

PROPERTIUS 3.7.1–12*

Ergo sollicitae tu causa, pecunia, vitae!
 per te immaturum mortis adimus iter;
 tu vitiis hominum crudelia pabula praebes,
 semina curarum de capite orta tuo.
 tu Paetum ad Pharios tendentem lineata portus 5
 obruis insano terque quaterque mari.
 nam dum te sequitur, primo miser excidit aevo
 et nova longinquis piscibus esca natat.
 et mater non iusta pia dare debita terrae
 nec pote cognatos inter humare rogos, 10
 sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa marinae,
 nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est.¹

Between the first eight lines of Propertius 3.7, addressed to ‘pecunia’, and the lover’s farewell couplet to Aquilo, the narration of Paetus’ shipwreck and death has first bewildered and then inspired generations of readers either to defend the basic order of verses given in the manuscripts or to create a more satisfactory arrangement through transposition. To some, the inherited poem presents a catastrophe equal to Paetus’ own dismemberment: Aquilo blew the pages around, a scribe playing Neptune took pleasure in his own power to change, while the uncontrollable seas of error scattered couplets far and wide and altered the shape of words and letters.² To others, the textual problems of 3.7 can be explained with appeals to parallels or to Propertius’ stylistic intentions.³ The lack of a common text has not interfered with the

* I wish to thank Elaine Fantham and Stephen Heyworth for their many helpful suggestions and encouragement.

¹ Texts and commentaries: M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* (Berlin, 1920); H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford, 1933); E. A. Barber, *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford, 1960); W. A. Camps, *Propertius, Elegies Book III* (Cambridge, 1966); L. Richardson, *Propertius Elegies I–IV* (Norman, Okla., 1977); P. Fedeli, *Sexti Properti Elegiarum Libri IV* (Stuttgart, 1984) and *Properzio, Il Libro terzo delle Elegie* (Bari, 1985); G. P. Goold, *Propertius, Elegies* (Cambridge, MA, 1990). References to these works will be by author’s name. This and all further citations of Propertius, unless otherwise noted, are from Fedeli 1984. All references in the text to the arrangements of 3.7 by Scaliger, Baehrens, Housman, Postgate, Richmond, and Tremenhoe can be found in W. R. Smyth, *Thesaurus Criticus ad Sexti Propertii Textum* (Leiden, 1970), p. 96. In addition, the following works will be cited by author’s name: M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (London, 1974); E. Schulz-Vanheyden, *Properz und das griechische Epigramm* (diss. Münster, 1969); T. Walsh, ‘Propertius’ Paetus elegy (3.7)’, *LCM* 12 (1987), 66–9.

² G. P. Goold, ‘On Editing Propertius’, in *Papers in Honour of Otto Skutsch, BICS* suppl. 51 (1987), 27–38, at 37: ‘Just as certain authentic words of the poet have been replaced by other words, so too the authentic position of certain verses has been falsified by deliberate removal of those verses elsewhere’, and Goold, p. 22. ‘The chaos of 3.7 exceeds that of all other poems in Propertius. But the underlying reason is both simple and clear: from some pre-archetypal manuscript a leaf became detached and was replaced back to front’. See also Goold, ‘Problems in Editing Propertius’, in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York, 1989), 97–119, at p. 108.

³ See Butler-Barber, p. 276 on Vahlen’s 1883 article; Richardson, pp. 341–2 and Fedeli 1985, p. 240 both use Propertian precedent to defend the unprepared shift in addressee at 11–12. Fedeli appeals to the rapid succession of apostrophes throughout the poem, while F. Robertson, ‘Lament for Paetus—Propertius 3.7’, *TAPA* 100 (1969), 377–86, at 379 reasons, ‘The bewildering succession of apostrophes to different persons...are less troublesome when we consider the poem as a rhetorical theme where Paetus is less in the forefront of the poet’s mind than the general reader who is being given a homily on ethics’.

usual tasks of classical scholars, such as textual criticism, the identification of themes and motifs shared by other genres and poets, and the labelling of rhetorical commonplaces. But the confusion usually felt upon reading 3.7 also inspires in editors and commentators some combination of justification and manipulation of the text. The result of these efforts is a proliferation of different texts and consequently, a reluctance to undertake literary studies of a text whose basic form is so disputed.⁴

This note is an attempt to combine the techniques of textual criticism with a literary historical approach by addressing the first problem one encounters when reading Propertius 3.7, the appearance of 'tua' and 'tibi' in lines 11 and 12 clearly addressed to Paetus without an intervening vocative after the initial eight-line apostrophe to 'pecunia'. I will argue first that 9-12 should not be separated from the context of 1-8; second, that if there is a disjuncture in the text after line 8, a simple lacuna of one couplet is a better solution to the problem than transposition; and third, that comparison with similar texts may suggest the missing content.

I

Scholars have long recognized that Propertius 3.7 incorporates many aspects of the sepulchral epigrams for victims of shipwreck and drowning preserved in the seventh book of the *Greek Anthology*.⁵ Of 3.7's beginning, Hubbard even suggests, 'These opening twelve lines could themselves be an epigram, though one of more complication and intensity than most'.⁶ Indeed, Propertius does not merely repeat epigrammatic commonplaces, but rather he expands the epigrammatic form into a quasi-narrative development revolving around a single character.⁷ The 'complication and intensity' Hubbard recognizes stems precisely from the elegy's transformation of sepulchral epigrams' brief and frozen moments into a progressive series of pictures.

Beginning with the reproach of 'pecunia', we learn first that Paetus has met his doom in a violent storm on the way to Pharos and that his body floats as food for fish (1-8). Next, Propertius turns to address the victim, telling him that his mother is unable to bury him at home; instead, sea birds now stand over his bones, and the whole sea serves as his tomb (9-12). The third variation on epigrammatic tropes begins with a rebuke of Aquilo and Neptune (13-16). Here, Propertius enhances the typical reproaches against wind and sea by addressing them in their mythological characters. When the misplaced collection of verses 17-24 is removed,⁸ the reproach continues in 'reddite corpus humo' (25) with the requests that Paetus' body be returned to land,⁹ that the sand should cover him of its own will (26), and that

⁴ Brief literary treatments can be found in J. V. Esteve-Forriol, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur* (diss. München, 1962), pp. 119-20; Schulz-Vanheyden, pp. 58-69; F. Robertson, op. cit. (n. 3); Hubbard, pp. 83-7; J. Warden, *Fallax Opus: Poet and Reader in the Elegies of Propertius* (Toronto, 1980), pp. 63-4, 97-9; G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven, 1980), pp. 112-13.

