

narrator) as developing so that sympathy diminishes and disapprobation grows. The final narrative portion provides an apparently decisive verdict from many sources; the virginal Vesta (69–70) is succeeded by males, Jupiter, Tatius, the narrator, who all heap up condemnation in deed or word no less overwhelming than the arms of the Sabines.

However, the morality of the final section is so stark, the inequality of the match between T. and her opponents so extreme, that we are drawn to question the onward movement of the poem, in the light of P.'s other poetry, other interpretations of these events (not concealed from our attention) and the terrifying fierceness and brutality of Tatius. There is further significance to the two interacting structures of the poem: a gradual movement against T., and a female monologue enclosed within a male narrative. A level emerges more subtle than either satisfied endorsement of the narrator's morality or ardent participation in T.'s passion. The poem contemplates error and the lover's mind. For all the narrator's postures, the poem is interested in T.'s seeing: her initial sight of Tatius, already shaped by her cultural conceptions, is followed by a whole elaborate development of vision and imagination as her fantasies build up. The interpretation of the man she can only see and not know provides a counterpart to Arethusa, whose real husband cannot be seen. The mental workings of both are explored absorbingly. There is a tragic side to this concern with delusion: tragic irony, revelation and violence. A certain more light-hearted detachment is also visible, created by the poet's wit and sense of humour. Thus neither moral outrage nor tragic compassion seems a wholly suitable or complete reaction to T.'s suggestion of revenge for the Rape of the Sabine Women (57–8); her excuses for going out (23–4) put us in comic more than tragic territory.

Intricacy also attends the treatment of history and period. The figures of Romulus and Tatius, considered by T. for their appeal as men, form from other angles of the book vital figures in the earliest history of Rome, now embroiled in its most significant early war (Romulus and Tatius 4.1.9–10, 29–32 (this war 29), 37–8, 49–50, 55–6; 2.49–52, 59–60; 6.43–4, 80; 10.5–22). This war is to be contrasted with the campaigns of 4.3 and 4.6. We are also shown Roman life at this early stage. The depictions which are subsidiary to the main narrative at 3–6, 9–14, 73–8 emphatically reflect the larger interests of the book. The poem becomes more complex as it proceeds. At first we see the clear opposition found in 4.1, of simple past against cosmopolitan present. The unlawful passion of T. of course spoils generalizations about the moral past and immoral present, particularly after 4.3. More intriguingly, though, we already see the appeal of the exotic, and of attractive material objects. Unexpectedly it is a Sabine, in his armour, who possesses this appeal (see 32n.). An inevitable corollary is the relativity of luxury (note 3.13.25–34): anything unusual and above the subject's own standard of living will possess the same allure. The description of the Parilia infringes the opposition differently: this pastoral crudity remains now. The antitheses of the book are smudged.

Some discussions: P. Grimal, *REL* 29 (1951) 201–14; H. C. Rutledge, *CJ* 60 (1964–5) 70–3; K. Wellesley, *Acta Classica Univ. Scient. Debreceniensis* 5 (1969) 93–103; Marr (1970) 167–73; P. Pinotti, *GIF* 26 (1974), 18–32; J. Warden, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 177–87; F. Brenk in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* 1 (Brussels 1979) 166–74; T. J. R. Walsh, *LCM* 8.5 (1983) 75–6; Stahl (1985) 279–304; L. Beltrami in G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (edd.), *Tredici secoli di elegia latina* (Assisi 1989) 267–72; R. King, *CJ* 85 (1989–90) 225–46; K. N. O'Neill, *Hermathena* 158 (1995) 53–60; Fox (1996) 160–5; P. A. Miller and C. Platter *CW* 92 (1998–9) 445–54; Heyworth (1999) 80–6; Janan (2001) ch. 4; Rambaux (2001) 286–9; Wyke (2002) 93–9; Miller (2004) 189–203; DeBrohun (2003) 146–9, 192–6.

