

## VEDIUS AND LIVIA (TAC. ANN. 1. 10)

Nec domesticis abstinebatur: abducta Neroni uxor et consulti per ludibrium pontifices an concepto necdum edito partu rite nuberet; que tedii et Vedii Pollionis luxus; postremo Livia gravis in rem publicam mater, gravis domui Caesarum noverca.

If we admit with D. C. A. Shotter (*CP*, LXIII [1968], 289) that this crux, *que tedii et*, is irremediable, it would still seem desirable that any proposed solution establish some degree of parallelism between the three members of the period. Inconcinnity is the most notorious characteristic of Tacitus' style, to such an extent that many good readers may not be disturbed by the sequence, *abducta . . . uxor* (Livia) . . . *luxus . . . Livia*, but others might prefer some fairly intelligible connection between Livia and Vedius. I suggest that such a connection is supplied by Dio in his account of the relation of Vedius to the ruling family (54. 23):

Pollio . . . left to Augustus a good share of his estate together with Pausilypon, the place between Neapolis and Puteoli, with instructions that some public work of great beauty should be erected there. Augustus razed Pollio's house to the ground, on the pretext of preparing for the erection of the other structure, but really with the purpose that Pollio should have no monument in the city; and

he built on it a colonnade inscribing on it the name, not of Pollio, but of Livia [trans. E. Cary, LCL].

This is not necessarily the specific connection required to bring Livia and Vedius together. We might assume that Dio, himself, reflects some quasi-Tacitean malice, and that Vedius, who may be said to have acted with great style in his way, had made this or some other handsome present to the Empress. Without chasing fancy too far, might it be suggested that what Tacitus wrote was something like "*abducta uxor . . . quae* dotata Vedii Pollionis luxu . . ." or "*cui dos* (erat) Vedii Pollionis luxus"? It is perfectly true that Augustus "did that afterward," as Dio says. Vedius died 15 B.C., forty-three years before Livia, twenty-three after her marriage, so that a legacy to Augustus could not have been Livia's dowry, *en secondes nocés*, in any strict sense.

It is easy, of course, to insert some derivative of *dives* or *dare* and patch up the text somehow, and certainty is impossible; nonetheless, as nothing can be done with what we have, perhaps we might try to bring Vedius somehow into line with Livia.

KIFFIN A. ROCKWELL

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

## A NOTE ON PROPERTIUS 2. 16. 41-42

Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:  
illa, qua vicit, condidit arma manu

[Prop. 2. 16. 41-42].

The compliment to Caesar contained in these lines loses much of its force if the distich is retained in its present position.<sup>1</sup> Not only is the introduction of Caesar's clemency irrelevant in the context of Prop. 2. 16. 35 ff., but

this irrelevance is emphasized by the lack of any connective words which might help smooth over the break in the elegy's pattern of thought.<sup>2</sup> One is ultimately led to agree with the judgment of Butler and Barber that "the opportunity of flattering Augustus has proved too much for the poet."<sup>3</sup> The assumption is that the thought of Antony and Actium has

1. Prop. 2. 16. 35-43:

at pudeat certe, pudeat! —nisi forte, quod aiunt,  
turpis amor surdis auribus esse solet.

cerne ducem, modo qui fremitu complevit inani

Actia damnatis aequora militibus:

hunc infamis amor versis dare terga carinis

iussit et extremo quaerere in orbe fugam.

Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:

illa, qua vicit, condidit arma manu.

sed quascumque tibi vestis, quoscumque smaragdos . . .

2. One may claim as Shackleton Bailey does, *Propertiana*

(Cambridge, 1956), p. 96, that the *sed* in 2. 16. 43 provides evidence for the distich being in its proper place, since *sed* "suggests return from digression." Enk, however, rightly points out in his edition (*Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber secundus*, 2d part [Leyden, 1962], *ad loc.*) that *sed* need not refer to 2. 16. 41-42 because lines 36-40 already constitute a digression. But Enk ultimately agrees with Shackleton Bailey that the distich is in its proper place.

