### **PROBLEMS of UNITY and DESIGN in PROPERTIUS II**

Michael Edward Hendry Charlottesville, Virginia

B.A., St. John's College (Annapolis), 1975 M.A., University of Chicago, 1979

A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**Department of Classics** 

University of Virginia May, 1990

More Tr. 05 Elizabeth A. Merch

© Copyright by Michael Edward Hendry All rights reserved May, 1990

.

#### ABSTRACT

The problem of the boundaries between the elegies of Propertius, particularly in Book II, is notorious. After a brief first chapter outlining the problem, Chapter II analyzes elegy 2.29 as a single poem, constructed on a series of antitheses: night-day, apart-together, and so on. The differences between the two halves are explained as an intentional juxtaposition of systematically opposed qualities.

Chapter III proposes combining elegies 2.6 and 2.7 into a single poem, antithetical in a different way: the first part (2.6.1-40) portrays the poet as jealous husband, complaining of Cynthia's open door and lewd paintings, with Horatian reflections on decayed temples and the decline of religious observance. The second part (2.7.1-20) portrays the poet as Bohemian lover, refusing all patriotic and paternal duties. Each is humorously exaggerated, and the two are united by the couplet between (2.6.41-42), which sums up the paradox expressed in the two parts, and should not be transposed elsewhere.

Chapter IV deals with two elegies that are not diptychs but triptychs. Elegy **2.17-18** (the unification was tentatively proposed by G. Williams) is symmetrical, with the dramatic situation gradually revealed through the three parts. Elegy **2.26-27** (this unification goes back to Scaliger) is asymmetrical, and balances the nightmare of Cynthia dying without Propertius (2.26.1-20), the

two lovers immortal together (2.26.29-58), and the lover dying without his beloved (2.27.1-16).

Chapter V tentatively proposes combining elegies 2.1 and 2.2 into a single poem. The argument is based on the similarities between 2.1.1-16 and 2.2.1-16, the symmetrical structure of the combined whole, and the fact that 2.3a, with its anonymous interlocutor objecting to the appearance of a new book, makes a better <u>second</u> than third elegy.

Chapter VI briefly summarizes my conclusions: that Propertius sometimes constructs his elegies in antithetical ways, and that this is a likely source of wrong divisions, since editors assume that sudden changes of situation or tone imply new elegies; that the boundaries between the elegies in Book II are even more questionable than usually thought; and finally, that there are fewer, larger, and more complicated elegies in Book II than in any recent edition.

## Table of Contents

. . . . . . . . . . . . .

·

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Antithesis as a Structural Principle I Elegy 2.29	14
	Appendix: Arrangements of Propertius 2.29	39
III.	Antithesis as a Structural Principle II Elegy 2.6-7	48
IV.	Two Triptychs Elegies 2.17-18 and 2.26-27	69
V.	The Opening of Book II Elegies 2.1-2 and 2.3a	96
VI.	Conclusion	137
	Bibliography	140

Chapter I

Introduction

.

The problem of the boundaries between the elegies in the text of Propertius is notorious: particularly in Book II, there is no consensus whatsoever on these boundaries, and editors seem, if anything, to be further from agreement than ever. The manuscripts are no better: they disagree among themselves, and are often clearly wrong when they do agree. My aim in this dissertation is to offer new solutions for a few of these problems: either new arguments for old arrangements, as in Chapter II, or entirely new arrangements, as in Chapter III.

To show that editors are not a reliable guide to where the boundaries should be, it is sufficient to compare the texts of Book II in any two recent editions. In my chapters on individual elegies (II-V), I will quote in detail the evidence from about two dozen editions, most from the twentieth-century: the total effect is not encouraging. The cliché *quot editores, tot Propertii* is true indeed: no two editors of this century agree even on the boundaries of the elegies in Book II, much less on the details of the individual words that should go within them. The problem is much worse than just a division into "conservative sheep and radical goats", as D. R. Shackleton Bailey has called them:<sup>1</sup> even the members of these two groups disagree among themselves. As Margaret Hubbard puts it,<sup>2</sup>

> "... of all the poems in a book of 1,362 lines there are only eight, amounting in all to 276 lines, which both have a harmonious manuscript tradition about where they begin and end and which have not been linked with others or themselves split into two or more poems by editors from the fifteenth century on."

She lists the eight in a footnote: they are 2, 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 21, and 25.<sup>3</sup> The situation has only gotten worse since Hubbard wrote. Camps has impugned the unity of 2.14,<sup>4</sup> unsuccessfully, in my opinion, and Butrica has convincingly suggested transposing the first couplet of 2.9 to the end of 2.8.<sup>5</sup> I myself will suggest in Chapter III that 2.6 and 2.7 are a single elegy, and in Chapter V, more tentatively, that 2.1 and 2.2 should be joined. All this reduces Hubbard's favored eight to four (12, 15, 21, and 25), and I cannot pretend to be quite certain about all of them.

