

been 170/1, in which year Notopoulos dated the archonship of Phlauios Harpalianos Steirius<sup>21</sup> and A. E. Raubitschek that of Tiberios Klaudios Demonstratos Meliteus.<sup>22</sup> Abaskantos' successor then would be Markos. Moreover, the new year proposed for the end of Abaskantos' παιδοτριβία would coincide with the end of the ὑποπαιδοτριβία of Τελεσφόρος Ἀβασκάντου Μειλήσιος (a son of the παιδοτριβίης Abaskantos?).<sup>23</sup> To be sure, Telesphoros is identified as a Μειλήσιος, but this may not be wholly against my suggestion.<sup>24</sup> That Telesphoros may have been a son of the παιδοτριβίης Abaskantos is suggested further, it appears, by the inscribed letter

kappa (K *vacat*, and not K – –) after his name,<sup>25</sup> which was presumably to complete the demotic Κηφισαεύς, also the demotic of the παιδοτριβίης Abaskantos. It is also possible that the inscribed kappa may be an error on the part of the stonemason. The kappa, however, does not mean that Telesphoros was given Athenian citizenship, if not already a citizen, during the last year of his office,<sup>26</sup> since IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 2100B, dates from the earlier rather than from the later years of Telesphoros' ὑποπαιδοτριβία.<sup>27</sup>

ELIAS KAPETANOPOULOS

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 28 and 52. Notopoulos dated Demonstratos' archonship in 172/73 (*ap.* Raubitschek; see below, n. 22).

22. Γέρας Ἀντωνίου Κεραμοπούλου (1953), p. 247, n. 2. Raubitschek identified the archon mentioned in IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1777, which J. Kirchner dated *ca.* 168/9 because its *adornatio* resembles that of IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1775 (168/9), with Tib. Klaudios Demonstratos Meliteus (see above n. 21). The archon's name is fragmentary (lines 1–2: ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου – – –) / – ἐως ἀρχοντος). For other names proposed in the past, see R. Neubauer, *Hermes*, XI (1876), 376–77, and P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'Empire* (1922), p. 279. When making his identification, Raubitschek suggested that the archon Klaudios Demonstratos (IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1777) may be the same as the archon of IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1775. However, this must be a typographical error, since the archon of IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1775 is Τινήσιος Πιπτικὸς Βησσεύς. What was meant probably was IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1795, but that archon Demonstratos belongs to the deme Marathon.

23. Telesphoros' ὑποπαιδοτριβία ends about this time, for the ὑποπαιδοτριβίης in 171/2 or 172/3 is Ἡρακλέων Ἑστ(ιαύθεν) (IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 2102, line 42 = *Hesp.*, XVIII, 53 [see above, n. 8]). Cf. also *Hesp.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 28.

24. See O. W. Reinmuth, "The Ephebate and Citizenship in Attica," *TAPA*, LXXIX (1948), 224–25, esp. p. 224: "No satisfactory explanation of the term 'Milesians' has been given."

25. As the squeeze provided by Mitsos shows (IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 2100B, line 39; see below, n. 27).

26. So Notopoulos, *Hesp.*, XVIII, 28; see also J. Kirchner's comment under IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 2100, line 38.

27. Mlle Simone Follet has joined IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 2100B and IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 2099 (*latus dextrum* [2099 + 2100B]), as B. D. Meritt has informed me *per litteras* (see above, n. 8). Undoubtedly she will publish her discovery.

#### CICERO PHILIPPIC 14. 18: DE CONTENTIONE PRINCIPATUS

Hartvig Frisch, in *Cicero's Fight for the Republic* (Copenhagen, 1946), pages 248–49, has suggested that, prior to the delivery of *Philippic* 14, Cicero had been elevated, unofficially at any rate, to take the place of the recently deceased P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus as *princeps senatus*. It is usually believed that Cicero's reply to his detractors in §18 is merely an extension of his attack on certain ex-consuls, whose weakness and unreliability he had criticized earlier in that speech (§17) and on other previous occasions (e.g., *Phil.* 8. 5), and that the word *tu* refers to a purely fictitious interlocutor (see E. Remy, *Trois "Philippiques" de Cicéron* [Louvain, 1941], p. 293). But the language of 14.18, especially the words "nollem primum rei publicae causa, deinde etiam dignitatis tuae," make it more

probable that the attack is directed at one particular individual.