3. Butler and Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford, 1933), *ad loc.*

inspired Propertius to voice approval of the Emperor's general policy of clemency, even though the reference to Antony, introduced to illustrate the power love exercises over men, is by no means a significant part of the elegy. We must, then, acknowledge that Propertius has chosen to flatter Caesar where his compliment might be missed entirely by a reader eager to return to the main line of thought (2. 16. 43). The only alternative is to consider the distich a transposition and look for its rightful place elsewhere.<sup>4</sup>

One alternative position is that suggested by A. E. Housman, who placed Prop. 2. 16. 41–42 after 3. 11. 38. Unfortunately, placing the distich here necessitates other changes in the text:

Haec tibi, Pompei, detraxit harena triumphos: 35  
 nulla Philippeost agmine adusta nota. 40  
 issent Phlegraeo melius tibi funera campo; 37  
 nec tua sic socero colla daturus eras:  
 Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est,  
 illa, qua vicit, condidit arma manu.

If, however, one transposes Prop. 2. 16. 41–42 to a position following Prop. 3. 11. 50, the couplet fits the context just as well, if not better, and no changes to the rest of 3. 11 need be made.

At 3. 11. 39 Propertius begins a long harangue against Cleopatra, ending (51 ff.) with a description of her fate after the Battle of Actium. Placing the distich in question after 3. 11. 50 gives us:

scilicet incesti meretrix regina Canopi,  
 una Philippeo sanguine adusta nota, 40  
 ausa Iovi nostro latrantem opponere Anubim,  
 et Tiberim Nili cogere ferre minas,  
 Romanamque tubam crepitanti pellere sistro,  
 baridos et contis rostra Liburna sequi,  
 foedaque Tarpeio canopia tendere saxo, 45  
 iura dare et statuas inter et arma Mari.  
 quid nunc Tarquinii fractas iuvat esse securis,  
 nomine quem simili vita superba notat,  
 si mulier patienda fuit? cape, Roma, triumphum

et longum Augusto salva precare diem! 50  
 Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:  
 illa, qua vicit, condidit arma manu.  
 fugisti tamen in timidi vaga flumina Nili: 51

*Augusto* in line 50 provides a connection for the couplet with what precedes, and *fugisti tamen* in line 51 provides a connection with what follows. *Tamen*, as 3. 11 now stands, is rather puzzling, but with 2. 16. 41–42 inserted here, a contrast is established—"Caesar would have been lenient, but nevertheless, Cleopatra, you fled." It is the lack of such connecting words which creates the objectionable abruptness of transition at 2. 16. 41–42. Placing this couplet after 3. 11. 50 also strengthens the force of Propertius' compliment to the Emperor, since the meaning would then be that he was capable of showing mercy to Cleopatra even after all of the terrible things she had plotted for Rome.

Additional evidence for the acceptance of this transposition can be found in the work of Ovid, who has imitated Prop. 2. 16. 41–42 at *Am.* 1. 2. 51–52: "aspice cognati felicia Caesaris arma: / qua vicit, victos protegit ille manu."<sup>5</sup> Ovid is attempting to create humor through parody, and, consequently, while the tone of the Propertian distich is solemn with the compliment to the Emperor meant to be taken seriously, Ovid's tone is playful and light. Caesar is held up as a lesson for the triumphant Amor—Cupid should follow Caesar's example and spare his victim's further suffering—and is not even treated in his own right but as a relative of Cupid (. . . *cognati . . . Caesaris*).

If we accept the proposed transposition, then Ovid's parody can be extended from two lines to four:

ergo cum possim sacri pars esse triumphi,  
 parce tuas in me perdere victor opes.  
 aspice cognati felicia Caesaris arma:  
 qua vicit, victos protegit ille manu  
 [*Am.* 1. 2. 49–52].

4. So, e.g., Butler would place it after 3. 22. 22 (cf. Barber, *Sexti Properti Carmina*<sup>2</sup> [Oxford, 1960], p. 54); Housman suggests it belongs after 3. 11. 38 (cf. Housman, "Emendationes Propertianae," *JP*, XVI [1888], 10).

5. This imitation has been previously noted by Butler and Barber (above, n. 3), *ad loc.*, by Neumann, *Qua ratione Ovidius in Amoribus scribendis Properti elegiis usus sit* (Götting-

en, 1919), p. 13, and by Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*, 1st part (Berlin, 1898), *ad loc.* In addition to the general similarity of wording, I believe that imitation is indicated by Ovid's use of the name *Caesaris*. He names the Emperor only three times in the *Amores* (if one agrees with Ehwald and brackets 3. 8. 52), a fact which gives us added incentive to look for outside influence here.

