

(2.1), Sallustius Crispus (2.2), Dellius (2.3), Pompeius (2.7), and Messalla Corvinus (3.21).²⁶ They are particularly prominent in the second book of *Odes*. To be sure, the war thematic varies greatly in these pieces, from its direct treatment in the *Pollio Ode* to the bare whisper of Horace's words to Postumus, "in vain will we escape war." It is also true that the nine poems by no means contain the totality of Horace's ruminations on the war (the tour de force being *Odes* 1.2, which presents Augustus as the redeemer who will expiate the nation's war-guilt as though he had not been one of the war's protagonists). Nevertheless, the link that at least nine of Horace's dedicatees can now be seen to share should invite us to think again about the treatment of civil war in the *Odes*. Horace was the only one of the Augustan poets, so far as we know, who had actually participated in it, and his oblique but repeated evocations of it form a counterpoint to his forthright celebration of the new Augustan order. This prosopographical note is not the medium in which to pursue so broad a topic. But having listed the nine names, I would like to point out that they represent all factions in the struggle recently concluded. There are partisans of Brutus (Pompeius, Sestius), of Antony (Pollio, Sallustius Crispus), of Octavian (Agrippa, Curtius Postumus), as well as some who had changed sides (Dellius, Messalla, Plancus). Perhaps in the *Odes* Horace was pursuing his own project of national reconciliation.

PETER WHITE
University of Chicago

26. The true number is likely to be somewhat higher. We know enough about the nine I have listed to know what they were doing in the 40s and 30s. But other, more obscure recipients of Horace's odes may well have played some part in the war that we happen not to be informed about.

SIC TE SERVATO: AN INTERPRETATION OF PROPERTIUS 1.21

"Tu qui consortem properas evadere casum,
miles ab Etruscis saucius aggeribus,
quid nostro gemitu turgentia lumina torques?
pars ego sum vestrae proxima militiae.
sic te servato ut possint gaudere parentes, 5
ne soror acta tuis sentiat e lacrimis;
Gallum per medios ereptum Caesaris ensis
effugere ignotas non potuisse manus,
et quaecumque super dispersa invenerit ossa
montibus Etruscis, haec sciat esse mea." 10

The final words of Gallus are so condensed and elliptical that they excite our curiosity even more than our compassion. No narrator prepares us for the voice that breaks the silence and arrests our attention with its abrupt second-person address. From here until Gallus falls silent again, this time forever, his words tell us hardly more than enough to raise questions. Who is the Gallus whose name we learn in line seven, other than a man who opposed Octavian at Perusia? Is Gallus alive or already dead when he speaks? Who is the addressee, and what is his relationship to Gallus?

1. The text printed is that common to manuscripts NAFF.

Why are his eyes swollen, and why does he avert them from Gallus' groans? In what sense is Gallus "the nearest part of [the addressee's] military service"? What does Gallus indicate by *sic* in line five? Who is the sister referred to? What *acta* must be concealed from her? Why must they be concealed? What could the addressee reveal by his tears? How was Gallus rescued from Caesar's troops, and who killed him? Why would the *soror* find bones of unspecified number scattered on the Etruscan mountainside? Is she to distinguish Gallus' bones from these, or identify the two? If she is to distinguish them, how will she do it? If she is to identify whatever bones she finds as Gallus', what could this mean? Did Gallus' message ever reach its destination? What is the relationship between Gallus and Propertius? Why is this poem in a volume of love elegy? All of these questions have been raised by interpreters; none is completely otiose. I mention them only to highlight the essentially evasive and enigmatic texture of this great poem.

All commentators on Propertius 1.21 do agree on one thing: the addressee is a passerby who as he flees Perugia chances upon the speaker. Yet surprisingly (or unsurprisingly, once we have adjusted to the darkness) nothing in Gallus' words indicates that he and the addressee have met by chance; Gallus uses no equivalent of the *siste viator* formula of grave inscriptions. In other ways, to be sure, Gallus' words remind us of epitaphs;² but one may wonder whether the speaker's employment of the accents of grave inscriptions requires that his addressee actually be a passerby; the speaker after all is not an inscribed stone but a man speaking somewhat like one.³ Catullus 101 offers an example of a poem rich in echoes of sepulchral epigram in which the addressee is not a wayfarer and the speaker is neither the departed nor the stone that marks his grave.⁴ The assumption that Gallus addresses a passerby poses a problem that has not, to my knowledge, been noticed. Why would anyone plead with a fleeing soldier to save himself (1.21.5), when by fleeing the addressee is already trying to save himself? Gallus' injunction has little point unless it turns the addressee from some alternative course of action. Posed in this way, the question suggests an answer that is logically obvious but by no means clearly indicated in the text: the addressee could try to save Gallus, or at least bring his body home for burial. This would be quite plausible if speaker and addressee are kinsmen or friends, as Gallus' oblique reference to the *soror* seems to imply. The possibility that the addressee might have tried to save Gallus leads me to think that if we peer deeply into the shadows of Propertius 1.21 we can discern the traces of a scenario that interpreters have not yet considered.

