The aged sire, the only and cherished son on whom the latter depends for protection, and, in spite of all this, the wish for distinction in war among renowned and brave heroes are all there. Phalerus, whatever Valerius Flaccus chose to make of him in his *Argonautica*,[7] makes his debut in Apollonius' narrative no sooner than he bows himself out of it. But it is like Virgil to have extracted and monumentalized the exquisite pathos inherent in the fleeting appearance and the summary family background of a well-nigh unknown Argonaut.[8]

University of Thessaloniki THEODORE D. PAPANGHELIS

[7] See 1.398–401, 4.654 and 6.217.

[8] 'Easterners' have been at work on the story of Pallas, arguing that Virgil has modelled it upon an episode from the Mahābhārata in which Arjuna entrusts his son Abhimanyu, a handsome young fighter, to his brother Yudhiṣṭhira. Abhimanyu is killed in the battle, is lamented by both father and uncle, and revenged by the former. The right to disbelieve is, I suppose, as sacrosanct as that to search. On the question, see J. Lallemant, 'Turnus and Duryodhana', *TAPhA* 92 (1961), 98–103 and G. E. Duckworth, 'Une source de l'Enéide: le Mahabharata', *Latomus* 18 (1959), 273–4.

HORACE, *EPISTLES* 1.2.42–43 AND TRADITIONAL LORE

Stephanie West suggested in a note in this journal (40 (1990), 280) that the presence of an anecdote in Lodovico Guicciardini's sixteenth-century *L'Hore di Ricreatione* furnishes a parallel for the fable alluded to by Horace, *Ep.* 1.2.42–3: 'Rusticus exspectat dum defluat amnis: at ille / labitur et labetur in omne volubilis aevum.' The parallels, and a third from nineteenth-century Sicily, allow her to imagine a tale, 'part of Italian traditional lore', already extant in Horace's time and presumably transmitted in rural regions down to Guicciardini and the Sicilian story-teller.

West rightly affirms that 'polygenesis is surely unlikely in this case', but the hypothesis of a millennial oral or peasant tradition is unnecessary. A new edition of Guicciardini's work[1] permits a better insight into his method. Guicciardini (1521–89), born into an aristocratic Florentine family, received a standard humanistic education. He came to Antwerp in 1541 as a merchant, and lived there for the rest of his life. While there, he studied with the humanist J. Velareus, and associated with others, such as Plantin.[2] The natural expectation that he was well acquainted with Horace is confirmed by his quotations from the poet in other items of his collection, including two from the same epistle, within a few lines of the passage in question.[3] It seems clear that Guicciardini framed this story on the basis of the Horatian verses, not on lore gathered from Italian folk tradition.[4] The Sicilian version was most probably influenced by literary transmission as well. Thus there is no evidence that the fable was a part of Italian traditional lore in Horace's time.

Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* is a useful finding-list of motifs, but provides no guarantee of their 'folk' or 'traditional' origin. Self-conscious and highly literate authors like Horace and Guicciardini were able to invent or adapt motifs, changing their form and point. Sayings or stories from standard authors can

[1] Lodovico Guicciardini, *L'Ore di ricreazione*, a cura di Anne-Marie Van Passen (Rome, Bulzoni editore, 1990). This fable is number 208.

[2] Guicciardini, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] Guicciardini, op. cit., no. 50 (*Ars poet.* 139); 64 (*Ep.* 1.2.57); 333 (*Ep.* 1.2.40).

[4] Numbers 64 and 333 were already present in an earlier version made by Guicciardini, *Detti e fatti piacevoli e gravi* (Venice, 1565); no. 208, which actually invents a story, does not appear until the first edition of *L'Ore* (Antwerp, 1568).

also re-enter oral folk tradition, via preachers or other professional story-tellers. In each case, we must ask what role an earlier written source might have played and what possible means of transmission existed. In the case of Hor. *Ep.* 1.2.42–3, as the *Motif-Index* shows, stories of fools are common throughout the world; they are still freely invented now. Horace may be alluding to a familiar story, or inventing one for the purpose. As Aristotle remarked, an invented story is useful because it can be fabricated to serve the occasion (*Rhet.* 2.20.7, 1394a2–8).

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill PHILIP A. STADTER

PROPERTIUS 3.11.33–38 AND THE DEATH OF POMPEY

In the midst of his fulminations against Cleopatra, Propertius denounces her land of Egypt in the following 'wholly admirable parenthesis:'[1]

> Noxia Alexandria, dolis aptissima tellus
> Et totiens nostro Memphi cruenta malo,
> Tres ubi Pompeio detraxit harena triumphos! 35
> Tollet nulla dies hanc tibi, Roma, notam.
> Issent Phlegraeo melius tibi funera campo
> Vel tua si socero colla daturus eras.

This is the unanimous reading of the major manuscripts (except that A, lost for this portion of the text, seems to have had 'Res tibi' at the start of 35)[2] and of all editions, but commentators find difficulties with 'harena' in 35, with 'notam' in 36, and with the repeated 'tibi' of 36 and 37.

'Harena' is questionable in the first instance because Pompey died not on the shore but in a skiff at sea ('in nauicula antequam in terram exiret' according to Liv. *Per.* 122, for example; see Lucan 8.667–73 for a vivid description of the decapitation 'in obliquo ... transtro'), and commentators have dealt variously with the factual error. Beroaldus and Passerat,[3] followed by Butler, simply rewrote history and asserted that Pompey was killed on the shore, an error shared by the doubly inaccurate Manilius, who at 4.50 has him dying 'Niliaco ... litore' (though perhaps 'Niliacus' simply means 'Egyptian' here); for the triply inaccurate Paley, the 'harena' is 'the African shore, where Pompey was killed by his freedman Pothinus at his own request'. Others, content with a looser association between Pompey and the shore, identify the 'harena' as either 'the beach where Pompey was about to land when he was murdered' (Camps) or else the site of his burial (Beroaldus, Butler and Barber); in the former case one could object that there seems little point in denouncing a place near the site of Pompey's death instead of the site itself, in the latter that it was his death, not his burial, that 'stripped' him of his glory. Hertzberg declared 'harena' an outstanding example of Propertian metonymy in which the place where an event

[1] The following are cited by author's name only: the commentaries of Beroaldus (from the edition of Zuan Tacuino (Venice, 1500)), Butler (London, 1904), Butler and Barber (Oxford, 1933), Camps (Book 3; Cambridge, 1966), Fedeli (Book 3; Bari, 1985), Hertzberg (Halle, 1843–5), Paley (London, 1872), Richardson (Norman, 1977), and Rothstein (Berlin, 1898), as well as D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956). The quotation is from Butler and Barber, p. 289.

[2] Among its descendants L alone preserves this; P has the further corruption 'Re tibi', while F's 'Haec tibi' seems to be a 'correction' by Petrarch.

[3] My knowledge of Passerat's view derives from the variorum edition of Simon Gabbema (Utrecht, 1659).