

does not say directly why he gave way. We are left to deduce that it was because he was hopeful that the inactivity caused by the bad weather might ultimately be to his advantage. It seems reasonable also to assume that when in fact the troops did become bored, Demosthenes surreptitiously suggested to them that they might usefully spend their time fortifying the place. Marshall maintains that in some way the idea came to the soldiers as a result of rumours which emanated from the animated discussions between Demosthenes and the others. This is possible, and certainly it is difficult to believe that the soldiers, without first having heard of the idea, would themselves have decided to fortify Pylos, but it is more likely, in view of Demosthenes' determination, especially if he did deliberately allow the weather time to play its part, that he had a hand in the business throughout.

Marshall believes that on my proposal the sentence *ὡς οὐκ ἔπειθεν . . . χωρίον* constitutes a highly condensed version of a Herodotean-type anecdote. There seems to me to be nothing Herodotean or anecdotal about the sentence. It is simply a condensed version of what happened, and is probably to be accounted for not by carelessness on Thucydides' part but partly, as I argued in my earlier note, by the fact that Thucydides is concerned only with the main facts about the building of the fort, as can be seen from his omission of other pieces of information that might be considered important, and partly by his desire to show 'the contribution of fortune, and not the contribution of Demosthenes, to the development of a situation which had unexpectedly far-reaching consequences'.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, if, as Marshall holds, it was Thucydides' intention in this 'anecdote' to throw credit on Demosthenes,<sup>2</sup> he would have tried to avoid saying anything directly which might have indicated in-subordination on Demosthenes' part.

*University of Manchester*

T. J. QUINN

### PROPERTIUS 3. 7

AFTER line 16 I read:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Paete, quid aetatem numeras? quid cara natanti   |    |
| mater in ore tibi est? non habet unda deos.      | 18 |
| sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa marinae, | 11 |
| nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est.   | 12 |
| reddat corpus humo, posita est in gurgite vita;  | 25 |
| Paetum sponte tua, vilis harena, tegas;          |    |
| et quotiens Paeti transibit nauta sepulcrum,     |    |
| dicat 'Et audaci tu timor esse potes.'           |    |

*ὑπὸ* here bears its usual meaning in such combinations with abstracts, indicating a yielding under the pressure or influence of something.

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Westlake, *Individuals in Thucydides* (1968), 108.

<sup>2</sup> I do not, in any case, believe this. See Westlake, *ibid.* Also I am not convinced by Marshall that the soldiers were willing to do Demosthenes' will unbidden. There is no evidence that these troops had any special

loyalty to him. What is more, he had been out of office since his return from Acarnania (4. 2. 4) and although his victory in Amphilochoia had clearly done something to erase from Athenian minds the memory of his defeat in Aetolia (3. 114. 1), so much so that he was given permission to use around the Peloponnese the ships that were destined for Sicily, one does not have the impression that he was enjoying any undue popularity.

Thus I recommend the following changes to the text of the manuscripts:

1. lines 11–12 I place after line 18
2. lines 19–24 I remove from this context, inserting 19–20 after line 36 and 21–4 after line 38
3. *reddite* (line 25) I correct to *reddat*.

In their mangled versions of this poem Baehrens and Housman have both anticipated the first of these changes whilst lines 19–20 are placed as I suggest by Housman and Postgate and lines 21–4 are placed before line 39 by Scaliger, Housman, Butler, and others. Nevertheless I recall these transpositions here, primarily because my third change is intelligible only through them, but also because their correctness has been generally neglected amid the confusing assortment of wholly unnecessary transpositions that this poem has suffered.

My reasons for recommending the above changes are these.

