

structions of Aphrodite." *πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα* would, then, be used in reference to the initial flight from Ilium to Ida. The only necessary adjustment to the text is a clarifying comma after *ἀνίσχοντα*.

L. αὐτῇ . . . ἀδελφούς δ' εἶχε τρεῖς, Τισίφονον καὶ Λυκόφρονα καὶ <Πυ>θόλαον. For the last name here the MSS read *θόλαον*. <Πυ>*θόλαον* has been restored on the authority of MS P of Plutarch *Pel.* 35. 6, a passage in

which the same person is named. Other MSS of Plutarch, however, give his name as *Πειθόλαος* and this is the name preferred by recent editors of Plutarch (K. Ziegler, *s.v.* "Pytholaos," *RE*, XXIV.1 [1963], 602). The corresponding name in our passage, then, should more probably be <Πει>*θόλαον*.

RORY B. EGAN

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

A LITERARY BURNT OFFERING (PROPERTIUS 4. 7. 77-78)

At Propertius 4. 7, in the course of Cynthia's complaint from the grave (13-94), the poet puts into the mouth of the querulous shade a couplet which runs as follows in the received text: "et quoscumque meo fecisti nomine versus, / ure mihi: laudes desine habere meas" (77-78). The following remarks are prompted by the apparent discomfiture of commentators when they come to interpret the couplet, especially the second verse. One finds distinct variation in the views taken of the meaning of this line and, in some cases, the offering of irreconcilable alternatives of interpretation by a single commentator.

Hertzberg did not mention the problematical second verse in his commentary.¹ He was too busy refuting Lachmann's argument, that *meo nomine versus* in 77 was evidence for the division of the Propertian *opus* into five books, to offer any interpretation of 78.² Paley solved whatever problem he saw in the couplet by interpreting *laudes meas* in 78 as equivalent to *τῇν δι' ἐμὲ δόξαν*.³ Quite different is the comment offered by Rothstein, who saw in the couplet Cynthia's instruction to Propertius to insure her standing in the eyes of the underworld by rendering to her shade the poems written in her honor during her lifetime.⁴

In this century, Butler's interpretation of the couplet marked a return to Paley's: "cease now that I am dead to win praise from your connection with me."⁵ But by alluding to Baehrens' conjecture *me sine*,⁶ if only to reject it, and by citing two of Rothstein's parallels,⁷ Butler apparently sought to accommodate the interpretations of both Paley and Rothstein.⁸ Enk rejected Baehrens' conjecture and Paley's interpretation, implying, but not specifying, that his understanding of the couplet was similar to Rothstein's.⁹ Butler too, by the time he came to collaborate with Barber in their joint edition, had abandoned Paley's view; *laudes meas* meant nothing like *τῇν δι' ἐμὲ δόξαν*, but must refer to Propertius' poems considered from Cynthia's point of view rather than the poet's ("your praises of me" or perhaps "that which was my glory"). This implicit return to Rothstein's interpretation was further advanced by the tentative observation that "perhaps the implication is that he was to burn them as an offering to her shade, to whom they would thus be conveyed."¹⁰

Butler and Barber did well in abandoning Butler's earlier attempt to interpret the couplet after Paley. It would be a futile request

1. W. A. B. Hertzberg, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor*, I (Halle, 1843), 213 ff., esp. 221.

2. Hertzberg, I, 221.

3. F. A. Paley, *The Elegies of Propertius* (London, 1853), p. 308.

4. M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* (Berlin, 1898), II, 271.

5. H. E. Butler, *Sexti Propertii opera omnia* (London, 1905), p. 376.

6. E. Baehrens, *Miscellanea critica* (Groningen, 1878), p. 106.

7. I.e., Hdt. 5. 92. η and Prop. 2. 13. 25. Cf. Rothstein, *loc. cit.*

8. See Butler, *loc. cit.*: "This sense [the sense sought by Baehrens' conjecture, see below, n. 14] is implied in the couplet as it stands."

9. "Cur dici non potest: desine diutius ea possidere, quae mea sunt." P. J. Enk, *Ad Propertii carmina commentarius criticus* (Zutphen, 1911), p. 336.