⁵ E.g. Rothstein, pp. 50-1; Schulz-Vanheyden, pp. 58-69. ⁶ Hubbard, p. 84.

⁷ Cf. the treatment of Propertius 1.1 as an expansion of Meleager *A.P.* 12.101 in W. A. Camps, *Propertius, Elegies Book I* (Cambridge, 1961), p. 42; Hubbard, pp. 14-20. On the affinities between epigram and Propertian elegy in general, see J.-P. Boucher, *Études sur Properce. Problèmes d'inspiration et d'art* (Paris, 1965), pp. 410-17.

⁸ This interpretation follows the transpositions of 17-24 to other locations in the poem. Lines 21-4 are transposed in the editions cited by Butler-Barber, p. 275, and the texts of Fedeli, Richardson, and Goold. Some, including Butler-Barber, guess that one or both of these couplets may be interpolated. Lines 17-20 are also transposed by the editions cited in Butler-Barber, by Richardson, Goold, and Walsh, p. 69.

⁹ There is no reason why Aquilo and Neptune together cannot be the plural subjects of 'reddite', even if they did cause the shipwreck. Walsh's suggestion, pp. 68-9, that 'humus'

whenever a sailor passes Paetus' 'sepulcrum', he should say 'Et audaci tu timor esse potes' (27–8). The motif of the passing sailor suggests that Propertius has collapsed the epigrammatic scenario in which a sailor finds a stranger's body and buries it out of piety with the (also epigrammatic) reflection that the dead man's tomb on the beach is a warning to other sailors.¹⁰

Lines 25–8 thus imagine an alternative fate for Paetus' body to the one given in 1–12, an alternative which represents an advancement over the body which was prey for fish and a perch for birds, whose tomb can only be called the whole Carpathian sea. Instead, the poet hopes that Paetus' body will come ashore, be found, and receive a 'sepulcrum'. Paetus will then be immortalized as a warning to all those bold enough, like him, to risk their lives at sea. In the first part of 3.7 (1–28 minus 17–24), therefore, Propertius does not randomly collect epigrammatic commonplaces, but rather he transforms a series of epigrammatic tropes into a progressive sequence focusing on the fate of one shipwrecked youth.¹¹

Propertius' first 'epigram' about Paetus is the eight line apostrophe to 'pecunia'. The tone of blame in 1–4 takes its cue from many epigrams, but usually wind or waves are the objects of rebukes, as in 3.7.13–16.¹² In one poem by Leonidas of Tarentum, the speaker berates the roaring sea for madly pouring out a violent wave over Teleutagoras and his ship:

Ἡχέεσσα θάλασσα, τί τὸν Τιμάρεος οὕτως
πλώοντ' οὐ πολλῇ νηὶ Τελευταγόρην
ἄγρια χειμήνασα καταπρηνώσας πόντῳ
σὺν φόρτῳ, λάβρον κύμ' ἐπιχευαμένη;¹³

(A.P. 7.652.1–4)

These lines correspond roughly to Propertius' 5 and 6. Like Teleutagoras, Paetus is the object of violence, named before the main verb with a participle to express his sailing ('tendentem lineae', 5; πλώοντ', 2). In both Propertius and Leonidas, the violence of the sea is represented as madness and compound verbs convey the force of the victim's defeat ('obruis insano terque quaterque mari', 6; 652.3–4). While 3.7.5–6 condense the first four lines of A.P. 7.652, Propertius' next couplet (7–8) borrows from the last four lines of another epigram by Leonidas.¹⁴ This time, the victim of the storm speaks:

ἀπώλισθον δὲ βίοιο
Κάλλαισχος Λιβυκοῦ μέσσα θέων πελάγευς.
κἀγὼ μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος ἰχθύσι κύρμα
οἴχημαι, ψεύστης δ' οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος.

(A.P. 7.273.3–6)

means 'the sand at the bottom of the sea' and thus out of Aquilo's jurisdiction, is outlandish. Goold 1987, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 37, supports the conjecture 'aquae' (vocative) for 'humo', but like others feels compelled to join these lines to the address to Thetis and the Nereids (67–70).

¹⁰ For examples, see Schulz-Vanheyden, pp. 61–2 and Fedeli 1985, pp. 237 and 247. I disagree with Schulz-Vanheyden that this 'sepulcrum' could be a cenotaph. If a passerby had not found something to bury, Paetus would have no tomb at all, except possibly a cenotaph at home.

¹¹ Moreover, the next passage, beginning 'ite, rates curvas et leti texite causas: / ista per humanas mors venit acta manus' (29–30) should be read as a response to the blame of external forces and pity for Paetus' miserable fate in 1–28 (cf. 'causa', 1; 'per te', 2).

¹² For other examples, see Schulz-Vanheyden, pp. 60–1. The literary background of the content of 1–4 is not epigrammatic.

¹³ The text of this epigram and of all others cited are from A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965) [= HE] or *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge, 1968) [= GP].

¹⁴ Gow-Page, HE, Vol. II, p. 369; Schulz-Vanheyden, p. 59; Fedeli 1985, pp. 235–6.

