

PROPERTIUS 1.1 AND CALLIMACHUS, *LYRICA*, Fr.228?¹

Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores
 saevitiam durae contudit Iasidos.
 nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,
 ibat et hirsutas ille videre feras;
 ille etiam Hylaei percussus vulnere rami
 saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit.
 ergo velocem potuit domuisse puellam:
 tantum in amore preces et bene facta valent.

Propertius 1.1.9–16

Professor Cairns has suggested (*CQ* 68, 1974, 95–7) that the use of *modo* in Propertius 1.1.11, which has long been seen as problematic, can be understood in terms of some instances of the Greek ἄρτι. *modo*, he says, here means not ἐνίστε μὲν but ἄρτι, and the *modo* clause is prior in time to the clause that follows it just as, in his view, a Greek imperfect with ἄρτι can have the force of a pluperfect and refer to a time prior to that of the verb of a following clause.

It will be convenient if I quote here Professor Cairns's own statement of his case:

Propertius intended these lines to bear the meaning demanded by common sense and he wanted his readers to understand this by recognising in them an imitation of Greek syntax. The closest Greek parallel to Propertius from a syntactical point of view which I have found is:

. . . ἄρτι γάρ οἱ Σικελὰ μὲν Ἐνν|α
 κατελείπετο, Λαμνιακοὶ δ' ἐπατεῦ|ντο βουνοὶ
 Δηοῦς ἀπο νεισομένα· σέο δ' ἦν ἀπ|υστος
 ὧ δαίμοσιν ἀρπαγίμα, φάτο δ' ημιδ|
 Callimachus, *Lyrica*, fr.228, lines 43–6 (Pf.)

This passage involves the following clauses:

1. (lines 43–4) ἄρτι γάρ + Imperfect
2. (lines 44–5) δὲ + Imperfect
3. (lines 45–6) δὲ + Imperfect
4. (line 46) + Aorist

and it is translated as follows by C.A. Trypanis in his Loeb Classical Text:

'For a short time ago she *had* left Sicilian Enna, and *was walking* on the hills of Lemnos returning from her visit to Deo. But she knew not of you (sc. of your death), O stolen by the gods, and said . . .'. As this translation shows, there is a temporal distinction between the first clause (ἄρτι γάρ + Imp.) and the second (δὲ + Imp.). The first clause is prior in time, although there is no temporal adverb in the second clause to help us to understand this. Thus the verb of the first clause is rendered in English by the pluperfect. The Propertian passage . . .

The interpretation of the lines of Callimachus set out above on which Professor Cairns's case is founded² is a serious misinterpretation, and the correct understanding of them provides no basis for his view.

The situation described in Callimachus, *Lyrica*, fr.228, in so far as it concerns us at the moment, is this: Arsinoë, Queen of Egypt, has died; her already dead and

¹ I am grateful to Mr. I.M. LeM. DuQuesnay for kindly discussing this article with me. He is not responsible for its shortcomings.

² It seems unlikely that anyone will feel that the material on the Greek imperfect

presented in K.—G.1, §383, 3,4, referred to by Professor Cairns (p. 97), provides on its own, divorced from ἄρτι, a convincing basis for his interpretation of the Latin.

deified, and extremely mobile, sister Philotera has been with Deo (i.e. Demeter) in Sicily and is now travelling away from Sicily via Lemnos, ignorant of the queen's death. Here is a horribly literal translation of lines 43–6 which is intended to bring out clearly the true relationship between the clauses and their tenses: 'for her situation was that just now on the one hand (μέν) Sicilian Enna was being left behind, on the other hand (δ') Lemnian hills were being trodden as she was on her way from Deo; and she was without information about you, o lady carried off by deities, and she said . . .'

The basic structure of ἄρτι . . . νεισομένα (43–5) is not ἄρτι γάρ + impf./δὲ + impf., but ἄρτι . . . μὲν + impf. . . δὲ + impf., and it is a mistake to see κατελείπετο as equivalent to κατελέλειπτο: ἄρτι, as its position shows, belongs both to κατελείπετο in the μὲν clause and to ἐπατεύντο in the δέ clause and to take the first verb as having the force of a pluperfect would bring about an altogether strange rift in the use of the adverb. And κατελείπετο is quite sensible and intelligible as an imperfect: Enna *was being left behind* all the time as Philotera proceeded on her journey. One cannot maintain either, that both κατελείπετο and ἐπατεύντο are pluperfect—equivalents relative to the ἦν of σέο δ' ἦν ἄπυστος: it would be inherently absurd to suggest that Philotera's journey preceded her ignorance of her sister's death. And as for φάτο, that expresses an activity performed within the period of her ignorance, indeed prompted by that ignorance.

So far I have addressed myself to Professor Cairns's argument. I shall now leave it for a while and set out more fully how I interpret lines 40–7 of the Callimachus fragment:

σαμάντριαν ἃ δὲ πυρᾶς ἐνόησ' ἰῶν,
 ἂν οὐλα κυλινδομέναν ἐδίωκ[ον αὐραι
 < >
 ἥδ' ἄμ μέσα Θρηγικίου κατὰ νῶτα [πόντου
 Φιλωτέρα· ἄρτι γάρ οἱ Σικελὰ μὲν Ἐνν[α
 κατελείπετο, Λαμνιακοὶ δ' ἐπατεύ[ντο βουνοὶ
 Δηοῦς ἀπο νεισομένα· σέο δ' ἦν ἄπ[υστος
 ὧ δαίμοσιν ἄρπαγίμα, φάτο δ' ἡμιδ[
 'ἔξεν Χάρι τὰν ὑπά[τ]αν ἐπ' Ἀθω κολῶ[ναν,
 κτλ.'

In fact ἄρτι refers only to the temporal relationship between what precedes it and what follows it. Despite the damage the text has suffered, it seems possible to work out that relationship with a fair certainty. The action of ἐνόησ(ε) (40) took place somewhere in the Thracian sea (42); the γάρ structure (ἄρτι γάρ . . . νεισομένα, all of which is parenthetical) explains that this was because Philotera was on Lemnos at the time *in the course of a journey from Enna*; and Philotera's employment of Charis (line 47), who would be living (with her husband Hephaestus) on the volcanic Lemnos rather than anywhere else in the region, confirms that Philotera should not be thought of as having passed beyond Lemnos on her journey. ἐπατεύντο (and so κατελείπετο in the corresponding clause) cannot therefore be regarded as expressing an action prior in time to that of ἐνόησ(ε). Here, then, ἄρτι with the imperfect expresses simultaneity with the preceding aorist and has roughly the force of τότε, just as with primary tenses it is sometimes more or less equivalent to νῦν. The clauses modified by ἄρτι follow the verb with which they are simultaneous because they are an explanatory after-

thought, referring specifically to the geography in the preceding sentence. Leaving aside all question of metre, the thought might have been expressed by ἄρτι οἱ Σικελὰ μὲν Ἔννα κατελείπετο, Λαμνιακοὶ δ' . . . νεισομένα καὶ ἐνόησε . . ., and, in prose at any rate, ἄρτι with its imperfects would normally be replaced by ἄρτι with *present* participles: e.g. Ach.Tat. 2. 31. 6. 11 ἀναγόμενον σκάφος εὕρομεν, ἄρτι τὰ πρυμνήσια μέλλον ἀπολύειν; cf. 1. 7. 3. 3 ἄρτι δὲ λέγοντος αὐτοῦ Χαρακλῆς εἰστρέχει (hist.pres.).

In a footnote (op.cit., 96, n. 1) Professor Cairns refers to a number of other passages that might be taken to support his view of ἄρτι with the imperfect. They do not, or, at very least, some of them certainly do not, and in the others it is easier and better to take the imperfect with ἄρτι simply as an imperfect since the context never demands otherwise: (1) at Tryphiodor. 668 ff. the sense is 'For dawn was just appearing (668–70) and they began to look . . .' (parataxis for 'when they . . .'); (2) Colluth. 202 ff. is not relevant at all, since ἄρτι goes only with the aorist ἡλλάξατο (and even if one believes that it can be taken with ἔπλεεν (205) too, the actions of ἔπλεεν and φαίνεται must be seen as simultaneous: the portent occurred at sea, lines 207–10); (3) in Theocr. *Id.* 24.63 ff. there is no indication that Alcmena's words to Teiresias followed rather than coincided with the crowing of the cocks; (4) in Ap.Rhod. 1.1222 ἄρτι marks the simultaneity of ἴσταντο and μετεκίαθεν (1221) which *precedes*; (5) in Ap.Rhod. 2.607–10 the meaning surely is 'And they were just recovering . . . and Tiphys . . .': it would be inappropriate to think of their recovery as immediately complete and done with, and lines 608–10 (ἡέρα . . . σώεσθαι) encourage the view that ἀνέπνεον has a definitely continuing force: (6) Professor Cairns's other passage from Callimachus I have left to the end:

ἄρτι [ν]εότμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφ]εαί,
καὶ πρόκατε γνωτὸς Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος
ἔτο κυκλώσας βαλὶὰ πτερὰ θήλυσ ἀήτης,
ἔππο[ς] ἰοζώνου Λοκρίδος Ἀρσινόης,
[.] ασε δὲ πνοιῇ με, δι' ἡέρα δ' ὑγρόν ἐνείκας
Κύπριδος εἰς κόλ[πους] ἔθηκε

Aet. fr. 110.51–6 (Pf.).

Here it is not fully certain that ἄρτι goes with ποθέεσκον (it just might belong to νεότμητόν), but it is very probable and is the assumption on which I shall proceed, as Professor Cairns did. But I cannot see that ποθέεσκον is prior in time to the verbs that follow: the other locks surely did not stop missing their sister when Zephyr intervened. Professor Cairns says (p. 96, n. 1) that 'πρόκατε clarifies the temporal sequence' (i.e. the temporal relationship between ποθέεσκον and what follows), but Zephyr hardly programmed his activities according to the emotions of the sister locks and πρόκατε means not 'straightway after the mourning (missing)' but 'straightway after the cutting'.