the Golden Age is redefined as the time before they were invented (tum paries nullo crinme pictus erat). This section, like the preceding one, ends with a couplet which combines both implications of the passage. The obvious meaning of 35–36 is that spider-webs and weeds have overrun the temples deservedly—because female fidelity and morality are no longer upheld. But the ambiguity of expression (sed non imnervito: what precisely is the crime, and who precisely is to blame?), and the absence of a clear connection with the preceding attack on the painters of obscene pictures, mean that the attribution of blame is left open; the fault may be Cynthia’s—or her lover’s—or perhaps even the gods. It should be noted that in the first and third sections the condemnation is veiled and couched in figurative language, while its repudiation is not. By contrast, the entire second section is couched in figural language and the condemnation there is “veiled” in that it is deliberately ambiguous. We should note further that: (1) the specific condemnation of Cynthia is now more veiled (in the first section the disconnected exemplum helps obscure the reference to her [etiam . . . tibi, 7]; in the second and third sections there is no reference to her at all); and (2) the tone of the condemnation is now less veiled (while the first section is largely personal, and the second entirely mythological, the third is overtly moral).

The conclusion of the poem is in two parts (37–42): 114


112 Compare Boyancé 1942 (n. 92): “Le vers 35 se raccorde mal, lui aussi, avec ce qui le précède immédiatement” (p. 59), who cites the problems it has caused commentators (p. 59, note 1, to which should be added R. Reitzenstein’s suggestion of a lacuna [n. 92], pp. 219–20).

113 Thus Camps (see note 108 above), who is presumably following Boyancé 1942 (n. 92): “puisqu’ils [les Dieux] n’ont pas su mieux défendre la vertu des femmes romaines, ils ont mérité leur abandon, en fait l’abandon du sanctuaire de Pudicitia” (pp. 61–62). This third possibility, however, is not clearly expressed, and cannot be insisted upon.

114 The phrase me ducet has been suspected, primarily because “the change from nos to me is needlessly awkward” (Butler and Barber, p. 201). But it is not unlikely that the
quos igitur tibi custodes, quae limina ponam, 
quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?
nam nihil inuitae tristis custodia prodest: 
quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est.
nos uxor numquam, numquam me ducest amica: 
semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.

It begins with figural language, a rhetorical question whose implication is that the faithfulness of women cannot be enforced. This veiled assertion is spelled out in the following line, and its restatement in the pentameter incorporates the theme of male immorality: she who is faithful is safe enough (i.e. from unwanted male lovers). The contradictory theme is worked into the assertion without repudiating it, and this first overt expression of criticism is made clearer and more forceful by naming Cynthia for the first time. This conclusion leads us to expect that he will place some demand upon Cynthia’s faithfulness, but once more we are surprised by a reversal: in the final couplet the speaker substitutes an exaggerated declaration of his own fidelity.

Each section of the poem begins with a veiled criticism of Cynthia, an implied condemnation of her unfaithfulness which takes on progressively stronger moral overtones. But each section then continues with an outlandish or exaggerated repudiation of this suggestion, whether his paranoid suspicions of the little baby (me tener in cunis et sine uoce puer, 10), his blaming Romulus for modern decadence awkwardness is deliberate. If me intrudes, it does so in order to emphasize once more the unnatural way in which the speaker places the burden of fidelity on himself. Hertzberg and Paganelli retain me ducest, while most editors read seducest. Enk and Richardson transfer the final couplet to the following poem.

Rothstein regards the substitution as calculated to secure Cynthia’s reform: “Dem leichtfertigen oder mindestens verdächtigen Treiben Cynthia’s stellt der Dichter als versöhnenden Abschluss, der der Bitte, die dieses ganze Gedicht enthält, grösseren Nachdruck geben soll, die Versicherung seiner eigenen unwandelbaren Treuen gegenüber” (p. 185). Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17) gives a more psychological explanation: “di questa fluttuazione ed incertezza è documento il continuo ondeggiaire dell’elegga che si chiude così repentinamente nella attestazione d’affetto che è l’unica certa e da cui ha avuto spunto ed origine il contrasto profundo dei sentimenti” (p. 41).

Rothstein, who regards the veiled condemnations as skirted or avoided rather than repudiated: “So sehr das Gefühl der Eifersucht das ganze Gedicht beherrscht, so bemüht sich der Dichter doch, alle verletzenden Vorwürfe und schroffen Forderungen zu vermeiden” (p. 178). Very similar is R. Reitzenstein (n. 92): “Solcher Argwohn muss die Geliebte kränken, und doch kann der Dichter ihn nicht unterdrücken. So sucht er ihn denn in der feinsten Weise zu motivieren, ohne doch Cynthia dabei zu verletzen. Hierdurch bestimmt sich der ganze Gang des folgenden Gedichtes” (p. 217).
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(per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor, 22) or his polemic against the "inventor" of pornography (quae manus obscenas depinxit prima tabellas, 27). In each case the attempt to shift blame from Cynthia to himself and other men has a ludicrous effect.\textsuperscript{117} and in the conclusion the burden of remaining faithful is shifted from Cynthia to himself in a similarly exaggerated manner (semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris, 42).\textsuperscript{118} We are not given a simple explanation for this self-censure; it may be an aspect of the lover’s pathological condition (if so, she is asked to excuse him: ignoscite timori, 13); it may be the practical consideration that he stands to alienate and lose her by direct criticism (such as he directs against Romulus: tu eriminis auctor, 19); it may be the observation that society influences our morals (illa puellarum ingenuos corrupit ocellos, 29); and it may be the generous impulse of the lover to undertake whatever obligation will spare hurting or pressuring his mistress (semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris, 42). Within the poem these are simply vague suggestions, and we are not expected to choose between them.

The speaker, for whatever reason,\textsuperscript{119} repeatedly shifts blame from Cynthia to himself,\textsuperscript{120} and the power of this poem derives from his being too much the victim of his conflicting emotions to know where blame truly belongs. This fundamental subjectivity, the inability to trust his own reactions to Cynthia’s conduct,\textsuperscript{121} is first clearly expressed in the opening section, in the disconnectedness of the

\textsuperscript{117} Compare Boucher (n. 18) on lines 7–8: “l'expression ironique—qui voile l'inquiétude fondamentale—dérive du matériel de la comédie” (p. 430).

\textsuperscript{118} On the earlier anticipation of this theme of marriage, see Williams (n. 59), p. 84.

\textsuperscript{119} I have suggested several reasons, but all are psychological in the sense that they reveal the speaker’s frame of mind. I therefore cannot agree with the conclusion of La Penna (n. 31): “invece che con l'accusa e con l'indignazione l'elegia si chiude con l'espressione patetica della dedizione: il passaggio da un polo all'altro avviene attraverso un lento processo in cui la componente retorico-discorsiva ha questa volta un'impor-
tanza maggiore di quello strettamente psicologica” (p. 231). Compare Hertzberg (n. 9): “Lyricum paene totum carmen est” (vol. 3, p. 103).

\textsuperscript{120} A significant difference between this poem and 1. 3 is that here the speaker shifts blame onto himself (or men in general), while in 1. 3 he blames a third party: “It is the Gods, Amor and Liber, then, who are made to bear responsibility for the idea of the rape” (Lyne 1970 [n. 37], p. 70), and “at the last moment he blames, not Cynthia herself, but sleep [v. 25] for the unresponsiveness of his loved one” (Lyne 1970, p. 72). This corresponds to the different kind of subjectivity presented in the two poems (see below).

\textsuperscript{121} Compare Boucher’s expression “Inquiétude fondamentale,” in note 117 above, and the discussion of Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17): “qui si tratta delle incertezze, degli abbandoni, delle riprese di un cuore dibattentesi tra posizioni opposte e discordanti” (p. 41).
exempla and their repudiation in the lines which follow. The subjective use of exempla at the beginning of this poem thus sets the tone and anticipates the structure of the whole elegy.  

Both of these poems begin with a series of mythological or legendary exempla which are used in a subjective manner. In the first poem these examples are used to suggest not an objective situation but the changing emotions and impressions of the drunken lover. The subjective nature of these impressions is emphasized by contrast with the objective presence of Cynthia. In the second poem the examples convey a condemnation which may (or may not) be simply a delusion of the infatuated lover. The subjective nature of this condemnation is emphasized by the contrast of implied assertion with extravagant repudiation. In both cases the subjectivity of the lover's experience is an important part of the poem as a whole. In the first his impressions are subjective in that they are (or seem to be) independent of the objective reality of his mistress. The comparison contained in the exempla is a subjective one. In the second his impressions are more fundamentally subjective in that there is (or seems to be) no way of deciding between contradictory impressions. The objective comparison contained in the exempla is contradicted by the speaker himself. The mythical and legendary exempla do not achieve their effect by alluding to external realms of truth or romance (though they may do these things as well); their effect is in the manner in which they are used, the suspension or disconnectedness which make the exempla—and the poem as a whole—a figure for the subjectivity of the lover's experience.  
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122 It is because this self-doubt, the assertion followed by contradiction, comes to structure the whole poem that "the cumulative effect of a series of abrupt transitions is almost overwhelming." But this effect is deliberate; it does not follow that "the sequence of thought is so far from clear that it is hard to resist the conviction that the text has been mutilated" (Butler and Barber, p. 200). Compare the observation by Hertzberg (n. 9): "Aestuantes huius elegiae affectus et transitus praeruptiores dubitationem criticis moverunt, an hic vel illic saeculorum injuria mancus esset et turbatus versusum ordo. . . . Nec tamen absonum videatur totius dispositionis figuram proponere, quo rectius nexu sententiarum perspecto interpretari singulos locos liceat" (vol. 3, p. 103).

123 Verstrae (n. 20) notes that "myth comes to assume, in the poet's mind, the emotional dimensions of his own experience. It is in the second book that this continual interpenetration of mythical and present reality may be most clearly felt" (p. 259). Although he does not discuss 2. 6 in any detail, his general observations are consonant with my own findings, and the differences I have noted between 1. 3 and 2. 6.
A Reconsideration of Ovid’s *Fastī*

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

We have come a long way from Michael Verinus’s fifteenth-century estimate of Ovid’s *Fastī* as “illius diuini uatis liber pulcherrimus.”¹ Those who now consider the elegy from a literary standpoint generally see it as little more than momentary flashes of genuine poetry against a chaotic, weak background.² Ironically, one of the poem’s chief modern exponents, Sir James George Frazer, has through his very approach helped to establish the work as an antiquarian curiosity, and the *Fastī* fades into obscurity among the anthropological oddities it treats.³ But though we may never recover the Florentine humanist’s enthusiasm, we cannot so easily walk around a work squarely and stubbornly rooted in the middle of the Ovidian canon.

² For example, comparing the *Fastī*’s style with that of the *Metamorphoses*, Brooks Otis comments that the diverse tales of the former were only loosely strung together by the calendar format, and that “Such ‘links’ were themselves a sign of discontinuity...” (*Ovid as an Epic Poet*, 2nd edn. [Cambridge 1970], p. 333). L. P. Wilkinson also complains of the fragment’s “haphazard” structure and its shallowness, concluding that “Ovid was interested primarily in rhetorical or literary effect, and only secondarily in truth” (*Ovid Recalled* [Cambridge 1955], pp. 269 and 266). Similarly, Hermann Fränkel condemns the endeavor because “to versify and adorn an almanac was not a sound proposition in the first place.” The critic finally decides that one might best read the *Fastī* “as if it were a book for children” (*Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds* [Berkeley and Los Angeles 1945], pp. 148 and 149). In his *History in Ovid* (Oxford 1978), Ronald Syme notes this last judgment and suggests that Ovid himself would perhaps concur with the adverse reaction (p. 36).
³ See the massive four-volume commentary appended to his edition and translation of the poem (London 1929).
In the following pages, I wish to suggest an approach which might further an appreciation of the poem, examining it as a reflection upon the contrast between the often arbitrary, obscure conceptualizations by which man orders his existence, and the eternal regularity of the stars. The calendar, itself a human construct based upon the ordered motion of the heavens, provides an appropriate focus for this meditation. Without denying that the state of the text as we have it prevents definitive assertions, I think we can in this way outline a thematic thrust which, once recognized, transforms the fragment from a disjointed, superficial narrative to the first movement of a coherent, perhaps even quietly profound, consideration of order, time, and permanence.

