

the eye 17. But three of these are part of prepositional phrases: 10. 13 *quid ad me?*; 13. 1 *apud me*; 50. 20 *a te*. Of the remaining 14, 12 are *est*, and with 10 of these the previous syllable is elided, or there is prodelision (7. 10; 10. 3; 12. 5; 12. 16; 13. 10; 16. 6; 23. 19; 36. 7; 38. 4; and 55. 1). At 55. 13 *labos est* is really a single phrase. In 24. 7 the use of the monosyllable is dramatic, “‘qui? non est homo bellus?’ inquires. est.” The last syllable of a Phalaecean does not commonly bear a word accent, and we are not to suppose *est* here as being stressed. This is not a strong assertion “He *is!*” but an apologetic “Well yes of course but . . .” The other two monosyllables are exquisite. At 5. 5, “nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux,” the regression from a three-syllable word to a two-syllable to a monosyllable represents the steady movement to nothingness. So at 7. 7 *cum tacet nox* there is a movement to silence.

Finally it is interesting to make a comparison with Martial. In his first book there are 18 hendecasyllabic poems totaling 199 lines. In all there are only 20 elisions, an average of one every 10 lines. But even these figures are misleading, as the first five lines of 1. 109 begin *Issa est* and inflate the figure. All the elisions except two precede *est* or *es*; the remaining two are both in 1. 99 *Calene, ut and atque intra*. There is no example of the elision of a monosyllable or a long syllable. The place

statistics are inflated for the second syllable by the five in 1. 109; there are hardly enough for a valid table, but the eighth does seem less common than with Catullus:

1st syllable elided	0
2nd .. ..	9
3rd .. ..	4
4th .. ..	0
5th .. ..	0
6th .. ..	2
7th .. ..	0
8th .. ..	1
9th .. ..	2
10th .. ..	0
11th .. ..	1

The whole effect is more regular—and duller. The five monosyllabic line-endings are proportionately fewer than Catullus shows. Four of them are on *est*, two with previous elisions, and the other two with the monosyllables *res* and *non*; the fifth is with *non volt*, which is virtually a single word. Martial’s hendecasyllabics show close familiarity with and extensive borrowing from Catullus, as I showed in *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations*, VI (1963), 3–15. His failure to follow his predecessor’s metrical practices throws additional light on the relative flexibility of the two poets.

JOHN FERGUSON

THE OPEN UNIVERSITY

### PARTICLES IN THE *PROMETHEUS BOUND*

In the discussions of the style and authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*, little attention has been paid to the peculiarity of the use of particles in *Pr* since J. D. Denniston’s masterly but brief treatment in *The Greek Particles*.<sup>1</sup> Now, with the assistance of Italie’s *Index*,<sup>2</sup> a more schematic and accurate comparative study can be made. “On the whole,” says Denniston,<sup>3</sup> “a greater variety of particles is to be found in the later plays [of Aeschylus] than in the earlier ones.” But with the new, later dating of the *Suppliant Women*, this does

not seem entirely true any more, since *Su* is a play that is weakest in its use of particles and particle combinations. The following list contains only those particles which in usage or frequency show the peculiarity of *Pr* in this area (the letters in parentheses refer to my later Remarks).

#### REMARKS

(a) On the combination, see Denniston, *GP*, pp. 441–42 (“not before Aeschylus”). Indeed, the form ἀλλ’ οὖν . . . γε is, in Aeschylus, only found at *Pr* 1058. Cf. also R. Kühner, F. Blass, and B. Gerth,

the *Supplices*.

2. G. Italie, *Index Aeschyleus* (Leyden, 1955), which supersedes the earlier *Lexicon* of Dindorf (1876) used by Denniston.

1. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (2d ed. with additions by K. J. Dover, Oxford, 1954), pp. lxxvii–lxxviii, and lxxix. Denniston at that time had accepted the early dating of

		<i>Pe</i>	<i>Se</i>	<i>Su</i>	<i>Ag</i>	<i>Ch</i>	<i>Eu</i>	<i>Pr</i>
ἀλλ' οὖν	(a)	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
ἀτάρ	(b)	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
αὖ		5	3	3	2(5?)	4(5?)	2	5(8?)
αὖτε		1	2	1	5	2(3?)	2	0
γε μὲν δὴ	(c)	0	0	2	2	0	1	0
γοῦν		0	0	0	2	0	1	0
οὐκουν . . . γε	(d)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
δὴθεν		0	1(?)	0	0	0	0	2
δῆτα		4	4	4	4	3	3(4?)	5
οὐ (μὴ) δῆτα	(e)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
εἴτα	(f)	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
ῆ		6(8?)	8	1(4?)	13(14?)	5(7?)	8(9?)	13
ῆ μὴν		0	1	0	0(1?)	0	0	3
θῆν	(g)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
καίτοι	(h)	0	0	0	0	0	0(1?)	3
μέντοι		1	3	1	3(4?)	0	1	5
μὴν		5	7	3(4?)	10(12?)	4(6?)	4(5?)	9(10?)
οὐκουν		0	0	1	0	0	1	5
τοι (choral [i])		3(4?)	5(6?)	8	4	1(2?)	5	0
τοίγαρ		3	1	2	0	1	2	0
ἔσ τε	(j)	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
μάτην		1(2?)	0	0	3	5	2	9
πάντως		1	1	0	0	0	2	5

*Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*<sup>3</sup> (Hanover, 1890–1904:), II: 2, 160–61.

(b) “It would appear that in post-Homeric Greek, at any rate in Attic, ἀτάρ was felt to be colloquial in tone” (Denniston, p. 51).

(c) “This rare combination is confined to tragedy, where it is commonest in Aeschylus, rarest in Euripides” (Denniston, p. 395; and cf. p. lxxix).

(d) That is, the negative form of the combination γοῦν (see Denniston, p. 422, and LSJ, s.v. οὐκουν). The form οὐκουν reveals little in Aeschylus, being used once in *Su* and twice in *Se* only. See *Italie*, *Index*, p. 224.

(e) In Aeschylus only in *Pr* (see Denniston, p. lxxviii; and cf. pp. 274–76). It is to be noted that the general use of the particle δῆτα steadily increases from Aeschylus to Sophocles and Euripides.

(f) It is to be noted that in *Pr* alone does this adverb occur in the postpositive position in Aeschylus; but there are, admittedly, only two other certain occurrences, both at *Ag* 308, and a possible one at 1089.

(g) In *Pr* this particle is unique in Greek tragedy. It is “almost confined to Homer and Sicilian literature (Sophron, Epicharmus, and Theocritus)” (Denniston, p. 288). To Denniston’s examples should now be added the Hellenistic poet Cercidas 4. 35 (ed. J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*

[Oxford, 1925], p. 204), and an almost certain instance in a mutilated papyrus fragment of Callimachus’ *Aetia* (R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, I [Oxford, 1949], 17. 5). See LSJ (with the *Supplement*, ed. E. A. Barber [1968]), s.v. The particle is not found in G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, fasc. 3 (Oxford, 1964).

(h) Another usage unique in *Pr* (see Denniston, p. lxxviii).

(i) Because of the nature of τοι, it is rarely found in the lyrics of tragedy, yet it was rather common in the Aeschylean chorus, even if we do not count the doubtful passages (Denniston, p. 538). See the older discussion of the particle in Kühner-Blass-Gerth, II: 2, 149–50. It is a strange fact that *Pr* with at least 9 and possibly 14 recorded instances of τοι (cf. *Italie*, s.v., pp. 301–2) has no instance of this particle used in a choral passage. The infrequent use of τοίγαρτοι (only *Su* 654) and τοίνυν (occurring 4 times, once each in *Se*, *Su*, *Ch*, and *Pr*) is not significant.

(j) The frequency of the temporal conjunction is noteworthy: ἔσ τε δὴ of an actual fact, in *Pr* 457 and 656 only; ἔσ τ’ ἄν once in *Eu* 449, and in *Pr* 376, 697, 792.

