

AMAZING GRACE: READING BETWEEN THE LINES IN PROPERTIUS 1.13.29–32*

It is now more than thirty years since Margaret Hubbard, in the monograph that I consider to be still the best general introduction to Propertius,¹ began her discussion of Book 1 with a sensitive appraisal of the first poem in the light a couple of epigrams of Meleager.² She was able to demonstrate convincingly not only that they were the chief inspiration for certain aspects of it, but also that interesting messages of Propertius' own could be read through close comparison with them. In her penultimate chapter, dealing with Book 4, she comments that 'we have come a long way since it made sense to do what we did at the beginning and analyse a poem of Propertius in terms of its relation to the elegancies of Meleager'.³ The claim is, of course, true enough with reference to the critical journey within her own book that parallels Propertius' artistic one within his *oeuvre* as he becomes increasingly ambitious in respect of the range and depth of his elegy. In broader terms, however, it makes even more sense now, in the intertextual age, to do what Hubbard did at the start: to read Propertius comparatively against the backcloth of Hellenistic epigrams by Meleager and others. I attempted to do it myself in two earlier interpretative papers on specific lines in Book 1,⁴ and I now suggest that some light can be thrown on one of that book's textually uncertain passages by much the same procedure.

I. THE PROBLEM: GRACEFUL GIRLS IN PROPERTIUS 1.13.29–32

nec mirum, cum sit Ioue digna et proxima Leda
et Leda partu gratior, una tribus;
illa sit Inachiis et blandior heroinis,
illa suis uerbis cogat amare Iouem.

29 digna et *codd.*: dignae *Heinsius* 30 post partu *interpunxit Lachmannus, scilicet Beroaldum secutus, qui partu pro datiuo explicauit.*

Not surprising, since she is worthy of Jupiter and both a match for Leda
and more attractive than Leda's offspring—one more than three.
She could be even more seductive than Inachian heroines,
she with her words could make Jupiter fall in love.

* Earlier versions of this paper were offered at seminars in the Universities of Leiden and Leeds and at the 2005 conference of the Classical Association of South Africa in the University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am grateful to my audience on each of those occasions for helpful comments and suggestions. I am also indebted to Michael Hendry and Kathryn Gutzwiller for stimulating my thinking at various stages by sending me personal copies of their articles cited in these pages.

¹ M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (London, 1974).

² Hubbard (n. 1), 14–20. The epigrams in question are Mel. *Anth. Pal.* 12.101 (= G.–P. 103) and *Anth. Pal.* 12.48 (= G.–P. 16).

³ Hubbard (n. 1), 152.

⁴ J. Booth, 'Moonshine: intertextual illumination in Propertius 1.3.31–2 and Philodemus, *Anth. Pal.* V.123', *CQ* 51 (2001), 537–44; id. 'Nostra Venus, uacuus Amor and the ending of Propertius I.1: double trouble?', *Mnemosyne* 54 (2001), 339–45.

In 1.13 Propertius plays the frustrated lover sourly warning a currently more successful friend named Gallus, in whose love-life he had previously taken a supposedly benevolent interest (1.10), what a rough time he can now expect as the favoured partner of a formidably sexy woman. The text of lines 29–32 printed above is that of Barber's *OCT*,⁵ with translation to suit; the working apparatus is mine. Lines 29–30, as printed and most frequently understood, say three things about Gallus' girlfriend: (1) that she is *digna Ioue*, 'worthy of Jupiter'; (2) that she is *proxima Leda*, 'a match for Leda';⁶ and (3) that she is *Ledae partu gravior*, 'more attractive than Leda's offspring'. Than all *three* of them, that is: *una tribus*, literally 'one (woman) than three', is taken to be in apposition to *Ledae partu gravior*, with *gravior* understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ and both *partu* and *tribus* as ablatives of comparison. Lines 31–2 add that she is an uncommonly winning talker: potentially even *blandior* than 'Inachian heroines' and 'with her words' (*suis uerbis*) able to make Jupiter fall in love (*cogat amare Iouem*). What, then, is the problem? In fact there are several.