The first of Gallus' words that is not a pronoun is *consortem* (1.21.1). When used adjectivally this word normally denotes a property that is shared by closely linked entities: they may be sibling coinheritors (Cic. *Verr.* 3.57), siblings who shed kindred blood (*consorti sanguine*) in dying together (the Thestiads, Ov. *Met.* 8.444) or whose kindred bodies are together given up to slavery (*consortia corpora poenae*

2. Similarities first commented upon by Lachmann; for discussion see Paolo Fedeli, *Sesto Propertio: Il Primo Libro delle Elegie* (Firenze, 1980), 487–88; Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 177–81; and R. I. V. Hodge and R. A. Buttmore, *The "Monobiblos" of Propertius* (Cambridge, 1977), 210–14.

3. Nor do stones speak; the conventions of the sepulchral epigram are metaphorical to begin with.

4. For a very old example of the same phenomenon, see Hom. *Il.* 7.87–91 and the comments of I. J. F. de Jong, "The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-Speeches in the *Iliad*," *Eranos* 85 (1987): 77–78. Hektor imagines a man sailing by a hero's tomb remarking on the man buried there, reversing the convention of the tomb telling the passerby about its occupant.

dedidit, of the daughters of Anius, Ov. *Met.* 13.663); they may be the bees who not only share homes (*consortia tecta*) but also have their offspring in common (Verg. *G.* 4.153); or *corpus et anima*, which according to Lucretius possess a shared life (*consorti . . . vita*, 3.332) that does not permit them to be separated without loss of sensation and indeed complete dissolution (Lucr. 3.323–36). Gallus' expression *consortem casum* (1.21.1) might have a similar force if it implied that Gallus and the addressee were kinsmen who have been fleeing Perusia *together*, and thus seeking to avoid a fate that would befall both if it befell either.⁵ The addressee might be the sole active partner (*tu . . . properas*, etc.) because he is much less seriously wounded than Gallus and has been helping Gallus to safety; in this way one man flees a double doom. It is evident from Gallus' groans (*nostro gemitu*, 3), the addressee's pity (*turgentia lumina*, 3), and indeed the whole drift of the poem, that Gallus' condition is already critical, while the addressee's is not. Gallus therefore might be asking his companion to save himself by allowing Gallus to take his own life and put an end to his misery: thus Gallus, who seeks the addressee's complicity in his death, will be part of his military service (*pars . . . vestrae . . . militiae*, 4). But the addressee cannot bear to see his companion kill himself and thus averts his eyes (*torquentia lumina torques*, 3). The adverb *sic* (5) would indicate Gallus' death as the precise means of the addressee's salvation, and could even denote the deathblow itself.⁶ If speaker and addressee are brothers⁷ (not implausible in view of the ordinary uses of *consors* and the unspecific reference to a *soror*) then Gallus' desire that the parents rejoice (*ut possint gaudere parentes*, 5) suggests that by taking his life and letting the addressee escape unencumbered Gallus hopes to spare his parents the tragedy of losing both sons at once.⁸ The *acta* (6) that the addressee must not reveal by his tears would thus be *the speaker's and his own involvement in the speaker's death*, which the addressee's tears would be likely to reveal since he wants to save his companion and recoils from seeing him take his life. But neither speaker nor addressee would wish it to be known that the addressee had abandoned his companion to death, lest he be blamed for doing too little. Gallus' sister would therefore be told *instead* that he was killed by unnameable brigands (*ignotas . . . manus*, 8) after being rescued (*ereptum*, 7) from Caesar's troops: the indirect statement *Gallum . . . non potuisse* would therefore be taken as depending upon *sciat* (10), and *et* (11) would link the two statements

5. Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, 175, infers from *proxima* in line four that speaker and addressee had fought side by side at Perusia.

6. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.644–45, where Anchises, refusing to flee Troy with Aeneas and the others, bids them abandon him to death: *sic o sic positum adfati discedite corpus. / ipse manu mortem inveniam*. Also Dido's words at Verg. *Aen.* 4.660 and Servius' comments *ad loc.* Other examples of *sic* indicating self-inflicted death: Sen. *Hercules Furens* 1210, *Hercules Oetaeus* 845–46. For *sic* indicating a death inflicted by another, see Livy 1.7.2 *sic deinde quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea* (spoken by Romulus immediately before slaying Remus); Livy 1.26.5 *sic eat quaecumque Romana lugebit hostem* (spoken by Horatius at the moment he slays his sister); Ov. *Met.* 12.285 *sic . . . cetera sit fortis castrorum turba tuorum* (spoken by Rhoetus right after his enemy Cometes has been killed by a rock thrown by one of his comrades).

7. As suggested by R. J. Baker, *Propertius I*, University of New England Teaching Monograph Series, No. 8 (Armidale, Australia, 1990), 219. Hodge and Buttimore, "Monobiblos," 210, suggest "brother-death" as a translation of *consortem casum*, although they do not think that speaker and addressee are to be thought of as kinsmen at all.

8. This might explain why Gallus uses the cautious expression *possint gaudere* instead of, e.g., *gaudeant*. One would expect parents to rejoice at the safe return of a son from war; why wish only that they *be able* to rejoice? On the reading suggested, they would only *be able* to rejoice because they would also have lost a son. *ut possint gaudere* would therefore be the equivalent of "so that they may have *something* to rejoice at."

so depending, *Gallum . . . non potuisse* and *haec . . . esse mea* (12). The couplet in lines 7–8 closely resembles a grave inscription, down to the use of the proper name identifying the occupant of the tomb;⁹ thus it is uttered in the correct style to serve as the public account of Gallus' death.¹⁰

Grammar alone offers no solution to the ambiguity in the function of the *quaecumque* clause in lines 9–10. Does Gallus want his sister to know that "whatever bones she finds are mine" (*haec* as the antecedent of *quaecumque*) or that "whatever other bones she finds, *these* are mine" (*quaecumque* concessive, *haec* purely deictic)? Holt Parker's recent argument that the *quaecumque* clause cannot belong to the indirect statement and thus cannot take *haec* as its antecedent wrongly supposes that in indirect discourse relative clauses with indicative verbs are always parenthetical;¹¹ such indicatives are found when the relative clause "is merely a circumlocution for something which might have been expressed by a single noun."¹² Thus in 1.21.9–10 *quaecumque . . . haec* may be taken as a periphrasis for *omnia ossa*. The fact, also brought in evidence by Parker,¹³ that real Roman soldiers always wished to be buried, and thus would not have wanted their bones confused with those of others, while certainly relevant to interpretation of the passage, is not decisive, because we are here dealing with a poem, not a transcription of someone's actual words about his own burial. Poems are not real life, and so Anchises, when asking to be left to die at Troy, can say *facilis iactura sepulcri* (Verg. *Aen.* 2.646).

The persistent efforts to dismiss the interpretation of *haec* as the antecedent of *quaecumque* rarely resist the temptation to ridicule it. Housman set the tone with his obtuse and insensitive comment that "certainly the discovery that her brother had 1,000 skulls, 2,000 femora, and 26,000 vertebrae, would be at once a painful shock to her affections and an overwhelming addition to her knowledge of anatomy."¹⁴ Parker quotes these words with hearty approbation, while David Traill rejects the reading *quaecumque* altogether on the grounds that it summons a "bizarre picture, at once Wagnerian and faintly comic . . . a respectable Roman woman, searching for her brother's remains, picks her way through piles of bones on a lonely hillside infested with bandits."¹⁵ On any reading of lines 9–10 Gallus has summoned the image of an Etruscan landscape strewn with skeletons. I can see nothing comic in this, especially since the context of the poem suggests that these would have been

9. Cf. Fedeli, *Primo Libro*, ad 7–8 and ad verbum *Gallum*; also see note 10 below.

10. It would be strange if in his dying moment Gallus wished to conceal from his sister that he had been killed by brigands, since a great many actual grave inscriptions record unheroic dooms inflicted by robbers, wild animals, or freak accidents; in fact such inscriptions often employ the same formula that Gallus uses, "saved from one death, only to meet another." See Richmond Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. 28 (Urbana, 1942), nos. 1–2, pp. 143–44, 151–53; p. 152, n. 79 mentions Latin epitaphs explicitly referring to death at the hands of brigands; see also W. R. Nethercut, "Propertius 1.21.5–6," *CP* 63 (1968): 143, n. 10. If Gallus is saying "Do not destroy her fond belief that I was killed in honorable battle" (J. P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius* [London, 1884], ad 1.21.6, followed by many other commentators), then the poem presents Gallus as something of a fraud whom Propertius exposes. But I do not wish to imply that it is either impossible or wrong to take lines 7–8 as depending upon *ne . . . sentiat* and explicating *acta*, as most scholars do; in fact this reading is stylistically perhaps somewhat easier than the ones that I have suggested. Propertius has constructed lines 7–8 ambiguously, as he did much in this poem.