The foregoing schematic chart reveals the striking peculiarity of the use of the particles

3. Denniston, p. lxxvii.

and their combinations in *Pr*. The figures are self-evident; but we must especially single out the colloquial ἀτάρ, δῆθεν, the Sicilian θήν, the adversative καίτοι, and the emphatic negatives οὐκουν . . . γε and οὐ (μή) δῆτα. Yet even in the case of those particles which appear sporadically in other Aeschylean plays, the high frequency in *Pr* is to be especially noted. Indeed, the frequency of ἦ μήν and οὐ δῆτα, together with the oft-repeated μάτην (also frequent in *Ag*), lends *Pr* a strangely asseverative style which seems unique among extant Aeschylean plays.

On the other side of the ledger, it should be noted that favorite Aeschylean expressions, like γε μὲν δῆ and τοι in choruses, are strangely

4. *Ibid.*, pp. lxviii, lxxviii, lxxxii. It may be added here that the statistics on Aeschylus' use of ἀλλά, ἄρα, ἄρα, γάρ, γε, δῆ,

missing from *Pr*. It would not need a scholar of Denniston's status to warn us repeatedly<sup>4</sup> how necessary it is to exercise caution in drawing conclusions about particles from the meager evidence of extant Greek literature at our disposal, especially on so difficult a terrain as the development of Aeschylus' style. Nonetheless, despite the ambiguity of our results, it would seem highly instructive to review the evidence we have in this comparative fashion, no matter what conclusion we may wish to draw about the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*.

HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

μὲν, νῦν, νῦν, οὕτως reveal nothing of significance for our investigation.

#### NOTES ON OVID *AMORES* 1. 3, HORACE *CARM.* 1. 14, AND PROPERTIUS 2. 26

Volume LXI (1966) of this journal contains papers on Ovid and Horace ("Desultores amoris: Ovid *Amores* 1. 3," by L. C. Curran, pp. 47 ff.; "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," by W. S. Anderson, pp. 84 ff.) which, in my opinion, did much for our understanding of the poems dealt with, and to which I feel impelled to add some comments, together with some observations on Propertius 2. 26.

Mr. Curran in his paper on Ovid *Am.* 1. 3 rightly draws attention to the interplay between the words *eques* (8) and *desultor* (15). I also agree with his statement that "the *desultor amoris* without equal is of course Jupiter" (p. 49). But as regards Ovid's "admission of his equestrian background (8)," the poet's precise intention is to announce himself as being and acting better than his fellow equestrians, and he modestly ascribes the credit for this to poetry, and love poetry at that. C. may call it unoriginal, so far as the superiority of poetry to wealth is topical; he even may consider it insincerity. But I think this insincerity is no more than peripheral: it does not reveal the heart of the matter. In any event, he did much to further our understand-

ing of the *double-entendre*, so characteristic of the poet, which had not previously been fully elucidated.<sup>1</sup>

As C. observed, Ovid conspicuously uses the word *fides* three times (lines 6, 13, and 16). This underlines and explains his well-known keeping aloof from his order, and here, almost at the start of the collection, it is as it were programmatic.<sup>2</sup> We know that Ovid's father wished his son to enter a political career. We may fairly doubt that the son's refusal was based only on his sense of being a poet, since in the reign of Augustus for *equites* in particular it was easy to take up such a career; on the other hand, few would have the heart to voice their reluctance in this matter. Even Horace shrank from declining bluntly to become the political confidant of his Emperor, and Ovid certainly was far from being a Horace in Augustus' eyes. It is, therefore, only natural that Ovid concealed his intentions of keeping aloof in this respect. Now the connection between the repeated use of *fides* and the intimation of doing better than his fellow *equites* becomes more evident: more and more under Augustus the *equites* were abandoning

1. Cf. E. Ripert, *Ovide: "Les Amours"* (Paris, 1941), pp. 358-59.

2. It was written, I think, for the second edition, when Ovid had developed fully his masterly blending of political topics with innocent poetical motifs.