The elegy begins with an address to *pecunia*. This address clearly continues for the first eight lines and there is no ground for supposing that the next couplet is not included as well. Throughout this address to *pecunia* special emphasis is placed on the second person pronoun in order to stress the responsibility of *pecunia* for the wretched state of men. That *tua* and *tibi* should be used in lines 11–12 to refer to Paetus without an announcement of this change is then unthinkable,<sup>1</sup> and this couplet would seem to belong somewhere after line 17 where Paetus is first addressed by name. It should, I believe, follow line 18 in view of the inappropriateness of the lines read by the manuscripts at this point. I do not insist on the fact that lines 19–20 are insufferably weak as evidence for the statement in line 18 that no gods are to be found in the sea. A more formidable objection to their inclusion here is their apparent conflict with what has already been said about the circumstances of Paetus' death. The definite impression is left by lines 5–6 that Paetus meets his death when actually under sail for the harbour of Alexandria;<sup>2</sup> the breaking of the stationary ship's moorings as described in lines 19–20 can only be reconciled with this earlier description of the predicament of Paetus if we freely interpret *tendentem lintea* as 'on his way' or the like and understand that the ship was swept from its moorings at some stage of its crossing to Alexandria (Camps<sup>3</sup> thinks in the Euripus, considering lines 21–4). This is a doubtful piece of guesswork as to the poet's meaning, especially since there is no evidence that *tendentem lintea* can be stretched so far. It is my opinion that lines 19–20 belong after line 36 and were brought forward to fill the gap which the scribe found when he had realized the dislocation of lines 11–12 (perhaps induced by the appearance of *mater* in the preceding couplet and the similarity in the ending of the pentameter) and had written in the intervening lines (13–18). Lines 19–20 make perfectly good sense after line 36 where mention is made of the treacherous nature even of a harbour. 'Whatever you fashion', Propertius observes, 'is prey to the winds: no boat has reached old age. The very harbour cannot be trusted; for all your

<sup>1</sup> At least four certain examples of the omission of the vocative in a sudden change to the second person may be found in Propertius alone (2. 9. 15, 2. 12. 17, 2. 34. 67, 3. 11. 37–8); but the peculiarity of this phenomenon at 3. 7. 11–12 is the prominence of the second person in the preceding lines, where its function is different.

<sup>2</sup> D. Paganelli, for example, translates in the Budé edition (p. 98): 'C'est toi qui envoies Pétus, toutes voiles dehors, vers Pharos et l'Égypte: une fois, deux fois, la mer est démontée et l'engloutit.'

<sup>3</sup> W. A. Camps, *Propertius: Elegies Book III* (Cambridge, 1966), 82–3.

cables bound fast to the rocks break when the rope has been worn away by the night's storms.' If lines 19–20 have this position, *tibi* does not refer to Paetus but is an example of the ideal second person that is used throughout the *locus communis* contained in lines 29–46;<sup>1</sup> perhaps it was misconception of the function of *tibi* that persuaded the scribe to attempt to repair the damage after line 18 by the transference of this couplet.

My restoration of lines 11–12 in the place of 19–20 in no way clarifies the point of the following mythological allusions. For since the shores of Aulis can scarcely be identified with the Carpathian Sea, the scene of Paetus' drowning, lines 21–4 can have no relevance in this context. Either these lines are spurious or they, too, belong elsewhere in this poem and have been displaced as the result of scribal negligence or confusion. I prefer to think that they have been drawn from the vicinity of lines 19–20 and most probably should be read after line 38 before reference is made to the return of the Greeks from the Trojan War. So the departure of the Greeks for Troy, like their return, is shown to be attended by a tragedy for which the sea is responsible. In saying this I am not unaware that Argynnus, strictly speaking, was drowned in the river Cephissus, but the choice of the ill-defined *aquae* I consider proof enough that the poet wishes this slight discrepancy to be overlooked. Like the distress of Ulysses at the shipwreck of his men, the suffering of Agamemnon at the drowning of Argynnus and at the consequent sacrifice of Iphigenia is intended to illustrate the dangers of the sea. Agamemnon<sup>2</sup> may not be particularly apt as an instance of *avari* but he is no less apt than Ulysses.