If the editors cannot be relied upon, we cannot go back to the manuscripts to find the proper divisions, either: like the editors, they disagree in too many places to be trusted in any, and in many cases the second hand of a manuscript disagrees with the first. Even where they are unanimous, they are sometimes clearly wrong: for instance, all early manuscripts combine 2.33 and 2.34, and not even the most conservative editors follow them on this point.<sup>6</sup> It seems clear that the manuscript divisions have little or no authorial authority, and are merely the opinions of medieval copyists. The evidence of the manuscripts is thus even less useful than the editions, insofar as the scribes give no reasons for their divisions. (I will, however, mention, for what little it is worth, any manuscript support that exists for my own preferred arrangements.)

Finally, there seems to be some trend towards trusting not the consensus of

the early manuscripts, but the standard numeration, which is quite a different matter. This numeration has no authority whatsoever, and is simply the result of editors getting tired of renumbering for every edition.<sup>7</sup> Recent defences of the unity of elegies often divided include G. Williams on 2.18, 2.22, 2.29, and several others, R. E. White on 1.8, 2.28, 2.29, 2.33, 2.34, and 3.20, C. Macleod on 2.26 (and Catullus 68), E. Lefèvre on 2.18 and 2.26 (and 2.8), T. K. Hubbard on 2.18, and almost everyone who has written on 2.1.<sup>8</sup> Although I am persuaded that all of the unifications listed are necessary, many of the arguments offered are, in my view, inadequate. Too many fall into the typical conservative error, refuting objections without giving positive reasons (White), or giving insufficient reasons (Williams).<sup>9</sup> In Chapter II, I deal with 2.29, which has been defended by White and Williams, and the reader will be able to compare my methods to theirs.

Further, there is only so far one can go in defending the standard numeration: although it is probably better on the average than any one of the early manuscripts, it still cannot be relied on. One example should suffice to show this: the elaborately symmetrical arrangement of Book I, first pointed out by O. Skutsch,<sup>10</sup> proves that either **1.11** and **1.12** must be combined (with Hodge-Buttimore) or **1.8** must be divided (with virtually everyone else). Other clear examples are difficult to find, because scholars are so prone to disagree among themselves, and to follow the standard numeration unquestioningly when they do agree, but the ring-composition in the first line of **3.24** (*falsa est ista tuae*, mulier, fiducia formae 3.24.1) and the last line of 3.25 (eventum formae disce timere tuae! 3.25.18) is strong evidence that 3.24-25 must be a single elegy.<sup>11</sup> In any case, the traditional numeration is simply one of the many modern arrangements in the category of 'editions' above. It may be better than average, but has no more authority than any other. The trend toward following the standard numeration is not entirely good, and is often accompanied by loose talk about 'dividing elegies' without due consideration of the fact that these 'elegies' have no *a priori* claim to be considered unities.

This being so, reunification of elegies divided by some scholars is not the only method needed. Sometimes the boundary between two elegies must be moved. There are at least two cases in Book II where, in my opinion, this must be done: Schrader proposed transposing the last five couplets of 2.3 (2.3.45-54) to the beginning of 2.4,<sup>12</sup> and Butrica recently proposed transposing the first couplet of 2.9 to the end of 2.8.<sup>13</sup> I suspect that there are others.

Finally, sometimes we need to reduce the number of elegies by uniting elegies that are numbered separately. Among the few recent examples of this method are Hodge-Buttimore's unification of 1.11-12, T. K. Hubbard's defense of the unity of 2.31-32, and Fedeli's defense of the unity of 3.24-25: Hubbard and Fedeli are defending some or all of the manuscripts against the standard numeration.<sup>14</sup> It is the thesis of this dissertation that the last method has not been used sufficiently in Book II, and that we need fewer divisions and more unifications, including some that have little or no manuscript support. To put it another way, the elegies of Book II are fewer, longer, and more complicated than is generally supposed. One of my proposals (Chapter III) is entirely original, and involves uniting what are generally counted as two adjacent elegies: 2.6 and 2.7. The others are further developments of previous defenses. Elegies 2.1, 2.18, and 2.26 are all often divided, and have all been defended recently: I propose to go further and unite each with one of its neighbors. The combined elegies are 2.17-18 (following a tentative suggestion of Williams) and 2.26-27 (following Scaliger), both treated in Chapter IV, and, more tentatively, 2.1-2, handled in Chapter V.

In default of reliable guidance from manuscripts or editors, we are left to our own wits. The first need is for reliable criteria for division. Perhaps the most important recent contribution to the problem of unity is Lefèvre's summary of the characteristics of Propertian 'monologo interno':<sup>15</sup>

- 1. Lo scambio di apostrofe
- 2. Il carattere fittizio della situazione esterna
- 3. L'incoerenza del tempo rappresentato
- 4. Il carattere associativo del concatenamento

These four principles might be summed up in one: Propertian elegies are not necessarily coherent in addressee, situation, time, or sequence of thought. The problem with Lefèvre's criteria is that they are fundamentally negative. He can tell us all of the things that do not prove division, but offers very little help in the way of principles for proving unity. Like most conservative editors, Lefevre restricts himself to defending the standard numeration in a few elegies, in particular 2.18 and 2.26. He does so by examining the argumentative structure of each, and his arguments are convincing, as far as they go.<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, it looks as if similar arguments could be used to defend almost any chosen sequence of couplets as a unity. Given the unreliability of the standard numeration, there is nothing to stop anyone from doing so. In order to get around this problem, we need positive criteria for the unity of elegies.