It is possible to deduce the identity of the object of Cicero's attack. At first sight, the most likely person would seem to be Fufius Calenus, whom Cicero criticizes strongly in *Phil.* 8. 11–19 and 10. 3–6, and is probably the person referred to in 7. 5. But the language used by Cicero in 14. 18, and especially the theme of *contentio* and *vincere*, indicates that his opponent was a disappointed rival for the honor of the *principatus senatus*, and Calenus, though of considerable political influence, was far too junior in status among the ex-consuls to have had any possible claim to this honor. The only ex-consul of comparable seniority to Cicero was L. Caesar, of whom Cicero invariably speaks with courtesy and

respect, even when opposing him (*Phil.* 8. 1). But a man with a very strong claim to the *principatus senatus* was L. Calpurnius Piso, consul in 58 and, more important, the senior living ex-censor. He was one of Antony's leading supporters, and the reconciliation between himself and Cicero can only have been

hollow. In view of their past enmity, Piso was a man of whom Cicero could easily have used such phrases as "vitiis cum virtute contendit," "ipse pessime senties," and "ad te improbos invitabis."

T. A. DOREY

BIRMINGHAM UNIVERSITY

### PROPERTIUS 3. 12-14

Poems 12-14 form two interlocking structures which merge and overlap in 3. 13, the numerical center in a book of twenty-five elegies.<sup>1</sup> The first frame is concerned with the loyal devotion of married couples; the second relates to the spontaneous gratification of lovers. The unifying interest of all three poems is the participation of women in military exercise, and the contest between *aurum* and *fides*. The over-all movement of the group is from what is more objective and Roman (Postumus leaving Galla to fight with Augustus in 3. 12) to what is subjective and personal (Propertius' wish for the city's women at the end of 3. 14). Elegy 3. 12 thus carries on well from the "Roman" poetry in 3. 11, while the latter part of 3. 14, though still including reference to Rome, prepares the way for the wholly amatory elegies to follow (3. 15-17). Poems 3. 12 and 14, with thirty-eight and thirty-four lines respectively, stand in balance around 3. 13 with sixty-six verses.

In 3. 12, Postumus is making ready to set out under Augustus toward the East. To the activity of one of the Princeps' soldiers abroad, Propertius opposes a second battle waged at home in the city—that against the corruption of morals—in the prosecution of which Augustus professed the greatest interest. What is a poor girl to do, the poet asks, when she has no scruples to defend her, no partner to keep her in line, and Rome to teach her indulgence?

"quid faciet nullo munita puella timore, / cum sit luxuriae Roma magistra suae?" (3. 12. 17-18). The military allusion in *nullo munita* . . . *timore* is continued by *uincit* in 19, where Postumus need not fear lest Galla be "conquered" by a wealthy seducer. On the day the fates grant his return, she will hang from his neck, modesty intact, even though time's passage weigh more heavily upon her than it did upon Odysseus' patient Penelope. Postumus, nevertheless, will not find his wife less faithful. Galla's *fides* is said to subdue even that of Penelope, "*uincit* Penelopes Aelia Galla fidem" (3. 12. 38).

Elegy 3. 13 falls into five sections. The moral climate at Rome is such, Propertius continues at the beginning, that Penelope herself would have found the siege carried against her, "*haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas, / quaeque gerunt fastus, Icarioti, tuos*" (3. 13. 9-10). Gold, rare dyes, and spices from the East have become *arma* in a struggle to subvert within Rome the integrity for which Icarius' daughter was famed.

The second part of 3. 13, verses 15-24, looks back to 3. 12 as it tells of the loyalty of wives toward their husbands, and concludes with mention, once again, of Penelope (*hic . . . nec pia Penelope*, 3. 13. 23-24). According to the Indian practice of suttee, a dead man's wives compete to place themselves on the pyre so that they may be burned with one

1. A preliminary sketch of the structure of Book 3 appears in the recent edition by W. A. Camps, *Propertius: "Elegies," Book III* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 4. The first five elegies form a group which, to some degree, parodies Horace's Roman Odes. Elegies 3. 6 through 3. 13 alternate erotic with nonerotic

verse. No clear arrangement can be discerned after 3. 14, but the last five elegies all seem to point toward the conclusion of Propertius' career as a lover. The two *epicedia* or laments for Paetus and Marcellus (3. 7 and 3. 18) are found at about the same distance from the beginning and end of Book 3.