The Fasti’s numerous technical inaccuracies prove the poet no astronomer, “being a townsmen writing a work of literature for townsmen who had long since regulated their lives by looking at calendars instead of stars.”4 Yet Ovid defines man in Metamorphoses 1. 84–86 as a congenital stargazer,5 and never loses sight of the constellations’ value as signa. Although W. R. Johnson alone strikes me as treating the Fasti’s intellectual seriousness fairly, I disagree with his conclusion that the poet can find no focus once the religious motif disintegrates.6 Ovid fully recognized, from the very inception of his calendar poem, that he would be writing about “illusions and disenchantments,” all grounded in the shifting, arbitrary nature of many human beliefs and practices, whose origins and rationales are seldom clear; but he also saw that this instability is finally balanced by the recurrent stellar cycles. Whatever sacred sites or myths humans may design, these are all secondary to the eternal symbols of genuine constancy circling far above our world. Thus Ovid punctuates his work repeatedly with references to the monthly astronomical motion, a subtle counterpoint to the frequently “entropic” narrative units.7 Far from having nothing to do with the thematic progression, these

4 Wilkinson, p. 265.
5 Pronaue cum spectant animalia cetera terram, hos hominum sublimes dedit caelumque uidere/ iussit et erectos ad sidera tollere nullus. . . . The last line of this passage is itself echoed in Fasti 2. 75. Franz Bömer, in the commentary to his two-volume edition of the Fasti (Heidelberg 1957–58) notes the parallel. Bd. 2, p. 87.
7 Recent scholarship has demonstrated a certain structural order within individual parts of the overall “blur” Ovid depicts. For the most recent assessment see L. Braun, “Kompositionskunst in Ovid’s Fasti,” in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt 2. 31. 4 (1981), 2344–83. For a summary of earlier work, consult John Barsby, Ovid (Oxford 1978), pp. 28–29 and his notes.
terse, epigrammatic interjections recall to the reader that, however jumbled the antiquarian lore surrounding any given festivity may be, the true indicators of permanence and order remain fixed in their celestial paths; as such, the passages constitute a possible bridge to what Richard Lanham calls the characteristic "hole"—the lack of a central, controlling principle—in the middle of the Ovidian text. 8

The Fasti's opening couplet, charged with an epic urgency, establishes the program the poet will follow in both the elegy's opening segment and the poem as a whole: "Tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum / lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam" (1. 1–2). 9 Besides tempora (the times, the measure) and "causes," he will treat the ultimate source or cause of all temporal order, the signa by which we mark the passage of time itself. But as Ovid sets out to fulfill this plan, he confronts us immediately with an image of the arbitrary, transient nature of humanly-fashioned "order." Speaking of the original ten-month format of the Roman calendar, the narrator humorously addresses its designer, "scilicet arma magis quam sidera, Romule, noras, / curaque finitimos uincere maior erat" (1. 29–30). Unmindful of stellar motion, the ancients instead founded their ratio for allotting this specific amount of time to the year upon human physical and social functions, such as the gestation period for an infant or a widow's prescribed term of mourning (1. 33–36). However reasonable this may have seemed to the planners, the structure of Romulus's calendar proves inadequate, and has to be adjusted by Numa.

Since the year begins with January, we are not surprised when the poet turns to the month proper to find him invoking Janus. It soon becomes clear, however, that this god's primacy in the Fasti goes beyond his eponymous status. The twin-faced deity in fact participates in the same kind of duality active at the poem's core: just as the stellar and human orders constitute the calendar, so Janus's visage attests to his position as both a guardian of divine boundaries and a symbol of arbitrary, chaotic form. At his coming, the narrator dismisses the legal wrangling which distinguishes fasti from nefasti, described at 1. 45–62, and directs attention to the sacrificial fires in a


9 All quotations from the Fasti refer to Bömer, with minor typographical adjustments.
line which could, curiously, refer to the ethereal "fires," the stars, as well (1. 73–76):

 lite uacent aures, insanaque protinus absint
 iurgia! differ opus, liuida turba, tuum!
 cernis, odoratis ut luceat ignibus aether,
 et sonet accensis spica Cilissa focis?

But we learn that if Janus's birth at the beginning of time corresponds to the establishment of universal order, his two faces serve as a reminder of the degree of disorder in his own being. The god himself indicates this in the description of his origins (1. 111–14):

 tuna ego, qui fueram globus et sine imagine moles,
 in faciem redii dignaque membra deo.
 nunc quoque, confusae quondam nota parua figurae,
 ante quod est in me postque, uidetur idem.

More importantly, the chaotic aspect encoded in his appearance carries over to the various causae he offers the poet. For example, the variant explications of the god's shape which effectively answer the questions posed at lines 89–92 also, when taken together, exhibit a certain incongruity. After making the statement just quoted, Janus goes on to say that he assumes the double visage because of his position as heaven's porter (133–40). His 360° vision may make him an appropriate candidate for the job, but the janitorial function is hardly the cause of his form. The slight confusion here is perhaps highlighted by the mock-serious stance of the god, who begins with the statement sum res prisca (103) and concludes by noting that his two faces prevent him from "losing time" twisting his neck to observe those who come and go (143–44). He again falls to inconsistency later when, after launching into a vituperative harangue against modern greed suggesting that money has become an acceptable sacrifice because it is so highly overvalued by men, he concludes that the gods actually enjoy the gold (223–26). By the end, Janus confuses the details of his own function outright: at lines 279–82, he states that his gates are closed in peacetime in order to hold peace in; at lines 121–24 he had indicated that the closed doors prevent war from bursting forth. Here, as we will see throughout the poem, the causae listed are for the most part, whether offered by man or god, multiple and potentially contradictory.

However, as human constructs break down and even the reason of the deities becomes muddled, the poet turns to the stars in the ensuing encomium of the astronomer's vocation. When Janus takes his leave, the narrator interjects, "Quis uetat et stellas, ut quaeque
oriturque caditque, / dicere? promissi pars sit et ista mei” (1. 295–96). He praises the “happy souls” whose contemplation of the stars has lifted them above the impediments and subjects that hinder and preoccupy mortals (1. 297–306):

felices animae, quibus haec cognoscere primis
inque domus superas scandere cura fuit!
credibile est illos pariter uitiisque locisque
altius humanis esseruisse caput.
non Venus et uinum sublimia pectora fregit
officiumque fori militiaeue labor,
nec leuis ambitio perfusaque gloria fuco
magnumque fames sollicitauit opum.
adouere oculis distantia sidera nostris
aetheraque ingenio supposuere suo.

Through this study men are able to reach the sky: “sic petitur caelum, non ut ferat Ossan Olympus / summaque Peliaucus sidera tangat apex” (307–08). Next to their office, all other human activity seems as futile as the giants’ attack on the gods. Finally, though the signa “wander,” the astronomers’ understanding of their regular motion permits us to “measure out” or chart the heavens: “nos quoque sub ducibus caelum metabimur illis / ponemusque ad uaga signa dies” (309–10). Not accidentally, the encomium directly introduces the first of many constellation notices (311–14):

ergo ubi nox aderit uenturis tertia nonis
sparsaque caelesti rore madebit humus,
sectepidis frustra quaerentur brachia Cancri:
praeceps occiduas ille subibit aquas.

Thus the poem’s first movement, capped by the simple surety of this statement, lends the stellar signs a peculiar eminence. The signa, which alone sweep out the flow of all tempora, preside over the uncertain, makeshift causae.

The further the reader proceeds, the more dissatisfied he becomes with the various aetiological quests. On the one hand, the encyclopedic multiplicity of causae surrounding certain of the subjects only forces us to realize the arbitrariness of human ingenuity. Any number of reasons might be concocted to explain a particular phenomenon, each one as good as another; as such, the value of explication erodes considerably. An example of this begins at 1. 317, where Ovid attempts to discern the rationale behind the term “Agonal,” and comes up with no fewer than five possibilities. He opts for the last as the true one without offering any justification for his choice, saying
simply "ueraque iudicio est ultima causa meo" (332). In the discussion of sacrificial traditions that follows, on the other hand, the causae he discovers for the animal slaughter seem sufficiently flimsy to excite a comic sympathy for the fates of the sheep and oxen (1. 383–84) and, later, the geese (453–54). Hyperion is propitiated with a horse, for instance, "ne detur celeri uictima tarda deo" (386). The sacrifice of the various animals to their respective deities appears, ultimately, as frivolously random a matter as the source of "Agonal."  

Seldom in the Fasti can the poet settle on one derivation, and aut becomes a presiding word. When tracing the source of the Lupercal ritual at 2. 267–424, he completes one legend only to declare, "adde peregrinis causas, mea Musa, Latinas, / inque suo noster puluere currat equus" (359–60). The Latin explanation will do as well as the Greek, no preference ventured. Similarly, in the description of Anna Perenna's festival in Book 3, the poet states, "quae tamem haec dea sit, quoniam rumoribus errat / fabula, proposito nulla tegenda meo" (543–44), and proceeds to mention six different identities for the goddess. Discussing the Parilia in Book 4, the narrator actually expresses intimidation at the proliferation of causae: "turba facit dubium coeptaeque nostra tenet" (784). Ovid's scholarship, as I think he is well aware and intends to convey, recurrently dissolves into guesswork. Men are capable of fashioning any number of reasons for their ritual behavior; no one can hope to light upon the single "true" aetiology amid the diffusion of mutually coherent legends.

The most salient instances of this multiplicity occur at the beginnings of Books 5 and 6, where the goddesses dispute the derivations of the months' names. If the poet was intimidated by the number of causae surrounding the Parilia, he feels completely abashed at the opening of 5 (1–6):

Queritis, unde putem Maio data nomina mensi?
non satis est liquido cognita causa mihi.
ut stat et incertus, qua sit sibi, nescit, eundum,
cum uidet ex omni parte uiator iter,
sic, quia posse datur diversas reddere causas,
quae ferar, ignoro, copiaque ipsa nocet.

Three Muses speak up, each claiming respectively that May takes its name from "Majesty," "maiores," and "Maia." In truly politic manner, the poet quietly records each version of the story, refusing to pass

---

judgment (108–10). Ovid finds himself in a similar position exactly one book later; and here again, he shifts the burden of decision to the reader: “Hic quoque mensis habet dubias in nomine causas: / quae placeat, positis omnibus ipse lege” (6. 1–2). The contending deities in 6 are Juno, who claims June was named for herself, Juventas (Hebe), who holds that “Iunius est iuuenum” (88), and Concordia, who attributes the name to the “junction” of Tatius’s and Romulus’s kingdoms. At the end, the poet politely withdraws, noting that “perierunt iudice formae / Pergama; plus laedunt, quam iuuet una, duae” (99–100). In this poem of peace, he eschews all strife. All the proffered causae appear sensible, and he would be as foolish as Paris to select among them.

Once we recognize the intentional aspect of the chaos in the poem, we can perhaps see the Fasti as participating, after the fashion of the Metamorphoses, in what Johnson has called the counter-classical sensibility.11 Augustus’s leadership will supposedly restore the golden age of our origins that the work ostensibly celebrates. The emperor strives to preserve the ancient shrines from decay (2. 57–64), and his efforts have resulted in the mille Lares established throughout the city (5. 145–46). But the narrator prefaces this last point with a note that “multa uetustas / destruct: et saxo longa senecta nocet” (5. 131–32), and mentions a few lines later “bina gemellorum quae rebam signa deorum: / uiribus annosae facta cadua morae” (143–44). And, far more important, there is the nature of the poem itself: the praise Ovid offers Augustus as the guardian of the sacred rituals, I think, hardly stands up in context against the flood of confusion and obscurity rushing all about its foundations. In the background seems to lie the implication that Caesar cannot ultimately hope to resuscitate or maintain the abstruse mythic structures in the face of human frailty and time’s eroding power. The obsequious gesture harbors a more subtle skepticism.