1 The last poem began with two Greek names that riddlingly denoted the Roman present; this poem resoundingly repeats a name that proclaims ancient Rome. After the alien narrators of 4.2 and 4.3, the narrator-poet re-establishes possession, with an archetypal poet's announcement. Latin poets often begin 'I sing' or the like (the *Aeneid*, Grattius etc.); cf. Call. fr. 86 Pfeiffer (beginning of *Aetia* 4).

scelus . . . turpe: the moral stance of the narrator is driven home. *Tarpeian nemus* (Ω) is not justified by the poem: the grove of 3–6 can hardly be called 'Tarpeia's' or made the poem's subject. The *sepulcrum* no longer existed (cf. Varro *LL* 5.41, Plut. *Rom.* 18.1, and Simonides' non-existent tomb in Call. fr. 64 Pfeiffer); but it gave the Tarpeian rock and citadel their name. *turpe* denies Piso's argument from T.'s honoured tomb to her virtue (fr. 11 Forsythe *ad fin.*). T.'s actual burial will be elided, though prefigured by a metaphorical burial (91–2).

2 labor: a more pompous verb than *dicam*; cf. Cic. fr. 25.3 Blänsdorf, Virg. *Aen.* 1.261. It stresses the act of speech.

antiqui . . . Iouis: not the massive temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, built later, but Romulus' small temple of Jupiter Feretrius, built just before (D.H. *Ant.* 2.34.4, Livy 1.10.5–7); hence *antiqui*.

The Sabines are evidently imagined to take both parts of the Capitol. The Capitol is a hill with two summits separated by a lower space. The larger of the two, in the usual terminology, was the Capitol proper, where the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was to stand. The other, with S. Maria in Aracoeli now at the top, was the Arx, which T. guarded. But *Capitolium*, *Tarpeius*, and *arx* (*arces*) were fluid terms. On the area see e.g. F. Coarelli, *Roma* (Rome 1985) 25–37, *LTUR* 1 226–34, IV 237–8, *MAR* 57, 78–9, 275. The Arx seems here to accommodate the cult of Vesta; this is greatly preferable to T. leaving a sanctuary in the Forum for a night job as guard (cf. 23–7, 43–6, 69–70, and also Livy 1.11.6). For ancient discussion on Romulus and this cult, see esp. D.H. *Ant.* 2.64.5–66.1.

3–6 By a common convention (Williams (1968) 637–45), the narrative starts with a free-standing description of a place, which is then attached to an event. In poetry, such places are usually shown as existing to the present day (ἐῖτι 'there is'

(not 'was') e.g. Hom. *Il.* 2.811, initial *est* e.g. P. 4.6.15, Virg. *Aen.* 1.159); so P.'s *lucus erat* emphasizes that this scene exists no longer. A grove of Silvanus is especially natural and unurban (Plaut. *Aul.* 674–5, Virg. *Aen.* 8.597–602); a pastoral scene is painted in 5–6; *natiuis* emphasizes the contrast with man-made beauty (cf. 1.2.9–14 (*natiuis* 13), 20.35–6). The untamed abundance of foliage is stressed: *felix* ('fruitful'), *multa*, the loud rustle of leaves. But P.'s art has recreated the scene, as is hinted by *conditus* ('hidden', but also 'composed'). The tension is supported by works like the triclinium of the 'Villa of Livia', which turn a whole room into a grove (20–10 BC; Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom.; M. M. Gabriel, *Livia's garden room at Prima Porta* (New York 1955)). The scene contrasts not only with the present but with the events to come.

3 antro 'glade' or the like. Cf. 1.1.11, 2.11, 4.9.33.

4 obstrepit 'competes with the sound of' (*OLD* s.v. 1a).

5 domus: cf. e.g. 1.20.34 *grata domus Nymphis*.