11. "The Bones: Propertius 1.21.9–10," *CR* 86 (1991): 331–32.

12. E. C. Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax* (London, 1959), no. 287. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 3rd Aufl., Vol. 2 (1955) no. 239 2 (a).

13. "Bones," 329–30.

14. "Butler's Propertius," *CR* 19 (1905): 320.

15. "Propertius 1.21: The Sister, The Bones, and the Wayfarer," *AJP* 115 (1994): 93.

the remains of men who, like the addressee and possibly Gallus as well, had been wounded while attempting to escape the siege of Perusia. In such a poetic landscape one might expect to find many Italian Antigones searching, often in vain, for the traces of their loved ones. Since the dead would have been the countrymen of Gallus and his sister and martyrs in their common cause, the thought of their unburied remains would have aroused deep pathos. The emotional charge of the *quaecumque* clause therefore should be taken into account by any who wish to read it as purely concessive. One does not easily put aside the unburied bones of patriots.

The reading that takes *haec* as the antecedent of *quaecumque* has been dubbed the "Unknown Soldier" interpretation.¹⁶ The basic problem that has aroused so much intemperate objection to this explanation of the text seems to be that it does not furnish a historically plausible means of burying the bones of Gallus, who appears to be saying "any old bones will do"¹⁷ or requesting burial in a mass grave.¹⁸ But let us first observe that Gallus never even mentions burial. What he does is identify his bones: *haec sciat esse mea*. The ambiguity in the construction of the *quaecumque* clause implies two sharply contrasting identifications. Taking the *quaecumque* clause as concessive would mean "these bones right here are mine," i.e., the same set of bones that has supported his flesh since his birth. Certainly this is what most people, in ancient Rome or other times and places, would mean by "my bones," and this is a strong argument for reading the *quaecumque* clause as concessive. Taking *haec* as the antecedent of *quaecumque* would mean "all these bones are mine." The sense of this would be not that Gallus was an individual with 1,000 heads, as Housman implied, but that Gallus did not see himself as an individual at all, that in death he had become one with his lost comrades. Such an idea would not have been foreign to the ancients. In the military context, dead comrades could be seen as having a kind of communal, first-person plural identity; think of the famous inscription erected at Thermopylae for the Spartans who died there, or the epitaph of the Tegean soldiers, also attributed to Simonides (*Anth. Pal.* 7.249, 512). While nobody might deliberately forego burial in an individual tomb, it was nevertheless conventional to say of those who died in battle that they had won a monument much greater than such a tomb: ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος κτλ. (Thuc. 2.43.3; cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7.252). Other hyperbolic statements also find a home in the style of sepulchral epigram: at the death of Ptolemy, Egypt tore her hair (ἡ μέγαρα δ' Αἴγυπτος ἔαν ὠλόωατο χαίταν; *Anth. Pal.* 7.241); the tomb of Alexander is both continents (*Anth. Pal.* 7.240); every stone wept at the death of Casandros (*Anth. Pal.* 7.328); the dead are not dead (οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες; *Anth. Pal.* 7.251). For these reasons it is plausible that Gallus should have said that he was one with all those who lay dead in the Etruscan hills, and that all the bones there were his. But as Propertius wrote them, lines 9–10 can also be taken to mean something quite different and ordinary, that Gallus' dying concern is the care of his individual body.

The plausibility of taking *haec* as the antecedent of *quaecumque* supports the plausibility of reading lines 7–8 as the message that will substitute for the truth

16. First by Hildebrecht Hommel, "Der 'Unbekannte Soldat.' Zu Propertius 1, 21, 9–10," *PhW* 46 (1926): 988–90, although the interpretation is older. Its most recent proponent has been H.-P. Stahl, *Propertius: "Love" and "War"* (Berkeley, 1985), 116. For further bibliography see Parker, "Bones," p. 328, n. 2.

17. As paraphrased by Kenneth Quinn, "Practical Criticism: A Reading of Propertius 1.21 and Catullus 17," *G&R* 16 (1969): 22.

18. Parker, "Bones," 329.

about Gallus' death. As David Traill has recently pointed out, an epitaph in the Greek Anthology (*Anth. Pal.* 7.737) suggests that there seems to have been an expectation that the body of the victim of bandits might not be recoverable.¹⁹ The story that Gallus had been killed by unknown hands might therefore have implied that his individual bones could not be found and should not be searched for.