But in order to gain a sense of stability in the midst of this chaos, we need only look to the skies, as Ovid makes plain in Book 3 where he again brings up the crafting of the original calendar, which the early Romans’ ignorance of astronomy dooms to fail (99–104):

nece to tidem ueteres, quot nunc, habuere kalendas,  
ille minor geminis mensibus annus erat.  
nondum tradiderat uictas uictoribus artes  
Graecia, facundum, sed male forte genus:

qui bene pugnabat, Romanam nouerat artem, 
mittere qui poterat pila, disertus erat.

This is less a snide invective against the effeminate Greeks than a comic indictment of the Roman emphasis on *arma*. (We recall the statement at the *Fasti*’s outset, “Caesaris arma canant alii, nos Caesaris aras . . .” [1. 13], and the astronomers’ disdain for warfare.) The poet continues (105–12):

```plaintext
quis tunc aut Hyadas aut Pleiadas Atlanteas
senserat aut geminos esse sub axe polos,
esse duas Arctos, quorum Cynosura petatur
Sidonii, Helicen Graia carina notet,
signaque quae longo frater percenseat anno,
ire per haec uno mense sororis equos?
libera currebant et inobseruata per annum
sidera. . .
```

Instead, we have the ironic reduction of lines 113–14, “non illi caelo labentia signa tenebant, / sed sua, quae magnum perdere crimen erat.” Romulus’s people ground their ten-month calendar in the same kind of arbitrary thought process, delineated in lines 121–134, standing behind most ordering constructs. But only the stars accurately measure the year’s length, and Caesar revises the calendar: “ille moras solis, quibus in sua signa rediret, / traditur exactis disposuisse notis” (161–62).

Once the reader grasps the centrality of the stars to the fabric of the work, he begins to realize that, far from being mere clumsy or even distracting junctures, the astronomical references serve as subtle reminders of the eternal certainty and order of stellar motion, contrasting with the often confused aetiological lore. Even the form of these references holds significance: they are (as Carlo Santini observes12) mostly brief, epigrammatic statements; as such, they stand in contradistinction to the aetologies’ protracted catalogues or legends. This becomes clear if we reconsider the first book. Ovid prefaces the long passage treating the Agonal rite and animal sacrifice, mentioned above, with the two short references to the constellations of the Crab (311–14) and the Lyre (315–16). Likewise, after the narrative has run its course, the poet suddenly interjects, “interea Delphin clarum super aequora sidus / tollitur et patriis exserit ora uadis” (457–58). Following the problematic section, this terse, simple expression seems to recall the reader to the surety of

12 Santini (above, note 8), 10–11.
celestial recurrence. And just as this reference, coupled with the subsequent line's "Postera lux hiemem medio discrimine signat" (459), completes the frame begun at 311–16, it also initiates the frame for the next narrative unit, which in turn ultimately lapses into a set of three astronomical notations in lines 651–56. Moreover, in these last passages the Muse herself rebukes the poet for seeking regularity in the wrong places: "utque dies incerta sacri, sic tempora certa . . ."(661).

Moving on to the second book, we see how the stellar references continue to counter the often dubious mythological narrative. February opens with a discussion of the purgation rituals from which the month supposedly derives its name, rites which the poet asserts were founded on extremely tenuous preconceptions: "ah! nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina caedis / fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua!" (2. 45–46). But after we learn that the entire placement of the month has shifted, and hear briefly of Caesar's "glory" (which was nevertheless unable to preserve the shrines of Sospita), we appropriately encounter at lines 73–78 the unshifting certainty of the constellations:

Proximus Hesperias Titan abiturus in undas
gemma purpureis cum iuga demet equis,
illa nocte aliquis tollens ad sidera uultum
dicit "ubi est hodie, quae Lyra fulsit heri?"
dumque Lyram quaeret, mediī quoque terga Leonis
in liquidas subito mersa notabit aquas.

Naturally, the stars themselves provide bases for mythological imagination; even Romulus's ignorant tribe attributed deity to them (3.111–12). Beginning in 2, Ovid elaborates on the tales behind the constellations. But again, as with the rest of the myths, the stories project an aura of uncertainty. For example, the dolphin wins its place among the stars "seu fuit occultis felix in amoribus index, / Lesbida cum domino seu tulum ille lyram" (2. 81–82). In the fourth book, similarly, the narrator posits variant reasons why only six of the seven Pleiades can be seen (171–78); nor can he definitely settle on the nature of the Hyades at 5. 159–82 or the Bull at 5. 603–20. Ovid's point is precisely that, whatever names are assigned to these guides, or whatever stories or rites grow up around them, the constructs remain secondary to the simple factuality of the stellar cycles. Aetiological study can only go so far; the poet is always left to look to the sky for a picture of true order.

Repeatedly the narrator directs our eyes upward. In Book 3 he seems to pun on the forms of suspicio. Trying to work out the
significance of the name “Veiovis” etymologically, he concludes, “uis
cae si uerbi est, cur non ego Veiovis aedem/aedem non magni
suspecer esse Iouis?” (447–48). But he immediately continues: “iam-
que, ubi caeruleum uariabunt sidera caelum,/suspec” (449–50).
Suspicion or conjecture gives way to observation of the stars. Like-
wise, the flurry of possibilities surrounding the feast of Anna Per-
enna, coupled with the assassination of Caesar, fades into a brief
reference to the Scorpion at 3. 711–12. Subsequently, the poet turns
to the “star of the Kite” (3. 793–94) after running into difficulties
determining the reason for the “toga libera” in the Bacchic festival,
and to the sun’s entry into the sign of the Ram (3. 851–52) after the
confusion over “Minerua Capta” at 835–48.

Read in this light, the Fasti becomes a modest celebration of the
heavenly perfection standing above all mortal formulation. The poet
may wonder at human ingenuity, may be fascinated by mythic or
historical lore, may partake in the rites deemed sacred by men; but he
remains always acutely aware of human limitation in the presence of
eternal order. A particularly stiking demonstration of this occurs at 4.
377–86, where the narrator meets an old soldier at the games
honoring the anniversary of Caesar’s victory at Thapsus. Johnson
notes that the old man, as “a sudden remnant of the vague, vanished
past,”

knows something about this day, this occasion, and, knowing something
about the past, perhaps he also knows something about the present and
the future that a younger man cannot know. A thunderstorm inter-
rupts the old veteran’s speech, and the conversation that was to have
taken place, that might have illumined—what?—is suddenly ended. . . .
This moment is a paradigm of all the moments in the poem . . . when
we seem on the verge of an illumination only to find that the truth that
we thought we had glimpsed has faded back into the incomprehensible
welter of days and their vanishing, uncertain rituals and meanings.13

I differ from Johnson in that I think this exemplary moment does not
signal a point of poetic dissolution in the text, but in fact illustrates
Ovid’s theme perfectly. Whatever the old man might say, he can
impart nothing more than the same kind of limited information
accumulated elsewhere in the poem. The narrator, by the same token,
can discover nothing more than what he already knows: namely, that
the order governing our lives always was and always will be located
solely in the stars. We note that the two speakers are parted when
“pendula caelestes Libra mouebat aquas” (386). And appropriately,

13 Johnson 1978, 10.

Also in Book 4, Ovid has the distraught Ceres, seeking the whereabouts of her abducted daughter, direct her inquiries ultimately not to the nymph Arethusa, as related in the Metamorphoses (5. 487 ff.), but to the heavens, turning first to the Hyades and then to the sun (4. 575–84). 14 At the opening of Fasti 5, the poet again moves from the confusion obscuring the naming of May to the rising of Capella at lines 111–14. In like manner, after the controversy over the rationale for the name “June” and the discussion of the numerous rites and temples in the first part of Book 6, we come to this reduction: “haec hominum monimenta patent: si quae ritis astra, / tunc oritur magni praepes aduna Iouis” (195–96). Near the conclusion of the same book, Ovid turns from myth and history, and from the quiet reminder of our own mutability at lines 771–72, to a humorous glance at the sky (785–90):

Ecce, suburbana rediens male sobrius aede
   ad stellas aliquis talia uerba iacit:
   “zona latet tua nunc et cras fortasse latebit:
   dehinc erit, Orion, aspicienda mihi.”
   at si non esset potus, dixisset eadem
   uenturum tempus solstitiale die.

Regardless of the transience of human ritual, the mortality of humans themselves, or even the capacity of the individual inebriated amid his own festivities to recognize their precise implications, the stars shine still.

Thus, these breakages in the narrative flow initiated by the Lyre, the Dolphin, the Bear, and the rest which pass persistently, if furtively, by the reader, are instrumental to the point Ovid wishes to make. As Lanham asserts, this poet “was not bad at transitions”; 15 if the junctures seem dissonant, then we must focus on the possible meanings behind these particular points of emphasis. While it is dangerous to speculate on what might have happened in the remainder of an unfinished work, we can reasonably posit, based on further comparison with the Metamorphoses, that the role of the stars might have become more explicit as the poem drew on to its close. Reading

14 Just as the transformation element of the Arethusa story squared better with the Metamorphoses’ theme, so the more “standard” version of this multiform myth (see, for example, the Homeric Hymn to Demeter) accommodated the Fasti’s celestial focus.
15 Lanham (above, note 8), p. 60.
the myths of change catalogued in the *Metamorphoses*, one would hardly see the poem as dealing with permanence. Yet when we reach the final book, we realize that immutability is precisely the poet’s topic: in spite of all the turmoil, only forms change (so the Pythagorean tells us) while an essence endures, remains constant, a revelation which itself transforms our reading of the verse up to this point (15. 252–58).  

Perhaps Ovid would have established a similar element in the *Fasti’s* conclusion, pointing out the stars as the central stabilizing factors. We should note that, as the old man in the *Metamorphoses* turns his speech towards the subject of permanence, he states (15. 147–52):

\[
iuuat\text{ ire per alta} \\
\text{ astra, iuuat terris et inerti sede relict a} \\
\text{ nube uelhi ualidique umeris insistere Atlantis} \\
\text{ palantesque homines passim et rationis egentes} \\
\text{ despectare procul trepidosque obitumque timentes} \\
\text{ sic exhortari seriemque eiuoluer e sa!} 
\]

Maybe the heavens themselves were the only bridge spanning the “gulf separating primitive, mythical Rome from the Rome of Virgil’s propaganda.” The narrative chaos, matched against celestial continuity, sets up this very contrast in the *Fasti* between the transient and the lasting.

Therefore, Fränkel and Otis miss the point when they fault the poet for attempting ostentatiously to exhibit “profound learning,” or subordinating the various story lines to “curious embellishments and learned asides.” “Learning” is precisely the thing Ovid questions throughout his calendar poem. The information which fills out the months, some of it profuse and some spare, some interesting and some tedious, cumulatively counts for little in the grand sweep of time. The *Fasti* shares with the *Metamorphoses* a fascination with uncertainty and confusion counterpointed by a reaching for permanence. Here the permanence is located in the endless recurrence of the years, measured by the eternal regularity of the stars. The

16 The precise intention behind the Pythagorean passage remains a major critical issue. See Johnson 1970 (above, note 11), 138 ff., and G. Karl Galinsky, Ovid’s “Metamorphoses”: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects (Oxford 1975), pp. 104–107 and n. 37 on p. 109. However, our attitude toward the speaker need not affect the present argument: regardless of the old man’s ultimate status, the point he makes does offer the reader one other way to digest the compendium of myth encountered up to the final book.

17 Lanham, p. 50.

18 Fränkel, p. 146.

19 Otis, p. 52.
astrological element diminishes the relevance of any earthly matters. The starry signa, themselves the source of our tempora, finally stand above the causae he lists at such careful, insignificant length.  