7–8 †fontem†: *hunc* would be awkward when a spring had not been directly mentioned; such a thickly wooded spot seems an unlikely choice for a camp; T. could not reach the spring if it was encircled. As in 1 and 15, scribal interest in the scenery has affected the text. Camps's *propter* is in principle attractive (cf. e.g. Livy 9.2.13, 35.28.8–10 for the location): *hunc* is *lucus* (better *hunc propter Tatius?*), and *castra* must be understood with *praecingit*, not altogether easily. For the mention of a place which will not itself be a setting cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.597–605, where *haud procul hinc* of the camp follows the description of a *lucus*. Tatius' warlike action contrasts with the peaceful behaviour of the shepherd (5–6). Nature is now forcefully manipulated: trees are made into a stockade, earth is heaped up around the camp.

fidaque: careful preparation is suggested; cf. Sil. 4.24 *fidus . . . obices* are given to the city gates. *fidēs* will become a theme and a problem of the poem.

9–10 The outburst springs from the mention of Tatius' attack. Cf. 3.15.19–21, where an outburst to Jupiter, beginning with a question, springs from the mention of his lover's sufferings; 4.6.65–6, 10.27–30, after 23–4. The possibility of attack from the nearby Sabine capital Cures (cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.48) now seems humiliating. Cf. Ov. *F.* 2.135 (denigrating Romulus) *te Tatius parvique Cures . . . sensit. Roma* near the start of line 9 is set against *Curetis* (nom. adj.) at the end.

uicina agrees with *saxa*; seemingly it governs *Iouis*: the rocks of the citadel on one peak of the Capitol adjoin the peak where Jupiter resided (cf. 30). But the elaborate interweaving is unusual in P., and the position of the Sabine camp could also be suggested.

In the impressive pentameter the violent *quateret*, often used literally of warfare (so Livy 27.28.17 *muros quatiebant*) is juxtaposed to the deep and sustained noise. Cf. Lucr. 4.543 *tuba depresso grauius sub murmure mugit*, Petr. 36.7 *lentissima uoce*.

A positive argument against the unnecessary transposition of 9–14 to after 2 (Shackleton Bailey) is the rarity in P. of consecutive couplets ending with a noun

of the same form and reference like *Iouis* (contrast 2.15.24, 26, 3.10.16, 18; 4.9.16, 18 *boues* is quasi-pastoral).

11–12 and **13–14** were transposed by Schippers: the *atque* does not follow well on the question. But 13–14 lead better into 15, and 11–12 link up more effectively with the point of 9–10 (Rome was feeble). *ubi . . . equus* would not in itself so forcefully support an argument about Rome's weakness or rusticity. Consequently, we should change *atque* to *namque* (Heyworth, Hutchinson). 11–12 spell out the reason for thinking Rome no likeness of her present self.

The pentameter undoes the hexameter, with an embarrassing clash of names. In prose cf. Livy 5.48.8 (the Romans buy off the Gallic siege) *mille pondo auri pretium populi gentibus mox imperaturi factum*. P.'s location for the camp is more pointed than the Quirinal, or on the flat ground between Quirinal and Capitol (Varro *LL* 5.51, D.H. *Ant.* 2.38.1).

11 iura subactis: conquest and justice are combined.

13 murus erant montes: a neat and contemptuous phrase, condensing Varro, *LL* 5.41 *tot montibus quos postea urbs muris comprehendit*. The first stone wall around the city was ascribed to Tarquin (Livy 1.36.1, 38.6). Gates had been prominent in 4.3 (17, 71).

Curia saepta: see 4.1.11–14, 13–14nn.

14 ex alto (Fontein): *ex illo* would not have a point of reference in the text as it stands (or with the transpositions of Shackleton Bailey and Schippers). *exili* (Postgate) is less suitable for a stream used in watering horses (Wellesley (intro. to poem) 99). The line suggests the appurtenances of epic (cf. e.g. 2.10.2, 3.3.40), and the mighty stream drunk from by the epic poet (3.3.1–16, note *equi* 2; contrast 4.1.59–60). There had been much water in the Forum of early Rome; this is reflected e.g. in the story of Curtius (Livy 1.12.10, D.H. *Ant.* 2.42.5–6, Ov. *F.* 6.401–4).