Some of these criteria are obvious, and unfortunately quite subjective. An elegy should be able to stand alone without misunderstanding. It should have a beginning, middle, and end. Symmetry is a sign of unity, though asymmetry is not a sign of disunity, since Augustan poets wrote both symmetrical and asymmetrical poems. Significant repetitions of words or themes are also a sign of unity, particularly when they are patterned into elaborate ring-compositions. The problem here is that thematic and verbal repetitions are also used to connect adjacent elegies: for instance, as Nethercut notes, "*Amor* appears at the beginning of elegies 2.12 and 2.13".<sup>17</sup> Further, verbal repetition is sometimes used to tie together a part of an elegy: for instance, the naming of Maecenas in 2.1.17 and 2.1.73 ties together the address to Maecenas which fills the whole of 2.1.17-78, but this passage is not usually considered a complete elegy. These complications make thematic and verbal repetitions and ring-composition extremely treacherous

criteria for unity. Finally, there is one criterion which is perhaps slightly more objective: this is what we might call the Occamite argument, whether more problems of text and interpretation are solved than are created by unity. For instance, we will see in Chapter IV (pages 74-76) that many of the arguments editors have adduced for dividing elegy 2.18 are in fact reasons in favor of the unity of 2.17-18.

However, there is no shortcut for determining elegy-boundaries: in order to show that a particular Propertian elegy is a unity, we must interpret it as a whole and in detail, and say what it is about. In doing so, we must not only explain (or explain away) any incoherencies of address, situation, or time as characteristics of Propertian style; we must show why it is appropriate for a particular elegy to change its addressee (or situation, or dramatic time) in the way it does at the particular point it does. Propertius does not do these things just to be difficult. All this is in the nature of generalities, if not banalities: the details will come in the arguments and interpretations of the next four chapters. Chapter II, on elegy **2.29**, comes first because it involves the most direct and extended juxtaposition of my methods of argumentation against those used by others.

However, before doing so, there are some odds and ends of information about text and so on that must be dealt with. For each elegy treated in detail, I provide my own text and select apparatus at or near the beginning of the discussion. It should be emphasized that my apparatus is select: silence on any point should not be construed as implying either certainty or approval of what is printed. It would not be advisable to attempt to provide a full apparatus: my knowledge of the manuscripts is entirely second-hand, and the sources (Barber, Fedeli, and Butrica MTP) are as readily available to my readers as they were to me. Nor would it be possible: any improvement in the knowledge of the manuscript readings will have to wait for the forthcoming texts promised by Butrica and Heyworth, among others. The apparatus lists all significant variants at points where I differ from Barber. That is, it will provide the same information as a list of differences from Barber, with the addition of extra items in more complicated instances. The apparatus will also list all significant variants for textual points referred to in each chapter, even where I do not differ from Barber: this will help to simplify and clarify the discussion.

When I refer to 'the early manuscripts' in the text, I mean the consensus of N, A, F, L, and P: this consensus is O in the apparatus. Since A is the parent of F, L, and P, it is cited alone as far as line 2.1.63, where it breaks off, and they are cited afterwards, where available.<sup>18</sup> Thus far, I follow Barber's nomenclature. However, limitations in the word-processing facilities at my disposal have obliged me to change two of Barber's symbols. Specifically, miscellaneous *codices deteriores* are referred to as s, rather than by the standard sigma-like stigma

symbol. A plus sign (+) is used instead of a dagger to mark corrupt passages. The "notorious delta group", now dethroned, which consists of manuscripts D, V, and Vo, is included among the *deteriores* and referred to by the same symbol.<sup>19</sup>

When I refer, for example, to elegy 2.6-7, I mean a single, complete elegy, consisting of what the standard numeration lists as two elegies, 2.6 and 2.7, and the earliest manuscripts as three (with 2.7 divided at line 13). For ease of reference in complicated discussions, I have divided most of these elegies into parts, labelled A, B, and sometimes C, with shorter transitional passages labelled **ab** or **bc**. These labels should <u>not</u> be confused with the letters used by Barber and most other editors to refer to what they take to be separate elegies. To take an example from Chapter II: in Barber's numeration, 29a and 29b are two entirely separate elegies, wrongly combined by the standard numeration; I take the elegy as one, and refer to the whole as 2.29 or just 29, and to the parts as A and B.