This last point leads to a final question, namely, why did Ovid protract this “insignificant” narrative to such a degree? The idea of confusion or impermanence might have been conveyed as effectively in much less space. I would suggest here that, despite the ultimate futility involved, human ingenuity delighted the poet, who took care to record those myths and rituals which man constructs to help him cope with the earthly confusion he finds all around him. Critics have argued that the Metamorphoses is “about people telling stories and how telling stories is one of the things that people do in order to get through it all,” that the “point is not to hierarchize—there are no hierarchies here, and no perspectives either—but just to keep going.” I think the narrative dimension of the Fasti at root partakes of the same spirit. Ovid never condemns the aetiological quest. He simply wishes to demonstrate its tenuous foundation. That is, men have established rituals by which they live their lives, and the legends behind these rites are shifting and obscure. The poet derives from his investigation not only a degree of amusement, but also a genuine feeling of sympathy and wonder at the sheer diversity of the mind in its attempt to justify human order, an order whose prime feature is its problematic multiplicity rather than any sort of unified truth.

The coherence of the Fasti, then, is grounded in the poet’s meditation on and celebration of the element of certainty overshadowing the human constructs occupying the foreground of his work. Though Ovid never finished enough of the poem to enable us to determine the extent to which his project might have succeeded, I

---

20 We may note how this antithesis between chaotic human explication and stellar certainty distinguishes the Fasti from its ostensible model, Callimachus’s Aetia. In contrast to Ovid’s skeptical overtones, the Greek poet offers alternative responses to specific aetiological questions on only two occasions of which we are aware (fragments 6 and 79 Pf.), and has the Muse resolve the earlier of these in a presumably definitive manner. As a result, Callimachus’s sole reference to a constellation in fragment 110 presents no discernible tension with his poem’s general sense of “Hesiodic” authoritativeness.


22 Lanham, p. 59.

think we are nonetheless capable of discerning what the chief thematic thrust was to be: as all around us may change, including the names of the gods we worship and the reasons for which we worship them as we do, the stars remain as eternal guides, reminders of the one unambiguous form of order. This realization provided the poet, it seems, with a sense of confidence; there was something above the frequently obtrusive pedantry of this world that made it all tolerable, even enjoyable. If anything killed the Fasti, I do not think it was, as Johnson suggests, an internal sadness uncovered in the course of composition, but the sadness of Tomis. In the bitterness of exile, the reflection upon universal order gives way to the more individualized poignancy of the Tristia.

I would venture a guess that Ovid could only smile at the fact that, barely fifty years after publication, Frazer’s voluminous commentary “is being outdated by advances in anthropological method and in comparative religion. . .”24 Perhaps only when the reader lays aside the book late at night, and himself glances out at the same stars which overlooked Romulus and Ovid, Verinus and Frazer, can he fully appreciate what the author of the Fasti was trying to say. It is a poem whose incompleteness we may very much regret.

University of Virginia

24 Barsby (above, note 7), p. 29n.
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W. S. WATT


Heinsius = N. Heinsius, in A. Drakenborch’s edition (Utrecht 1717).

4. 248: Crixus, ut in tenui spes exiguumque salutis,
armat contemptu mentem necis.

With exiguum one must presumably supply est; so TLL 5. 2. 1477. 67. This is not satisfactory for two reasons: (a) one would expect salutis to be governed by spes, (b) exiguus is a natural epithet for spes. Both of these considerations still apply if (with Summers and some of the early editors) one believes that a line has been lost after 248. I suggest that exiguae (spes being plural, as frequently in Silius) would be an improvement, despite the tautology with in tenui.

6. 485: exposcunt Libyes, nobisque dedere
haec referenda, pari libeat si pendere bellum
foedere et ex aequo geminas conscribere leges.

Regulus addressing the Roman senate.

* I am very grateful to Professor J. Delz for commenting on an earlier version of these notes.
“The Carthaginians demand . . . that you should weigh this war in equal scales” (Duff). I say nothing about this translation of pari foedere; what is even more startling, indeed impossible, is that exposcere should be construed with si instead of with ut. I suggest libeat suspendere, referring to a truce which would in due course be followed by a treaty of peace (conscribere leges). With exposcunt libeat compare 16. 601 f., “deturque potestas / orat,” and Livy 2. 35. 5, “exposcentes . . . donarent.” Silius may have had in mind Lucan 4. 531 f., “temptavere prius suspenso vincere bello / foederibus.”

7. 515: dividitur miles Fabioque equitumque magistro imperia aequantur. penitus cernebat et expers irarum senior magnas ne penderet alti erroris poenas patria inconsulta timebat.

penitus LOV: gemitus F

Fabius’s reaction to the division of power between himself and his Master of Horse.

“penitus cernebat, vor allem ohne Objekt, ist kein Latein,” Delz (p. 220). gemitus, although it is not the paradoxis, is much more likely to be right: Fabius groaned at the mistake which his country was making and feared its consequences. But he kept his temper and (presumably) suppressed his groans; Summers’s retinebat or Postgate’s frenabat would seem to give the sense which is required, but neither is palaeographically probable. Better, I suggest, clau{d)ebat; cf. Lucan 8. 634, “claude, dolor, gemitus” (with Postgate’s note); Silius himself uses claudere with metus (6. 381) and with pavor (10. 377).

8. 502: sed populis nomen posuit metuentior hospes, cum fugeret Phrygios trans aequora Marsya frenos Mygdoniam Phoebi superatus pectine loton.

The Marsi in central Italy derive their name from the Phrygian Marsyas, who was forced to flee after being defeated by Apollo in a musical contest; in the usual version of the story he did not flee but was flayed alive by Apollo.

The vulgate is Phrygias . . . Crenas (= Aulocrene in Phrygia), but this conjecture is (to my mind convincingly) disposed of by L. Håkanson (Silius Italicus: kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen, Lund 1976, p. 21), who proposes Phrygios . . . fines: a possible solution, but not one which commands instant assent. I suggest Phrygius (so Ruperti) . . . poenas: Marsyas fled from the punishment (presumably flaying) which threatened him as a result of his defeat by Apollo. The
nominative *Phrygius* is an easy change, and is appropriate to the context (an Italian people derives its name from a Phrygian fugitive); and *poenas* assumes the quite common confusion of *p* and *f* (some examples are given by Håkanson, p. 15).

8. 604: nec non cum Venetiis Aquileia *superfuit* armis.

From Silius’s “gathering of the clans” for the battle of Cannae.

There is no doubt that *superfuit* (FL) is the paradosis and *superfluit* (OV) a further corruption. I think there is equally little doubt that Silius wrote *supervenit*; prosaic though it is, this is the *mot juste* to express the sense (*OLD* sense 2b); *Venetiis* is an adjective with *armis*, as is pointed out by Delz (p. 220). The corruption of *venit* to *fuit* is found in Cicero’s Letters (*Att. 4. 4. 1; 8. 11D. 4; 10. 16. 1*) and no doubt elsewhere.

9. 649: 

*abruptere cuncta iamdudum cum luce libet, sed comprimit ense nescio qui deus et *meme* ad graviora reservat.*

From a soliloquy of Varro at the battle of Cannae.

I agree with S. B. (p. 174) in replacing *meme* with a pyrrhic word followed by *me*, and suggest *et ma(la) me*, comparing Seneca, *Oed. 31*, “cui reservamur malo?”

10. 228: squalentem rumpens ingestae torvus harenac ingreditur nimbum ac *ritu iam moris* Hiberi carmina pulsata fundentem barbara caetra invadit.

At the battle of Cannae Paulus breaks through a thick cloud of sand and slays a Spaniard called *Viriathus*.

“*ritu moris* mira dictio. *Forte leg. ritu victoris,*” Ruperti. Postgate, followed by Summers and Duff, preferred to replace *ritu iam* by the man’s name *Viriathum*. Against both of these readings, apart from palaeographical considerations, it can be objected that *iam* should not be dispensed with (the Spaniard was already celebrating victory); *ritu* also appears sound, since Silius is particularly fond of that word with a genitive (or adjective equivalent to a genitive). So it must be *moris* that is corrupt: I suggest *Martis*, “after the fashion of Spanish warfare,” i.e. Spanish fighters; cf. 11. 24 *Tyrio Marti* = “Poenis.” The corruption of *Martis* to *moris* is easy enough in itself but here it has been helped by a psychological factor: *ritu* has suggested to a scribe its synonym *mos*.

11. 291: namque iovem et laetos per furta canebat amores
Electraeque toros Atlantidos, unde creatus, proles digna deum, tum Dardanus.

It might be difficult to find a more otiose tum than this one. It looks to me as if it had been inserted to fill the gap left by the loss of another monosyllable, perhaps sit.

11. 356: hoc iugulo dextram explora; namque haec tibi ferrum, si Poenum invasisse paras, per viscera ferrum nostra est ducendum.

A Capuan father threatens to interpose his own body if his son tries to assassinate Hannibal.

Heinsius found the repetition of ferrum, at the end of two consecutive lines, “elegant.” In Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 13 (1967), 23 f. A. Ker disagrees, and thinks that one ferrum must be corrupt; he tentatively proposes fili in 356. Better, I suggest, saevum, if change is required: for this epithet of ferrum see 13. 284, Lucan 7. 313, Seneca, Thy. 573. The two words are not unlike.

12. 630: tandem post clades socium caelique ruinam, non hoste in nimbis viso, non hoste, referri signa iubet castris.

Hannibal is thwarted by a terrible storm in his attack on the city of Rome.

One of the two occurrences of hoste must be wrong. It has been usual to replace the second by ense, which is an impossibly feeble guess. Much better is Blass’s urbe, in support of which one could adduce 614 f., “hostique propinquuo / Roma latet.” Another possibility, I suggest, is sole (preferably replacing the first occurrence of hoste); cf. 612 f., “caelumque tenebris / clauditur et terras caeco nox condit amictu”; contrast 637 (when the storm ends), “serenato clarum iubar emicat axe.”

12. 684: rursus in arma vocat trepidos clipeoque tremendum increpat atque †uenus† imitatur murmura caeli.

The subject is Hannibal.

The old correction armis has usually been accepted, despite arma (in a different sense) in the previous line, and despite the fact that it repeats clipeo. Other suggestions are amens, tumens, fremens, sonans, minis. Better than any of these, I think, would be tonans; cf. 9. 423 (also of Hannibal), “ingentis clipei tonitru praenuntiat iram,” 13. 10 (words of Hannibal), “armorum tonitru” (half metaphorical). Unelid-
ed atque is not a serious objection; Silius has 17 instances of this, of which seven are in the second foot.

14. 580: nec mora quin trepidos hac clade inrumpere muros
signaque ferre deum templis iam iamque fuisset,
ni subito importuna lues inimicaque pestis
invidia divum pelagique labore parata
polluto miseris rapuisset gaudia caelo.

After a victory at sea the Romans would have made an immediate assault on the city of Syracuse but for a sudden outbreak of plague.

It makes good sense to take fuisset as the equivalent of licuisset; so already Ruperti, referring to 1. 163, "sistere erat"; this would be an extension of the impersonal use of est or erat dealt with by Hofmann-Szantyr, Lat. Synt. u. Stil., p. 349. There is therefore no need for Heinsius's emendation ruisset (sc. Marcellus), which in any case is open to the objection that, although Silius is very fond of ruo, he never construes it with an infinitive.

In 583 there is no doubt that S. B. (p. 179) is right in taking pelagi labore parata with the following gaudia, not with the preceding pestis, but it is not clear that invidia divum should likewise be taken thus (in what sense was the victory at sea won "through the jealousy of the gods"?). It is much more probable that invidia divum goes with what precedes; in that case it would appear that a line has dropped out after 582, e.g. pestis / (orta graves multis morbos mortesque tulisset) / invidia divum, pelagique etc.

15. 51: aberunt sitis aspera et haustus
sub galea pulvis partique minore labores.

Pleasure (Voluptas) promises Scipio freedom from the hardships of military life.