10. H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford, 1933), p. 364.

on Cynthia's part to ask Propertius to cease having praise from the love elegies inspired by her. Such praise had already been irrevocably and eternally won.¹¹ This fact militates against the interpretation of *laudes meas* as signifying some aspect of the poet's own reputation, such as Paley's τῇν δι' ἐμὲ δόξαν. It is true that a recent editor has suggested the possibility that *laudes desine habere meas* may mean "boast no more of your possession of me."¹² However, this is not a likely interpretation on general grounds; and in the context of this elegy it is surely inapposite. It is precisely to remind Propertius of his possession of her in the past (15–20) and to assure him of their possession of each other in the future (93–94) that Cynthia's shade has come to visit him. And her spirit of forbearance, announced at lines 49–50 ("non tamen insector, quamvis mereare, Properti: / longa mea in libris regna fuere tuis"), has been prompted by those very poems that have celebrated his persistent pursuit of his ideal of possessing her exclusively.¹³

Much preferable would be an interpretation which recognizes that the burning of Propertius' poems involves not so much the denial of their *laudes* or δόξα to the poet as the restoration thereby of something that rightly belongs to Cynthia. With this general observation Rothstein, Enk, and Butler and Barber are in agreement.¹⁴ The precise significance of Cynthia's injunction to burn the poems which Propertius has written about her, however, still requires a better explanation than is to be found in the agreement on the general sense of the couplet among Rothstein, Enk, and Butler and Barber.

My own view is that these verses are to be read in the light of Propertius' literary development—from the love theme of his first three books to the national themes which take their place beside it in the fourth.¹⁵ This line of approach to the couplet was opened, somewhat tentatively and in passing, by W. C. Helmbold twenty years ago. Referring the *meo nomine versus* (78) specifically to *Elegies* 3. 24 and 25,¹⁶ Helmbold argued, first, that since the rejection of Cynthia in those poems Propertius had lost the right to invoke her name as literary material; and, second, that Cynthia's passage to the underworld had shown her that she in her fashion had been more true to the bond between them than had Propertius himself.¹⁷

If Helmbold's second point is acceptable, as I think it is,¹⁸ the precise interpretation of 77–78 offered by Rothstein has, incidentally, to be rejected.¹⁹ Cynthia's standing in the underworld in no way depends upon Propertius' sending down to her shade the poems he has written about their love, as is made abundantly clear by the development within the poem itself. Cynthia's solemn affirmation of preserved *fides* on her part (51–53) is made well before the thought expressed in 77–78. And the realization of her worthiness to take her place beside Hypermestra and Andromeda, which is her warrant for that affirmation (note *nam*, 55), is itself separated from our couplet in the structure of the poem by expressions of concern for her faithful servants Parthenie and Latris (71–76). Helmbold is near the mark when he links Cynthia's request for the burning of poems with those elegies (3. 24 and 25) which mark the *foederis discidium*. I should

11. See, e.g., 1. 7. 7–14 and 21–24; 3. 1; 3. 9. 43–46. Cf. R. J. Baker, "Propertius III 1, 1–6 again. Intimations of Immortality," *Mnemosyne*, XXI (1968), 35–39. Also I. M. Lonie, "Propertius and the Alexandrians," *Aumla*, XI (1959), 17–34.

12. W. A. Camps, *Propertius: Elegies Book IV* (Cambridge, 1965), p. 123. The parallel Camps cites for this is Prop. 2. 21. 9–10.

13. Cf. my remarks at *Latomus*, XXIX (1970), 696–97.

14. See above, nn. 4 (Rothstein), 9 (Enk), and 10 (Butler and Barber). In the light of this agreement, it is puzzling that the emendation proposed by Baehrens (above, n. 6)—"et quoscumque meo fecisti nomine versus / ure: mihi laudes me sine habere meas"—has not received even the courtesy of a mention in more recent comments on these lines. His reading has the merit of emphasizing this point of the restoration to

Cynthia, rather than the denial to Propertius, of whatever is achieved by the burning of the poems. To this extent, the conjecture is still attractive enough to be acknowledged, if not compelling enough to be adopted.

15. The process of this development in Propertius I have discussed elsewhere, at *Latomus*, XXVII (1968), 322–49 and XXIX (1970), 670–98. Cf. *Mnemosyne*, XXI (1968), 35–39, and *AJP*, XC (1969), 333–37.

16. W. C. Helmbold, "Propertius IV, 7: Prolegomena to an Interpretation," *CPCP*, XIII (1949), 333–43. See esp. p. 339, n. 16.

17. Helmbold, p. 340, n. 20.

18. Hence the solemnity of the claim at 51–53 of this elegy. Cf. *Latomus*, XXIX (1970), 696, with notes.

19. N. 4 above.

go further and suggest that, especially in view of the warmth of Cynthia's avowal of loyalty to the *foedus*, Propertius is in this couplet putting in her mouth a request to thaw some of the appalling coldness of 3. 24 and 25.