Verbal reminiscences are evident in Propertius' 'excidit aevo' (ἀπόλισθον δὲ βίοιο, 3) and the appositional phrase 'piscibus esca' (ἰχθύσι κύρμα, 5), while 'nata' contains the idea of πόντῳ δινεύμενος (5). Propertius' juxtaposed adjectives 'nova longinquis' reinforce the sense of the inappropriateness of Paetus' fate. The chiasmic arrangement of 'nova...esca' around 'longinquis piscibus' is almost gory in its suggestion of dismemberment, for instead of the fish gathering around Paetus' floating corpse, he surrounds them. This pointed image provides the closing touch to the first eight lines.¹⁵

In Section II, I will show that the address to 'pecunia' should not extend beyond the first eight lines and that while lines 9–12 continue to portray Paetus' corpse, all four lines are addressed to Paetus. I will also argue later that the vocative reference to Paetus, which would signal the beginning of Propertius' second epigrammatic variation, has been lost. In Leonidas *A.P.* 7.273, cited above, the tomb is a liar (6) because it does not contain the body which it is supposed to mark.¹⁶ So too the loss of the body in a shipwreck leads to the common observation in epigrams that the parents must erect a cenotaph. This motif occurs in the second half of Leonidas *A.P.* 7.652 (5–8):

χῶ μὲν που καύξιν ἢ ἰχθυβόροις λαρίδεσσι
τεθρήνητ' ἄπνους εὐρεῖ ἐν αἰγιαλῷ,
Τιμάρης δὲ κενὸν τέκνον κεκλαυμένον ἀθρῶν
τύμβον δακρύνει παῖδα Τελευταγόρην.

Here, the lifeless Teleutagoras is bewailed by sea-birds somewhere on the broad beach (5–6), while his father weeps over an empty tomb (7–8). In 3.7.9–12, Propertius also introduces a deprived parent, Paetus' mother, but he reverses the two images, mentioning first the mother (9–10) and then the birds (11). Propertius' emphasis thus falls on Paetus' lack of burial and on his exposed corpse rather than on the parent's loss. The funereal connotation of Propertius' 'volucres astant' reflects Leonidas' image of Teleutagoras being lamented by birds (τεθρήνητ', 6).¹⁷ Instead of Paetus' mother inhuming his bones, birds stand over, or even on, them. This contrast between mother and birds may imply that Paetus' bones lie on the shore, just as in Leonidas' epigram Teleutagoras' body lies on a broad beach lamented by gulls while his father mourns at a cenotaph.¹⁸ Unlike Leonidas, Propertius does not give Paetus the comfort of a cenotaph at home or mention the mother's weeping. Lines 9–12 instead convey Paetus' deprivation of any memorial at all.¹⁹

Lines 11–12 also recall an epigram by Glaukos of Nikopolis.²⁰ The whole sea is the

¹⁵ Cf. the last line of Catullus 67: 'falsum mendaci ventre puerperium' (48).

¹⁶ The paradox is enhanced by the fact that the speaker of the poem, the sea-tossed victim, is also not present, though he is able to point out 'this stone'.

¹⁷ The same motif occurs in Leonidas *A.P.* 7.654.5–6. Fedeli 1985, p. 239, explains that 'adstare' can signify 'la presenza di congiunti accanto alla tomba o al rogo funebre'.

¹⁸ Commentators dispute the exact meaning of line 11. Do the birds hover or stand? Are Paetus' bones still floating or have they drifted to shore? My position is that the birds are not flying, but standing (as Fedeli 1985, p. 239). Virgil's depiction of Iris coming down to Dido ('devolat et supra caput adstitit', *Aen.* 4.702) means that Iris flies down and comes to a stop standing over Dido's head as she lies dying. Fedeli supposes that the birds are standing on floating bones, citing the Ovidian echo ('ossa superstabunt volucres inhumata marinae?' *Her.* 10.123), but as Gow-Page, *HE*, Vol. II, p. 287 recognize, Ovid, at least, portrays the bones lying unburied on the beach, for Ariadne was left behind on shore.

¹⁹ In addition to building a series of pictures concentrating on a single character, Propertius' elegy differs from epigrams in that it never pretends to be words inscribed on stone. From the first line the elegy presents itself as an emotional outburst at the death of Paetus.

²⁰ Rothstein, p. 51; Butler-Barber, p. 287; Gow-Page, *HE*, Vol. II, p. 287; Schulz-Vanheyden, pp. 69–70; Fedeli 1985, p. 240.

tomb of this victim of nautical catastrophe, and only the seagulls know the location of his bones (*A.P.* 7.285):

Οὐ κόνις οὐδ' ὀλίγον πέτρης βάρος ἀλλ' Ἑρασίππου
 ἦν ἐσορᾶς αὕτη πᾶσα θάλασσα τάφος,
 ὤλετο γὰρ σὺν νηϊ, τὰ δ' ὁστέα ποῦ ποτ' ἐκείνου
 πύθεται αἰθυαῖς γνωστὰ μόναις ἐνέπειν.

The epigram makes its initial point with the construction, 'neither this nor that, but thus' (1–2), just as 3.7.9–12 uses 'non...nec...sed'. Propertius' 'pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est' (12), modifies Glaukos' lines 1–2, and Propertius' line 11, like the epigram's second couplet, joins sea-birds and bones. Again, Propertius reverses the two ideas, mentioning bones and birds first and then Glaukos' conceit πᾶσα θάλασσα τάφος (2). As in other epigrams of this type, the point is that Erasippos himself is not present in the tomb on which the epigram purports to be inscribed. The specific irony lies in the contrast between the slight weight of stone which is not really Erasippos' tomb and the expanse of the whole sea which is. Since Propertius' poem makes no pretence of marking a cenotaph, he adds *pro*; Paetus has the whole Carpathian sea instead of a tomb. The epigram also plays on the problem of knowing the real location of a body lost in a shipwreck: only the gulls know where his bones are rotting (3–4). It is not clear whether the bones are drifting or beached, but Glaukos' echo of Telemachos' words in *Odyssey* 1.161–2 suggests that the bones should be pictured on land.²¹ Since only the gulls know where, one might as well say that the whole sea is his tomb. Propertius' 'nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est' is similar.²² The exact location of Paetus' remains would never be known.

