

recently have suggested, that poem can be seen as referring to or at least as playing with the idea of referring to not a night of voyeurism ('Durchs Schlüsselloch?' asks Skutsch), but Propertius' reading of Cornelius Gallus' love-poetry.² A. S. Benjamin noted the ambiguity of 1.10.9–10:

non tamen a vestro potui secedere lusu:
tantus in alternis vocibus ardor erat.

The use of the word *lusu* resembles that of the verb *ludere* in Catullus 50 (*hesterno, Licini, die otiosi/ multum lusimus...*), where amatory language is used of poetry writing. The phrase *in alternis vocibus* in line 10, while referring on the literal level to the love talk of Gallus and the girl, also 'suggests amoebaeon verse'.³ Some may still resist the idea of linking Cornelius Gallus the poet to the addressee of Propertius 1.5, 10, 13, and 20, but recent arguments have explained the principal barrier to this line of interpretation, the reference to Gallus' *nobilitas* at Prop. 1.5.23–4.⁴ The finding of possibly amoebaeon verses by Gallus further argues for such a link, and the phrase at Prop. 1.10.10 supports Fairweather's suggestion that the elegiacs from Qaṣr Ibrīm are amoebaeon verse.

Wesleyan University,
Middletown, Connecticut

JAMES J. O'HARA

² cf. Franz Skutsch, *Gallus und Vergil* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1906), pp. 144–6, A. S. Benjamin, 'A Note on Propertius 1.10: *O iucunda quies*', *CP* 60 (1965), 178, David O. Ross, Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry. Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 83–4, and F. Cairns, 'Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the "Gallus" of the Monobiblos', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, Fourth Volume (Liverpool, 1984), p. 101 n. 73.

³ Benjamin (previous note), 178.

⁴ *nec tibi nobilitas poterit succurrere amanti: / nescit Amor priscis cedere imaginibus*. See Ross (above n. 2, pp. 83–4, and especially Cairns (above n. 2), pp. 61–103, with full references. Line 24 does not have to mean that the Gallus has *priscae imagines*, especially since the line is probably adapted from a line from Cornelius Gallus' own work. Cairns shows that use of the words *nobilitas* or *nobilis* is not always so precise as to exclude the word *nobilitas* from being used of Gallus.

OVID, *METAMORPHOSES* 8.476

incipit esse tamen melior germana parente,
et, consanguineas ut sanguine leniat umbras,
impietate pia est.

Met. 8.475–7

In these lines Ovid introduces Althaea's debate whether or not to kill her son Meleager by burning the brand which was his life, because he had killed her two brothers during the Calydonian boar hunt. A. S. Hollis (Oxford, 1970) says of line 476 that it contains 'a forced and almost pointless word-play'. If *sanguis* is taken in its primary meaning, 'blood', this condemnation is quite justified. However, if one takes into account a secondary sense, the word-play acquires more strength. This sense is that of 'offspring' or 'descendant'. Examples of this usage (see Lewis and Short s.v. B1b and *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s.v. 10) include Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.835 'sanguis meus' (Julius Caesar), Horace, *Carmen Saeculare* 50 'clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis' (Aeneas), *Odes* 3.27.65 'regius sanguis' (Europa), and, in the *Metamorphoses* itself (5.514–15) 'pro ... meo veni supplex tibi, Iuppiter, ... sanguine'. It may well be that Ovid was intending implications of both meanings in his choice of the word.

Worcester College, Oxford

KATIE E. GILCHRIST