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BY
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vv. 7-8: Illa rapit iuvenes prima florente iuventa,
non oblita tamen‡sed repetitque‡senes.

sera petisse Goodyear (sero petisse \textit{iam I. Vossius}) : sera petitque Burmannus:
(rapit) sed tamen illa γ; sed rapit illa ed. Ald. 1534 (cf. Cons. ad Liv. 372): al\textit{i} al\textit{i}

The latest attempts to emend these much discussed lines are from
E. Courtney \textsuperscript{2}), who suggests to read: \textit{non oblita tamen stat repetitque
senes}, and from J. A. Richmond \textsuperscript{3}), who proposes: \textit{non oblita tamen
nat repetitque senes}. Yet in spite of all conjectures and proposed
emendations the serious criticism of Holland is still hanging over
these verses \textsuperscript{4}) : "(Ein solcher Topos ist v. 5 ff. die) Bemerkung über
das schonungslose Verfahren des Todesnachens, der jung und alt
davonträgt, in der Fassung nicht logisch, weil v. 8 die selbst-
verständliche Entführung von Greisen in betonten Gegensatz zum
Hinraffen von Jünglingen gestellt wird, nicht umgekehrt, wie man
erwartet sollte".

Let us try to clear our poet at least from this imputation of
illogicality by a closer examination of vv. 7-8.

Commentators have noticed the literal similarity of the hemistich
\textit{illa rapit iuvenes} in v. 7 with the \textit{Consolatio ad Liviam} v. 372, but did
so almost only to state the superiority of concise thought of the
comforter as contrasted with the elegist's "languid" lines \textsuperscript{5});

1) In this article I give the text and app. crit. as presented by E. J. Kenney
in his edition of the \textit{Elegiae (Appendix Vergiliana, Oxford 1966)}.
2) Phoenix 21 (1967), 49.
3) Cl. Q. (N.S.) 19 (1969), 388.
4) WS 45 (1926), 81.
5) Cf. e.g. F. Th. Adler (in: \textit{Programm...}, Anclam 1851, 16): "Neque
quenquam fugit, quam languide ille poeta illum pentametrum: illa rapit
iuvenes, sustinet illa senes, ita recoxerit et in totum distichon duxerit, ut ad
Maecenatem pertinere posset".
furthermore the critical eye seems to have been fixed only on the words *tamen sed repetitque*, which in my opinion have been defended or rejected on insufficient grounds. Let us first consider the combination *tamen sed*: all commentaries agree that these words never occur in this order but always as *sed tamen*. To defend the present order they refer to the “strange hyperbaton” *tamen nec* in v. 3r

A serious objection to this reasoning is the fact that our poet does know the correct order: in v. 155 (= II 11) there occurs *sed tamen* and in v. 160 (= II 16) we read *nec tamen*. Moreover *tamen nec* in v. 31 has to be interpreted in another way (see below).

As the possibility of a combination *tamen sed* with the meaning of *sed tamen* has to be eliminated, we have to look at the phrase *sed repetitque* and especially at the particle *-que*. This particle has been taken by some commentators as an equivalent of *quoque* or *etiam* 2), and rightly so, I think. But the evidence for this meaning of *-que*, based by the *viri docti* on rather meagre material (they refer to *hodieque* and some instances of this *-que* after *pronomina personalia* 3) may be extended. J. Martin gives an instance in Commodianus II 17, 3 of *-que = quoque* 4). J. Svennung points out that *-que* in Chiron has been changed by Vegetius in one instance into *etiam* 5). E. Löfstedt, discussing the word *ideoque*, comes to the conclusion that in some cases *ideoque* must be an equivalent of *ideo quoque* 6). And at

1) F. Ageno, AAPad 44 (1927), 168 (cf. 306 n. 2); J. Middendorf, *Elegiae in Maec.* (Marburg 1912), ad v. 31; M. C. Miller, *The Elegiae in Maec.* (Philadelphia 1941) ad v. 8.


3) All instances can be found in Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (München 1964), 474-475 (henceforth abbreviated LHS).


5) *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Lund 1935), 490: *Chiron* 112, 23 (*excrebitque purulentum*) = *Veg.* 190, 9 (*excrebit etiam purulentum*).