1. It seems reasonable to suppose that some sort of climactic sequence is intended in lines 29–30, and yet to describe Gallus' girlfriend as 'a match for Leda' after she has already been described as 'worthy of Jupiter' arguably adds nothing, for the mythological Leda's primary claim to fame was precisely that she *was* one of Jupiter's many beautiful loves. And why Leda, we may ask, rather than any of the others (Semele, Danae, Europa, to name but a few at random)?

2. The appositional construing of *una tribus*, marked by the modern editorial comma after *gravior*, produces a peculiar sense-pause in the pentameter (30). What is more, I instinctively feel that there is something abnormal about the Latin of the foregoing phrase et *proxima Leda* et *Ledae partu gravior* (consoling, so apparently did Scaliger, for he would attach *gravior una tribus* to the *illa* of the following line, anticipating Lachmann up to a point—quite literally 'up to a point' (see apparatus)). For a long time I could not put my finger on what the oddity was, but now I think perhaps I can. Jeffrey Wills' chapter on 'coordinated polypoton'⁷ at first appeared only to prove my hunch wrong, because it revealed that (a) terms of generational relationship (mother, father, daughter, son etc.), (b) adjectives of similarity and dissimilarity (*similis*, *uicinus*, *contrarius*), and (c) comparative forms are all common in co-ordinated phrases with polypoton.⁸ And here there is one of each of these elements: (a) *partu* (= 'offspring'); (b) *proxima*; (c) *gravior*. I subsequently realized, however, firstly that *both* (b) *and* (c) do not normally occur together in such expressions,⁹ but here we do have both—in *proxima* (b) and *gravior* (c); and secondly that the usage of neither of them here conforms to the regular pattern. This pattern I think is well illustrated by the examples from Wills¹⁰ that I reproduce, with notation of my own, below.

⁵ E. A. Barber, *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford, 1953).

⁶ *Proximus* does not necessarily imply inferiority: see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), 41.

⁷ J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), 255–68.

⁸ Wills (n. 7), 233, n. 24, 258, 263.

⁹ Ov. *Her.* 16.85–6 *pulchrae filia Leda / ibi in amplexu, pulchrior illa, tuos* at first sight seems to present an exception to the 'rule', but crucially it lacks the element of co-ordination.

¹⁰ Wills (n. 7), 263.

Hor. <i>Odes</i> 3.19.22–4	audiat inuidus T dementem strepitum <i>Lycus</i> b t et uicina seni non <i>habilis Lyco</i> . T b t
Ov. <i>Met.</i> 2.541	qui color <i>albus</i> erat nunc est <i>contrarius albo</i> T t b
Ov. <i>Met.</i> 8.471	quam <i>uentus uentoque</i> rapit <i>contrarius</i> aestus T b t
Ov. <i>Met.</i> 14.301	<i>uerbaque</i> dicuntur dictis <i>contraria uerbis</i> T b t
Juv. 5.133	si quis <i>deus</i> aut <i>similis dis</i> . . . T t c
Ov. <i>Met.</i> 7.225	Othrysque <i>Pindusque</i> et <i>Pindo maior</i> Olympus T t c
Ov. <i>Met.</i> 15.243	alta petunt, <i>aer</i> atque <i>aere purior</i> ignis T
Ov. <i>Pont.</i> 2.9.19–20	hoc tibi et <i>Eumolpus</i> . . . c t et <i>prior Eumolpo</i> suadet Erichtonius T t c
Juv. 11.125	et <i>Mauri</i> celeres et <i>Mauro obscurior</i> Indus ¹¹

From this it is clear that the normal essential elements, whatever the word-order, are *either* the key term (T) + adjective of similarity (b) + appropriate case of the key term (t) *or* the key term (T) + comparative adjective (c) + appropriate case of key term (t). Ignoring metrication, a more normal pattern in the lines under discussion would thus be either *proxima Ladae et Ladae partu* (*tout court*), ‘a match for Leda and Leda’s offspring’, or *proxima Ladae et Ladae partu gratiori*, ‘a match for Leda and Leda’s even more attractive offspring’, and even then the second would involve both, rather than just one, of the elements that are generally mutually exclusive. So, although I do not claim that Propertius’ expression as it is usually understood here is entirely impossible Latin, it is certainly not normal.

