(a pereat, si quis lentus amare potest!). The first and last types are even juxtaposed in a single couplet, as in 2.4.17-18: hostis si quis erit nobis, amet ille puellas: / gaudeat in puero, si quis amicus erit. It is worth noting that the two halves of our pentameter could be reversed: it seems that chiasmus and avoidance of a trisyllabic pentameter ending are more important to Propertius than providing a construction that would be more readily intelligible—at least to English-speakers.

10) Not that that makes it any more admirable: as Seneca puts it (E.M. 47.17), nulla seruitus turpior est quam voluntaria.

11) Perhaps we should say rather that it appears voluntary to non-lovers, and that its end, if any, depends, as with other forms of slavery, upon the will or whim of the master—or mistress.

12) It might be possible to take line 23 as referring to the increased restrictions on adultery in Augustus’ moral legislation, which would fit particularly well after nolim furtu pudica tori (22), if—a very big if—the text there is sound. However, I prefer to take iam as meaning ‘any longer’, referring to the period of time after the commencement of the individual lover’s seruitium.

13) I should perhaps add here that I have a bad habit of misremembering 2.23.24 as nuncquam (or nullus) liber erit, si quis amare uelit. A mixed condition would be quite appropriate in this context, if we think of elegiac love as having some resemblance to a lobster-pot, with the lover playing the part of the lobster: ‘if anyone should (hypothetically, because who would be so foolish?) be a willing lover, that man will (as night follows day) never be free’. Most likely, there is something wrong with my Stilgefühl, or I am unconsciously aiming at a rhyme of erit and uelit, but the idea seems worth mentioning. Another apparently inadvertent conjecture to add to the margin of one’s Smyth is found in a place where Propertians are not particularly likely to come across it. In Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists (Chicago, 1985), 223, n. 23, A. W. H. Adkins misquotes the famous line 1.9.11 as plus in amore uiget Minnemeri versus Homero. Although I do not think that this is particularly likely to be true, it is rather above the average of those listed in Smyth.

14) As Paolo Fedeli notes (Sesto Properzio, Il Primo Libro delle Elegie [Florence 1980], ad loc.), in these lines, “[s]i tratta di una nuova definizione del seruitium amoris: l’innamorato dovrà essere schiavo della sua donna e rivolgere sempre ad essa il suo pensiero”. We might say that elegy 1.10, particularly lines 21-30, in which Propertius gives Gallus advice on how to be a good love-slave, is a kind of mirror-image of 2.23. Besides being more distant verbally, the parallel in Cicero (Parad. 36, an ille mihi liber cui multier imperat?) omits the element of time.

IMPROVING THE ALLITERATION:

OVID, METAMORPHOSES 6.376

One of Ovid’s most admired descriptive passages is his account of the Lycian peasants after Latona has transformed them into frogs (Met. 6.370-376):

iuuat esse sub undis
et modo tota caua submergere membra palude,
nunc proferre caput, summo modo gurgite nare,
saepe super ripam stagni consistere, saepe
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in gelidos resilire lacus; sed nunc quoque turpes
litibus excenter lingus pulsoque pudore,
quamuis sint sub aqua, sub aqua maledicere temptant.
376 sub aqua\textsuperscript{2} ] linguis FL semper d

As Bömer (partly quoting Herter) puts it, “Die glänzende Lautmalerei
in dem berühmten Verse 376’... ist wohl die bekannteste Onomatopoie
des Dichters”\textsuperscript{192}).

There is a small interpretative problem in the famous line. The phrasing,
with quamuis and the subjunctive, might be taken to suggest that the
frogs are attempting to curse while they are entirely underwater. This
would certainly help to make their voices unintelligible, and Dante seems
to have understood the line this way, if he was thinking of this passage
when he wrote his own description of the sullen (“tristi”) bubbling beneath
the muddy water in Inferno VII.117-126. However, it is clear that the curses
of Ovid’s frogs come out as croaks not because they are uttered under-
water, but because the metamorphosed Lycians no longer possess human
vocal powers in or out of the water: there can surely be no implication
that frogs are capable of articulate speech so long as their mouths are
above water-level. If quamuis sint sub aqua means ‘although they now live in
the water’ rather than ‘however far under the water they may be at any
given time’, should not sint be sunt\textsuperscript{3}? My suggestion is not utterly
unprecedented. Although twentieth-century editors generally omit
to mention the fact, two of Heinsius’ manuscripts read sunt\textsuperscript{4}.

Finally, it seems to me at least possible that we should go one
step further and that what Ovid wrote was neither quamuis sint nor
quamuis sunt but quamquam sunt\textsuperscript{5}. In addition to clarifying the mean-
ing, this would have the further advantage of adding one more qua
to the croaking alliteration, with quamquam sunt sub aqua, sub aqua
maledicere temptant clearly implying the frogs’ qua(m)qua(m) ... qua ...
qua\textsuperscript{6}. Given the insubstantial nature of final m in Latin, there
would have been little difference between the sounds of the double
quam at the beginning of the line and the repeated –qua in the
middle\textsuperscript{7}). It is worth emphasizing that quamquam, with two croaks
in one disyllabic word, is more compactly alliterative than sub aqua,
sub aqua, where the two croaks are spread over four words and six
syllables\textsuperscript{8}). Of course, the added croak in the second syllable of
quamquam, not having an ictus, will be less striking than the other
three, but every little bit helps. Indeed, with another poet, this
degree of alliteration might be thought a bit much, but with Ovid,
who, as the Elder Seneca put it, nescit quod bene cessit relinquere (Con.
9.5.17), we need not worry about making him go too far.

TUSCALOOSA, University of Alabama  MICHAEL HENDRY