Prop. 3. 11. 49, . . . *cape, Roma, triumphum*, roughly corresponds to line 49 of Ovid's elegy. Propertius tells Rome to have her triumph, while Ovid is admitting his own position as a captive in Amor's triumph. A similar correspondence of ideas is found in the next line of each elegy where both poets plead for an untroubled life. Propertius asks this boon for Augustus, but Ovid asks it for himself. Even though the contrast between Prop. 3. 11. 49–50 and *Am.* 1. 2. 49–50 is less specific than that of the two distichs praising Caesar, Ovid, by

insinuating that Rome's triumph over Cleopatra is in some way analogous to Cupid's triumph over him, has transferred Propertius' serious idea to a much lighter context, exactly as he has done concerning Caesar in the following distich. This evidence from outside the Propertian text, then, provides the final and most conclusive proof of the validity of this transposition.

KATHLEEN BERMAN

HERBERT LEHMAN COLLEGE

### AESCHYLUS' *MYRMIDONS* (FRAG. 224 METTE)

Τεύκρος δὲ τόξου χρώμενος φειδωλῖαι  
ὑπὲρ τάφρου πηδῶντας ἔστησε <ν> Φρύγας.

Although Mette questioned<sup>1</sup> the inclusion of these lines from Trypho<sup>2</sup> among the list of fragments attributed to Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* and Nauck printed them as Fragment 569 *Adespota*,<sup>3</sup> on the basis of papyrological, literary, and stylistic considerations, I am convinced that the lines belong to that play.

It is at least possible that the quotation can be used to restore one of the fragments of *POxy.* 2163.<sup>4</sup> The first of these papyrus fragments<sup>5</sup> can be attributed with certainty to the beginning of the *Myrmidons*.<sup>6</sup> Since the other fragments are written in the same hand and were found with the first fragment, one may assume that they also belong to the play.<sup>7</sup> I want to suggest that Trypho's quotation is a likely restoration for Frag. 6 of *POxy.* 2163<sup>8</sup> and, therefore, comes from Aeschylus'

*Myrmidons*. The papyrus fragment is transcribed as follows:

1 ] . . [  
2 ] πρ α . [  
3 ] κ ρ ο [  
4 ] ρ . [  
I superimpose Frag. 224, Trypho's quotation, over lines 3–4 as follows:<sup>9</sup>

3 Τεύ]κρο[ς δὲ τόξου χρώμενος φειδωλῖαι  
4 ὑπὲρ]ρ [τάφρου πηδῶντας ἔστησε <ν>  
Φρύγας·

The position of the extant letters matches that of the quotation perfectly, and the three letters thus restored to the left of the two lines make the left margin of this fragment the same as that of Frag. 4, col. 2 (*POxy.* 2163).<sup>10</sup>

MAE SMETHURST

PITTSBURGH UNIVERSITY

1. H. J. Mette, *Die Fragmente der Tragoedien des Aischylos* (Berlin, 1959), p. 78. All fragments mentioned will be numbered according to Mette.

2. Trypho *Περὶ τρόπων 5* (*Περὶ μεταλήψεως*), p. 195. 15, L. Spengel (1866).

3. *TGF*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1926), p. 952.

4. Mette, *op. cit.*, pp. 74 ff. The papyrus fragments are restored by E. Lobel, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XVIII (1941), pp. 23 ff.

5. Frag. 213 (Mette).

6. Restored from schol. Aristoph. *Frogs* 992. Cf. Harp., s.vv. *Λέξεις ῥητορικαί*, p. 159, Bekker<sup>6</sup> (1833).

7. Lobel, *op. cit.*, p. 23, warns that this is merely an assumption.

8. Frag. 218 (Mette).

9. Lobel, *op. cit.*, p. 25, n. 6, thinks that the left-hand side of a circular letter, e.g., Θ, can be seen after the ρ of line 4. It appears to me to be difficult to tell.

10. Frag. 216 (Mette).

### ANYTE (*ANTH. PAL.* 7. 208)

Μνᾶμα τόδε φθιμένου μενεδαίου εἷσατο Δᾶμις  
ἵππου, ἐπεὶ στέρνον τοῦδε δαφνοῖν Ἄρης  
τύψε· μέλαν δὲ οἱ αἶμα ταλαυρίνου διὰ χρωτὸς  
ζέσσει, ἐπὶ δ' ἄργαλέαν βῶλον ἔδευσε φόνῳ.

As transmitted, the above epigram by Anyte

on the horse of Damis (*Anth. Pal.* 7. 208; Gow-Page, *The Greek Anthology*, "Anyte" No. IX) makes no sense in line 4, as ἀργαλέαν βῶλον can hardly mean the "battlefield."

Various emendations have been suggested: