

PRODELIDED *EST* IN OVID

Further proof of Professor Kenney's assertion that in the case of prodelided *est* the syncopated form was written by Ovid as well as spoken (*CQ* 36 [1986], 524) is provided by *Metamorphoses* 15.426ff.:

clara fuit Sparte, magnae viguere Mycenae,
nec non et Cecropis, nec non Amphionis arces.
vile solum Sparte est, altae cecidere Mycenae,

The symmetry is clear and *vile solum Spartest* balances *clara fuit Sparte*. (Perhaps we should write *necnon*.)

The next three lines (429–31) are interesting:

Oedipodioniae quid sunt, nisi nomina, Thebae?
quid Pandioniae restant, nisi nomen, Athenae?
nunc quoque Dardanium *fama est* consurgere Romam,

Here, the balance is of a different kind: each line represents a third of the poem and ends with the name of the city which is the focus of that third. By writing *famast*, Ovid gives each pentad a line of six words.

University of Florida, Gainesville

ALLAN KERSHAW

PROPERTIUS ON THE BANKS OF THE EUROTAS
(A NOTE ON 3.14.17–20)

Propertius' essay on the virtues of Spartan nudity includes a simile comparing the Spartan female athlete with Helen (3.14.17–20):

qualis et Eurotae Pollux et Castor harenis,
hic victor pugnīs, ille futurus equis,
inter quos Helene nudis capere arma papillis
fertur nec fratres erubuisse deos.

Notice of this simile tends to consider three points: the similarity of the first pentameter to an Homeric verse, *Iliad* 3.237; the apparent Propertian fiction of the 'tradition' of Helen's nudity reported in 19–20; and the indirect means by which Propertius focuses our attention on Helen, beginning with *qualis*... *Pollux et Castor* and only in the second couplet moving to *inter quos Helene*. The Hellenistic provenance of the last feature has, however, gone unnoticed.

In the fifth hymn, Callimachus combines description of Athena's beauty with comparison to the athletic Dioscuri (23–5):

ἀ δὲ δις ἐξήκοντα διαθρέξασα διαύλως,
οἷα παρ' Εὐρώται τοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι
ἀστέρες...

In his recent edition of the hymn, Bulloch comments: 'Although the Dioscuri were famous Doric representatives and patrons of athletic achievement, Athena was herself renowned for athletic prowess and physical strength and stands to gain nothing from a comparison with them as a runner... Mention of the Dioscuri does, however, establish the presence of the person most closely connected with them, their sister Helen...' ¹ In order to reinforce the presence of Helen, central but unnamed,

¹ *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*, ed. A. W. Bulloch (Cambridge, 1985), 133.

Callimachus incorporates into this section of the hymn extensive recollection of Theocritus 18 (the *Epithalamion for Helen*).² In this latter poem, the nubile Helen is praised as surpassing all her friends in beauty (22–5):

ἄμμες δ' αἱ πᾶσαι συνομάλικες, αἷς δρόμος ὠπτός
χρισαμέναις ἀνδριστὶ παρ' Εὐρώταο λοετροῖς,
τετράκις ἐξήκοντα κόραι, θήλυς νεολαία,
τᾶν οὐδ' ἄτις ἄμωμος ἐπεὶ χ' Ἑλέναι παρισωθῇ.

Callimachus depends upon recognition of the Theocritean echo in his hymn to make his point: Athena's beauty is comparable to that of Helen, 'who combined femininity with very masculine Spartan athletics'.³ Callimachus never mentions Helen by name, however. Instead, he opens the simile with a term of comparison, a reference to the Spartan river Eurotas, and mention of the illustrious Dioscuri.

The opening of the Propertian simile is identical: a term of comparison, mention of the Eurotas, and the naming of the Dioscuri. What makes the similarity between simile openings most unlikely to be accidental, however, is Propertius' point: Helen is really the important character in this comparison, as an embodiment of femininity combined with Spartan athleticism. Following Callimachus' example, Propertius constructs a simile that is visually and syntactically deceptive; Propertius' own innovation here, Helen's erotic partial nudity, is a creative embroidery upon Hellenistic material.

Bowdoin College, Maine

BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD

² Bulloch 46–7, 131–2.

³ Bulloch 132.

PROPERTIUS 4.1.8

The manuscript version of this line, apart from a nonsensical variant *tutus* for *bubus*, is

et Tiberis nostris advena bubus erat.

The trouble here has been that scholars have taken *advena* to mean 'stranger', 'foreigner', 'alien', or German 'fremd'. Clearly the sentence

and Tiber was a stranger to our oxen

makes no sense in the context, and for this reason many scholars have either produced strange translations ('alien Tiber served our oxen', Butler and Barber) or else have dabbled in dubious emendation (*temptus* Baehrens, *tortus* Postgate, *Tusculum* Havet in place of *bubus*).

Most recently S. J. Heyworth, in 'Propert. III and IV', *CQ* 36 (1986), 199–211 (208–9 in particular), has suggested *murus* for *bubus*. He feels that Ovid's *advena Thybris* and *advena Thybri* in *Fast.* 2.68 and 3.524 respectively, together with Varro, *LL* 5.29, make it 'probable' that *advena* in Propertius should also be taken attributively with *Tiberis*, not as predicate after *erat*. I cannot see why the usage in Ovid carries any implication whatever that we have the attributive use in Propertius also; and the word order in Propertius militates strongly against this. Heyworth also feels that, after the *boves* in 4.1.4, we cannot have yet another set of *boves* in line 8. But why not? There is a difference between the way the point is made, as between lines 4 and 8. In line 4, it was a specific batch of cattle, Evander's, which settled down at a specific (and particularly important) site in Rome. In line 8, it is generalised cattle which are to be found along the banks of the Tiber.

The fundamental objection to the views of Heyworth and other scholars is the