3. Then there are the ‘three’ (presumably female) offspring of Leda whom Gallus’ girlfriend is claimed to outshine: who are they? Leda was noted for somewhat grotesque fertility: she is variously reputed to have conceived Pollux and Helen by Zeus (disguised as a swan) and Castor by Tyndareus on the same night, to have laid an egg from which Helen hatched, and also to have been the mother of Clytemnestra and three other daughters, Phoebe, Timandra and Phylonoe. Phoebe, Clytemnestra and Helen are mentioned together as Leda’s daughters at Eur. *IA* 49, and editors of Propertius are inclined to identify these as his *tribus*,¹² but the difficulty is that although Helen, proverbially the most beautiful mortal woman ever, is an obvious candidate for one of the places, none of the others seems to fit.

4. Finally, why the sudden heavy emphasis in lines 31–2 on the *verbal* seductiveness of Gallus’ girlfriend? Not that this is in itself incompatible with alluring physical

¹¹ Wills (n. 7), 263 includes Prop. 1.13.29–30 in his group containing comparatives.

¹² See, e.g., n. ad loc. in each of the following: P. J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber I* (Leiden, 1946); W. A. Camps, *Propertius: Elegies Book I* (Cambridge, 1961); P. Fedeli, *S. Propertio: il primo libro delle elegie* (Florence, 1980); and R. J. Baker, *Propertius I*² (Warminster, 2000). M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius. Bks 1–2*³ with addenda by R. Stark (Dublin and Zurich, 1966), at least considers the point worthy of discussion, while H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber (*The Elegies of Propertius* [Oxford, 1933], understand *partu* as Helen, Castor and Pollux, despite comparison only with females making most sense in the context.

beauty, but *active seduction* of this kind on her side (implied by *blandior*) is not an element which has entered the picture of the relationship in the poem at all so far. And even if the girl is supposed to be the same one as in the earlier poem about Gallus' love-life (1.10)—a girl who, as commentator Baker points out, 'did not remain silent' during the sex-scene (there is mention of *alternis uocibus* at 1.10.10)¹³—the impression there is still that the most effective verbalizing came from Gallus himself (1.10.5–6 *cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella l uidimus et longa ducere uerba mora*). What is more, notably persuasive 'Inachian heroines' (line 31) are remarkably difficult to identify, and the pentameter (32) seems somewhat lame as a climactic compliment: Jupiter did not usually need talking into it.

So, quite a collection of interconnected problems and queries, even if they are not all generally recognized or all of equal magnitude.

II. SOME TRADITIONAL 'SOLUTIONS'

Suggested solutions for at least some of the above-mentioned problems are not far to seek.

1. A remedy¹⁴ for the alleged tautology and anti-climax in *Ioue digna* and *proxima Leda* (29) is to adopt Heinsius' elegant and palaeographically plausible conjecture *dignae* for *digna et* (see apparatus), which gives: '[not surprising] since she is a match for Leda [who was] worthy of Jupiter'. But nervous though I am about rejecting Heinsius, I have my doubts about this proposal. For I notice that the text as transmitted produces a neat ABBA chiasmus in lines 29–32: (A) the girl and Jupiter, (B) the girl and mythological girls (Leda/Leda's daughter[s]): (B) the girl and mythological girls (Inachian heroines), (A) the girl and Jupiter. With Heinsius' conjecture, this is lost, and Leda, in a sense, gets between Jupiter and the girl. And, of course, it does not help at all with any of the other problems.

2. A possible remedy, however, for the syntactic abnormality of the 'co-ordinated polypotton' and the rhythmic awkwardness of the pentameter is available: it is to adopt Lachmann's punctuation, with the comma after *partu* rather than after *gratior*. This attaches *gratior* to *una* alone ('one woman "gratior" than three'), and means that *partu*, like *Leda*, must be understood as dative and construed with *proxima*: 'a match for Leda and Leda's offspring'. The shortened form of the fourth declension dative ending (-u for -ui) need not cause any anxiety: as pointed out by Michael Hendry,¹⁵ 'Propertius used no other'.¹⁶ Hendry, almost needless to say, endorses Lachmann's punctuation.

3. But there is still the problem of the children of Leda. Burman (yet another name to make me tremble) took one of the *tribus* to be Leda herself. Hendry follows him in this and in the assumption that Helen will surely be one of the 'offspring', which are by this interpretation helpfully reduced to two. Hendry attempts to make a case for Clytemnestra as the inevitable other, but the inevitability remains unobvious.¹⁷

¹³ Baker (n. 12), 132.

¹⁴ It is applied, e.g., by Fedeli (n. 12).

¹⁵ M. Hendry, 'Propertius 1.13.29–32', *Museum Criticum* 30–1 (1995–6), 239–45 (241, n.7).

¹⁶ He cites (loc. cit.) four secure examples of this (Prop. 1.11.12 *manu*; 2.1.66 *manu*; 2.19.19 *pinu*; 2.27.7 *tumultu*) and one doubtful, which could also be ablative (4.6.22 *manu*).

¹⁷ The same is true of Juno, championed by Burman as the other of the two.

III. NEW IDEAS

It was, however, a suggestion made by Hendry, virtually as an afterthought in the last lines of his article, which set *me* thinking on a somewhat different tack. He claims Propertius' 'source' to be an epigram of Callimachus in the *Anthologia Palatina* (*Anth. Pal.* 5.146 = G.-P. 51):

Τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες· ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ κείναις
ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη κῆτι μύροισι νοτεῖ.
εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίσταλος Βερενίκα,¹⁸
ὥς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ ταὶ Χάριτες Χάριτες.

The Graces are four, for an extra one beside those three
has been recently fashioned and is still dripping with perfume:
blessed Berenice, outstanding among everyone,
without whom the Graces themselves are not Graces.

Hendry hears an echo of Callimachus' μία ταῖς τρισὶ in Propertius' *una tribus* and concludes that 'Callimachus flatters his queen by comparing her to three Graces, while Propertius flatters Gallus' *amica* by comparing her to three Tyndarids' (that is, for him, Leda, Helen and Clytemnestra). Additionally, though, he wonders whether Propertius, inspired by this epigram's word-play, is in his turn playing on the non-personal and the personal sense of *gratia*: non-personal 'grace' and personal 'a/the Grace'—whether, in other words, the comparative adjective *gratior* suggests not only 'more beautiful', but also 'more Grace-like'. Sceptical though I am about his Tyndarids, I find this second point most attractive, precisely because I think it helps to do away with them—or at any rate with the awkward necessity for even *two* of them, with all the attendant problems of identification. For if *gratior* can indeed suggest the comparison with the Graces and so allow *tribus* to refer only to them,¹⁹ *partu* need not refer to any more than *one* child of Leda: the obvious one—the legendarily beautiful Helen. The increasingly extravagant sequence Jupiter's fancy → Leda → Leda's own incomparably beautiful daughter → better than all three Graces (one of the few available ways of outdoing Helen in beauty) does then, to my mind, make the initial compliment to Gallus' girl satisfying climactic. To put it another way, all by herself she out-graces the three Graces.

There is, however, a significant difference between my interpretation and Hendry's. For him the alleged play on *gratior* is an embellishment: for me this play is crucial to the sense. A new departure in the last quarter of a couplet (unusual in itself) depends on it, and, in the absence within that couplet of any other clear verbal hint at the personified *Gratia* (a synonym, say), the demand that I make on *gratior* may seem too heavy—unless there are supporting factors of a different kind, and I think perhaps there are. These are factors which involve the following couplet and may account for at least one of the puzzling elements in it—its otherwise curious insistence on the verbal powers of Gallus' girlfriend.

Hendry is right to support his citation of the Callimachean poem with one or two references to other play on *Χάρις/χάρις*, 'Grace'/'grace', in epigrams of the *Anthologia Palatina*, but I think he has not considered quite thoroughly enough the extent, the context and the nature of the epigrammatic Grace-theme. It is well known

¹⁸ The reference is to a statue of Berenice II, queen of Egypt.

¹⁹ Usually three in number since Hes. *Theog.* 907–9 and named by him as Euphrosyne ('Joy'), Thalia ('Flowering') and Aglaea ('Radiance').

(and better demonstrated than it used to be, thanks to the work of Kathryn Gutzwiller²⁰) that blocks of epigrams from earlier anthologies, especially the *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip, are incorporated into the *Anthologia Palatina*. The Callimachean epigram highlighted by Hendry is found within a series (now *Anth. Pal.* 5.134–49) that seems likely to have formed the whole or part of one of these blocks²¹ in Meleager's original *Garland*. A main principle of arrangement there appears to have been juxtaposition or grouping of epigrams on similar topics, with those of Meleager's models interspersed with his own. I present below five epigrams from the putative block, all by Meleager himself, whose work, as Hubbard rightly insisted so long ago, is much reflected elsewhere in Propertius:

Mel. *Anth. Pal.* 5.137 (= G.–P. 43)

Ἔγχει τὰς Πειθοῦς καὶ Κύπριδος Ἥλιοδώρα
καὶ πάλι τὰς αὐτὰς ἄδουλόγου Χάριτος.
αὐτὰ γὰρ μί' ἐμοὶ γράφεται θεός, ἃς τὸ ποθεινόν
οὖνομ' ἐν ἀκρήτῳ συγκεράσας πίομαι.

One ladle for Helidora Peitho and one for Heliodora Cypris,
and one for Heliodora, the Grace sweet of speech.
For I describe her as one goddess, whose beloved
name I mix in the wine to drink.

Mel. *Anth. Pal.* 5.139 (= G.–P. 29)

Ἀδὺ μέλος, ναὶ Πᾶνα τὸν Ἀρκάδα, πηκτίδι μέλπεις,
Ζηνοφίλα, ναὶ Πᾶν', ἀδὺν κρέκεις τι μέλος.
ποῖ σε φύγω; πάντῃ με περιστείχουσιν Ἔρωτες,
οὐδ' ὅσον ἀμπνεῦσαι βαιὸν ἐῷσι χρόνον.
ἦ γὰρ μοι μορφὰ βάλλει πόθον ἢ πάλι μούσα
ἦ χάρις ἢ—τί λέγω; πάντα· πυρὶ φλέγομαι.

Sweet is the melody, by Arcadian Pan, that you coax from your lyre,
Zenophila; yes, by Pan, a sweet melody you strike.
Where can I take refuge from you? The Loves completely surround me
and do not allow me even a moment of time, so much as to breathe.
For either beauty throws desire at me, or the Muse in turn,
or the Grace or—what shall I say? All of them; I burn with fire.

Mel. *Anth. Pal.* 5.140 (= G.–P. 30)

Ἡδυμελεῖς Μοῦσαι σὺν πηκτίδι καὶ Λόγος ἔμφρων
σὺν Πειθοί καὶ Ἔρως †κάλος ἐφ' ἡνόχῳ†
Ζηνοφίλα, σοὶ σκήπτρα Πόθων ἀπένειμαν, ἐπεὶ σοι
αἱ τρισαὶ Χάριτες τρεῖς ἔδωσαν χάριτας.

The sweet-strained Muses through their lyre, wise reason
through Persuasion and Eros [?through his dispensation of beauty]
assigned to you, Zenophila, sovereignty over Desires, since
the three Graces gave you three graces.

²⁰ K. J. Gutzwiller, 'The poetics of editing in Meleager's *Garland*', *TAPhA* 127 (1997), 169–200; id., *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1998).

²¹ Gutzwiller argues (n. 20, 1997), 172–89, that four epigrams now placed elsewhere in the *Anthology* (12.49–51 and 256) originally made up, together with *Anth. Pal.* 5.134–49, a twenty-poem series which she thinks (172) constituted the 'initial, programmatic cycle' in Meleager's amatory book.

Mel. *Anth. Pal.* 5.148 (= G.-P. 51)

Φαμί ποτ' ἐν μύθοις τὰν εὖλαον Ἑλιοδώραν
νικάσειν αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν.

I say that some day in words sweet-spoken Heliodora
will surpass the Graces themselves by her graces.