For the last three words S. B. (p. 180) lists nine conjectures of previous scholars, none of which he likes, and then adds three more of his own. All twelve are, in varying degrees, remote from the paradosis. Yet good sense can be obtained at the cost of little more than the insertion of one letter: pretil(o)que minore labores, "toils that are poorly rewarded" (Silius is quite fond of pretium in this sense). I hesitate to suggest that Silius may have remembered Lucan 1. 282 (a disputed line), "par labor atque metus, pretio maiore petuntur."

15. 726: tunc aversi turgentia colla
disicit ense Mosae; percussit pondere terram
cum galea ex alto lapsum caput, at residentem
turbatus rapuit sonipes in proelia truncum.
Livius slays a tall Gaul in a cavalry engagement.

*turgentia colla* is appropriate of a snake (2. 546) but not obviously of a human being; Duff’s notion that it refers to goitre is quite fantastic. Heinsius’s *fugientia* is a poor conjecture, despite 2. 250, *terga fugientia*, and 8. 1, *cedentia terga*.


16. 170: Massylis regnator erat ditissimus oris

   nec nudus virtute Syphax; quo iura petebant
   innumerae gentes extremaque litore Tethys.

If sound, *quo* must mean *a quo*; so Ruperti, quoting Curtius 5. 7. 8, “regia totius Orientis, unde tot gentes antea iura petebant”; but *quo* cannot mean *unde*. Summers adopts Schrader’s *quem*, but the use of *peto* with two accusatives is very doubtful; see C. F. W. Müller, *Synt. d. Nom. u. Akk.* (Leipzig and Berlin 1908), 148 f. I can only suggest that *quo* is a stopgap to repair the loss of *hinc*.

*Aberdeen, Scotland*
Leopards, Roman Soldiers, and the
Historia Augusta

BARRY BALDWIN

'Από Συρίας μέχρι Ρώμης θηριομαχών, διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, ψυκτός καὶ ἡμέρας, δεξίμηνος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὁ ἐστὶν στρατιωτικόν τάγμα.

Thus Ignatius, in the opening sentence of his Fifth Letter to the Romans, describing his journey in captivity and expectations of martyrdom. Or, as Jerome, De Vir. Illust. 16 (PL 23. 635A), renders the key words, ligatus cum decem leopards, hoc est, militibus qui me custodiant, translating (it should be noted) a Greek text whose reference to the soldiers at the end of the sentence is different, reading as it does τούτῳ στρατιώταις τοῖς φυλάσσουσι με. As a convenience to readers, I might mention that this point is obscured in the TLL’s notice of leopardus, where also Jerome’s decem is misreported as duobus.

This passage bothered Kirsopp Lake, the Loeb editor of Ignatius, who felt that “leopards” was the name of a regiment, the following words in the Greek being an explanatory gloss. But, as he admitted, there is no evidence for any such nomenclature, rich though Roman military slang was in such contexts.¹ Ignatius is probably being figurative,² as his opening verb θηριομαχῶ implies. He could well have been trying a conscious variant on figurative uses of other animals in Christian literature, e.g., the lion in Paul, II Timothy 4:17.

---

¹ See the examples collected by R. MacMullen, Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire (Harvard 1963), pp. 166–67.

Such an explanation does not detract from the linguistic interest of the passage. If we may trust the dictionaries, this is the first occurrence of “leopard” in both Greek and Latin. *LSJ* adduce only Galen 5. 134 (Kühn), *Edict. Dioclet.* 8. 39, and Theognostus, *Canon* 98. Lampe’s Patristic Greek Lexicon adds to the present passage only *Acta Philippi* 96 and the seventh century Joannes Climacus, *Scala Paradisi* 7 (PG 88. 812D). All the examples collected by the *TLL* are late, whilst Lewis & Short quote only two passages from the *Historia Augusta,* and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* merely a couple of inscriptions. Furthermore, the Ignatian passage is the only figurative example in Greek, and there is none in Latin.

The Roman soldiers who provoked Ignatius to this apparent artistic innovation will almost certainly have been the so-called *diogmitae,* a tough crowd of vigilantes or enforcers, hardly deserving *LSJ*’s mild description of them as “mounted policemen.” *LSJ,* who spell the word διωγμείτης, adduce only *CIG* 3831 a8; this is altered in their Supplement to *OGI* 511. 10, actually the same inscription via Dittenberger’s *OGIS,* with the addition of a second inscription from Pisidia, published by Louis Robert, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 52 (1928), 407–09. It is striking that all four of the examples in Lampe (who spells it διωγμίτης) come from martyrlogies. To give the best example, Polycarp was arrested by a joint force of *diogmitae* and cavalry (the distinction is to be noted) who were sent out to find him “with the usual arms as though against a brigand.”

The Latin equivalent *diogmitae* (which may justify the orthography of Lampe over that of *LSJ*) is not to be found in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary.* Both Lewis & Short and the *TLL* are confined to the same two passages. Ammianus Marcellinus 27. 9. 6 relates how Musonius, the *vicarius* of Asia in 368, tried to combat the brigands of Isauria *adhibitis semermibus paucis, quos Diogmitas appellant.* It may be notable that the historian, who says that Musonius was compelled to use this posse because the regular soldiers were enfeebled by luxury, finds it necessary to explain the term.

The other passage is in the *Historia Augusta.* In his Life of Marcus Aurelius (21. 7), ‘Julius Capitolinus,’ having said that the emperor created bands of Volones (armed slaves), Obsequentes (armed gladia-

---


4 *M. Poly.* 7. 1; *M. Pion.* 15. 1. 7; *M. Agap.* 2. 1.

tors), and reformed bandits from Dalmatia and Dardania, adds the laconic sentence *armavit et Diogmitas*. The word is absent from Lessing's Lexicon to the *Historia Augusta* perhaps because he treated it as a proper name.\(^6\) This account has been accepted at face value by the best modern authority,\(^7\) and may be authentic, given the undoubted existence of *diogmitae* at that time. Yet one has to wonder what the chances are of the *Historia Augusta* independently coming up with the only extant Latin use of the term outside Ammianus, especially when we notice how a crude alliteration (*Dalmatiae . . . Dardaniae . . . Diogmitas*) is thereby achieved, also that the biographer's account opens with an ablative absolute, *instante sane adhuc pestilentia*, as does that of Ammianus, *deploratis novissime rebus, luxuque adiumento militari marcente*. Conceivably, then, we have here yet another small link in the chain of details\(^8\) that betrays the fraudulent nature of the *Historia Augusta*.

*University of Calgary*

\(^6\) As does the Loeb text of Magie; in Hohl's Teubner, it is printed with a small "d."


\(^8\) As put together by many scholars over the years since Dessau. A bibliography is here unnecessary; *HA* fanciers know where to look.
Three Notes on *Habeo* and *Ac* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*

CLIFFORD WEBER

1. *Habeo* = *Habito* (20. 7)

The frequentative *habito* is the usual Latin word for "reside," but in pre-Classical texts this idea is occasionally expressed by the simplex *habeo*. Of the latter usage there is one example in the third-century Sacra Argeorum quoted by Varro, but otherwise it is limited to drama: nine times in Plautus, twice in Naevius, and once each in Accius and Afranius. By 100 B.C., however, this usage would appear to have become obsolete, for not only is it never attested in any Classical text, but subsequently the grammarian pseudo-Placidus states that *habeo* = "reside" "nunc frequentative tantum dicitur." In Late Latin, to be sure, isolated examples are to be found: one in Apuleius, one in Dictys Cretensis, and one in Paulinus of Nola. Nevertheless, two examples drawn from a poet and from an archaizer like Apuleius are not sufficient to establish the survival of *habeo* = *habito* in post-Classical Latin, nor is an isolated instance in Dictys. A search for additional late examples, moreover, would not appear to hold much promise. In the entry on *habeo* in the *Thesaurus Linguae* 

---

1 Ling. 5. 50.
2 Textual conjectures would add three more examples in *Cur. 44. Men.* 308, and *Poen.* 1093.
3 Lindsay, *Glossaria Latina*, IV (Paris 1930), H 15 (p. 64).
4 Two if *habeo* in *Apol.* 21 (p. 25. 4 van der Vliet) is intransitive.
5 The same goes for *CIL*, VI, 38274 from Etruria, which is of unknown date and in any case displays a modicum of literary knowledge.
Latinae⁶ the lexicographer unequivocally declares, “Locos dedi omnes.”

In Itinerarium Egeriae 20. 7, however, this sentence is found:

... mox de noce petiunt heremum et unusquisque eorum monasteria sua, qui ubi habebat.

As long ago as 1912, in his review of Löfstedt’s commentary on the Itinerarium,⁷ Schmalz recognized (without, however, expressly drawing attention to the fact) that in this passage habebat is best taken to mean “reside.” Otherwise, an ellipse of monasterium suum must be assumed. Thus, whatever may be the correct analysis of qui ubi in the above sentence, there can be little doubt about the equivalence of habebat to habitabat, so that qui ubi habebat means something like “each wherever he happened to be living,” as Schmalz took it. This instance in Itinerarium Egeriae 20. 7 should be added, then, to the examples of habeo = habito cited in the Thesaurus, “locos dedi omnes” notwithstanding. Another fact, however, is more important. Taken together with Dictys Cretensis 4. 15, this passage demonstrates that habeo = “reside” was still in current use as late as the late A.D. 300s. Thus, as it appears in Apuleius and Paulinus of Nola, this usage is not a case of literary affectation but is rather current idiom. It also affords an especially clear illustration of the so-called “classical gap.” Amply attested in pre-Classical drama, habeo = “reside” then disappears from view for the next two centuries, but not because it became obsolete. On the contrary, though rejected by Classical and Silver purists, the use of habeo in this sense lived in the non-literary language of everyday life.⁸ This is the reason why it reappears in Late Latin, after the breakdown of the complex stylistic canon which had earlier distinguished everyday speech from acceptable literary usage.

II. Ibi Habet = II y a (4. 4)

It is common knowledge that the impersonal use of habet with an accusative, first appearing in Late Latin in the A.D. 300s, is the linguistic ancestor of French il y a (“there is,” “there are”) and the parallel expressions in Spanish (hay), Catalan (hi ha), and Italian (vi ha, cè ha). In the French expression the adverb y is optional until the

⁶ Col. 2401, 13.
⁷ Berliner philologische Wochenschrift 32 (1912), 549–61.
⁸ Löfstedt implicitly recognized this fact in Eratos 7 (1907), 67, where he has this comment on Dictys Cretensis 4. 15: “Dass habeo = habitare bei einem Spätlateinier nicht beanstandet werden darf, braucht kaum hervorgehoben zu werden.” How, four years later, did he miss the same usage in Itinerarium Egeriae 20. 7?
1700s, but in all the languages preserving impersonal *habet* + acc., examples containing this adverb or one of its cognates are attested from the earliest period on. Of *ibi habet*, however, the primordial Latin expression, only one example has been identified, and that, found in chapter 19 (p. 145. 19 Geyer) of Theodosius’ *De situ terrae sanctae*, is no earlier than the A.D. 500s:

*ibi habet dactalum Nicolaum maiorem, ibi et Moyses de saeculo transitivit, et ibi aquas calidas sunt ubi Moyses lavit et in ipsas aquas calidas leprosi curantur.*

It is clear, moreover, that even in this passage *ibi habet* is far from being a fixed expression. Impersonal *habet* is here only one of the three verbs which are used with *ibi*, the full semantic value of which is indicated not only by its specific reference to a particular city, but also by its anaphora at the head of three successive cola. Indeed, the occurrence of *ibi* with impersonal *habet* in this passage is largely fortuitous and fails in any case to prove that *ibi habet* had solidified even as late as the A.D. 500s.

In the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, however, there is a significant example of *ibi habet* + acc. which, though rendered correctly in more than one translation, otherwise appears to have gone unnoticed (e.g., in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*). This example, moreover, dates to the late 300s, and thus it establishes that the exact Latin equivalent of *il y a* is in fact coeval with impersonal *habet* without *ibi*, even if, to be sure, the latter is considerably more common. The passage in question is this in *Itinerarium Egeriae* 4. 4:

> In eo ergo loco, licet et lectum non sit, tamen petra ingens est per girum habens planitiem supra se, in qua stetisse dicuntur ipsi sancti: nam et in medio ibi quasi altarium de lapidibus factum habet.