### Notes to Chapter I

- <sup>1</sup> Bailey 1952-53, 9.
- <sup>2</sup> MHubbard, 44-45.
- <sup>3</sup> MHubbard, 45 n 1.
- <sup>4</sup> Camps II, ad loc., followed by Giardina II.
- <sup>5</sup> Butrica MTP, 188-91.
- <sup>6</sup> There are two other examples in Book II, though neither is quite unanimous. All early manuscripts divide 2.7 after line 12, and no one except Phillimore and Paganelli follows them. All early manuscripts combine 2.31 and 2.32, and no one except Phillimore again, Richardson (with some rearrangement of the order of the lines), and T. K. Hubbard follows them. The manuscripts may in fact be correct on the second point: see Hubbard's arguments in TKHubbard 1986.
- <sup>7</sup> I have not been able to discover precisely when this particular numeration became standard, but it seems to go back to the earliest editions. Butrica offers no guidance in his chapter on the incunabula and their descendants (Butrica MTP, 159-69).
- <sup>8</sup> These may be found in Williams FoT, White 1958, 1961, and 1964, Macleod 1976, Lefèvre 1976, and TKHubbard 1984. For those who write on 2.1, see the introduction to Chapter V.
- <sup>9</sup> It is not enough to point to metaphoric and metonymic means of making a transition from one theme or situation to another: we must understand why the poet wants to get from the one to the other. Like White, Williams (in FoT) too often shows how unity is possible without showing why it should be preferred to division.
- <sup>10</sup> See Skutsch 1963 and Otis 1965.
- <sup>11</sup> Full discussion in Fedeli III, ad loc.
- <sup>12</sup> Schrader EL, 119: most recently printed by Luck; Helm, and Enk II. Full discussion in Chapter V below (pages 122-24).
- <sup>13</sup> Butrica MTP, 188-91. As he puts it (189), he "makes a new cut in the deck without shuffling first".

- <sup>14</sup> Hodge-Buttimore I, ad loc., TKHubbard 1984, and Fedeli III, ad loc.
- <sup>15</sup> Lefevre 1976, 43.
- <sup>16</sup> As mentioned above, I hope to show in Chapter IV that neither of his arguments goes far enough, and that 2.17-18 and 2.26-27 are each a complete elegy.
- <sup>17</sup> Nethercut 1980, 96, with further examples in note 8, and references for wordrepetition within elegies at 95, note 7.
- <sup>18</sup> Butrica's second chapter provides a full description of the interrelationships of the A manuscripts (Butrica MTP, 37-61).
- <sup>19</sup> For the provenance and value of the delta group, see Butrica MTP, 125-29. The description is from Goold's review (Goold 1988).

Chapter II

# Antithesis as a Structural Principle I

Elegy 2.29

.

•

Α	Extrema, mea lux, cum potus nocte uagarer,	
	nec me seruorum duceret ulla manus,	
	obuia nescio quot pueri mihi turba minuta	
	uenerat (hos uetuit me numerare timor);	
	quorum alii faculas, alii retinere sagittas,	5
	pars etiam uisa est uincla parare mihi.	
	sed nudi fuerant. quorum lasciuior unus,	
	'Arripite hunc,' inquit, 'iam bene nostis eum.	
	hic erat, hunc mulier nobis irata locauit.'	
	dixit, et in collo iam mihi nodus erat.	10
	hic alter iubet in medium propellere, at alter,	
	'Intereat, qui nos non putat esse deos!	
	haec te non meritum totas exspectat in horas:	
	at tu nescio quas quaeris, inepte, fores.	
	quae cum Sidoniae nocturna ligamina mitrae	15
	soluerit atque oculos mouerit illa grauis,	
	afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores,	
	sed quos ipse suis fecit Amor manibus.	
	parcite iam, fratres, iam certos spondet amores;	
	et iam ad mandatam uenimus ecce domum.'	20
	atque ita mi iniecto dixerunt rursus amictu:	
	'I nunc et noctes disce manere domi.'	
<b>B1</b>	mane erat, et uolui, si sola quiesceret illa,	
	uisere: at in lecto Cynthia sola fuit.	
	obstipui: non illa mihi formosior umquam	25
	uisa, neque ostrina cum fuit in tunica,	
	ibat et hinc castae narratum somnia Vestae,	
	neu sibi neue mihi quae nocitura forent:	
	talis uisa mihi somno dimissa recenti.	
	heu quantum per se candida forma ualet!	30

- Extrema Heinsius : Hesterna O mea NF4, P corr. : modo F1L, P primo
   iam N1 : nam FLP
   post hunc u. duo uu. excidisse putat Butler
   foris Dousa pater
   23-42 separauerunt s, Guyet, alii

4

15

í

B2 'Quid tu matutinus,' ait, 'speculator amicae? me similem uestris moribus esse putas? non ego tam facilis: sat erit mihi cognitus unus, uel tu uel si quis uerior esse potest.
apparent non ulla toro uestigia presso, signa uolutantis nec iacuisse duos.
aspice ut in toto nullus mihi corpore surgat spiritus admisso notus adulterio.'
dixit, et opposita propellens sauia dextra prosilit in laxa nixa pedem solea.
sic ego tam sancti custos deludor amoris: ex illo felix nox mihi nulla fuit.

