

of being smitten by love, even if the love is unrequited and the lover adamantly rejected. It is only at the conclusion of the poem that we catch a glimpse of the great pain that lies dully in the core of the poet's own being. Even here Propertius has turned to another lover, in his role as *praeceptor amoris*, and insists on the great pain he will have if the lesson goes unheeded: "quod si quis monitis tardas aduerterit auris, / heu referet quanto uerba dolore mea!" (37-38). This warning relaxes for a moment the austere and monumental atmosphere and gives us briefly a glimpse of Propertius' own pain, existing on a poignantly human level. This glimpse comes as a result of an indirectness that does not begin to destroy the fabric of the poem as previously woven; it is the barest hint tantalizing us with an overture of something with which we can humanly identify. It is this touch which spreads our receptivity to the overwhelming starkness of the rest. It convinces us too of the poet's strong humanity, which he nowhere else allows to appear.

Although Freudian psychology may help in

determining the meaning of *castas odisse puellas* (5), we can now see that it is not appropriate to say, with Sullivan,⁹ that Propertius gives a valid psychological account of love, as a judgment of the whole poem. Nor is the poem, as Allen would suggest (p. 265), "direct self analysis." Propertius is not interested here in psychology, he is hardly interested in the people involved; he is totally concerned in creating a state and in creating in the reader, through complete immersion, an experience of this state. There is nothing clinical in Propertius' description; there is the expression of total emptiness. So great is the reader's absorption in the experience that there is no possibility of objectivity.

The total is utterly consistent within itself. It rings true as an imaginative capturing of a state of empty degradation, and it is the imagination here that is more important than clinical information.

P. J. CONNOR

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

9. *Op. cit.* (n. 2).

ON THEOGONY 118 AND 119

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόντος Ὀλύμπου,
Τάρταρά τ' ἡερβέντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρυδείης

[116-119].

M. L. West in his commentary on the *Theogony* (Oxford 1966), pp. 193-94, argues for the retention of 118 even though both 118 and 119 are ignored by Plato *Symposium* 178B. Aristotle *Metaphysics* 984a27, and other ancients. His method of proof entails taking both lines separately. Although I agree with West that the line should be retained, I find that his argument lacks force. He turns to "the sense" of the line, attributing the appearance of Olympus to "Hesiod's tendency . . . to see the elements in his cosmogony as homes for the gods." From an examination of all lines including the regions in which gods dwell, West

concludes that a god may have homes both on earth and in heaven, thereby answering any objection advanced on the grounds that the gods should be placed in one particular location alone. "The line 118 is best retained."

Earlier in the argument, West noted, however, that 118 recurs at 794 and is, therefore, in some sense formulaic. The question he should have asked at this point was: "Does this 'formulaic' line have any essential relationship with any other?" If it has, certainly the best line of attack would be to consider these lines together and not, as he does, separately. The problem is simplified greatly if one sees 118 and 119 in what I should like to call "structural terms," making specific use of the well-known oppositional nature of the poem as a whole (cf. especially P. Philippson "Genealogie als mythische Form," *Symb. Osl.*,

Suppl. VII [1936]). West himself comments upon Tartarus in 119 as a "deep" or lower region but does not consider the high or upper one which is needed to complete the structural image. Olympus in 118 is this region. 118 and 119, in structural terms suggested by the poem

itself, form a polar entity. Hence the authenticity of both is assured.

RAYMOND ADOLPH PRIER

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

TWO NOTES ON APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

I. Thelyphron's Oratorical Gesture

"Ad instar oratorum conformat articulum duobusque infimis conclusis digitis ceteros eminens [porrigens] et infesto pollice clementer subrigens infit Thelyphron" (Apul. *Met.* 2. 21. 2 [Robertson], 2. 21. 3 [Helm]).

Annotators and translators seem either to have missed the point here or to have been inadequately explicit. As Mr. D. M. Reynolds of the University of Washington has suggested, Thelyphron was not making the conventional oratorical gesture, but the insulting one in which the tip of the thumb protrudes between the next two fingers. This suits the context; it explains *infesto*; it accounts for the ablative (*subrigens* governs *ceteros*). *Clementer* in Apuleius normally means "gently" or "slightly," but no doubt Apuleius was aware of its special applicability here. Thelyphron, not presuming too much on the privileges of a *scurra*, merely sketches the offensive gesture.

II. Put Yourself in His Place

"... adulterum alveo ligneo, quo frumenta confusa purgari consuerant temere propter iacenti suppositum abscondit... praetergre-diens observatos extremos adulteri digitos qui per angustias cavi tegminis prominebant, obliqua atque infesta ungula compressos usque ad summam minutiem contero" (Apul. *Met.* 9. 23 and 27).

All the translations I know of say, or imply (depending on the language), that the young man got his fingers trampled. If you were under a sifting-bin, hiding from a husband, would your *fingers* stick out? But your toes might, without your knowing it. Surely it was the toes, not the fingers, that got squashed.

L. A. MACKAY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY