

the statue's wardrobe: perhaps it was a small cape that was placed over the *peplos*.

In sum, one may argue that, in addition to the *peplos*, perhaps as many as three other items of clothing were part of the *xoanon*'s outfit. Moreover, a *khiton* or an *esthes* or a *himation* may have been significantly thinner and lighter and smaller than the *peplos*. When folded, any one of these lesser items might well resemble the object depicted on the frieze. Thus it is worth suggesting that the vestment in the frieze is in fact one of these other garments of the *xoanon*. If correct, the other-vestment theory has all the advantages of the old-*peplos* theory. The new *peplos* is still suggested; the gods et al. can look away; the bearded man can be shown giving the object to the attendant; and the folded condition of the garment is no longer troublesome. But unlike the old-*peplos* theory, this new theory accounts for the size of the object in slab V.

BLAISE NAGY

*College of the Holy Cross*

## TWO UNNOTICED PARALLELS TO PROPERTIUS 2. 12

Among the parallels to Propertius 2. 12 are two passages cited at Athenaeus 13. 562.<sup>1</sup> The first, from Eubulus (Kock, *CAF*, 2, frag. 41), is usually cited in the commentaries; the second, from the *Apocryptomenus* of Alexis (*CAF*, 2, frag. 20), has been noted by Richard Reitzenstein.<sup>2</sup> I should like to adduce two previously unnoticed further parallels from the comic fragments. One is quoted by Athenaeus in the same section and comes from the *Phaedrus* of Alexis (*CAF*, 2, frag. 245):

πορευομένῳ δ' ἐκ Πειραιῶς ὑπὸ τῶν κακῶν  
καὶ τῆς ἀπορίας φιλοσοφεῖν ἐπῆλθέ μοι.  
καὶ μοι δοκοῦσιν ἀγνοεῖν οἱ ζωγράφοι  
τὸν Ἑρωτα, συντομώτατον δ' εἰπεῖν, ὅσοι  
τοῦ δαίμονος τούτου ποιοῦσιν εἰκόνας.  
ἔστιν γὰρ οὔτε θῆλυς οὔτε ἄρσεν, πάλιν  
οὔτε θεὸς οὔτ' ἄνθρωπος, οὔτ' ἀβέλτερος  
οὔτ' αὐθις ἔμφρων, ἀλλὰ συνεννεγμένους  
πανταχόθεν, ἐνὶ τύπῳ τε πόλλ' εἶδη φέρων.  
ἡ τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀνδρός, ἡ δὲ δειλία  
γυναικός, ἡ δ' ἄνοια μανίας, ὁ δὲ λόγος  
φρονοῦντος, ἡ σφοδρότης δὲ θηρός, ὁ δὲ πόνος  
ἀδάμαντος, ἡ φιλοτιμία δὲ δαίμονος.  
καὶ ταῦτ' ἐγώ, μὰ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ θεούς,  
οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἔχει γέ τι  
τοιούτου, ἐγγύς τ' εἰμί. τούνοματος.

The other is from Lucian (*Amores* 32), attributed by Kock to an unknown comedian (*CAF*, 3, Adespota, frag. 1214):

οὐχ ὁποῖον ζωγράφων  
παῖζουσι χεῖρες, ἀλλ' ὅν ἡ πρωτοσπόρος  
ἀρχὴ τέλειον εἶδος—

1. P. J. Enk (ed.), *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum liber secundus* (Leyden, 1962), pp. 169 ff., compiles and analyzes the ancient parallels.

2. *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 166–69.

From the two passages previously cited and from these two new parallels, it is clear that the appropriateness of Cupid's emblemata was a commonplace of Middle Comedy. All of the passages take the painters' portrayal of the divinity as their starting point, as Propertius does. But unlike parallels to the elegy from poetry (Meleager *Anth. Pal.* 5. 177; Moschus 1. 16–23) or mythography (Cornutus *Theol. Graec.* 25), each comic parallel refutes some aspect of the artists' depiction, either the appropriateness of the wings or the portrayal of love as a boy. In this the comedians agree with a fragment of the novel of Metiochus and Parthenope, adduced by A. D. Nock as a parallel, in which the young Metiochus, probably in a rhetorician's class, gives a spirited diatribe against the painters' portrayal.<sup>3</sup>

That the topic was a favorite of the teachers of rhetoric is confirmed by the well-known parallel to Propertius 2. 12 from Quintilian (*Inst.* 2. 4. 26): "solebant praeceptores mei neque inutili et nobis etiam iucundo genere exercitationis prae-parare nos coniecturalibus causis, cum quaerere atque exsequi iuberent 'cur armata apud Lacedaemonios Venus?' et 'quid ita crederetur Cupido puer atque volucer et sagittis ac face armatus,' et similia, in quibus scrutabamur voluntatem, cuius in controversiis frequens quaestio est." Georg Spalding long ago pointed to the note of wonder or indignation which attaches to questions introduced with *quid ita*.<sup>4</sup> For the question Quintilian's teacher posed, these reactions would indicate that students were more probably expected to develop the thesis in the manner of Metiochus and Alexis than in the manner of Moschus and Cornutus. Even by the fourth century this commonplace of the plastic arts had become entrenched. Justification was otiose, but refutation offered possibilities for originality.

The starting point of Propertius 2. 12 is not painting but rhetoric, and the words *puerum qui pinxit amorem* are only a signal that the poem takes up the dispute of the classroom. If, however, we are led by this to expect from Propertius the same disapproval of the painter we have found in the comedians, the second line surprises us with its question, "nonne putas miras hunc habuisse manus?" Propertius intends to argue the unusual side of the thesis. Eubulus and Alexis accuse the artists of ignorance of their subject, but Propertius admires the insight of the painter who "primum vidit sine sensu vivere amantes." Both of the comedians deny the major emblem of Eros—his wings. Propertius ironically emphasizes the introduction of each new symbol with an expression which demands agreement. The painter has given Eros wings *non frustra* (5), and armed him with a bow and arrow *et merito* (9). All of this is a playful false start on the rhetorical topic. The second half of the poem is a volte-face in which Propertius confirms the customary argument of the rhetoricians through personal experience.

TIMOTHY LONG  
Indiana University

3. *PBerol.* 7927, cited as a parallel to 2. 12 by A. D. Nock, "Propertius II. 12," *CR* 43 (1929): 126–27. See also B. Lavagnini, *Eroticorum Graecorum Fragmenta papyracea* (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 21–24 and *Studi sul Romanzo greco* (Messina, 1950), pp. 11–12 and 87–89.

4. G. Spalding, *M. Fabii Quintiliani "De institutione oratoria" libri duodecim*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1798), ad loc. R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*<sup>2</sup> (Hannover, 1912), 2:499, remark that the particular meaning of *ita* gradually recedes from Livy on, but the question as to the rate of its disappearance remains open. There is certainly the note of which Spalding speaks in the combination at *Inst.* 9. 4. 110. See also *TLL*, s.v. *ita*.