27 et hinc ] ut hinc Lachmann : uti Barber

38 motus Marcilius : natus Dousa pater

42 nox s : non O

I will argue in this chapter that Propertius 2.29 is a single, complete elegy, that it should not be divided after line 22, contains no lacunae, and needs no transpositions. I will also argue that Heinsius' *extrema* in the first line, and the early humanists' *nox* in the last, are necessary changes. None of these claims is particularly adventurous: the elegy is a unity in all of the earliest manuscripts, and *extrema* has been printed by many editors, and *nox* by nearly all. The text printed above is in fact identical in these respects to those of Lachmann, Hertzberg, Keil, Paley, Rossbach, and Palmer. Yet no editor in this century has printed the elegy as I have. Ronald E. White argued for this particular arrangement in a paper published in 1961,<sup>1</sup> but apparently convinced none of the several ensuing editors. P. J. Enk argued for the same arrangement in 1911, but by 1962 his previous arguments did not convince even himself, and he changed

his mind on two points out of three.<sup>2</sup> More recent defenders of unity are G. Williams and F. Cairns: both read *hesterna* in 1, and Cairns reads *non* in 42.<sup>3</sup> The positions of various editors and scholars on the question of division and the related textual questions are provided in the appendix to this chapter (pages 39-42 below). They can be summed up in a few words: we are further from a consensus than ever. It is time to reopen the question, and try a new approach.

Elegy 2.29 falls into two fairly well-defined halves: the poet's capture and transportation to Cynthia's house (1-22), and what he finds there (23-42). The large differences in tone and situation between the two halves have persuaded many, perhaps most, Propertian scholars since Guyet in the 17th century to divide it in two, making the cut after line 22, and renumbering the two parts 29a and 29b.<sup>4</sup> While rejecting the proposed division, it will be convenient, in the following analysis, to divide the poem into parts, and refer to 1-22 as A, and 23-42 as B. Since there is another fairly strong break after line 30, separating Cynthia's stupefying appearance from her rude words, I will also refer to 23-30 as B1, and 31-42 as B2. This distinction is no more a reason for division than the other, and has rightly never been used as one by scholars.

Different scholars have offered at least eight different specific reasons for dividing the elegy. The three offered by Butler and Barber are among the most popular, so I will quote their analysis in full:<sup>5</sup>

"In the MSS. there is no division between 1-22 and 23-42. But (1) *hesterna nocte* in the first line, and *ex illo felix nox mihi nulla fuit* (where the best MSS. wrongly read *non*) are obviously inconsistent with one another. (2) Though Propertius has been told (13 sqq.) that Cynthia is waiting for him, in 23, 24 he enters to spy upon her. (3) He begins by addressing Cynthia as *mea lux*, but in line 24 he speaks of her in the third person and continues to do so to the end. Guyet with some late MSS. therefore rightly divided the poem into two elegies. In line 1, where Nfp read *mea* and F1LP1 give *modo*, Heinsius conjectured *extrema* for *hesterna*, which would meet (1) but not (2) or (3)."

Others offer vaguer and broader reasons, having to do with the very different styles and tones of the two halves. A good example is J.P. Sullivan:<sup>6</sup>

"In [2.29b] there are passions at work in Cynthia and the poet which are expressed in extremely coarse language. Cynthia is extremely indignant at Propertius' suspicions of her infidelity -- and this is one of the reasons why [it] is wrong to conjoin it to the highly artificial genre-picture of the gang of Cupids [=2.29a]."

Point by point consideration of the eight arguments for division advanced by various scholars has been relegated to the end of the chapter (pages 30-37), since many of the arguments for division will be refuted in passing, as it were, and since a refutation of the arguments against is by no means a demonstration of the case for: that can only be done by showing that **2.29**, taken as a whole, is a better poem than either of its parts taken separately. I will also assume, for the sake of the argument, that Heinsius' *extrema* is the correct reading in line 1: it will, I think, become clear before the end of the chapter that this must be so.

The two halves of elegy 2.29 are complementary: neither can be understood properly without the other. It is constructed on a whole series or set of interlocking antitheses: details of the plot, situation, and tone of A are balanced by the opposing plot, situation, and tone of B. The antitheses are related to one another in intricate ways, not all of which are listed below.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, Propertius is not just playing with binary oppositions: we shall see that the order in which each antithesis is used, its 'direction', is crucial.

We will begin with the antitheses of situation, which are established in the first words of the poem:

1. In A it is night: in B it is morning. Specifically, in A it is the very last part of night (*extrema* . . . *nocte*), while in B it is daybreak (*mane erat* 23).<sup>8</sup> The formal antithesis of night and day is signalled at the very beginning of each part. At the same time, the two halves of the poem are adjacent in time, making the narrative continuous in time, with a sharp break as the sun rises and all the antitheses are reversed. The fact that the connection in times between *extrema* . . . *nocte* (1) and *mane* (23) is so close is the first point in favor of Heinsius' *extrema*: it not only allows the two halves to be a unity, by abolishing the contradiction between *hesterna* . . . *nocte* (1) and *ex illo felix nox mihi nulla fuit* (42), it makes the unity a tight one. This argument is not quite so circular as it looks. Even without the explicit phrases, it is clear that the action of A takes

place very late at night (*totas*... *in horas* 13), and that of **B** very early in the morning (Cynthia, whether alone or not, is still in bed).

2. In A the poet is drunk: in B he is apparently sober, although we are never told so specifically. His drunkenness is stated at the very beginning of A (*potus* 1), and illustrated in his actions throughout A. His sobriety in B is implied by the whole tone of the passage: Cynthia's cruelty and crudity, the poet's frustration and desolation, all seem to add up to sobriety.<sup>9</sup> We could go further and say that B corresponds to hangover rather than simple sobriety: this would be likely enough, given the hour, and provide an arguably more suitable antithesis. In any case, the transition is rather abrupt, and some might take this as an argument against the close connection in time suggested in the previous paragraph. However, I find nothing difficult in the poet sobering up fairly quickly as he is dragged off to Cynthia's house and goes inside: it would be a rather sobering experience.