15–16 The spring is not part of the camp itself; it does not strain imagination too much that T. should come to it, the juncture necessary to the story (cf. Livy 1.11.6; Ov. *F.* 3.11–12 (Vestal)). One might, however, suspect the tense of *libauit* ('drew', cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.371 *inde . . . libatos*). *urgebat* would be more fitting when the jug was full, and the sequence of the couplet suggests it; but in 21–2 (cf. *manus*) she seems to be still filling the vessel. A perfect might be best saved for the crucial moment of 19. *libabat* (Hutchinson) would make the couplet describe habitual action, as 14 describes repeated action. *et* (Fontein) is preferable to *at*, which should set one person against another. Cf. 4.7.11–12n.

deae: Vesta, as the informed reader will know (cf. Varro *LL* 5.41); so *deo* in 4.3.16. The next line gives a further indication. *laticem* (Barber) would be one possibility for *fontem*, intruded from 14; *ex . . . fonte . . . hinc fontem libauit* cannot be right.

urgebat: for the carrying of the vessel on the head cf. e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 1197–9; Villa della Farnesina (Augustan), Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. inv. 1071, stucco

(I. Bragantini and M. de Vos (edd.), *Le decorazioni della villa romana della Farnesina* (Rome 1982) 177).

fictilis urna: the ancient feature (cf. 4.1.5) here marks an unexpected continuity. The cult of Vesta still used earthenware vessels (Val. Max. 4.4.11; cf. Kießel on Pers. 2.60).

[17–18] (del. Carutti): the outburst would have to be prompted by the presentation of T. as a Vestal in 15–16; the grounding does not seem adequate. Disruption of the narrative is unwelcome after the careful unfolding of 3–16; the couplet is out of place in tone and time. The language combines the extreme with the feeble: *malae* is unsuitable for so extravagant a question. *malus* should not mean ‘wicked’ rather than ‘malign’ in the poetry of this period; perversion of a specific role is different (2.24b.44 *hospes*, Ov. *Tr.* 3.12.9 *matris*). The meaning of *fallere* is unclear: if breaking an oath sworn by Vesta (N–H on Hor. *C.* 2.8.10), then *flammae* rather than *te* obscures the point; ‘escape the notice of’ (e.g. Livy 23.19.10) is too weak, ‘deceive’ is not apt. An obvious motive for interpolation would be the wish to identify the goddess of 15.

There is no fitting home for the couplet in the vicinity; after 2 (Wellesley), it is awkwardly preceded by a different point, and the *et* becomes unnatural. Transposition to the last part of the poem is intrinsically less plausible. After 92 (Broekhuizen), the switching of vocatives in the last three couplets would become awkward (Heyworth (1999) 84); because of the assertion *apta* 92, 17 with *nec* (Postgate) would have to mean unconvincingly that the many shields inflicted a multitude of deaths (contrast Lys. 12.37, Hor. *C.* 3.27.37–8 etc.). After 86 (so Housman), 17–18 would clash with *apta* (92), and spoil the sobriety of 92.

19–22 adapt a common pattern for describing love at first sight: there the verb of seeing is repeated with the onset of love (Hom. *Il.* 14.293–4, Virg. *Ecl.* 8.37–41... *uidi*...; *ut uidi, ut perii*... , Ov. *Am.* 3.10.25–8, *al.*). Here the verb of seeing is not repeated, and falling in love is not described directly: instead amazement (cf. 2.29b.25 *obstipui*) and the consequence for T.’s urn.

19 **procludere** ‘practise manoeuvres’. Not real fighting (cf. *prolusio* Cic. *Div. Caec.* 47); but decisive in its impact on T. Other girls fall in love watching actual fighting: A.R. fr. 12.6–9 Powell, Val. Fl. 6.575–86, and probably Ov. *Met.* 8.19–37.

20 **frena:** Palmer’s conjecture would describe the reins being raised through the horse’s mane, where they had lain slack; cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.4.16 *frenaque in effusa laxa iacere iuba*. Manes should be thick (Virg. *G.* 3.86 etc.). It is not apparent why weapons should be raised through the mane; *arma* will have come from 21. Presumably the harness could be thought of as decorated by the relatively flamboyant Sabines. Cf. the more extensive decoration in 4.3.9 *pictoquo Britannia curru*.

21 **regalibus:** a king’s arms will be especially fine, cf. Livy 30.12.11 *cum*... *Masinsiam insignem cum armis tum cetero habitu conspexisset, regem esse*... *rata*. T.’s own familiar king has less appeal (26, 53–4). The Sabines’ arms in general seem different from the Romans’, and less austere (cf. 32, and 4.10.19–22 (Romulus)). Cf. on another Italic people Livy 9.40.1–6, 10.39.12 *per picta atque aurata scuta transire*

Romanum pilum, G. Schneider-Hermann, *The Samnites of the fourth century BC* (BICS Suppl. 61, 1996) 4–5. Foreign luxury had an effect even then – in the most manly form.

22 **interque oblitas:** the spondaic metre mimics T.’s mind. The particularly striking pattern disyllable + trisyllable comes only twelve times in book 4’s pentameters.

excidit urna: cf. 4.8.53 for the effect of shock. The action also symbolizes T.’s abandonment of the Vestal spirit.

23–6 **saepe . . . saepe:** the repetition serves a narrative function, swiftly evoking a sequence (cf. 3.15.15–18); it also conveys the obsessive behaviour of love (cf. *Cir.* 172–6).

23–4 Religious excuses for women’s movements form an unexpected link with the poet’s present. Cf. 2.32.3–4, 4.8.1–16 (both of Cynthia), Tib. 1.6.21–2, cf. 1.3.17 (man’s excuses for not going, *sum causatus . . . omina dira*). Since Tatius would not be on view at night, the omens only form the reason for T. to descend in the morning and purify herself. For washing in rivers and streams after nocturnal pollution, cf. e.g. Val. Fl. 5.329–52; for washing of the head, Pers. 2.15–16, Juv. 6.522–4 (note *matutino*). *comas* is more sensuous than the satirists’ *caput*.

immeritae adds to the humour. P. plays with injustice in the neighbouring poems (4.3.19, 5.16); here there is hinted the mortal mistreatment of the Moon, a common subject for wit (A.R. 4.54–65, Ov. *Her.* 6.85–6, *Met.* 12.263–4).

25–6 Ritual is now actually performed, but with a personal and traitorous aim. For offerings of flowers and plants to Nymphs cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 3.27.30. The hexameter is attractive and pastoral; *argentea* instead of *candida* makes an ironic contrast with modern luxury, cf. 3.13.25–34, Ov. *Met.* 8.668–9 *caelatus eodem . . . argento* (i.e. clay). *blandis* recalls the *faciles* Nymphs of pastoral (Virg. *Ecl.* 3.8–9), and perhaps evokes elegy (4.6.5n.). The pentameter brings in treachery and war. However, the concern for Tatius’ beauty as well as his welfare strikes an elegiac note; cf. Tib. 1.1.67–8. T.’s prayer is ironic in the light of what Tatius will do to her with his men’s weapons (91). Short-lived lilies, aptly offered to the dead, may be symbolic too (cf. Nic. fr. 74.70 G–S etc.).

27–8 P. is blurring a movement from repeated actions in 23–6 to a single action in 29–30. T. returns after a day of looking at Tatius. She has been hiding in the brambles, as she needs to remain unobserved (so Agenor in Hom. *Il.* 21.556–61; cf. Livy 25.21.3), and comes back at twilight, when fires are being lit (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 1.82–3).

cumque: there seems little point to ‘while she climbed (*dum* Ω) . . . , she brought back’; we should read *cum* (Heyworth), and perhaps make the same change at 3.13.52.

primo . . . nubila fumo: the phrase atmospherically combines ‘dim at the first lighting of fires’ and ‘hazy with smoke’.

After the hexameter has named the Capitol (the whole hill), in the pentameter the brambles imply a rough rustic scene beneath, the more so for the echo of Virg. *G.* 3.444 *hirsuti secuerunt corpora uepres* (of sheep). In part, they reinforce the