Just as the epigrams which purport to mark cenotaphs play with the paradox of a stone identifying an absent body, so other epigrams play on the body divided between land and sea. When only a part of the body is recovered to be buried, fish and other hungry sea creatures may be associated with the partial loss. A good example is an epigram ascribed to Antipater of Thessalonica (*A.P.* 7.288):²³

Οὐδετέρης ὅλος εἰμὶ θανὼν νέκυσ ἀλλὰ θάλασσα
 καὶ χθὼν τὴν ἀπ' ἐμεῦ μοῖραν ἔχουσιν ἴσην,
 σάρκα γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ φάγον ἰχθύες ὁστέα δ' αὖτε
 βέβρασαι ψυχρῇ τῇδε παρ' ἡϊόνι.

²¹ Cf. the analogous use of *που* in line 3 and in *A.P.* 7.652.5, cited above. This interpretation is the reverse of Gow-Page, *HE*, Vol. II, p. 287: 'G. plainly remembers *Od.* 1.161 ἀνέρος οὐδ' ἡ που λεύκ' ὁστέα πύθεται ὄμβρῳ | κείμεν' ἐπ' ἡπείρου, ἣ εἰν ἀλὶ κύμα κολύνδει, and he and Propertius chose the second alternative'. Glaukos' words (ὁστέα ποῦ... πύθεται) actually echo Telemachos' first alternative; the bones rot somewhere on land or a wave whirls them in the sea. Glaukos adds birds, who alone can tell where Erasippos' bones are rotting. Even if a human were to find the bones on land, they could not be identified, and still only the gulls would know the true location of Erasippos' remains. Propertius leaves out the rotting, but adds further that the birds are standing on the bones. While bones can be tossed in the sea, they do not float, as Fedeli and Gow-Page suggest.

²² Rothstein, p. 51, appropriately pictures the bones tossed by the sea onto a rock in 11, but explains 12, 'Schon im nächsten Verse lässt P. mit der ihm eigenen Freiheit in der Behandlung des Tatsächlichen dieses Bild durch ein anderes verdrängt werden; der Leichnam liegt nicht mehr auf einem Felsen im Meere, sondern auf dem Meeresgrunde, von dem Wasser bedeckt wie von einem Grabhügel'. This is an over-literal interpretation of the line; *pro* probably means simply 'instead of'.

²³ See also *A.P.* 7.276, 294, 506. On the difficulties of assigning authorship of epigrams to Antipater of Thessalonica (dated to the Augustan period) or to the earlier Antipater of Sidon, see Gow-Page, *HE*, Vol. II, pp. 31–3 and *GP*, Vol. II, pp. 20–21. This epigram is headed Ἀντιπάτρου, but its location in a 'small Philippan group' suggests its attribution to Antipater of Thessalonica (*GP*, Vol. II, p. 68).

The victim states that sea and land hold an equal share of him: in the sea fish ate his flesh, but his bones were washed onto the cold beach. This epigram points to a two-step process in the decay of a drowned body: the flesh is consumed by fish and the bones eventually wash ashore. Although someone has found the bones and buried them, their owner remains nameless and part of him remains in the sea. Here, bones are certainly associated with the part of the body which eventually returns to land. Propertius' mention of fish feeding on Paetus' flesh in line 8, followed by his combination of 'ossa' and 'volucres' in line 11, suggests that the poem has moved from the immediate aftermath of the shipwreck in 1-8 ('obruis', 6; 'natat', 8) to a picture of Paetus' bones, their flesh stripped by fish, washed to the shore and providing perches for birds in 9-12. Part of Paetus will always remain in the sea with the fish, and until his exposed bones are covered by sand or given a 'sepulcrum' by a passing stranger (25-8), Paetus will still have the 'whole sea' instead of a tomb. To conclude the passage emphatically, Propertius employs the repeated 'nunc' with chiasmus in 'tua nunc... / nunc tibi' (11-12) and the strong alliteration of 'm' in line 12.

Propertius thus weaves together in 3.7.5-12 a series of related tropes for which parallels can be found in the *Greek Anthology*: in *A.P.* 7.652.1-4, the shipwreck in a violent storm; in *A.P.* 7.273, the body floating in the sea providing bait for fish; in *A.P.* 7.652.5-8, the mourning parent replaced by sea-birds; in *A.P.* 7.285, the association of sea-birds and bones and the notion that the whole sea is the tomb of a shipwrecked sailor; and in *A.P.* 7.288, the division between sea and land of flesh consumed by fish and marooned bones. To transpose lines 9-12 would unnecessarily disturb Propertius' linking of these epigrammatic themes.

II

Because the first section of this paper uses epigrammatic evidence to demonstrate the continuity of 3.7.1-12, the second section's argument for a lacuna between lines 8 and 9 must by nature seem contradictory. However, the arguments I present in this section will not undermine the evidence presented in the first. Instead, I will attempt to prove the unity of 1-8 as addressed to 'pecunia' and of 9-12 as addressed to Paetus. If this is accepted, then a gap in the text is necessary to indicate the change of addressee. Next, I will show that the poem is not improved by transposing lines 9-12, and finally, in the third section, I will use comparative data to surmise the content of the missing lines.

The first eight lines of elegy 3.7 comprise a complete and coherent unit addressed to 'pecunia'. Second person singular pronouns 'tu' and 'te' appear five times in the eight lines (1, 2, 3, 5, and 7), and the possessive adjective 'tuus' occurs in line 4. As commentators often note, the invocation exploits hymnic form.²⁴ The first four lines enumerate in asyndeton the general powers of 'Pecunia'. The cause of a troubled life, she carries us on the road to early death, offers cruel fodder to human weaknesses, and the seeds of cares sprout from her head. The next two couplets continue the mock-hymnic invective in the present tense but introduce a specific individual as her victim: 'you crush Paetus, stretching his sails towards the port of Alexandria, three and four times over with the raging sea'. If we have not already gathered from the allusion to Rome's main source of grain and link to the precious goods of the East, the next couplet explains the accusation: 'for while following you the unfortunate lost his

²⁴ Richardson, p. 341; Fedeli 1985, pp. 232-3.

young life and floats, an exotic morsel for faraway fish'. This vivid picture of Paetus' dead body floating in the water as food for fish complements the food imagery of 'pabula praebes' in line 3. The word 'pabulum' has strong connotations of fodder for animals, especially in the Lucretian phrases 'pabula praebens' and 'pabula laeta'.²⁵ When Paetus himself becomes 'esca' he takes yet another step down on the food chain and even reverses the natural order of who should eat whom.²⁶ Stressing the inappropriateness of fish feeding on human flesh, 'nova' accentuates this inversion.