Mel. *Anth. Pal.* 5.149 (= G.-P. 32)

Τίς μοι Ζηνοφίλαν λαλιὰν παρέδειξεν ἑταίραν;
τίς μίαν ἐκ τρισσῶν ἤγαγέ μοι Χάρिता;
ἦ ρ' ἐτύμως ἀνὴρ κεχαρισμένον ἄνυσεν ἔργον
δῶρα διδοὺς καὶ τὰν Χάριν ἐν χάριτι.

Who pointed out to me Zenophila, the talkative courtesan?
Who brought to me one Grace of the three?
Really that man performed a gracious deed
by giving me gifts and an actual Grace *gratis*.

These poems, taken together with that of Callimachus printed at the beginning of this section, all turn on the power of Grace/grace,²² and three of them (*Anth. Pal.* 5.137, 148 and 149) address in some way or other the question of whether attractiveness of speech is a qualification for 'Gracehood' (to coin a word).²³ Two (137, 140) by implication additionally raise the question of whether 'Persuasion' (Peitho) is complementary to, or identical with, winning speech, or is the equivalent of a Grace, or is a Grace in its own right.²⁴ Possibly this picks up on an earlier poetic debate, for according to Pausanias (9.35.5), Hermesianax, the third-century B.C. composer of three books of elegiacs entitled *Leontion* (probably the name of his mistress), 'in his elegiac poetry differs from earlier opinion to the extent of saying that Persuasion (*Πειθῶ*) is a Grace, in fact the only Grace' (*Ἑρμηςιάννακτι δὲ τῷ τὰ ἐλεγεία γράφαντι τοσόνδε οὐ κατὰ τὴν τῶν πρότερον δόξαν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ πεποιημένον, ὥς ἡ Πειθῶ Χάριτων εἷη καὶ αὐτὴ μία*). At all events, against the background of the Grace/speech/persuasion nexus in the *Anthologia Palatina* Propertius' striking insistence on the seductive *talk* of Gallus' girl at 1.13.31–2 suggests to me that he was already thinking of this whole series of epigrams, and hence of Gallus' girl's claims to

²² Gutzwiller (n. 20, 1997), 172–89, identifies four different sub-cycles within her proposed main initial cycle (*Anth. Pal.* 5.134–49 + 12.49–51 and 256): 'wine', 'song', 'garlands' and '*charis*' (= 'grace'). Only epigrams 146–9 does she classify specifically as '*charis*' poems, but she rightly points out that there is considerable, and probably strategic, overlap between the main themes of the sub-cycles. There appear to be traces of another 'grace' series at *Anth. Pal.* 5.194 (by Posidippus or Asclepiades), 195 and 196 (both by Meleager); this, like *Anth. Pal.* 5.140, turns on what 'grace' the 'Graces' bestow upon a girl, and not, like the others in the earlier series, on whether the girl herself is a 'Grace'. For ingenious variation on a theme as a general characteristic of the poems of the *Anthologia Palatina*, see S. L. Tarán, *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden, 1979).

²³ γλυκύμυθον ἔπος, 'sweet-worded speech', is also one of the three gifts bestowed on Zenophila by the Graces at *Anth. Pal.* 5.195.4 (Meleager).

²⁴ Also at *Anth. Pal.* 5.195.5–6 (surely a separate poem from 195.1–4, with which this couplet conflicts) Peitho is conceived of as the giver of an attractive girl's speech. Peitho is not specifically designated a Grace here, but, in the company of Cypris and Eros, two other bestowers of attractions, possibly she is supposed to represent the Graces. In *Anth. Pal.* 5.144, one of the introductory cycle detected by Gutzwiller (nn. 21, 22 above), Meleager depicts Zenophila (line 4) as *Πειθοῦς ἡδὺν* . . . *ρόδον*, 'sweet rose of Persuasion', superior to any other flower. This could have been prompted by the Hesiodic naming of one of the Graces as Thalia (n. 19 above).

