these wretched philosophers are running all over the city. It would be odd if we failed to make such a connexion between the two places in Horace's *Epistles*<sup>13</sup> where the poet presents us with unhealthy dogs and muddy pigs, when the connexion can so easily be made.<sup>14</sup>

Merton College, Oxford

J. S. C. EIDINOW

- <sup>13</sup> 'Canis' and 'sus' are paired again at *Epod.* 12.6, but it is difficult to see a philosophical connexion there.
- <sup>14</sup> I am grateful to Dr N. J. Richardson and Dr L. G. H. Hall for their encouragement and comments.

## CERINTHUS' PIA CURA ([TIBULLUS] 3.17.1-2)

In a recent issue of CQ, N. J. Lowe refers to the 'slyly Catullan appeal to the language of *pietas*' in [Tib.] 3.7 (4.11) 1–2 ('Estne tibi, Cerinthe, tuae pia cura puellae / quod mea nunc vexat corpora fessa calor'?). In this he follows Matthew Santirocco, who comments on these lines: 'significantly, the expression for love here is not just *cura* as before [sc. in 3.16 [4.10] 3], but *pia cura*. We recall the *pietas* Catullus proclaimed in his affair with Lesbia (cf. 76.2,5) and perhaps also *pius Aeneas* and all that *pietas* meant to the Augustan age, and then we realise that Sulpicia is now concerned not so much with the mere fact of Cerinthus' affection as with its quality.'<sup>2</sup>

I think this is misguided, that pia cura has nothing to do with the 'quality' of 'Cerinthus' affection', and that there is no 'slyly Catullan appeal to the language of pietas'. What is important in Sulpicia, as in Catullus, is the language of amicitia. Pius (and pietas) carries with it the notion of the fulfilment of obligations, whether to the gods or, as often, to one's family or friends. Thus it can be employed in the context of amicitia, as it is by Catullus at the opening of 73 (a poem on the betrayal of friendship):

desine de quoquam quicquam bene velle mereri aut aliquem fieri posse putare *pium* 

on which Kroll aptly remarks: 'die pietas zeigt sich auch darin, dass man die beneficia des Freundes erwidert.' Indeed, *pius* and *pietas* appear frequently in the context of the obligations of friendship: cf. Cic. *Ad. Fam.* 1.9, *Att.* 9.11a3, *Fam.* 1.1.1, 1.8.2, *Planc.* 96, Curtius 9.6.16, Horace, *Epist.* 1.14.6 (with K–H's note), Ovid, *Trist.* 1.5.38, 5.3.47 etc.

Catullus' importance in this regard is that he seems to have been the first to apply the language of *amicitia* and the notion of reciprocal *beneficia*, which of course lies at the heart of Greco-Roman ideas on friendship, to a (heterosexual) love-affair. Nowhere is this better to be seen than in 76, a poem replete with the language of *amicitia* and which begins with the linking of *benefacta* (*beneficia*) and *pietas*:

siqua recordanti benefacta priora voluptas est homini, cum se cogitat esse pium...<sup>3</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> 'Sulpicia's Syntax', *CQ* N.S. 38 (1988), 193–205, p. 200.
- <sup>2</sup> 'Sulpicia Reconsidered', CJ 74 (1979), 229-39, p. 233.
- <sup>3</sup> On the 'recalling of benefits' as a topos of moral philosophy, see J. G. F. Powell, 'Two Notes on Catullus', CQ N.S. 40 (1990), 199–206. Powell points to its occurrences in Cicero, but rightly sees that it is a case of Vulgarethik rather than literary influence. The same, of course, is true of beneficia vis-à-vis friendship and pietas. I am grateful to Dr Powell for sending me an advance copy of his article.

έν δὲ τούτῳ ψυχήν, ή καταμανθάνεις καὶ ὡς ἄν ἐμβλέπουσα χαρίζοιο καὶ ὅ τι ἄν λέγουσα εὐφραίνοις καὶ ὅτι δεῖ τὸν μὲν ἐπιμελόμενον ἀσμένως ὑποδέχεσθαι, τὸν δ' ἐντρυφῶντα ἀποκλείειν καὶ ἀρρωστήσαντός γε φίλου φροντιστικῶς ἐπισκέψασφαι καὶ καλόν τι πράξαντος σφόδρα συνησθῆναι καὶ τῷ σφόδρα σοῦ φροντίζοντι ὅλη τῆ ψυχῆ κεχαρίσθαι.

(Xen. Mem. 3.11.10)4

In the Hellenistic period it becomes firmly ensconced along with the giving of legal assistance, accompanying on a journey, arranging marriages etc. in the canon of standard benefits one might expect from a friend, or be expected to extend to a friend: cf. Plutarch, *De Am. Mult.* 95d, *De Am. et Ad.* 63d, *De Tu. San. Praecept.* 15., Lucian, *Tox.* 18, etc.<sup>5</sup>

