

transferred to her instrument of destruction. Ennius elsewhere describes parts of the body and articles of clothing or armor in human terms:

Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur
[Ann. 381 V2].
Effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto
[Ann. 540 V2].
Utinam ne umquam, Mede, Colchis cupido corde
pedem extulisses [Sc. 279 V2].
Peto priusquam oppeto malam pestem mandatam
hostili manu [Sc. 162 V2].
praepete ferro
Histri tela manu iacientes sollicitabant
[Ann. 407-8 V2].
Proletarius publicitus scutisque feroque
Ornatur ferro [Ann. 183-84 V2].
et quis illaec est quae lugubrⁱ
Succincta est stola [Sc. 386-87 V2].

13. P. 198. 3-4 M.

14. They were perhaps suggested by line 1196 of Euripides' play, where Glauce's body is described as "difficult to recognize, except for a parent" (πλὴν τῷ τεκόντι κάρτα δυσμαθῆς ἵδειν). Ennius may have added to the drama and the pathos (if we grant him this freedom in his version) by having Creon

The last of these fragments is especially illuminating. The editors print these words, quoted by Nonius,¹³ with the tragic fragments from unidentified plays of Ennius. The *Medea* may well be the source of these lines also, though in the absence of a Euripidean parallel this hypothesis cannot be substantiated.¹⁴ Whatever their origin, the mere existence of the phrase *lugubri stola* in an Ennian context sheds further doubt upon the queer meaning given *saeua stola* by Servius and tends to confirm the interpretation which would give the adjective its more ordinary force.¹⁵

W. DE GRUMMOND

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

actually fail, for a moment, to recognize the mutilated body of his daughter.

15. A remarkably close English parallel is to be found in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1. 12. 22. 2-3): "For she had layd her mournfull stole aside, / And widow-like sad wimple throwne away."

THEOCRITUS 6. 15-17

ἃ δὲ καὶ αὐτόθι τοι διαθρύπτεται ὥς ἂν ἀκάνθας
ταὶ καπνυραὶ χαῖται, τὸ καλὸν θέρος ἀνίκα φρύγει,
καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει . . .

One aspect which seems to make the poetry of Theocritus more palatable to latter-day taste than that of some of his Hellenistic contemporaries or his pastoral successors is the clarity and economy with which he is able to create vivid and attractive pictures through comparison and description. In some passages editors and critics have not always done complete justice to this gift by their "elucidation." The following note aims to re-establish Theocritus' neatness in a point of comparison, of which editors seem to have made unnecessarily heavy weather.

The song of Daphnis in *Idyll* 6 presents an apparently unprecedented version of the Polyphemus-Galatea relationship in which *he* affects indifference to *her* advances. She pelts him with apples and, when he ignores this, she throws them at his sheep dog, which runs up and down barking. As Galatea emerges from

the sea, there is a very real danger that the dog will jump up in its excitement and attack Galatea's legs. Still Polyphemus seems to take no notice, although even as Galatea reaches the shore (καὶ αὐτόθι) she is attempting to provoke a reaction from him. Gow sees her as acting in a "wanton" manner (διαθρύπτεται) "rather provocative than . . . coy"; Cholmeley suggested "coquets." The only point of comparison Gow can find between Galatea's action and thistledown is their levity: "The simile is loosely attached to its context; Galatea is light and inconsequent as thistledown, but her inconsequence is described in terms inapplicable to the thistledown." Cholmeley finds a little more point here, connecting Theocritus' simile with its probable source of inspiration in Homer (*Od.* 5. 328 ff., where the shipwrecked Odysseus is tossed by the waves, like thistledown in the air): "Galatea is as fickle and restless as the thistledown is tossed this way and that never settling." Gow then pronounces the first part of 17 irrelevant:

"The first clause, though describing Galatea's levity, is not relevant to the immediate situation; her present behaviour is described in the second and what follows." This "irrelevancy" he explains by suggesting that Theocritus felt constrained to put in both halves of what was probably a proverbial expression. Cholmeley too wanted the line to be "taken universally." Gow feels it necessary in this context to explain Theocritus' use of *φιλεῖν* rather than *ἐρᾶν*.

Gow's suggestion that 17 is proverbial seems weak. The idea appears as a commonplace only after Theocritus' use of it (e.g., 5. 247; Nonnus 16. 297; Terence *Eun.* 812 ff.). Sappho (1. 21 ff.) uses a similar idea but not in a way that suggests it was at all trite or proverbial. Even if it were proverbial by the Hellenistic age, Theocritus is quite capable of using it without its "irrelevant" first half (e.g., 11. 75). If *διαθρύπτεται* means that Galatea puts on only a single air, a provocative one, then in the strictest sense only *οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει* applies, but only the most literal and prosaic reading could dismiss the rest as irrelevant. Clearly, *διαθρύπτεται* could equally well imply that she puts on both airs, the provocative *and* the coy, and in that case *φεύγει φιλέοντα* is also appropriate, as Gow finally, if grudgingly, seems to admit ("Alternately 17 might be regarded as an expansion of *διαθρύπτεται*"), following Cholmeley ("The sentence should probably be taken universally, connecting it with *διαθρύπτεται*"). What both seem to have failed to see is that the simile bears out the double action aptly and completely, for the floating seed naturally moves

toward you, attaching itself to your hair or woolen garments; but, if you attempt to snatch it in your hand as it approaches, the draught created by your movement wafts it away again. Although Galatea herself is the subject in 17, the action described in both halves fits the thistledown exactly. *φιλεῖν* seems appropriate to the behavior of both girl and thistledown, whereas *ἐρᾶν* might be said to fit only the former. Galatea may be in pursuit at this point, but Theocritus intends us at least to infer that Polyphemus' indifference is only temporary or feigned. The comparison shows precisely what her reaction will be to a change in him.

When Homer compares Odysseus' wrecked raft to thistledown tossed in the wind, he is, as Cholmeley noted, concerned primarily with the restless and aimless movement of both, but he refers also to the thistledown's adhesive quality. The seeds cling together (*πυκινὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχονται*, *Od.* 5. 329), and the poet perhaps intends us to see in this Odysseus clutching the raft (*οὐδ' ὧς σχεδὴς ἐπελήθετο . . . ἐλλάβει' αὐτῆς*, 324–25). It is the adhesive rather than the restless quality with which Theocritus is concerned. He is not throwing down inept proverbial phrases; he has borrowed a simple simile from Homer and given it new vitality and complexity, making it even more appropriate to his context than it was to Homer's. In no sense could it be described as "loosely attached to its context" and no part of it is inappropriate or irrelevant to the situation.

JOHN H. BETTS

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

ON PROPERTIUS 3. 24: A REPLY

Propertius 3. 24, a poem well known for difficulties which stem in the main from uncertainty in the text and punctuation of lines 9–12, has lately been re-evaluated by Alva Walter Bennett.¹ An able Latinist, Bennett has contributed to our understanding of Propertius; but with reference to 3. 24, not only his

conclusions but also his methodology seem to me unsatisfactory.

Bennett writes: "Cynthia's *superbia* had taken in action the form of *perfidia* toward her lover/poet; and the invective of the elegy is his poetical response to her infidelity. It is Jupiter, Zeus Horkios, who demands punishment for

1. A. W. Bennett, "Propertius 3. 24: A New Approach," *CP*, LXIV (1969), 30–35.