---

9 Walther von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 4 (Basel 1952), 364. Presumably this is true of Portuguese also, even though modern Portuguese *ha* is unique in preserving *habet* + acc. without *ibi*.

10 Viz. Livia, visited by Egeria in 10. 4–7. The anaphora of *ibi* in Theodosius is reminiscent of the string of five sentences in succession which Egeria introduces with the phrase *Hic est locus ubi* or some variant thereof. The reminiscence can hardly be coincidental.


12 S.v. *habeo*, col. 2461. 78 – 2462. 11.
To paraphrase: "In that place, even though no passage of Scripture referring to it is read, there is a large round rock which is flat on top. There [i.e., on the flat summit] the holy ones are said to have stood [= resided?], and in the middle of that space there is a sort of altar made of stones."

What is the subject of habet at the end of this passage? To judge from the silence of Löfstedt and others, petra ingens is understood as its subject, and hence habet is not impersonal. This analysis, however, is mistaken for at least three reasons:

1. The rock habet planitiem supra se, and this planities, in turn, in medio altarium habet. Thus, if habet has a subject, that subject is planities, not petra. Earlier in the clause, however, demonstrative ibi is equivalent to in planitie, and hence planities also is eliminated as subject of habet.

2. In the relative clause and all that follows it, Egeria is concerned solely with the planities. Even in her nonchalant prose, to return abruptly to the petra in the final word in the sentence would require at the very least a pronominal reference to that effect.

3. Egeria has a penchant for losing the syntactical thread established at the beginning of a sentence. Indeed, this is so marked a characteristic of her writing that anacolutha are ubiquitous in the Itinerarium. The following examples are both typical and similar in structure to the sentence under discussion:

\[\ldots\text{ita tamen ut lapis cum corpore non moveretur in alio loco sed ibi ubi}
\text{inventum fuerat corpus positum esset.}\ldots\] (16. 6)

Here the insertion of the relative clause ubi inventum fuerat corpus is sufficient to cause the authoress to forget lapis, which is the grammatical subject of both verbs in the antithesis. She thus writes positum instead of positus.

\[
\text{Nam ecclesia quam dixi foras civitatem} \ldots, \text{ubi fuit primitus domus}
\text{Abrahae, nunc et martyrium ibi positum est.}\ldots\] (20. 5)

After two relative clauses ecclesia is forgotten and left without any grammatical connection with the rest of the sentence—a so-called "nominativus pendens."

\[
\text{Tunc statim illi sancti dignati sunt singula ostendere. Nam ostenderunt}
\text{nobis speluncam illam ubi fuit sanctus Moyses cum iterato ascendisset in}
\text{montem Dei ut acciperet denoto tabulas, posteaquam priores illas}
\]

\(^{13}\) In the combination of continuative nam and et = etiam, which occurs occasionally in Cicero and very often (26 times) in Egeria, et is otiose.
frequerat peccante populo, et cetera loca, quaecumque desiderabamus vel quae ipsi melius noverant, dignati sunt ostendere nobis. (3. 7)

The grammatical subject of both sentences is *ili sancti*, but the digression on the Sinai cave is of such length and complexity that a return to this subject has to be signaled with *ipsi*, and *ostenderunt nobis* preceding the digression, by now forgotten, is subsequently repeated as *dignati sunt ostendere nobis*.

For these reasons, to return to the passage before us, neither *petra* nor *planities* can be the subject of *habet*. This verb is rather the impersonal *habet* which, occurring twice elsewhere (1. 2 and 23. 2) in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, eventually became firmly established in several Romance languages. In this passage, moreover, is found the *ibi* which, though presupposed by all Romance expressions except Portuguese *ha*, nevertheless occurs in only one of the Latin examples heretofore identified.

Thus, impersonal *ibi habet* + acc., the exact Latin equivalent of French *il y a* etc., is unambiguously attested as early as the late 300s. This *terminus post quem* is more than a century earlier than that previously established, and no later than the earliest examples of the same construction without *ibi*. To judge from its use in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, moreover, impersonal *ibi habet* + acc. is subject to the same conditions in Late Latin as govern its use in primeval Romance. There the adverb always refers to a specific place, and thus it is not used if such a place in otherwise indicated, or if extent of time is referred to. Corresponsingly, in *Itinerarium Egeriae* 4. 4 *ibi* refers specifically to the *planities* atop the *petra ingens*, but in 1. 2 and 23. 2, where *habet* indicates extent of space (the logical and usual antecedent of extent of time), *ibi* is not to be found.

III. *Ac Tertia Die* (6. 1, 23. 1)

It is typical of Egeria's repetitious style of writing that in chapters 1–23 there is a certain sentence-pattern which recurs no fewer than seven times. The pattern in question consists of these elements in this order:

14 There is no weight in the objection that, so soon after *habens planitiem* earlier in the sentence, *habere* is unlikely to be repeated in a different sense. In 27. 5, for example, *similiter* is used as a sentence-connective = "likewise," only to be followed four words later by the adverb *similiter* = "in the same way." In 21. 1 *locus* recurs three times within two sentences, and each time in a different sense: first "passage of Scripture," then "place," and finally, as the adverb *loco*, "there."

A. Clause-initial sentence-connective, whether word or phrase (followed once by an enclitic personal pronoun)
B. Ablative die preceded by an ordinal numeral (alia = secunda)
C. Participial clause (missing in two cases)
D. Perfect active indicative of rogo, venio, or pervenio in the first person.

Without exception in chapters 1–23 every sentence that contains an ordinal numeral + die conforms to this pattern, viz.,

1. Et alia die, maturius vigilantes, rogavimus (4. 8)
2. Et inde alia die, subiens montem Taurum et faciens iter iam notum per . . . , perveni (23. 7)
3. Inde denuo alia die, facientes aquam et euntes adhuc aliquantulum inter montes, pervenimus (6. 1)
4. Ac tertia die, inde maturantes, venimus (6. 1)
5. Ac tertia die perveni (23. 1)
6. Ac sic ergo alia die, transiens mare, perveni (23. 8)
7. Ac sic ergo nos alia die mane rogavimus (16. 7).

It is noteworthy that although they conform to type in all other respects (only the absence of a participial clause in no. 5 is at all anomalous), the two citations containing tertia die differ from all others in respect to element A. In all other citations this element is subject to some variation. Indeed, only ac sic ergo occurs more than once, and it is common throughout the Itinerarium, occurring 31 times in all. In both cases, however, of tertia die, far separated though they are in the text, ac functions as element A. If this fact per se is not particularly remarkable, it surely becomes so when considered together with the general incidence of ac/atque in the Itinerarium. As part of the fixed expressions ac sic ergo, ac sic, and ac si,16 this conjunction occurs 53 times. In four other cases it connects syntactically parallel pairs in three-word phrases like viri ac feminae.17 Otherwise ac/atque is

16 That ac had no semantic autonomy ("valence") in these expressions is especially clear in the case of ac si, the eventual univerbation of which is indicated by its Romance descendants: Old French eissi, Provençal aissi, Spanish asi, and Portuguese assim.
17 To this category, by way of comparison, belong 28 of 36 instances of ac in Tertullian’s Apologeticum and De anima. In its other eight occurrences ac is part of a formula (ac per hoc three times, rursus ac rursus twice, and novus ac novus, ac si, and semel [sic] ac once each).

Aside from one instance of simul atque and four of alius atque alius, all the occurrences of atque in these texts fall into the same two categories as in the Itinerarium Egeriae: three-word phrases like illuminator atque deductor, composed of two syntactically parallel (and often morphologically identical) words joined by atque (47 examples).
found only four times, not including daggered *atque* in 27. 5. Thus, of the apparently unrestricted use of *ac/atque* there are only four examples, and in half of them this rare conjunction is part of the phrase *ac tertia die* falling at the beginning of a sentence.\(^{18}\) Conversely, these two instances of *ac tertia die* amount to half of all occurrences of *tertia die*.\(^{19}\)

If it is reasonable to ask why an otherwise rare conjunction is found in both of the above citations in which *tertia die* occurs, at least one need not wonder why *ac* is in general not part of Egeria's active vocabulary. Since ample documentation already exists concerning the formal, literary tone of *ac/atque* as compared with *et* in particular,\(^{20}\) here a few statistical data will suffice. In Cato's speeches *ac/atque* is common, but rare in the *De agricultura*. In Cicero too it is commonest in the speeches. In the pseudo-Caesarian *Bellum Hispaniense* it is limited to a single instance of *ac si*. The same is true of the vernacular passages in Petronius, but in the verse passages, meager by comparison, *ac/atque* occurs no fewer than 30 times. It is rare in Vitruvius, the phrase *dextra ac sinistra* (cf. Egeria's *viri ac feminae* etc.) accounting for half of all examples, and rare as well in Commodian and the *Mulomedicina Chironis*. In Phaedrus, with one possible exception, it is limited to *simul ac*, and among the inscriptions found at Pompeii before 1911 there are no examples at all. This statistical evidence of the early obsolescence of *ac/atque* appears corroborated, moreover, by the following remark of an admirer of Cato in *Fronto Epistulae* 2. 16:

> Uni M. Porció me dedicavi atque despondi atque delegavi. Hoc etiam ipsum "atque" unde putas?\(^{21}\)

and formulae composed of *atque* and an adverb or conjunction (*atque adeo* and *atque ita* [cf. Egeria's *ac sic* and *ac sic ergo*] nine times each, *atque exinde* three times, and *atque inde* [cf. Egeria's *et inde* above], *atque illíc*, and *atque vitinam* once each). It is noteworthy that the phonology of these two categories conforms to entirely different norms. In the formulae constituting the second category, the word following *atque* begins with a vowel in all 24 instances without exception, but among the 47 examples belonging to the first category, this is the case in no more than seven. This striking discrepancy demonstrates that the expressions belonging to the second category are all formulae inherited from the time when *atque* was generally restricted to use before words beginning with a vowel. Finally, *ac* is never used at the beginning of a sentence (cf. Egeria's practice), but *atque* appears 13 times in this position.

\(^{18}\) In the other half *atque* is found, viz., in 18. 1 and 21. 1.

\(^{19}\) The other two are in 25. 11 and 49. 3, and only in the latter at the beginning of a sentence (*Item tertia die*).

\(^{20}\) For particulars see Hofmann and Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax*, pp. 476–78 and the bibliography cited there.

\(^{21}\) It is not impossible, however, that the Catonism in question here is not the use of *ac/atque* per se, but rather the particular use of *atque* before consonants, for which see
It is clear enough, then, why *ac/atque* does not belong to Egeria’s active vocabulary. Why, then, in both of its occurrences above, is *tertia die* in particular preceded by this formal, literary, and even vaguely grandiloquent conjunction, which otherwise is used without restriction in only two places in the entire text? The answer follows from the nature of the conjunction itself. If *ac/atque* is a word unique to the written language, then *ac tertia die* is likely to be a quotation or a paraphrase, even if unconscious, of some written text with which the authoress is familiar.\(^22\) In the vernacular, moreover, as has just been shown, *ac/atque* had long been virtually extinct and must therefore, by Egeria’s day, have had a distinctly archaic ring. This consideration leads to a liturgical text as the likeliest source of *ac tertia die*, for however unaffected and straightforward the Latin of Christian writers may have been, the language of Christian worship was quite another matter.