3. In A the poet is out of doors and in motion, wandering at first (*uagarer* 1), and then hustled along by the Cupids (this is implied by *uenimus* in 20): in B he is indoors and fixed to one spot (Cynthia's bedroom) throughout.<sup>10</sup>

4. In number of characters, A is plural: B is dual. In the first (1-2), the middle (21-22), and the last couplet (41-42) of the elegy, the poet is alone: during the main part of A (3-20) he is surrounded by Cupids, while in the corresponding

portion of **B** (23-40) he is face to face with Cynthia. The plural Cupids make a plurality of speeches. First one (*lasciuior unus* 7) speaks two lines (8-9), then another (*alter* 11) speaks 9 lines (12-20), then they all make a final collective one-line statement (22, introduced by *dixerunt* 21): in each case the speech begins in a pentameter. In **B** Cynthia makes one speech, simple and straightforward, which fills four couplets (31-38). The poet himself is silent throughout **A** and **B**.

5. The next antithesis is closely related to the first four, and might be taken as a variation on any one of them. A is turbulent and confused: all is clarity in **B**. The confusion in **A** is partly made explicit in the plot and in the vocabulary (for instance, *nescio quot* and *turba* in 3 and the quintuple *iam* in 8, 10, and 19-20), and is partly a matter of stylistic devices (for instance, the enjambement in 7). The formal clarity of **B** is most apparent in the straightforward couplet-by-couplet structure.<sup>11</sup>

6. The movements of the characters in the two parts are also opposed. In A the poet moves toward Cynthia: in B she flees from him. Further, his movement is constrained, hers voluntary.

These antitheses of situation are matched by antitheses of tone or mood which are more difficult to define precisely. Consequently, each of them will have to be described at greater length: 7. A is 'poetic': B is 'prosaic'. To put it another way, A is fantastic and artificial, with a multiplication or telescoping of metaphors: *seruitium amoris*, the lover as slave (whether of Venus or of his beloved), leads to *fugitiuus amoris*, the unfaithful or unwilling lover as runaway slave, which in turn demands *fugitiuarii amoris*, the Cupids as runaway slave catchers.<sup>12</sup> B, on the other hand, is narrative, somewhat Catullan, and more or less realistic.

The same point could be put another way. A is flowery and romantic: B, or at least **B2**, is crude and almost clinical. A more precise way of defining the difference in tone is to note the way the poet's gaze drops, as it were, between A and B. The references to Cynthia's beauty in A are to her eyes (oculos ... grauis 16) and, by implication, to her hair (Arabum de gramine odores 17);<sup>13</sup> in Cynthia's speech in **B2**, all of the anatomical references are explicitly or implicitly to her whole body or to those parts of it below the neck (toro uestigia presso 35, signa uolutantis... nec iacuisse duos 36, and toto... mihi corpore 37); the last we see of her is her fleeing foot (in laxa nixa pedem solea 40). The references to her clothing are similarly arranged: her nightcap is mentioned in A (nocturna ligamina mitrae 15), her purple tunic in B1 (ostrina . . . in tunica 26), and her bedroom slipper in B2 (laxa ... solea 40). Thus, this antithesis might be put in either of two ways: 'above the neck' versus 'below the neck', or, more broadly if less precisely, romantic love versus crude sex. Sullivan's remarks about the "extremely coarse language" of B and the "highly artifical genre-picture" of A (quoted on

page 18 above) are pertinent here. I would only add that what Sullivan sees as grounds for division I see as grounds for (antithetical) union.

The difference in mood between A and B also explains the apparent difference in motive for the poet's visit: to be captured by Cupids and dragged off to one's mistress' house, and to decide to go and visit her, if she's sleeping alone, are perhaps the same reason described in different moods: the former is the poetic and metaphorical equivalent of the latter.<sup>14</sup>

8. A is a pleasant dream: **B** is a cruel awakening. This is closely related to Antithesis 2, Drunk-Sober. Alternatively, **A** might be described as a religious epiphany: the *pueri*, as *Cupidines*, are, after all, divinities. **B** is a wholly profane and secular drama: there is a reference to religion in line 27, *ibat et hinc castae narratum somnia Vestae*, but it is placed in the past, and only used for comparison with her present appearance. (Though it is difficult to avoid referring to **A** as a dream or fantasy at some points, we should not assume that it is simply a drunken dream: the status of the Cupids, whether they are 'real' or not, is carefully balanced between dream and epiphany, fiction and fact.)

The same point could again be put another way. Though dealing with kidnapping and (re)enslavement, **A** is quite a pleasant piece. **B**, on the other hand, or at least **B2**, is thoroughly unpleasant. The *pueri* pretend to be cruel, but they make voluptuous promises as well: Cynthia is simply cruel, and very

crude about it, too. No doubt one reason for most scholars' easy acquiescence in Guyet's proposed division is that it enables them to read A often and B seldom, with a clear conscience.

