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PROPERTIUS 3.3.7

1 Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra,
   Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi,
reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum,
tantum operis, nervis hiscere posse meis,
5 parvaque tam magnis admiram fontibus ora,
   unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit
et cecini Curios fratri et Horatia pila
   regiaque Aemilia vecta tropaea rate... 
12 anseris et tutum voce fuisse Io vem,
cum me Castalia spectans ex arbore Phoebus
   sic ait....

The Renaissance emendation cecini in 7 has gained widespread, though far from universal, support. The reasons adduced in its favour are:

(1) Some of what Propertius says does not seem to correspond to the content of the Annals of Ennius: (a) if 8 refers to the triumph of Aemilius Paulus after the battle of Pydna in 167 B.C., Ennius could not have described this, since he died in 169 B.C.: (b) in 12 Propertius follows the usual version in which the Capitol was saved from the Gauls by the geese in 390 B.C., whereas Ennius seems to have described it as actually captured (227-8 Skutsch; see his commentary pp. 407-8 and Studia Enniana (1968) 138-141).

(2) The sequence ‘I laid my lips to the great springs from which Father Ennius drank; and he sang... (catalogue)...; when Apollo addressed me’ seems unworthy of Propertius’ (Skutsch Stud. Enn. 141 n.10); to similar effect, ‘How, after Virgil’s “when I sang of kings and battles I was stopped by Apollo” could the younger poet say “He sang... when I was stopped by Apollo”? ‘ (Skutsch BICS 27, 1980, 108 n.2).

These difficulties may be answered as follows:

(1) (a) The reference is probably to the victory of Aemilius Regillus over the Syrian fleet at Myonessus in 190 B.C. (XIV fr. x Skutsch); (b) as Skutsch himself admits in his commentary l.c. (he is somewhat more positive on pp. 15-16), there is room for doubt here; it is hard to be certain either that the fragment in question refers to 390 B.C. or that it necessarily implies the heterodox version

(2) Skutsch has misunderstood the construction, which is rightly understood by Jocelyn 116 (to his references add Housman on Manil. 4.695). It is not *admoram ora fontibus (unde Ennius bibit) et cecinit cum Phoebus ait*, but *admoram ora fontibus (unde Ennius bibit et cecinit) cum Phoebus ait*, with the second verb in the relative clause unattached to the relative pronoun, as often happens in Latin; another way of putting the same thing is to say that we here have a paratactic method of expressing ‘having drunk from which Ennius sang’. As Jocelyn says, this way of construing gives a much smoother pair of pluperfects, *visus eram* and *admoram*, leading up to the inverse *cum ait*; the interposition of *cecini* or *cecinit* into this sequence would be most disruptive. Again see Heyworth 200 for similar arguments.

There are two other arguments which decisively refute the conjecture:

(1) It would mean that Propertius represented himself as having actually composed epic; this is impossible. In a similar situation Virgil (*Buc.* 6.3) says *cum canerem* (conative imperfect) *reges et proelia*, Horace (*Odes* 4. 15. 1) *volentem proelia me loqui*, and, with Quirinus instead of Apollo as the remonstrating god, *cum Graecos facerem* (another conative imperfect) ... *versiculos* (*Serm* 1. 10. 31); these and other passages are compared by Heyworth 201. This is the *somnium* of the Roman Callimachus; the Greek Callimachus, just before his dream at the beginning of the *Aetia* (fr. 1.3) says positively that he did not write about kings or heroes. Moreover, as K. Sara Myers has insisted to me, in 43–6 Calliope forbids to Propertius topics from post-Ennian Roman history. These are surely meant to be regarded as Propertius’ potential epic themes, and it would not make any compositional sense to have two lists of his potential epic themes.

(2) In his dream on Helicon Propertius is reproducing the shape of Callimachus’ dream there (fr. 2):

```
1 ποιμένι μῆλα νέμοντι παρ' ἵχνινον ὄξεος ἵππου
    'Ἦσιόδω Μουσέων ἐσμός ὁτ' ἤντισεν
    μέν ὁι Χάεως γενεσ[       ]
    ἐπὶ πτέρνης ὑδα[      ]

5 τεῦχον ὡς ἐτέρρῳ τις ἔδω κακὸν ἡματι τεῦχει.
```

That is, Callimachus makes the Muses impart (the beginning of 3 is supplemented ἐπε μιέν by Pfeiffer) to Hesiod the content of the *Theogony* (3) and the *Works and Days* (5, with allusion to Hesiod 265 στ' αὐτῷ κακά τεῦχει ἀνήρ ἄλλο κακά τεῦχον; the reference of Callimachus’ adaptation was so clear that two later sources, for which see West’s apparatus ad loc., ascribe his wording to Hesiod himself). Callimachus, like Propertius, did not sing of these things himself; it is a summary of Hesiod’s poetry, as the Propertius passage is a summary of that of Ennius. Likewise Archias *AP* 9. 64, reflecting the passage of Callimachus, says that the Muses gave Hesiod a drink from Hippocrene (evidently referred to in
Callim. fr. 2.4)

οὖ συ κορεσσάμενος μακάρων γένος ἔργα τε μολπαῖς
καὶ γένος ἀρχαίων ἑγραφὲς ἡμιθάνων.

Apollo and the Muses direct Propertius to quite a different kind of poetry
(though oddly enough this, like the Annals, seems to be inspired by the waters of
Hippocrene, 32 and 51–2), as they directed Callimachus to his Aetia (Schol. Flor.
p.11 Pfeiffer, anon. AP 7. 42).

It is a pleasure, and something of a relief, to find the manuscripts of Propertius
right for once.
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A NOTE ON THE CONSULS FROM 69 TO 60 B.C.

by Richard J. Evans
(University of South Africa)

The consuls between 69 and 60 are an interesting group of politicians and,
according to E.S. Gruen, of the twenty-one elected during this decade, no less
than seventeen had ancestors in the same magistracy. His statement suggests
that the citizen body at Rome preferred to vote for old and established families
rather than elect to the highest office of the cursus honorum newcomers or
relative newcomers to political life. Closer inspection of the individual consuls
and their families, however, produces a somewhat different perspective of
Roman politics in the middle of the first century B.C.

It is certainly true that the three Caecilii Metelli who won the consulship
between 69 and 60 were all directly related to Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus,
consul in 143, who represented the third generation of his family to achieve this
honour. Q. Caecilius C.f. Q.n. Metellus Creticus, consul in 69, and L. Caecilius
C.f. Q.n. Metellus, consul in 68, were both sons of C. Caecilius Macedonici f.
Metellus Caprarius, consul in 113. Q. Caecilius Q.f. Q.n. Metellus Celer, consul
in 60, was a grandson of Q. Caecilius Metellus Balbaricus, consul in 123, and son
of the consul of 98, Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos, but had been adopted by a
politician who is not known to have progressed further than the tribunate. None
of the Caecilii Metelli of the 60's, moreover, had descendants in the consulship,
since Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus Silanus, consul in A.D. 7, the last Caecilius
Metellus in the fasti, was an adopted great-grandson of the consul of 69.

It is also an undoubted fact that L. Aurelius M.f. Cotta, consul in 65, was the
third member of his immediate family to win the highest magistracy in the space
of ten years. But the three Aurelii Cottae, the consul of 65 and his brothers, the
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