Most of the icy sting in those two elegies of disillusionment and repudiation lies in the poet's regret at having made his love poetry an instrument of Cynthia's *laudes* (3. 24. 3–6) and in his savage withdrawal from her of his *fides* (3. 25. 3–4). These references to *laudes* and *fides* are answered, in a somewhat chiasmic pattern, in Cynthia's complaint in 4. 7. The development of thought in her answer runs thus: "You have repudiated the *foedus* that was between us [13–22]; the withdrawal of your *fides* from me in 3. 25 and your attack on my *laudes* in 3. 24 are reinforced by your lack of concern for my burial [23–24], by your complicity in the treachery of my unfaithful servants [35–40], and by your allowing the abuse of those persons and objects which might have kept my *laudes* green [41–48]. But I cannot really blame you; your love poetry was for a long time devoted to the ideal of *fides* between us and to the assurance which that gave of our posthumous reunion [49–50].²⁰ I can solemnly swear that I have been more faithful to that ideal than you thought [51–54]. Proof of this is my presence among those women who have known suffering in pursuit of honorable love [55–68]. Because I love you so, still, I am unable to charge you with the consequences of your repudiation of *fides* towards me [69–70]. And just as your *perfidia* was evidenced by your attitude to my servants, so my capacity for *fides* extends to *mandata* in the interests of those among them dearest to me [71–76]. In view of all this, can you not now repair your record of persistence in *fides* and relax the stern power of your poetry over my *laudes* by unsaying the bitter-

ness of 3. 24 [77–78] and according me a poetic burial [79–86] worthy of the *docta puella* that I once was in your eyes?"²¹

This reading of Cynthia's complaint follows Helmbold's identification of *meo nomine versus* with 3. 24 and 25. But, as so often happens in poetry, the allusion evokes a circle of association much wider than the immediate point of reference; there is a sense in which 77–78 refer not only to the two elegies most recently written about Cynthia, but also to the whole body of personal love elegies contained in the three books which these two poems close. It is in this sense that the couplet is capable of interpretation in the light of Propertius' poetic development.²²

In his edition of Propertius' third book, Camps notes that *Elegies* 21, 24, and 25 suggest that a new phase is about to begin for the poet.²³ This new phase in his development is the patriotic poetry, especially the aetiological elegies, which Propertius announces in 4. 1. But three books of love elegies bear witness to the *foedus* that once united him and Cynthia, and to his long struggle to preserve it. These books, which represent the years devoted to the love elegist's ideal of the *vita iners*, the years spent in living and writing for love, can now be burned, in the sense that the twin promises they made, of literary immortality for the disciple of Callimachus and of justification by *fides* of the lover-poet and his Cynthia, have been fulfilled.

We have here, in terms quite apart from the expediency, often hinted at, of obeying official promptings,²⁴ a justification of Propertius' passage from the poetry of love to poetry on national themes. Cynthia herself, their very inspiration,²⁵ is made to sanction his quitting the love elegies designed for her glorification. Her glory is complete in her justification and her attainment of the regions

20. For this interpretation, see *Latomus*, XXIX (1970), 696.

21. References to Cynthia as *docta puella* are to be found at 1. 7. 11; 2. 11. 6; 2. 13. 11. See also 3. 20. 8. Cf. *AJP*, XC (1969), 336. In the dream elegy, 2. 26a, where Cynthia is about to drown, there is a similar attribution of poetic elements to mark her passing—in the appearance of the dolphin (17–18). See K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations* (London, 1963), p. 195, and my comments at *Latomus*, XXIX (1970), 687. See now also A. W. J. Holleman, *CP*, LXV (1970), 179–80.

22. See above, p. 287 with n. 15.

23. W. A. Camps, *Propertius: Elegies Book III* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 154. See *AJP*, XC (1969), 333–37, in which I extend Camps's suggestion to *Elegies* 20–23, a cycle which serves as a prelude to 24 and 25.

24. *Elegy* 2. 1 is the first evidence of this. Cf. R. Lucot, *REL*, XXXV (1957), 199; on this and other *recusationes*, such as 2. 10 and 3. 9, see *Latomus*, XXVII (1968), 327–35.