By this point, it should be clear that 2.29a and 2.29b are not just different, an apple and an orange, they are polar opposites. The differences between them are too systematic to be coincidental, and it is the very differences that show that they go together. This brings us to the next two antitheses, which are stylistic, and closely interrelated:

9. A is written in the second person, with a vocative in the first line (*mea lux* 1): **B** is written in the third person throughout. This is paradoxical, in two ways. First, the part of the elegy in which he is not with Cynthia is addressed to her, and vice versa. This is the opposite of what we would expect, though at the same time it fits better with the pleasantness and anticipation of **A** and the cruelty and disappointment of **B**. (For more on this point, see Antithesis 11 below.) Second, we cannot assume that *mea lux* is part of the dedication of the whole elegy, implying that he has been reconciled with her since the events depicted, since we learn in the last line (*ex illo felix*... 42) that she is still estranged. This antithesis is one of the principal reasons why editors have divided the elegy.<sup>15</sup> However, division does not entirely abolish the problem, because the second person of **A** is at odds not only with the third person of **B**, but with the plot of **A**, and vice versa.

10. In A Cynthia is *haec* in the Cupid's description (13) and Propertius is *hic* (9): in **B** she is *illa* from the start (23, 25). She is *illa* even in **B1**, before her abuse begins, as if it is her beauty as much as her hostility or indifference that keeps him at a distance: note *obstipui* (25). This antithesis is parallel to the previous one: the shift from second person to third and from *haec* to *illa* combine to produce a distancing effect. The fact that they are parallel phenomena helps to show that both are intentional, and belong in the same elegy.

All of the differences in mood between the two parts correspond to and are explained by the most basic difference in situation:

11. In A the poet is away from Cynthia: in B he is with her. As shown by the change of persons and the demonstrative pronouns, he is, paradoxically, closer to her, his love is most openly and freely expressed, when he is not (bodily) with her. The subject of Propertius 2.29, if it is permissible to sum it up in one sentence, is the disproportion between Propertius' slavish devotion to Cynthia and her aversion to him: in Catullan terms, *amo et abhorreor*.<sup>16</sup> The mood of B destroys that of A: the poet's dreams are shown to be empty and false.

I would now like to digress somewhat, to deal with four apparently assorted topics that will be seen in the long run to have some bearing on the unity of the elegy:

a. The poet himself is completely passive and ineffective (inepte 14) throughout both parts of the poem. He does not speak, as if he has nothing to offer in reply either to the Cupids or to Cynthia. The elegy is full of seeing words (uisa 6, 26, 29, uisere 25, speculator 31, apparent 35, signa 36, aspice 37), and in each case it is Propertius who is looking, and someone else who is doing. He does not appear to offer any resistance to the Cupids' assault (dixit, et in collo iam mihi nodus erat 10, also his apparent mute submission in 19-20) -- too drunk and in love, no doubt. He is balked at every turn. This is subtly underlined by the three ob words in the poem: (1) obuia nescio quot pueri mihi turba minuta / uenerat 3-4 -the appearance of the Cupids puts a check to his wanderings, (2) obstipui 25 -- his motion towards Cynthia is halted by her stunning beauty, and (3) opposita ... dextra 39 -- she fends off his attempt at a kiss and flees. His attempts at flight, visiting, and a kiss are all equally unsuccessful.<sup>17</sup> The emotional progression of the poem is from intoxication and infatuated love (A), through arm's-length stupefaction (B1), to sober and miserable desolation (B2). The movements of the characters correspond: Propertius moves unwillingly towards Cynthia (A), comes to a stop as he reaches her (B1), and she then flees (B2).<sup>18</sup> The repetition of forms of *propellere* in A and B2 reinforces the effect: the Cupids force him bodily into their midst in order to drag him off towards her (hic . . . iubet in medium propellere 11), then she pushes away his attempt at a kiss (opposita propellens sauia dextra 39).

**b.** The Cupids' parting command at the very center of the poem (22) is disquietingly double-edged:

#### i nunc et noctes disce manere domi!

The import of the Cupids' words seem clear enough: 'go now and find out what kind of things you have been missing by staying out all night'. But they are actually quite ambiguous in this context, and it is not clear whether they are a threat or a promise. The preceding promises (15-18) suggest that this also is a promise, and that he will find Cynthia waiting up for him, and so will be sorry he did not arrive sooner. But the more usual use of *i nunc* is in threats,<sup>19</sup> so the words could just as easily mean that he will be sorry that he stayed out, because he has stayed too long and now she is hostile. The ambiguity seems to be intentional, and provides a very neat transition from A to B.

c. The purpose of the poet's visit is usually misconstrued. As Richardson puts it, commenting on *uolui*, si sola quiesceret illa, / uisere (23-24):<sup>20</sup>

"I cannot believe the usual interpretation of this as: 'I wanted to see whether she was sleeping alone.' Surely P. would have inquired of the servants before lumbering into her room and not have been admitted to the house if she were entertaining company. Here, as the word order suggests, *uisere* ought to have its common meaning, the meaning it always has in P., 'to pay a visit'; cf. 2.3.31; 3.10.1; 3.22.15. The sense is: 'I wished, if she were sleeping alone, to pay her a visit.'"