The thought beginning with 'et mater' in the next couplet (9–10), that Paetus' mother will not be able to perform due rites or bury him in the family plot, appears to amplify the discussion of the fate of Paetus' body begun in line 8. It also appears to continue the address to 'pecunia'. But because 'tua' and 'tibi' in the next couplet (11–12) must be aimed at the dead Paetus, the apostrophe to 'pecunia' must be over by the end of line 10. At the same time, however, the syntactical construction from 8 to 12 continues without a full stop with conjunctions 'et' (8), 'et...non' (9), 'nec' (10), 'sed' (11). This fact is obscured by editors and commentators who employ punctuation to cover the unexpected shift in addressee from 'pecunia' to Paetus. Rothstein, Barber, Camps, Richardson, and Fedeli all confirm the intimate connection between 9–10 and 11–12 by placing a comma after 'rogos' at the end of line 10, but after 'nata' in line 8 Fedeli places a period; Barber, Camps, and Richardson use a semi-colon; and Rothstein uses a colon. The choice of stronger punctuation after line 8 conveys the sense that the apostrophe to 'pecunia' does conclude at line 8.

What, then, is the connection of 'et mater...' (9) to what precedes? One argument is that 9–10 is simply a transitional couplet between 1–8 and 11–12 which prepares us for the direct address to Paetus by mentioning his mother. But this would mean that 9–10 is addressed to no one in particular, neither 'pecunia' nor Paetus. Such an explanation is possible, but it is an impression created mostly by modern punctuation, which requires the reader not only to make the jump to the unexpected address to Paetus in line 11, but also to intuit that the apostrophe to 'pecunia' has already ended at line 8. With a comma instead of a period or semi-colon after 'nata' (8), 9–10 could easily be read as a continuation of the apostrophe in 1–8. In fact, Baehrens, Housman, Richmond, Butler and Barber, and Morsley do treat 1–10 as the complete invocation to 'pecunia', but then they move the problematic 11–12 to elsewhere in the poem.²⁷ This strategy, however, disturbs the syntactical parallelism and antithetical content of the two couplets 9–10 and 11–12. The contrasting stress on land in the former ('terrae' and 'humare') and on sea in the latter ('marinae' and 'mare'), in addition to the 'non...nec...sed' construction, sets the couplets in deliberate opposition. The mother who cannot be present in 9–10 is replaced by the sinister 'volucres' in 11–12.²⁸ Again, such close parallelism invites us to conclude that *both* couplets, not just 11–12, address the dead Paetus. Scaliger, Postgate, Tremenheere, and most recently Walsh and Goold preserve 9–12 intact but locate them at some point after the vocative address to Paetus in 17–18. Since all must agree

²⁵ In the *D.R.N.*, 'pabula praebens' occurs at 1.229, 'pabula cum praebet' at 2.996, 'pabula...praebent' at 5.991, and 'pabula laeta' at 1.14 and 2.317, 364, 596, 875, 1159.

²⁶ Propertius uses both 'esca' and 'pabula' in one other place, again together and with sinister tones, as the food brought by trembling girls into the dark lair of Juno Sospita's sacred serpent at Lanuvium (4.8.7 and 11).

²⁷ K. Morsley, 'Propertius 3.7', *CQ* 25 (1975), 315–18, at 316: 'This address [to 'pecunia'] clearly continues for the first 8 lines and there is no ground for supposing that the next couplet is not included as well'.

²⁸ See also the epigrammatic evidence adduced in Section I.

that 11–12 inform Paetus that sea birds perch on his bones and the whole sea is his tomb, should not the previous contrasting couplet also inform Paetus that his mother will not be able to put his remains to rest in the family plot?²⁹

Scholars who oppose a lacuna in the text between lines 8 and 9 rely chiefly on Propertian parallels to show that a vocative is not necessary. In this case the use of precedent is especially tricky because the parallel passages are themselves considered dubious by some editors. It should also be added that even if an example of an unprepared change of addressee can be found in our manuscripts, this fact still does not necessitate that the text of 3.7.1–12 is also correct. The most interesting parallel for 3.7.11–12 is 2.9.15–16 because it also addresses a man who has died far from home. The relevant passage reads:

nec non exanimem amplexens Briseis Achillem
candida vesana verberat ora manu,
et dominum lavit maerens captiva cruentum,
propositum flavis in Simoente vadis,
foedavitque comas, et tanti corpus Achilli
maximaeque in parva sustulit ossa manu;
cum *tibi* nec Peleus aderat nec caerula mater,
Scyria nec viduo Deidamia toro. (2.9.9–16)

This passage differs from 3.7 in several respects.³⁰ First, before the ‘*tibi*’ directed at Achilles (15), there is no other vocative or second person pronoun to cause any confusion as there is with the 8-line apostrophe to ‘*pecunia*’ in 3.7. Second, Achilles is a well-known hero named just two lines and again six lines before the ‘*tibi*’, while the unknown Paetus’ name occurs once, for the first time, six lines before ‘*tua*’ in line 11. Third, the sudden apostrophe to Achilles is rhetorically effective because it immediately alerts the reader to Achilles’ own perspective; he would have wished his family to be present at his funeral, and the absence of his mother is especially poignant given his close relationship with her in the *Iliad*. Finally, this passage supports the conclusion that 3.7.9–10, which stresses Paetus’ separation from his mother, is also part of an address to Paetus. Is the reader supposed to think more of Paetus’ mother feeling deprived of her son’s body or Paetus’ own sacrifice of both life and burial for the sake of money? The latter is the main theme of the poem, and it is the dying Paetus who later wishes that his body could drift back to Italy and his mother: ‘*at saltem Italiae regionibus evehat aestus: / hoc de me sat erit si modo matris erit*’ (63–4).³¹

In the note on 2.9.15, Butler and Barber list several other parallels, including 3.7.11–12. The case in 2.12.17 (‘*quid tibi iucundum est siccis habitare medullis?*’) is like 2.9.15 in that there is no preceding vocative or second person pronoun alluding to any other person. The poem begins with the general ‘*nonne putas...*’ (2) and, after sixteen lines describing Cupid, turns to address him for the rest of the poem. The

²⁹ For example, Warden, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 98, who does not concern himself with the text of 3.7, assumes, ‘In line 9 the address switches to the drowned Paetus’. Walsh, p. 67, reverses the order of the two couplets to ensure that the ‘*tua*’ and ‘*tibi*’ of 11–12 apply also to Paetus’ mother and explains, ‘it is pointless for Propertius to tell Money that Paetus’ mother is unable to give him proper burial’.