'Gracehood', when he wrote *gratior una tribus* in line 30.²⁵ A further indication of conscious allusion to the Meleagrian series involves the name of one of the women celebrated in it: Zenophila (*Anth. Pal.* 5.139, 140, 149). She has an obvious *nom parlant* derived from *Zeus* and *phile*, 'Zeus-love(r)': I think it cannot be coincidental that the four Propertian lines at issue (1.13.32) end climactically in *amare Iouem*.

One of Meleager's own epigrams in the series identified, however, is even closer in sense and wit to Propertius' lines than is the Callimachean one, and it *may* even clinch the case for conscious intertextuality with the 'Gracehood' sequence on Propertius' part. Callimachus in *Anth. Pal.* 5.146 intimates that the Graces themselves are deficient without the culminating grace of Berenice, and Meleager himself in *Anth. Pal.* 5.149 recognizes Zenophila as *being* one of the three; but in *Anth. Pal.* 5.148 Meleager directly claims, like Propertius in line 30, that a woman (Heliodora) will not just match, but will surpass, the Graces. And where is the possible clincher for Propertius' allusion to this? *μύθοις*, 'in words' (line 1), appearing in exactly the same metrical *sedes*²⁶ as Propertius' *uerbis* (line 32). 'With/by her words' (Propertius) is not of course the same as 'in words' = 'in respect of words' (Meleager), but perhaps that is part of the capping-game that Propertius is playing with Meleager: *his* sweet-talking Heliodora may be predicted 'one day' (*ποτε*) to 'conquer the Graces in words' but Gallus' girl 'with her own words' could (in a different sense) conquer god almighty—now!

I say 'part of the capping-game', however, because I think there may be yet a further dimension to it. If Propertius in his elegy was keen to compete poetically with Meleager's *Garland*, allusion to the grace/Grace sequence will have been an appropriate way to signal this. For, as Gutzwiller notes,

charis as a literary quality seems to have a special significance for Meleager's own assessment of his poetic art. In a series of four self-epitaphs from the sepulchral book [of the *Anthologia Palatina*] (7.417–19, 421), he connects his early prose works . . . entitled *Charites*, with his later erotic epigrams, which he 'clothed in merry graces' (7.419.4). . . . The quality he attributes to his erotic poetry in his self-epitaphs is, then, the same quality he attributes in this programmatic sequence to the women who inhabit that verse.²⁷

What is more, Meleager's *ἐν μύθοις* (*Anth. Pal.* 5.148.1), as already noted in Gow–Page,²⁸ besides denoting on one level the verbal powers of a supposedly real girl, on another suggests the words of Meleager's poetry, which will bring her fame in the future (*ποτε*). 'On this reading, Heliodora is more poetic subject than living girl'.²⁹ The same claim for Propertius' Cynthia is well established,³⁰ and if Gallus' girl in 1.13 should also be understandable on a metapoetic level as the subject matter of

²⁵ The 'one-step-ahead-of-himself' procedure can be detected elsewhere in Propertius; e.g., at 1.1.23–4 in the hexameter he regards *ferrum* and *ignes* as instruments of healing—by means of surgery and cautery—but must have already begun thinking of them as the instruments of torture into which they have metamorphosed, without warning, in the pentameter.

²⁶ The points holds good, for all that Meleager's line is a hexameter and Propertius' a pentameter.

²⁷ Gutzwiller (n. 20), 185. See also id., 'Meleager: from Menippean to epigrammatist', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Groningen, 1998), 81–93.

²⁸ A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), ad loc.

²⁹ Gutzwiller (n. 20), 187.

³⁰ See the landmark paper of M. Wyke, 'Written women: Propertius' *scripta puella*', *JRS* 77 (1987), 47–61.

Propertius' elegy now stolen by a rival love-elegist (recognizable as a semi-fictionalized version of Cornelius Gallus?),³¹ the claim in line 32 of what 'her words' are capable of may be interpreted as a warning to the rival that he has probably taken on more than he can handle.