As I see it, then, the reference to the Carpathian Sea as Paetus' tomb immediately precedes line 25 of the manuscripts where the return of his body to land is mentioned. Although one expects some natural force to be ordered to do this, in the text of the manuscripts the identity of this force cannot be determined and the absence of a vocative with *reddite* 'cannot be condoned'.<sup>3</sup> Aquilo (13) and Neptune (15), the only suitable agents that have been named, are separated from *reddite* by the address to Paetus and thus (*pace* Camps, p. 85) cannot be understood here. The alternative, to assume *reddite* to be 'a vague general appeal to wind and wave',<sup>4</sup> is a desperate measure and quite untenable. Shackleton Bailey<sup>5</sup> has unnecessarily supposed a lacuna before line 25 to account for the missing vocative. Reading lines 11–12 immediately before, I suggest as the solution a much more likely verbal correction than Damsté's conjecture of the vocative *aquae* for *humo*;<sup>6</sup> I suggest the correction of *reddite*, the common reading of all manuscripts, to *reddat* so that it is the Carpathian Sea from the previous line that is asked to restore the body to land. This is as it should be, since it is the sea that later (line 63) Paetus asks to carry his body

<sup>1</sup> Against Scaliger, Housman, Postgate, and Butler and Barber, all of whom separate lines 39–42 from 43–6 in their reconstructions of the poem, I agree with Camps, p. 86, that 43–6 go with what precedes and refer to Ulysses, not Paetus. To the arguments of Camps I add that Paetus is depicted in the following lines as of delicate nature (47 f.) and accustomed to luxury (49 f.); he is hardly likely to have ploughed fields (43). Moreover, lines 43–6 are in keeping with the character of Ulysses as representative of *avari*. The presence of *Penates* in the home

of the Greek Ulysses causes no difficulty (cf., e.g., Virg. *Aen.* 1. 527 'Libycos Penates').

<sup>2</sup> Surely the comparatively unknown Argynnus is not the point of the example (as Butler and Barber, in their criticism of the reading of lines 21–4 after line 38, seem to think), but the famous Agamemnon deprived by the sea of his boy-love and, indirectly, of his daughter.

<sup>3</sup> So D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), 151.

<sup>4</sup> So Butler and Barber, 278.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. 151. <sup>6</sup> *Mnem.* lii (1924), 415 f.

to Italy—and the poet in the present passage (lines 17 ff.) has Paetus' speech in mind. Such a corruption could have been an innocent scribal slip but it is conceivable that the scribe having wrongly inserted six lines after line 18 was now thoroughly confused about the sense and, possibly influenced by the plural imperatives of line 29, deliberately changed the original *reddat* to *reddite*. In point of fact, of course, the use of the present subjunctive in *reddat* is consistent with its use in *tegas* (26) and *dicat* (28), verbs whose subjects are also clearly expressed, whereas in line 29 Propertius begins to address men in general and introduces plural imperatives for this purpose.

The references in lines 17 ff. to the content of the speech of Paetus have been thought by many<sup>1</sup> unlikely to come before the speech itself. This objection I dismiss as inadequately justified and regard as originating in a desire to impose a pedantic order on the poem that Propertius very probably did not wish. Hence the lines that I have quoted above I read after what is line 16 in the *textus receptus*, that is to say the fourteenth line in my view of the poem.

University of New England, N.S.W.

KAY MORSLEY

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Scaliger, Housman, Postgate, Vivona, Richmond, Tremenheere.

---

## R. G. COLLINGWOOD MEMORIAL FUND

ROBIN GEORGE COLLINGWOOD (1889–1943) was a Fellow and Tutor in Philosophy at Pembroke College, Oxford, from 1912 to 1935. During this period he published or prepared his most important philosophical and historical works.

The College has decided to establish an annual essay prize named after him and is appealing for contributions from those who would like to express their appreciation of his work. Cheques, made payable to Pembroke College and crossed R. G. Collingwood Fund, should be sent to the Vicegerent, Pembroke College, Oxford, England, from whom further information may also be obtained.