³⁰ 2.9.15 also has not escaped emendation. Goold accepts Housman’s ‘*cui tum*’ for ‘*cum tibi*’ (15), while Butler-Barber, p. 206, suggest a vocative, ‘*tantum corpus, Achille*’, at 13. Others, such as Fedeli, Camps, and Richardson, do not deny Propertius his rhetorical freedoms, especially when there is no chance of confusion.

³¹ Cf. Tibullus 1.3.5–6 (‘*non hic mihi mater / quae legat in maestos ossa perusta sinus*’), where the poet dying far from home fears that his mother will not gather up his bones.

proper addressee is obvious, and the unprepared shift causes no confusion: instead, the imperatives and rhetorical questions raise the speaker's emotional tone as he pleads with Cupid not to destroy him.³² The next example, 2.34.67, has 'tu' without a vocative where the addressee, Virgil, has been named six lines above and continuously discussed since that point. And still unlike the case in 3.7, no other second person singular pronoun intervenes, only the exclamation, clearly an aside, 'cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai! / nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade' (65–6). Other examples cited by Butler and Barber they acknowledge as probably corrupt.³³ The parallels given from other authors (Virgil, *Aen.* 7.759–60 and Lucan, *B.C.* 1.114–15) again use second person pronouns without vocatives, but then there are no other similar vocatives in the vicinity to complicate the passages. Fedeli adds only 2.13.18 to Butler and Barber's list.³⁴ But this example too is not an exact parallel for the situation in 3.7. If lines 1–16 and 17–58 of 2.13 do make one poem without a lacuna, the imperative 'accipe' (18) is clearly directed to Cynthia (7), the 'docta puella' (11) and 'domina' (14). There is no intervening second person singular pronoun or vocative to raise any doubts.³⁵

Only one precedent cited by Butler and Barber and Fedeli, 3.11.37–8, appears to be a true parallel for the situation in 3.7.11–12. In 3.11.35–6, Propertius mentions the death of Pompey with a vocative to 'Roma', following rapidly on the heels of vocatives to Alexandria and Memphis. The next couplet uses 'tibi' and 'tua' to invoke Pompey without an intervening vocative:

noxia Alexandria, dolis aptissima tellus,
et totiens nostro Memphi cruenta malo,
tres ubi Pompeio detraxit harena triumphos!
tollet nulla dies hanc tibi, Roma, notam.
issent Phlegraeo melius *tibi* funera campo,
vel *tua* si socero colla daturus eras. (3.11.33–8)

Nevertheless, this couplet also differs slightly from 3.7.11–12 because it expresses a counterfactual wish which is syntactically independent from the previous couplet. Pompey is named only two lines before. Moreover, even here the text is considered dubious by some. This example is the only potential parallel in the Propertian manuscripts for the transition from one singular addressee to another without an intervening vocative such as we find in 3.7.1–12.

The unsignalled change from addressing 'pecunia' and referring to Paetus in the third person to addressing him in the second person in 11–12 is the starting point of most rearrangements of the poem, which transfer a new group of verses to the position after either line 8 or 10. This initial displacement then requires further transpositions which drastically alter the shape of the poem. Two other problems

³² Moreover, 2.12.18 ('si puer est, alio traice puella tuo') is certainly corrupt, and Goold's 'si pudor est, alio traice tela, puer!' explains the paradox better than Fedeli's (1984) 'si pudor est, alio traice tela tua'.

³³ These are 2.9.52, 3.4.4, and 3.13.42. 2.12.17 (see n. 32) and 4.11.42 should be moved to this list: Camps obelizes 4.11.39–40 and Goold uses Heyne's 'qui tumidas' for 'quique tuas' in 40. In 42, Goolds prints the variant 'nostros' for 'vestros' which lacks a second person plural antecedent, whether verb or vocative. If correct, 'vestros' would have to refer back to 'maiorum cineres' in 37. Though confusing, the issue is still not an unprepared shift in addressee of the same person and number.

³⁴ Fedeli 1985, p. 240.
³⁵ S. J. Heyworth, 'Propertius 2.13', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), 45–59 argues for the unity of the poem with a lacuna before line 17 and notes on 46–7 that 'the sudden change from third to second person without a vocative or a personal pronoun is one of those phenomena found most frequently in those authors whose manuscripts are late and corrupt'.

contribute to the logic of these transpositions. First, some critics consider the apparent references to Paetus' speech in lines 17-18 awkward before the speech itself has been reported (55-66). Second, the passage beginning *quod si contentus...* (43-6) implies 'Ulixes' (41) as its subject, but the passage makes better sense with Paetus as the subject.³⁶ If 43-6 do refer to Paetus in the third person, why not put these lines after line 8? Then, if Paetus' speech in 55-66 should also come before 17-18, why not put the whole section 43-66 after line 8 or 10? This is the basic solution of Baehrens, Postgate, Housman, and printed most recently by Goold. Scaliger and Tremenhoe put 55-66 after 8, while Richmond put 51-66 after 10. These two problems are indeed serious, but one cannot always hope to repair two textual holes at once. I believe that the disjunction between 8 and 9 is independent of these other difficulties, and instead of starting a series of transpositions by transferring lines from elsewhere in the poem to fill the gap, we should at least consider the possibility that a couplet was lost after line 8 which would have included an apostrophe to Paetus.