In turning to the question of what Gallus' sister was supposed to do with his bones, we must first remember that this poem could have no effect upon the treatment of the actual Gallus' remains, however defined, and that the everyday practices and physical practicalities of Roman burials are therefore not of much relevance. It may be taken for granted that a Roman sister, real or mythic, would have felt a strong obligation to bury the remains of her brother. If the *quaecumque* clause be taken as concessive, then Gallus implies that his sister should find his bones and bury them. If *haec* be taken as the antecedent of *quaecumque*, does this mean that Gallus expects his sister to scour the Etruscan countryside and bury all the bones she finds there? All the text would really imply is that she ought to feel that this is her duty, that all the bones on the mountainside are her brother's and deserve the same love and care she would accord his. The sister would feel not only her own anguish at the loss of her brother, but all the anguish of all the sisters and wives and mothers who had lost kin in the war and who were unable to bury them. Just so in poem 1.22 Propertius' unburied kinsman focuses a feeling of affiliation that is much broader than that between one individual and another: the whole Umbrian land has given the poet birth (1.22.9–10).

I have suggested that the text of Propertius 1.21 transmitted by NAFB can without emendation be read as the fragment of a scenario in which two wounded brothers flee Perugia together, the less seriously wounded aiding the other, who is Gallus, the speaker of the poem. Gallus elects to kill himself so that his brother can escape and their parents' lives be not deprived of all joy. Their sister is not to be told of Gallus' end; instead she will hear that he was assaulted by strangers, and that his body is lost. In death he has become one with all his murdered countrymen, who take his place as the object of his sister's love and pious devotion. This reading magnifies the pathos of Gallus' death, which would have occurred in order to save the life of a brother and fellow Etruscan, and had to come at his own hand and with the complicity of his companion, even though Caesar was ultimately responsible. Gallus dies almost as a sacrificial victim who symbolizes the entire Etruscan cause. In elegy 1.21 Propertius would have created the myth of a local hero whose story he rescues from oblivion, and whom he provides with the epitaph that could not be inscribed in stone.

This interpretation, however, does not furnish a solution to the poem's myriad difficulties. While I believe that it is a valid reading of the Latin transmitted by the best manuscripts, it is by no means strongly enough indicated to rule out other interpretations; in particular, it remains not only possible but rather easy to take lines 7–8 as explicatory of *acta* and *quaecumque* as concessive. However, I would venture to say that the interpretation here offered is emotionally deeper than that which supposes that Gallus tells a wayfarer that he was killed by bandits, and that it is more in accord with the patriotism expressed by Propertius in poem 1.22. Propertius 1.21 seems to conceal a powerful scenario within a text that is not

19. "Propertius 1.21," 94–95.

merely obscure and ambiguous but actually misleading. What could be the point of such a poetic labyrinth?

The scenario of 1.21 as well as its form involve suppression, for the addressee is instructed to conceal from Gallus' sister the *acta* surrounding his death. Thus, on the reading I have suggested, the poem would remain faithful to Gallus' dying wish by merely hinting at the truth of his death. Many of Propertius' readers, even Etruscans like Tullus,²⁰ would have been unmoved by Gallus' self-sacrifice and the bonds that it creates, either because of indifference or sympathy for Octavian. It would have been indecent to expose such intimacies to them. But for those whose hearts were unified by their loving memories of Etruria, the poem on the death of Gallus would have served as a riddle in whose solution lay the secret of their invisible communion.

By 28 B.C. the Etruria of Propertius' youth had completely disappeared, leaving only a trace in the tombs of its martyrs that lined the Italian roads. To anyone who could not remember Italy as it had been before the Civil Wars, this trace would have been barely legible; the tomb of one man is much like another's, and no stereotypical epitaph could possibly evoke the life of an individual, much less that of a community, for anyone who had not been there to experience it. For Propertius the poetry of the Perusian epitaphs must have been the most eloquent and inarticulate imaginable: evoking for him floods of deep feelings and precise memories, but expressing nothing at all to the great mass of Romans who passed them on the road every day. Meleager's description of a frivolously enigmatic epitaph could apply with deeper meaning to both the graves of Perusia and poem 1.21: φέγγος μὲν ξυνετοῖς, ἀξυνέτοις δ' ἔρεβος (*Anth. Pal.* 7.429). In the final words of Gallus we too behold the obscure traces of brutality, sacrifice, and denial.²¹

BRUCE HEIDEN

The Ohio State University

20. Who served Augustus; see Prop. 1.6.

21. Thanks to Professors June Allison, Will Batstone, and Kirk Freudenburg for discussing this interpretation with me.