Finally I would just mention that Propertius' interest in the whole nexus of ideas in the 'Grace' series of epigrams has already manifested itself once before in Book 1. In poem 2, where the elegiac lover is trying to persuade Cynthia that she has no need of cosmetics because her natural beauty and other endowments are more than enough, he reinforces his argument as follows (lines 27–32):

cum tibi praesertim Phoebus sua carmina donet
Aoniamque libens Calliopea lyram,
unica nec desit iucundis gratia uerbis,
omnia quaeque Venus, quaeque Minerua probat. 30
his tu semper eris nostrae gratissima uitae,
taedia dum miserae sint tibi luxuriae.

especially since Phoebus makes you a present of his own poetry
gladly and Calliope of her Aonian lyre,
and missing from your lovely words is not a single grace (*gratia*) –
everything that Venus and everything that Minerva approves.
Because of these qualities you will be supremely precious (*gratissima*) to
me while I live,
provided that you despise these wretched luxuries.

Here the untranslatable play on the Latin cognates *gratia* and *gratus* looks rather like another attempt to cap Meleager's Greek play on personified and non-personified *Charis* in the context of loveliness of speech at *Anth. Pal.* 5.148, 149 and 195. The collocation *unica . . . gratia* perhaps also suggests some awareness of the notion apparently traceable to Hermesianax that *Peitho* was the only Grace.

IV. AN INTERIM CONCLUSION—AND SOME FURTHER THOUGHTS

I hope that I may have said enough to explain why I would like to revise the punctuation and translation of 1.13.29–30 thus:

nec mirum, cum sit Ioue digna et proxima Ladae
et Ladae partu, gratior una tribus;

no wonder, when she is fit for Jupiter, both a match for Leda,
and for Leda's daughter, a single woman more 'Graceful' than three.

That will accommodate the 'Amazing Grace'. It will be noticed, however, that I have so far had nothing to offer on the *Inachiis heroinis*. Even if *Inachiis* is understood as a common poeticism for 'Argive' or simply 'Greek',³² the whole phrase is much too grand for the persuasive Zenophila and Heliodora, unless it is very tongue-in-cheek, and the text offers no hint in that direction. Nor is it likely, as Rothstein suggests,³³

³¹ There is much to commend such an interpretation, but a full justification of it lies outside the scope of the present discussion.

³² It appears to be so used by Propertius himself at 2.13.8 *tunc ego sim Inachio notior arte Lino*. See also *OLD* s.v., b.

³³ Rothstein (n. 12), ad loc.

that the ‘Inachian heroines’ are the forty-nine Danaids (so called after their homeland Argos, ruled by the legendary river-god Inachus), who ‘persuaded’ their husbands into bed to murder them. It is true that the patronymic *Inachides* is used of the Danaids by Ovid at *Heroides* 14.23, but the context there makes it perfectly clear that the reference is to them, and *verbal* seduction is not a notable feature of the Danaid myth anyway. The plural form, however, may be a red herring. If it stands poetically for singular here, there is an attractive candidate: Io. She was the most famous daughter of Inachus, and famous precisely for being *amata Ioue* (turned into a heifer to protect her from the jealous Juno’s wrath).³⁴ No more than in the case of the Danaids do known versions of her story credit her with unusual verbal seductiveness, but one undoubtedly influential version of it from the generation before Propertius has been lost: the epyllion *Io* by Licinius Calvus. Propertius’ reference could well have been clarified by access to this.³⁵ Alternatively, if the Gallus of Propertius’ poem is indeed supposed to be a semi-fictionalized version of the elegist Cornelius Gallus, an original Gallan context could elucidate the allusion.³⁶ On present evidence, however, nothing more than speculation is possible.

Universiteit Leiden

JOAN BOOTH

j.booth@let.leidenuniv.nl

³⁴ The earliest recorded instance of the adjective *Inachus* is used with oblique reference to Io at Verg. *G.* 3.153 *Inachiae ... iuuenucae*; see further R. F. Thomas, *Virgil, Georgics, Vol 2, Books III–IV* (Cambridge, 1988), ad loc.

³⁵ I owe the attractive suggestion to Stephen Heyworth.

³⁶ The fact that the story of Io was included in the compendium of unhappy love stories offered to Cornelius Gallus by Parthenius of Nicaea for reworking in his own poetry (*Erot. Path.* 1; see J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Erotika Pathemata* [Oxford, 1999], ad loc.) strengthens the possibility of allusion to a Gallan treatment.