One reason I prefer a lacuna to transposition at this point is that lines 9-12 cannot be convincingly relocated. Because the text of 3.7 is riddled with controversy, those who transpose must explain not only why the original site is faulty but also provide a valid explanation for the new context and explain why the lines are better in the new site. At the same time, those who follow the manuscript reading must not only explain what the lines mean where they are, but also why the present location is better than the transposition. If 9-12 are to be kept together, they should follow a direct address to Paetus, but the only one available is 17-18 (or 17-20). This is just the place where several editors, including Goold, do place 9-12, but 9 after 18 produces the unusual and rhetorically pointless repetition of a noun, 'mater', at the beginning of consecutive lines, and 9-12 after 20 creates a disconcerting leap in time from the breaking of the cables during the shipwreck to the future of Paetus' drowned body.

Because Goold's Loeb edition is the most recent text of this poem, I will confine the rest of my discussion to his proposed placement of 3.7.9-12. In Goold's version, 17-18 plus 9-12 follow Paetus' own dying words (55-66). However, even the assumption that 17-18 must follow this speech is far from certain. The questions 'quid aetatem numeras? quid cara natanti / mater in ore tibi est?' (17-18) refer to Paetus' drowning and speaking in the present tense *as if they are still happening*. This seems strained after the finality of 'ultima quae Paeto voxque diesque fuit' (66).³⁷ Instead, as Richardson has recognized, 17-18 may belong to Paetus' own speech as he sinks into despair and the water.³⁸ In this context, for Paetus himself to add lines which include 'sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa marinae' (11) is clearly inappropriate, and even if the poet does ask the questions in 17-18 as Goold wishes, it would still be strange to tell a drowning man that there are sea-birds now standing

³⁶ The problem here is not so much the idea that the poet could not have spoken to Ulysses ('verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea', 44), but rather the implication in the tense of 'viveret' that Ulysses would still be living content as a 'pauper'. For various arguments, see Goold 1987 and 1989, op. cit. (n. 2); Morsley, op. cit. (n. 27); Walsh, pp. 67-8.

³⁷ I owe this observation to Stephen Heyworth.

³⁸ Only Richardson, p. 345, fully confronts the problem of 'non habet unda deos' (18) in the mouth of a poet who rebukes Aquilo and Neptune for causing the shipwreck (13-16) and Thetis and the Nereids for not saving Paetus (67-70). Cf. Camps, p. 84: 'Formally there is a contradiction between this and the poet's apostrophe of Aquilo and Neptune in 14-15; but we do not feel this because beneath the stylized rhetorical manner the sentiments are consistent: wind and sea are cruel—prayer is useless, there is none to help you'. Fedeli 1985, p. 243: 'vista l'inutilità dei tentativi dell'incolpevole Peto il poeta si senta autorizzato a concludere che in realtà non sono gli dei, ma una cieca violenza, a governare il mare'. Both dodge the problem.

over his bones. There is a certain neatness in placing all three references to Paetus' mother within six lines of each other, but the main motive for placing 9–12 after 17–18 seems to be that it solves the problem of 'tua' and 'tibi' in 11–12 by providing a vocative. The other possible location for 9–12 is a continuation of the sailor's apostrophe at the 'sepulcrum' in line 28. It is tempting to think of the passing sailor uttering a complete epigram at the grave, but the implication of 25–8 is that Paetus' body has been washed ashore and covered by a bit of sand when the hypothetical sailor comes by. If we are to imagine Paetus now having some sort of a 'sepulcrum', the sailor could hardly say 'nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est' (12).

III

In the previous section, I presented arguments for the unity and continuity of 1–8 as addressed to 'pecunia' and 9–12 as addressed to Paetus, for the presence of a lacuna between these passages, and against any of the proposed transpositions. In Section I, I argued that Propertius' concentrated patterning of epigrammatic themes in the first part of the poem is part of a deliberate strategy which should not be disturbed. What, then, besides the unprepared shift in addressee indicates a possible lacuna between 8 and 9, and what might the lacuna have contained? While lines 9–12 emphasize a contrast between two possible fates of the corpse—proper burial with mother attending (9–10) or bones exposed to disinterested seagulls (11–12)—the emphatic repetition of 'nunc.../ nunc' with asyndeton can also imply a contrast in time between the past and the present. In general, Propertius is just as likely to use 'nunc' to contrast past and present as he is to mean simply 'at present'. But in speaking about the dead, 'nunc' has a special nuance because what was once the speaking, breathing individual is now a handful of ashes, a heap of bones; whatever the state of the physical remains may be, they are certainly less than the living human being once was. In his study of Greek and Latin epitaphs, Lattimore names the antithesis between life and death, in which 'the poems reflect on the characters which the dead had in life, what they did, all the things which are gone', the 'contrast theme'.³⁹ Four of Lattimore's examples use 'nunc' to express the loss of what the deceased had in life or the apparent futility of life's pursuits in the face of death. Here is a brief example: 'Servavi thalamum genio, dulcissime coniux: / servandus *nunc* est pro thalamo tumulus'.⁴⁰ Propertius too, when he writes his own epitaph, uses the contrast theme with 'nunc': 'qui *nunc* iacet horrida pulvis, / unius hic quondam servus amoris erat' (2.13.35–6).

Catullus 68, in the passage which laments the death of his brother at Troy, offers another poetic example of the contrast theme. First, Catullus tells his brother that his death means the end to their family and all their joys (68.93–6):

ei misero fratri iucundum lumen ademptum,
tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus,
omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra,
quae tuus in vita dulcis alebat amor.

The brother represented 'tota...domus', now buried with him, and with him the joys which the brother's love had nourished 'in vita' have also perished. These lines are addressed directly to the absent brother (92), and the repeated 'tecum...tecum...tuus' parallels 'tua...tibi' in 3.7.11–12.

³⁹ R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1942), p. 175.

⁴⁰ Lattimore, *op. cit.* (n. 39), p. 177.

The following two couplets (68.97-100) complete the contrast theme (moreover, they are explicitly echoed by Propertius in 3.7.9-12):⁴¹

quem *nunc* tam longe non inter nota sepulcra
 nec prope cognatos compositum cineres,
 sed Troia obscena, Troia infelice sepultum
 detinet extremo terra aliena solo.