... Latin used in the liturgy displays a sacral style. The basis and starting point of Liturgical Latin is the Early Christian idiom, which, however, ... has taken on a strongly hieratic character, widely removed from the Christian colloquial language. ... Liturgical Latin is not Classical Latin, but neither is it, as is so often said, the Latin which was considered decadent by educated people. The earliest liturgical Latin is a strongly stylized, more or less artificial language, of which many elements ... were not easily understood even by the average Christian of the fifth century or later. This language was far removed from that of everyday life.\(^23\)

“And on the third day...” Even for a believer less thoroughly steeped in Scripture and liturgy than Egeria, it would have been a natural reflex to express this idea by using the elevated expression with which many a sacred text must have referred to this central event in the life of Christ, and in the belief of Christians everywhere. As far as Egeria in particular is concerned, her propensity for adopting

---

Bertil Axelson, *Unpoesische Wörter* (Lund 1945), pp. 82–85, and J. A. Richmond, *Glotta* 43 (1965), 78–103, esp. 80, 82, 93–94. *Me dedicavi ac despondi ac delegavi* might have occasioned no comment, at least not concerning the conjunction.

\(^22\) In this connection it is significant that in 18. 1, one of the two instances of the free use of *ac/atque* just mentioned, *atque* is followed immediately by a Biblicism drawn from Deut. 28:11, for which see below.

Scriptural and liturgical modes of expression has been well documented. To cite only a few among many examples, the phrases *in nomine Dei*, which she uses five times, *iubente Deo*, occurring eight times, and *gratias agentes Deo*, found once (in 16.7), are all formulae of prayer which have become part of Egeria’s normal pattern of speech. When she mentions Biblical Egypt in 5.9, she calls it *terra Aegypti*, its designation in the Vulgate and in her own quotation of Gen. 47:6 in 7.9. Contemporary Egypt, however, she calls simply *Aegyptum* in 3.8 and 7.1, for example. In 4.2, referring to the flight of Elijah from King Ahab, she adopts the Biblicism *fugere a facie* + gen., which, since it occurs at least four times in the Vulgate translation of the Psalms, Ziegler has suggested was familiar to Egeria from its frequency in the pages of her psalter. Yet another example has heretofore gone unnoticed. In 18.1, writing of her stopover in Hierapolis in Syria, she characterizes that city as *abundans omnibus* and thus adopts the phraseology of the Vulgate at Deut. 28:11.

In short, quite apart from explicit references to specific passages of Scripture, Biblical turns of phrase so permeate the *Itinerarium Egeriae* that they have left their stamp on the language of the entire work. In many cases, moreover, Egeria’s familiarity with these Biblicisms will have been indirect, due more to their occurrence in her liturgy than to her own Scriptural erudition. Nevertheless, whether she is quoting a specific text or, as is more likely, using an expression

---


25 Ibid., 177.

26 “Abundare te faciet Dominus omnibus bonis.” With *abundare omnibus* here cf. *abundare in omnibus* (Eccles. 10:30, 11 Cor. 1:7) and *abundare in omne* (11 Cor. 9:8, 9:11). This and other correspondences between Egeria’s language and the text of the Vulgate should not, however, be taken to imply that the Vulgate and Egeria’s Bible are one and the same. On the contrary, direct quotations from her Bible indicate that the latter, like the Itala in general, was more similar to the Septuagint than to any other extant text. In quotations from the New Testament she comes much closer to the Vulgate, but that is because there Jerome by and large preserved the text of the Itala. See ibid. 165, 167, 187, 197.

27 Ibid., 177, 184–85, 188, 190.
common to a multitude of texts with reference to the Resurrection of Christ, in neither case can it be known precisely what this text or these texts may have been.\textsuperscript{28}

\textit{Kenyon College}

\textsuperscript{28} In the Vulgate New Testament the phrase \textit{et tertia die} (in Luke 24:7, \textit{et die tertia}) occurs in eight places (Matt. 16:21, 17:22, and 20:19, Luke 9:22, 13:32, and 18:33, John 2:1, and Acts 27:19), and in five of these it refers to the Resurrection. There is no instance of \textit{ac} in place of \textit{et}, however, either in the Vulgate or in the Itala. Tertullian and Irenaeus are the only Latin fathers who quote any of the above verses (Luke 9:22 in Tert. Adv. Marc. 4. 21. 7 [\textit{et post tertium diem}] and Irenaeus Adv. haereses 3. 16. 5 [\textit{et die tertia}], and Matt. 16:21 \textit{ibid.} 3. 18. 4 [\textit{et tertia die}]), and there also only \textit{et} is found.

In the Roman missal \textit{tertia dies} with reference to the Resurrection occurs only in the creed, which has \textit{et resurrexit tertia die}. In all other extant creeds, however, there is no conjunction at all. In the Leonine Sacramentary \textit{tertia dies} does not occur. Finally, in the supplements to the \textit{Corpus Christianorum} entitled “Instrumenta lexicologica Latina,” no parallel for Egeria’s \textit{ac tertia die} is to be found.
On the Survival of an Archaic Latin Case Form in Italo- and Balkan-Romance

PAUL A. GAENG

Among the vexatae quaestiones of historical Romance morphology, the origin and development of Italian and Rumanian third declension plurals in */-i/* from Lat. */-ēs/* (e.g., It. monti, Rum. munți derived from Lat. MONTĒS) is still high on the list. In his recent Proto-Romance Morphology (Amsterdam–Philadelphia 1983), Robert A. Hall, Jr. supports the widely accepted explanation to account for this development when he says that these plurals, which seem to point back to Proto-Romance */-i/*,¹ are the result of an analogical replacement of earlier */-ēs/* by */-i/* under the influence of the second declension MURI-type plurals rather than a phonetic development, that is, the closing of Lat. [e] to [i] brought about by the following [s]. The implication of this statement is that there are essentially two hypotheses, phonological versus analogical development of */ēs/>*/-i/*, to account for these plurals. The arguments underlying these theoretical positions may be briefly summarized as follows:²

¹ It should be recalled that Hall’s “Proto-Romance” is a theoretical construct, and that he deals with a reconstructed morphology based on the earliest Romance attestations rather than with evidence culled from Vulgar Latin texts and inscriptions.

² The literature dealing with the problem of 3rd decl. plurals in Italian and Rumanian is quite extensive, since all manuals and studies on the historical morphology of these languages make reference to it. Among the essays specifically devoted to the problem at hand, the following should be mentioned: Robert L. Politzer, “On the origin of Italian plurals,” Romanic Review 43 (1952), 272–81, and “Vulgar Latin */-ēs* Italian */-i/*,” Italica 28 (1951), 1–5; Paul Aebischer, “La finale */-i* des pluriels italiens et ses origines.” Studi linguistici italiani 2 (1961), 73–111; Francesco Sabatini, “Sull’origine dei plurali
(a) The change to It. *cani*, Rum. *ciuni* from Lat. CANÉS is the result of an analogical pull exerted by plurals of the o-declension nouns (as in It. *il gallo* versus *i galli*) and the need to differentiate singular from plural, since Lat. CANÉ(M) and CANÉS would have given It. *cane* and Rum. *ciune* in both singular and plural (after the loss of *\/-s/*, a phonological development shared by both Italo- and Balkan-Romance). A contributing factor influencing the change of final *\/-é/* to *\/-í/* may also have been, so the argument goes, the analogical pressure that the definite article (in the guise of a weakened demonstrative) and the adjective must have exerted in a construction of the *illì bonì* CANÉS type, changing it to *illì bonì canì*. The same desire to differentiate singular from plural would, then, also explain the *\/-í/* plural ending of 3rd decl. feminine nouns, e.g., CLAVÉS > It. *chiavi*, Rum. *chei*.

(b) The change to It. *cani*, Rum. *ciuni* from Lat. CANÉS is a purely phonetic development, with *\/-s/* causing the closing (palatalization) of final *\/-é/* to *\/-í/*: *\/-és/* becoming *\/-ís/* and, finally, *\/-í/* after the loss of *\/-s/*. As an alternative to the closing influence of *\/-s/* on the

---

3 The analogical explanation of Lat. *\/-és/>It. *\/-í/* of 3rd decl. plurals is closely associated with the German scholar Gerhardt Rohlfs (Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten [Bern 1949], II, pp. 49–52), although he is by no means the first one to propose it. Among his predecessors concerned with the problem one must single out the Italian scholar Francesco D'Ovidio who, after first entertaining the likelihood of a connection between an OLat. FONTIS nom. pl. and It. *funti* (Sull'origine dell'unica forma flessionale del nome [Pisa 1872], pp. 45–46), changed his mind in favor of an analogical extension of 2nd decl. nominatives to those of the 3rd declension: "è fuor dubbio che *cani* ecc. sono formati analogicamente su MULÌ, BONÌ, ecc." ("Ricerche sui pronomi personali e possessivi neolatini," Archivio glottologico italiano 9 [1886], 25–101). So far as Rumanian is concerned, H. Tiktin (Rumanisches Elementarbuch [Heidelberg 1905], pp. 80–81) and O. Densusianu (Histoire de la langue roumaine [Paris 1901–1938], II, p. 166) must be singled out as early supporters of the analogical theory. More recent advocates of this theory have been Al Rosetti (Istoria limbii române [Bucharest 1978²], II, p. 42), I. Siadbei and M. Iliescu (see above, note 2).

4 In essence, this hypothesis rests on W. Meyer-Lübke's phonological "law" according to which Lat. *\/-és/>It. *\/-í/* (e.g., Lat. FLORES>It. *fiori* (Italianische Grammatik [Leipzig 1890], p. 60). Polizer, in an attempt to refine the hypothesis of a phonetic development to account for this change, suggested that in the final syllable there occurred a neutralization of the front vowels in late Vulgar Latin resulting in a single *\/-e/* phoneme in that position with an [i] allophone developing before *\/-í/* and that, with the
preceding /ë/, the vocalization of the final consonant, i.e., turning
/-s/ into the semivowel -/j/, may also be envisaged, paralleling the
/s/>/j/ evolution in monosyllables (e.g., Lat. TRES>OLat., Rum.
trei); /-ës/>/-ej/>/-i/, with the reduction of the diphthong in
polysyllables, whereas in stressed position (monosyllables) it is
preserved. 5

In a footnote, Hall notes that “Puscariu (1927) ascribed the Italian
and Roumanian /-i/ to the OLat. ending /-is/ of the pure i-stems,”6 a
hypothesis that the Italian savant D'Ovidio had already entertained
over a century ago (see above, note 3) before he changed his mind 15
years later (ibid.). Struck by the frequent alternation of orthographic
-es and -is in nominative and accusative functions in both consonant
and i-stems occurring in Latin authors7 and inscriptions (e.g., parentes/
parentis; sorores/sororis; partes/partis), Sextil Pusçariu, the well-known
Rumanian scholar of the first half of our century and the first one, to
my knowledge, to deal with the origin and development of 3rd decl.
plurals in Italian and Rumanian, advanced the hypothesis that the
OLat. /-ës/ of i-stems had persisted in the spoken language and that
after the fall of /-s/ the /-i/ prevailed as a morphological marker of all
masculine nouns under the influence of second decl. masculines
where the /-i/ plural morpheme is etymological.8 Feminine nouns,
under the influence of those of the first decl., preserved the /-e/
ending (/-ës/) somewhat longer, as evidenced in medieval literary
texts.9

5 Cf. Heinrich Lausberg: “Im Mittel- und Südit., im Vegliot. und im Rum. wird /s/ zu
[i] das hinter betontem Vokal (in Einsilbern) erhalten ist, hinter unbetontem Vokal (in
Mehrsilben) mit diesem verschmälert (meist: a + i > e, e + i > i, i + i > i)...” (Romanische
Sprachwissenschaft, II: Konsonantismus [Berlin 1967?], p. 82). In his Beiträge zur
romanischen Lautlehre (Jena–Leipzig 1939), Günther Reichenkron advanced a four-stage
development of Lat. /-ës/>/-is/>/-i/ involving vocalization of /-s/, as follows:
/-ës/>/-is/>/-i/>/-i/ (p. 42).


7 Varro notes that people said hae puppis, restis side by side with hae puppes, restes
and “in accusando hos montes, fontes.” as well as hos montis, fontis as reported by Aebischer, art.
cit. (above, note 2), p. 100. Cf. also Ferdinand Sommer, Handbuch der lateinischen Laut-
und Formenlehre (Heidelberg, 1914263), p. 382.