25. See the poet's claim: "ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit" (2. 1. 4).

of blessed women. Having thus assured him that their purpose has been served, Cynthia might well bid Propertius to offer to her shade the verses dedicated to winning her love and loyalty while she lived: "et quoscumque meo fecisti nomine versus, / ure mihi: laudes desine habere meas" (77–78). Along with the poetic burial, this burning of the poems will be a token, albeit late, of the *fides* which, after all,

will unite them still. Other themes as well as other loves may occupy him now; their union in the afterlife is already assured. "Nunc te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo: / mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram" (93–94).²⁶

ROBERT J. BAKER

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND
ARMIDALE, NEW SOUTH WALES

26. I owe thanks to Professor J. H. Bishop who read a draft of this article.

A NOTE ON ARISTOPHANES *ACHARNIANS* 834–35

The starving Megarian, who in the course of a rather extended scene (*Ach.* 729–835) manages to sell his twin daughters to Dicaeopolis as sacrificial piglets, closes the episode with the following exhortation: ὦ χοιρίδια, πειρήσθε κᾶνις τῷ πατρὸς / παίειν ἐφ' ἀλὶ τὰν μᾶδδαν, αἷ κά τις διδῶ.¹ Despite the doubts of some commentators,² it is all but certain that *παίειν* here means *avide vorare*:³ not only is there the testimony of the scholiast,⁴ Hesychius,⁵ and Photius,⁶ but there are other words, similar in meaning to *παίειν*, which seem also to have been used in the sense of "eat avidly." These are (1) *ἐρείδειν*, "to set violently to work on," used of the ravenous dung-beetle at *Pax* 31 (cf. 25);⁷ (2) *κόπτειν*, "to peck, gnaw, or chew," used usually of animals;⁸ (3) *σποδεῖν*, "to batter with one's jaws," used of vehement eating at the banquet of *Pax* 1306;⁹ and (4) *φλᾶν*, "to crush with the teeth," as often in comedy: e.g., *Ar. Pax* 1306, *Plut.* 694; *Antiph.* 190. 19; *Men.* 607.

The real problem concerns the phrase ἐφ' ἀλὶ. It has long been realized that ἐπί in the idiom φαγεῖν ἐπὶ τινι designates the main dish, not the condiment or side dish. A

few examples from Aristophanes alone will suffice to demonstrate the pattern: *Ach.* 967, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ταρίχει τοὺς λόφους κραδαινέτω; *Pax* 123, ἔξετ' ἐν ὥρᾳ / κόλλυραν μεγάλην καὶ κόνδυλον ὄψον ἐπ' αὐτῇ; *Frag.* 630, ἐπὶ τῷ ταρίχει τὸν γέλωτα κατέδομαι, and so forth.¹⁰ Thus, in the abnormal logic of our passage, the girls are being asked to "bang down the bread with their salt." Moreover, the singular ἄλς is most unusual in Attic in the meaning "salt"; the normal Attic usage was the plural, οἱ ἄλεις.¹¹ In the face of these difficulties, it has always seemed that our only alternatives are either to call the lines *verba obscura*¹² and leave it at that, or to try to force a joke out of them, a "Megarian" reversal of the usual order of things: salt would be the main article of the diet, bread the relish.¹³ Unfortunately for the latter interpretation, we must note that Aristophanes' Megarians needed salt as desperately as any other necessity of life (see *Ach.* 811 ff.).

It may be possible to account for the oddities of these lines without strain if we keep in mind that in Aristophanes peculiarities of grammar and syntax, outlandish diction,

1. I follow the Budé text of V. Coulon, *Aristophane*, I⁷ (Paris, 1960).

2. For example J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Acharnenses* (Leyden, 1901).

3. So F. Blaydes, *Aristophanis Comoediae*, VII (Halle, 1887).

4. ἐσθίειν μετὰ τῶν ἄλῶν τὸν ἄρτον διὰ τὸ ἀπορεῖν προσφαγίου.

5. παίει' τύπτει, πλήττει, κρούει, δέρει' ἢ ἐσθίει.

6. παίειν' ἐσθίειν.

7. LSJ *s.v.* ἐρείδω II. 2 cites *Ar. Frag.* 493, in which ἐρείδεται appears to have nothing to do with eating. (All

fragments of Attic comedy cited in this article refer to the edition of T. Kock.)

8. LSJ *s.v.*, I. 10.

9. LSJ cites *Pherecr.* 55 ὧλέν' ὀβελίαν σποδεῖν, where the meaning is at least problematical.

10. Further citations are given by Blaydes (n. 3).

11. See Van Leeuwen, *ad loc.*; LSJ *s.v.* ἄλς; and cf. *Ach.* 814.

12. Van Leeuwen, *ad loc.*

13. So, e.g., W. Rennie, *Acharnians* (London, 1909), *ad loc.*