The construction 'non... / nec... / sed...' exactly matches the construction of 3.7.9-12. The first couplet expresses precisely the same thought as 9-10, and even uses the same words and sounds; Propertius' 'nec pote cognatos inter humare rogos' (10) combines Catullus' 'inter nota sepulchra' and 'nec prope cognatos compositum cineres' (97-8). Propertius' 'nunc... nunc' in 11-12 shares the emphatic repetitiveness and asyndeton of Catullus' 'Troia... Troia', and likewise mirrors these lines in content, except that Catullus' brother is buried in a distant foreign land and Paetus' location might as well be the whole Carpathian Sea. Finally, Catullus' lines use 'nunc' (97), though not in the 'sed' clause, to effect the contrast between what his brother was in life with the fate of his body.⁴² Propertius' use of 'nunc', in addition to the unprepared 'tua' and 'tibi' at 3.7.11-12, may hint at the existence of a lost couplet before line 9 which would have said something about Paetus' life in order to contrast it with his miserable death.

The contrast theme often works with a related theme, the thought that what one did or had in life could not alter the ineluctability of death, which I will call the 'quid prodest' theme. This topos occurs in Propertius' elegies on Marcellus and Cornelia to express the futility of family connections in the face of death (3.18.11-14; 4.11.11-12). The beginning of Horace's 'Archytas Ode' is another example (*Carm.* 1.28.1-6):⁴³

Te maris et terrae numeroque carentis harenae
 mensorem cohibent, Archyta,
 pulveris exigui prope litus parva Matinum
 munera, nec quicquam tibi prodest
 aeras temptasse domos animoque rotundum
 percurrisse polum morituro.

What good did it do Archytas to have measured the world when he now lies confined by a bit of dust? Hubbard, in linking this poem with 3.7, comments, 'they operate with many similar commonplaces and use them in a similar patterning way'. Like Propertius 3.7, *Carm.* 1.28 'depends for evocative effect on a mosaic of epigrammatic commonplaces'.⁴⁴ It is possible that like the Cornelia and Marcellus elegies, and the Archytas Ode, Propertius' elegy on Paetus also contained a variation on the 'quid

⁴¹ Rothstein, p. 51: 'Unverkennbar is der Anklang an Cat. 68.97'. Fedeli 1985, p. 238, calls the verbal similarity 'la chiara allusione di Properzio ad un noto contesto catulliano', but does not remark on the close structural correspondence.

⁴² Propertius' postponement of 'nunc' is a simple variation on its usual placement at the start of the account of the present which is contrasted with the past. Even in poem 68, Catullus does not use 'nunc' in 93-4, which describe the present, but waits until he describes the body's situation in 97-100. So Propertius chooses not to emphasize the fact of Paetus' non-burial with 'nunc', but rather to stress the actual present state of Paetus' corpse. To reverse the two couplets, as Walsh does (pp. 67-8), disturbs the more significant construction 'non... nec... sed'. For another example of this construction in a Greek epitaph for a dead youth which also employs the contrast theme, see Lattimore, op. cit. (n. 39), p. 176.

⁴³ R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 318 and 323. Many more examples of this theme are given in P. Fedeli, *Properzio Elegie Libro IV* (Bari, 1965), p. 247; cf. Lucretius' mock lament, 'omnia ademit / una dies infesta tibi tot praemia vitae' (*D.R.N.* 3.898-9).

⁴⁴ Hubbard, p. 86.

prodest' theme near the beginning. This topos would be especially effective in Paetus' case because his pursuit of money is the very cause of his death. Later in the poem, Propertius clearly makes use of this notion in the problematic lines 47–50. Though their exact meaning is uncertain, they must point to a discrepancy between the luxurious comforts which Paetus hoped for (or had) in life and the violent storm which killed him.

Finally, a sepulchral epigram in the *Greek Anthology* by Antipater of Thessalonica contrasts a young man's prosperous life with his premature death in a shipwreck.⁴⁵ Just as in 3.7.9–12, the speaker of *A.P.* 7.286 addresses the dead man himself:

Δύσμορε Νικάνωρ πολιῶ μεμαραμμένε πόντῳ,
 κείσαι δὴ ξείνῃ γυμνὸς ἐπ' ἡϊόνι
 ἢ σύ γε πρὸς πέτρῃσι, τὰ δ' ὀλβία κείνα μέλαθρα
 φρούδα <υ> πάσης ἐλπίς ὄλωλε Τύρου,
 οὐδέ τί σε κτεάνων ἔρρύσατο. φεύ ἔλεεινέ,
 ὦλεο μοχθήσας ἰχθύσι καὶ πελάγει.

The poem begins with a picture of Nikanor lying naked on foreign sand or perhaps by rocks, where the speaker assumes Nikanor's remains have landed. This pathetic end is contrasted with his now vanished wealth and lost potential. Line 5 contains the 'quid prodest' theme, expressed negatively: Nikanor's possessions could not save him, and his toils enriched only the fish and sea. Paetus too was young, 'miser' (7; cf. Δύσμορε, 1; φεύ ἔλεεινέ, 5), and profited the fish. Perhaps a thought similar to Antipater's lines 3–5 was lost between 3.7.8 and 9. One couplet (or at most two) would have intervened, probably in order to tell Paetus of the folly and futility of his pursuit of money when he was alive: 'What did sea-faring avail you, Paetus? A luxurious life could not help you when the storm came blowing; your hope for wealth is gone, and your mother cannot bury you, but now sea birds stand over your bones, now the whole sea is your tomb'. This thought, including a vocative address to Paetus (though not necessarily his name), would make Propertius' second variation on the sepulchral epigram complete, set between the rebukes of 'pecunia', and Aquilo and Neptune, and representing the intermediary stage between drifting at sea after the shipwreck and eventual burial.

Boulder, Colorado

ALISON ORLEBEKE

⁴⁵ The phrase, ἐλπίς ... Τύρου (4), suggests that Nikanor was young (Gow-Page, *GP*, Vol. II, p. 32). This epigram could be by either Antipater (see n. 23 and Gow-Page, *GP*, Vol. II, pp. 31–2).