

simple and straightforward poet, I suspect that he was less well-known at Rome in the triumphal period than the much more formidable Euphorion (admired by Cornelius Gallus), let alone Callimachus. The position would probably have been different in the next generation, from which we have two indications (perhaps connected) of Roman interest in Rhianus. Together with Euphorion and Parthenius, Rhianus was one of the favourite poets of Tiberius Caesar, who saw to it that their works were available in public libraries and stimulated scholarly writings, dedicated to himself, on these poets (Suetonius, *Tib.* 10.2). Secondly, when Manilius catalogues the subjects which he does not intend to treat, and includes among them 'annosa... Messenes bella nocentis' (3.14), he surely alludes to the most famous poem by Rhianus (at least among the Greeks), his epic *Messeniaca*.<sup>13</sup>

Keble College, Oxford

A. S. HOLLIS<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> cf. Pausanias, 4.6.3 'Ριανῶι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσιν οὐδὲν Ἀριστομένης ἔστιν ἀφανέστερος ἢ Ἀχιλλεύς ἐν Ἰλιάδι Ὀμήρῳι. The fragments of the *Messeniaca* in Powell (nos. 49–55) are nearly all geographical references from Steph. Byz. But the anonymous papyrus, *Suppl. Hell.* 946–7, is very plausibly ascribed to this poem (with less confidence also *SH* 923) and allows us to gain some impression of the overall style (largely Homericizing, similar to that of fr. 1 Powell).

<sup>14</sup> I am grateful to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet and to the Editors for comments on earlier drafts of this note.

#### PROPERTIUS AND 'COAN PHILITAS'

This is our well received text of Propertius' celebrated address to the shades of Callimachus and Philitas at 3.1.1–2:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,  
in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.

Well received it may be, but scholarly worries and disagreements about the precise meaning of *sacra*, and indeed about the real purpose of the address, perhaps have diverted editors' eyes from a possible corruption. I would like to suggest that the pairing of ethnic adjective and personal name, *Coi* and *Philitae*, in line 1 may not be Propertian.<sup>1</sup>

In general, of course, the use of 'Coan' with personal names is quite unobjectionable; cf. e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 12.18 'Cous...Amyntas' and Ov. *Ars* 3.401 'Cous Apelles'. In the case of Philitas, however, the practice of Latin elegy would seem to require that when 'Coan' is used 'Philitas' is not used; he is then the 'Coan poet' or simply the 'Coan': antonomasia appears to be the rule.<sup>2</sup> Thus Ovid speaks of the 'Coan poet' at *Ars* 3.329,

sit tibi Callimachi, sit Coi nota poetae,  
sit quoque vinosi Teia musa senis,

and twice of the 'Coan', at *Rem.* 760,

Callimachum fugito, non est inimicus amori,  
et cum Callimacho tu quoque, Coe, noces,

and *Trist.* 1.6.2,

nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae  
nec tantum Coe Bittis amata suo est.

<sup>1</sup> Let me thank Dr S. J. Heyworth for helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this note.

<sup>2</sup> On antonomasia in Latin poetry, and its precedents in Greek poetry, see J. Farrell, *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (Oxford, 1991), 27ff.

And while one cannot be absolutely sure that the *poeta* apostrophized by Propertius at 3.9.44 is in fact Philitas, since the manuscripts identify him only with an impossible *dure*, most editors think that it is and emend that *dure* to *Coe* (Beroaldus):

inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos  
et cecinisse modis, Coe poeta, tuis.

In 3.1.1, therefore, we might expect Propertius to have written:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra *poetae*

The manuscripts' *Philetæ* would then be an early gloss on *poetae* which had found its way into the text.

Against *poetae*, it might be objected that *Philetæ* better balances *Callimachi* at the beginning of the line. Yet it may be worth considering that Propertius could have inherited—from Callimachus surely, if from anybody—the established antonomasia which we find in Ovid's references to the 'Coan' and the 'Coan poet'; Callimachean allusiveness will then have been more desirable than a nice balance of personal names. There is no reference to the 'Coan' in Callimachus' surviving works, although Wimmel and others have supplied *Κῶιος* in line 9 of the lacunose *Aetia* prologue (I fr. 1 Pf.).<sup>3</sup> But Callimachus almost certainly refers to the poetry of Philitas by a sort of antonomasia in his tantalizing mention of 'Coan writing' (fr. 532 Pf., τῶι ἱκελον τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κωϊόν),<sup>4</sup> and it is not hard to imagine that he may have referred elsewhere to Philitas himself simply as the 'Coan'.

*Penn State University*

ARCHIBALD ALLEN

<sup>3</sup> W. Wimmel, 'Philitas im Aitienprolog des Kallimachos', *Hermes* 86 (1958), 346–54, at 352. W. M. Edwards, *CQ* 23 (1930), 110, first thought of it.

<sup>4</sup> See Pfeiffer's notes ad loc., including his observation that 'Ovidius semper *Coum poetam* sine nomine proprio significat'. And on the likelihood that Prop. 2.1.5–6 ('sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere... / totum de Coa veste volumen erit') is indebted to this Callimachean comparison, see S. J. Heyworth, *CQ* 36 (1986), 209.

### RESTORATIONS IN LIVY 9.40: A REASSESSMENT\*

In 1918 Conway and Walters published a restoration of Livy 9.40.3.<sup>1</sup> The passage in question describes how the Samnite army of 310 was composed of two differently equipped corps. Conway and Walters' restored text runs as follows:

(2) Duo exercitus erant; scuta alterius auro, alterius argento caelaverunt; forma erat scuti: summum latius, qua pectus atque umeri teguntur, fastigio aequali; ad imum cuneatior mobilitatis causa. (3) Spongia pectori tegumentum et sinistrum crus ocrea tectum. Galeae cristatae, quae speciem magnitudini corporum adderent. Tunicae auratis militibus versicolores, argentatis linteae candidae. <<(His vaginae argenteae, baltea argentea)>> <auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant, et equorum inaurata tapeta>. His dextrum cornu datum; illi in sinistro consistunt.

There were two armies; the shields of one were inlaid with gold, of the other with silver, and the shape of the shields was this: the upper part was quite broad where it protected the breast and shoulders and had a smooth rim, while the base was rather tapering, for easy handling. A corslet made of sponge covered the breast, and the left leg was protected by a greave. Helmets were

\* I should like to thank Dr J. Briscoe for his generous assistance during the preparation of this piece, and Dr S. P. Oakley for his criticism of an earlier draft. I should also thank Dr N. V. Sekunda for first drawing my attention to this passage.

<sup>1</sup> 'Restorations and Emendations in Livy VI–X', *CQ* 12 (1918), 98–105; for Livy 9.40 see 103–4.