In Roman literature, cf. Lucilius 181ff., Hor. Sat. 1.1.80ff., Ep. 2.2.69 (more references in Krenkel on Lucilius 182ff.). In Seneca sick-visiting is a standard beneficium which reappears frequently in the De Beneficiis. At 3.9.2. adsedisse aegro is classed as an important beneficium, as important, says Seneca, as defendisse capitis reum (sc. amicum). It occurs along with the travelling-together beneficium in 3.19.1 and (in an erotic context) in 6.25.2 (cf. also 4.20.3, 4.37.1, 6.16.4, 7.14.4; Sen. Controv. 1.4.9, Macrob. Sat. 2.2.5). In Petronius (Sat. 101) we find the expression officii causa visere languentem. That this was very much a part of everyday life and not just a purely literary theme is clear from the fact that Tiberius, Claudius, Trajan and Hadrian are all cited by the historians as performing this particular beneficium. In elegy Propertius refers to his visit to the ailing Cynthia as the act of an amicus ('et lectum flentes circum staremus amici' [2.9.27]), significantly the only place in Propertius where he speaks of himself as an amicus of his mistress. Both Ovid and Martial give visiting a sick friend as an excuse an adulteress might use for absenting herself from her husband (Am. 2.2.21f., AA 3.641; Martial 11.7.7 [with Kay ad loc.]).

Sulpicia, then, is not 'concerned about the quality of Cerinthus' love. She is sick; he is her lover; he is to be expected to perform the standard beneficium of visiting her. This would be demonstrating his pia cura (which might be translated as 'dutiful concern'); he would be fulfilling the obligation called for by the circumstances. The adjective pius and the noun pietas are, as we have seen, often used with reference to the obligations of friendship, and here pia cura suits the context perfectly. We may add two more examples which have a direct bearing on Sulpicia and her situation. In the De Beneficiis Seneca discusses people who want their gratitude to be seen in their fulfilment of beneficia and who accordingly wish for some misfortune to befall those who have previously placed them under obligation. These people, he claims, are analogous to lovers who want their mistresses exiled so that they might attend them, or sick so that they may visit them (De Benef. 6.25.1–2). Seneca wonders if this can

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> I owe this reference to Prof. W. J. Slater. It is significant that Xenophon uses the word  $\phi$ ίλος rather than  $\epsilon \rho \alpha \sigma \tau \eta s$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See further *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 185–6; SO 56 (1981), 63–9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Fergus Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World (London, 1977), p. 112 and n. 18.

be justified: 'an hoc recte faciant et pia voluntate quaeritur.' Closer to Sulpicia's own time and writing in her genre, Ovid tells the prospective lover that he should sit at the girl's bedside to demonstate his *pietas*: 'tunc amor et pietas tua sit manifesta puellae' (AA 2.321).

Finally, the actual expression *pia cura* occurs only twice elsewhere in Augustan poetry, and one of these is Ovid, *Am.* 2.16.7 Significantly this is a poem which is built around the 'travelling-together' *beneficium* (see especially 17ff.) and Ovid is here complaining about Corinna's *failure* to keep her word and travel with him to Sirmio:

at mihi te comitem<sup>8</sup> iuraras usque futuram – per me perque oculos, sidera nostra, tuos. verba puellarum, foliis leviora caducis, irrita, qua visum est, ventus et unda ferunt. si qua mei tamen est in te *pia cura* reliciti, incipe pollicitis addere facta tuis.

So the situation parallels what we find in Sulpicia.

University of Ottawa

J. C. YARDLEY

- <sup>7</sup> The other is Ovid, *Her.* 8.15 where Hermione appeals to Orestes' sense of duty (cf. 16 'inice non timidas in tua iura manus').
  - <sup>8</sup> On comes in 'travelling-together' contexts, see SO 56 (1981), p. 64.

## ALTERNAE VOCES-AGAIN

There is a persistent tradition of reading Propertius 1.10, according to which the Gallus addressed by the poem is the elegiac poet, and the poem itself is a description, not, or not only, of Gallus and his girl in bed but of Propertius reading Gallus' love elegy. In CQ 39 (1989), 561–2, James O'Hara suggests that the phrase 'in alternis vocibus' in Prop. 1.10.10 is a hint at amoebean verse, and as such may refer to the amoebean elegiac experiments by Gallus which Fairweather argues are represented by the Qasr Ibrîm papyrus. This may well be right. I suggest, however, that the primary metaphorical meaning of 'in alternis vocibus' is 'in your elegiac verse'. Oblique hints at such a reading can be found in Ross (above n. 1), who describes 9f as 'an extremely suggestive couplet', and Hinds, in his discussion of alternus as a programmatic term in Ovid, Fasti 4.484.

On the primary level, the phrase 'in alternis vocibus' refers to the reciprocal conversation between the lovers, thus evoking a picture unusual in elegy, where the woman's voice is seldom heard.<sup>4</sup> At the metaphorical level, the 'voice' is the tenor of the poetic expression.

Examples of the use in elegiac poetry of the word alternus to refer to the poetry are

- <sup>1</sup> F. 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, D. O. Ross, Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry. Gallus, Elegy, and Rome (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 83–4, 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.
  - <sup>2</sup> J. Fairweather, 'The "Gallus Papyrus": a New Interpretation', CQ 34 (1984), 167-74.
- <sup>3</sup> S. Hinds, The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 119-20, p. 162 n. 9.
- <sup>4</sup> Propertius 1.13 is quite similar to the poem under consideration: again addressed to Gallus, again describing the poet's pleasure at 'watching Gallus in his mistress' arms'. In 1.3 Propertius says 'at non ipse tuas imitabor, perfide, voces'. If the identification of Gallus with the elegist is correct, *voces* here must refer to, or at least hint at, Gallus' own poetry.