8 “... le maintien des pluriels en -i de la troisième décl. en ital. et en roum., à côté
de quelques reliques en -e, prouve que l'hésitation entre -ës et -ë, constatée à l'époque
latine archaïque, s'est perpétuée dans le parler populaire de l'Italie et des contrées
danubiennes.” (art. cit. [above, note 2], p. 362).

9 Although Pusçariu is not explicit as to the causes of the eventual change of the
It is worth noting that despite his firm belief in “une continuité entre les pluriels archaïques en -IS et les pluriels italiens et roumains en -i” (p. 363), Pușcariu gives the force of analogy its due since, as he admits, “les formes à flexion [sont] soumises à l’influence de l’analogie” (p. 361). He rejects, however, the hypothesis of a phonetic /-ès/>/-is/>/-i/ evolution, claiming that “il m’a toujours paru étrange que s final ait pu avoir en tombant une autre influence sur l’e précédent que m final” (p. 361).

The frequent alternation of orthographic -es and -is that Pușcariu observed suggests that there must have been a free variation of two expression elements on the morphological level, since it has been generally recognized that this alternation occurs only in 3rd decl. plurals. Scholars who have analyzed Late Latin documents and charters from the Italian area have found that the -is orthography was widespread in the plurals of 3rd. decl. nouns, regardless of their stem. Except for a passing reference to inscriptive material in feminine pl. in /-e/ to /-i/ it must be assumed that it occurred under the influence of masculines, aided by the desire to keep singular and plural apart.

10 This chronological continuity is also acknowledged by Carlo Tagliavini: “al plurale, specialmente all’accusativo, troviamo larghe trace di -is per -es, ciò che dimostra la continuazione sviluppata nel latino arcaico” (Le origini delle lingue neolatine [Bologna 1969], p. 208).

11 C. H. Grandgent, a staunch supporter of the theory of analogy, has levelled similar criticism against the alleged closing influence of /-s/ on the preceding vowel, calling it “a conjectural phonetic principle at variance with familiar linguistic experience” totally unsupported by direct evidence. The American scholar wonders, as a matter of fact, “why should -s, which was always feeble in Latin, work such a miracle?” (“Unaccented Final Vowels in Italian.” Mélanges Antoine Thomas [Paris 1927], pp. 187–93). It may be more than just a coincidence that Puscarui's most virulent critics are those who invoke phonetic criteria to explain the Lat. /-ès/>/-i/ development in Italian and Rumanian. Cf. Bengt Löfstedt. Studien über die Sprache der langobardischen Gesetze (Stockholm 1961), pp. 39–47; F. Sabatini, art. cit. p. 34. above note 2.

12 What adherents of the “phonological theory” seem to have failed to recognize, however, is that the orthographic alternation of -es and -is reflects a morphological phenomenon (formal variation of /-es/ and /-is/) and that the phonetic factor (such as the closing influence of /-s/) is irrelevant.

13 In their analysis of the Codice Diplomatico Lombardo, the Politzers conclude that “in the nominative plural of the third declension, the distribution of -es and -is follows no pattern and seems to indicate that the endings were completely interchangeable” (Frieda N. and Robert L. Politzer, Romance Trends in 7th and 8th Century Latin Documents (Chapel Hill 1953), p. 28. The same phenomenon is also observed by B. Löfstedt in his study of the language of the Edictum Rothari: “Betreffs der Verwendung von -is statt -es im Edikt ist ferner zu beachten, dass in den ältesten Hss. -is ebenso häufig im Nom. wie im Akk. -es ersetzt und ebensooft bei Kons. Stämmen eintritt” (op. cit., p. 39). P. Aebischer also finds confirmation of this fact in medieval Latin charters examined by
determining whether the Classical Latin -IS ending survived in the postclassical period or not, a more systematic examination of inscrip-tional resources to see if they could yield some clue to solving this controversial problem still remained to be done.

The purpose of this paper is an attempt to show, by drawing on evidence culled from inscriptions exclusively, that not only did this Old Latin ending survive, but that in this particular context Lat. /-ēs/ and /-is/ may be looked upon as variants of the 3rd decl. nominative and accusative plural morpheme, and that they reflect a continuation and extension of the alternation between consonant and i-stems in Classical Latin. The inscriptive data are drawn from a corpus of funerary prose inscriptions published in Ernst Diehl’s *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* covering the Italian Peninsula, Dalmatia, and the Danubian Provinces.\(^4\) In order to give inscriptive evidence greater weight for the documentation of -is spellings in 3rd decl. nominatives and accusatives, I have attempted to give a comparative, quantitative, and chronological presentation of the -es/-is orthographic alternation, in the hope that it may yield some interesting results and, thus, contribute to the resolution of a problem that, to date, remains largely unsolved.\(^5\)

Here, then, is a numerical summary showing the ratio between -es and -is spellings in both nominative and accusative cases, based on dated epitaphs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>-es</th>
<th>-is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Danubian Provinces</td>
<td>(\text{IV})</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{V-VI})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Dalmatia</td>
<td>(\text{IV})</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{V-VI})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Northern Italy</td>
<td>(\text{V})</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{VI})</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Central Italy</td>
<td>(\text{IV})</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{V})</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{VI})</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\)him: “les formes en -es de la troisième déclinaison ont passé dans leur majorité à -is” (art. cit., p.104).

\(^4\) Since I am only concerned with developments in Italo- and Balkan Romance, my corpus is limited to 3296 inscriptions, broken down as follows: Danubian Provinces (the inner provinces of Noricum, Pannonia, Dacia, Moesia, Thracia, and Macedonia): 83; Dalmatia: 212; No. Italy: 418; Ce. Italy: 280; So. Italy: 485; and Rome: 1818.

\(^5\) Approximately 40 percent of all inscriptions from the Italian area are dated, but only about 20 percent in the Eastern Provinces. Because of the scantly material from the latter, fifth and sixth cent. inscriptions are lumped together. Note also that in No. Italy there are no dated inscriptions before the fifth cent.
(e) Southern Italy

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Rome

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the orthographic changes in this material involve the form *mensis* (for CLat. MENSES)\(^\text{16}\) as well as an alternation in the spelling of substantivized adjectives of the *octobris/octobres* type. But there are plenty of other examples of -is for -es spellings (as well as -es for -is where we would expect the latter in regular i-stems) in both nominative and accusative functions. The same alternation observed in non-dated epitaphs supports the data concerning the alternation of -es/-is in dated inscriptions. Here are a few illustrative examples taken at random:

- *coniuncti amantis se bene dicere debent* (1336, 4th cent., Noricum)
- *parentis dolientes . . . ficerunt* (847, No. Italy)\(^\text{17}\)
- *fratris se bibi . . . fecerunt* (4146F, a. 400, Rome)
- *de filius [= filios] ipeius qui superstitis sunt* (2372, Rome)
- *de tres fratris cursoris* (381B, Rome)
- *cum . . . sororis suas* (808A, Rome)
- *inter innocentis* (2500B, Rome), etc.

An interesting example of the concurrent use of -es and -is occurs in the following accusative absolute construction: *locum emerunt presentis omnis fossores* (3761, Rome).

The data presented in this summary show a clear trend in the direction of the -is spelling, particularly in the Centro-Southern

\(^{16}\) It has been suggested that in the numerous instances in which *mensis* is preceded by *annis*, as in *vixit annis LII mesis VIII* (Diehl 3252A), the -is spelling may be due to an orthographic assimilation to the form *annis*. (Cf. B. Lofstedt, op. cit., p. 41.) This is not the case. A careful count has revealed that in more than half of the instances in which the form *mensis* (also spelled *mesis* and *messis*) was found it is preceded by *annum* and *annos* (or *annus*). In fact, it is not unusual to find cases where *annis* is followed by *menses*, e.g., *vixit annis L. menses sex* (Diehl 1329). Without meaning to deny the likelihood of such an orthographic analogy, I believe the evidence does not seem to suggest it; rather, it would seem that the -es/-is alternation is independent of what precedes or what follows. The concurrent use of *mensis* and *mensis* in the same inscription (Diehl 3761A)—both times preceded by *annos*, incidentally—only confirms my contention that the apparently interchangeable use of orthographic -es and -is reflects a variation on the level of form.

\(^{17}\) The form *parentis* occurs quite frequently in late 4th/early 5th cent. Italian epitaphs in nominative function. It is also found in the Eastern Provinces.
Italian area, with 75 percent of all 3rd. decl. nominatives and accusatives in the area of Rome by the sixth century, suggesting that it may well have been the focal point of the survival of OLat. /-is/ in the popular language, whence it spread to other Latin-speaking areas. In any event, this kind of evidence is difficult to reconcile with Grandgent's statement that "apparently -ês crowded out the rarer -is which left no sure traces,"\(^{18}\) or the view that the /-is/ ending of i-stems had become "moribund" by the early third century A.D.\(^{19}\) Quite the contrary would seem to be the case. Inscriptional data suggest that not only did a free variation between /-ês/ and /is/ persist throughout the Vulgar Latin period (echoing what must have been a similar alternation between consonant and i-stem plurals in Classical Latin) but that /-is/ also gained considerable ground, taking the upper hand in the Roman area by the sixth century. It is this persistence of OLat. /-is/ in inscriptions (which, after all, are more faithful and reliable monuments of everyday speech habits than would-be charters or other legal documents\(^{20}\)) that led Pușcariu to argue that /-is/ had lived on in the spoken language and that, after the fall of /-s/, final /i/ prevailed as a morphological marker of all 3rd decl. masculine nouns under the influence of 2nd decl. masculines where /-i/ is etymological. Thus, the hypothesis of a chronological connection between OLat. /-is/ and 3rd. decl. plurals in /-i/ and the analogical extension of the "masculine declension" come to complement each other, in that what speakers felt to be the plural pattern in /-i/ eventually helped resolve an age-old conflict between Lat. /-ês/ and /-is/, a conflict extending well into the Italian and Rumanian phases,\(^{21}\) in favor of the /i/ plural marker in modern Italian and Rumanian.

The parallelism between the Italian and Eastern Latin developments becomes evident when we consider that the Eastern Provinces were, in the main, colonized by Italic immigrants from the lower social strata who brought with them their rustic speech habits.\(^{22}\) It is

---


\(^{19}\) Cf. M. Iliescu, art. cit., p. 15; also B. Löfstedt, op. cit., p. 40.

\(^{20}\) B. Löfstedt, loc. cit.

\(^{21}\) "Il y avait donc en latin une oscillation entre la désinence -IS (à l'origine justifiée seulement pour les accusatifs des radicaux en i) et -ÉS. Cette oscillation apparait chez les écrivains classiques, après même que la grammaire eût déclaré correcte la forme en -ÉS. La même hésitation entre -IS et -ÉS s'aperçoit dans les inscriptions et elle continue jusque dans l'italien (le vite et le viti) et le roumain (cari, pace à côté de cari, pâci)" (Pușcariu, art. cit., p. 363).

not surprising, therefore, to find early attestations of plural forms in 
/-is/ on written monuments from the East also.

Unless one refuses to admit, as Puşcariu's critics do,\textsuperscript{23} that certain 
"vulgar" or "rustic" features of speech could well have been transmit-
ted from an archaic Latin period to the Romance languages "im 
Dunkeln der Volkssprache"—to borrow Karl Meister's expression\textsuperscript{24}—
there is solid evidence to support the hypothesis of a chronological 
continuity between /-is/ of Old Latin i-stems and the modern plural 
outcome of Italo- and Balkan-Romance languages.

\textit{University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign}

\textsuperscript{23} See above, note 19.

\textsuperscript{24} "Altes Vulgärlatein," \textit{Indogermanische Forschungen} 26 (1909), p. 89.
The following *erratum* has been noticed by Professor Gerald M. Browne in his article “Chariton and Coptic,” *ICS* X (1985), pp. 135–37:
p. 136, line 8, should read: *The-fact-that-the-man-stays (is) in-the-house*
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