There are two other points in favor of this interpretation. The first is that it allows us to take *si* as well as *uisere* with its usual meaning: although *si* is used for *utrum* in Propertius 2.3.5 and occasionally elsewhere in Latin verse, there is no reason to take it that way here. The second is that it removes one of the standard arguments for dividing the elegy, the supposed difference in motive for the poet's visit in **A** and **B**: see pages 34-36 below.

**d.** The Cupids, whether they are minor deities or figments of the poet's intoxicated and disordered imagination, are surely liars: they say that Cynthia is waiting up for him when she is not. But their lies contain a hint of an unpleasant truth (or possibility). Their words in 15-18

quae cum Sidoniae nocturna ligamina mitrae soluerit atque oculos mouerit illa grauis, afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores, sed quos ipse suis fecit Amor manibus.

exactly contradict Cynthia's in 35-38:

apparent non ulla toro uestigia presso, signa uolutantis nec iacuisse duos, aspice ut in toto nullus mihi corpore surgat spiritus admisso notus adulterio.

J.P. Sullivan has demonstrated that *spiritus* in 38 refers to an odor rather than heavy breathing:<sup>21</sup>

"Propertius has come to see if Cynthia has spent the night alone; it is not a question of catching her *in flagrante delicto*, but of finding some rival there or the evidence of his stay not yet removed. ... Assuming that Cynthia is in normal health, the heavy breathing (*anhelitus*) ... would not last long enough to be worth mentioning as evidence. ... Breathing, even when one is panting, does not rise *in toto corpore* but *ab imo pectore*."

Although Sullivan is wrong about the meaning of *uisere*, *si*, the rest of his argument is quite sound. Cynthia protests that there is no "smell of love" on her, where the Cupids had promised just such a smell. Their phrasing (*odores*, / quos *ipse suis fecit Amor manibus* 17-18) is, as Sullivan puts it, "not perhaps as 'poetical' as it appears".<sup>22</sup> The two passages quoted are the ending lines of the two longest speeches in the elegy: their differences, not least the antithetical styles or tones of the two passages (the 'highest' and 'lowest' in this poem) reflect the more general differences between **A** and **B**. Note in particular how many of the passages quoted under Antithesis 7 above are from these four couplets.<sup>23</sup>

The question of whether or not Cynthia has entertained another man on this particular night is not only unanswered, but intentionally unanswerable: we can go back and forth between Cynthia's words and the Cupids' and reread every word of the poem, and we are none the wiser. (Cynthia's crude appeal to the physical evidence is unconvincing: given the extreme lateness of the hour, she could have entertained four or five lovers in sequence and still had time to bathe and change the bedclothes before Propertius' arrival.) We are put in the same position as the poet: painful uncertainty, along with a distressing awareness, based

on our knowledge of Cynthia's character, of which alternative is the more likely. This likeliness is also strongly implied by the 'direction' of most of the principal antitheses: (1) Night-Day, (2) Drunkenness-Sobriety, (5) Confusion-Clarity, and (8) Dream-Waking<sup>24</sup> imply a last, unstated, antithesis:

12. Falsehood-Truth (in that order).

We will now turn to the specific reasons which various scholars have given for dividing elegy 2.29, to see how my analysis can be used to answer or evade them. Butler and Barber, in their commentary, gave three reasons (quoted on pages 17-18 above), Enk, in his, four (Enk II, 1962, *ad loc.*), and Francis Cairns, most recently, eight (Cairns 1977: list on 337-38). Ronald E. White (White 1961) has already argued for unity, answering Butler-Barber's arguments in turn. Since Cairns' list is the longest as well as the latest, I will quote his statement of each objection first, followed by my own statement of the reply, sometimes borrowed from White.<sup>25</sup> Cairns himself defends the unity of the elegy, but many of his answers to the objections he lists are quite different from mine, so I cannot simply depend on him for the defence.

The first two objections are closely related, and can be taken together:

1. Cairns (337):

"The action of A (1-22) takes place at night (*nocte*, 1; *noctes*, 22) whereas the action of B (23-42) takes place in the morning (*mane erat*, 23)."

#### **2.** Cairns (337):

"In A Propertius speaks of 'last night' (*hesterna nocte*, 1) whereas in B, in all modern texts, he says 'from that time I have never spent a night with Cynthia' (*ex illo felix nox mihi nulla fuit*, 42). The implication of this latter statement is that the action of B took place at least two nights before Propertius narrates it. This would tell against A and B being continuous because in A Propertius is relating what happened 'last night'."

White has succinctly answered the second of these objections:<sup>26</sup>

"This objection can be met [if] . . . we . . . adopt Heinsius' emendation of *hesterna* to *extrema*, giving the meaning 'late at night' instead of 'last night'. In support of this emendation I cite, with Hertzberg, the common confusion of *hesternus*, *externus*, and *extremus* in the manuscripts. For example, in 3.8.1 we find this variety of readings: *hesternas* in N, A and F; *externas* in D and V; *hexternas* in L (Holkhamicus); *extremas* in Vo. (Leidensis Vossianus 117). Again, in 2.18.24 the manuscripts read *externo*, except for V2 which gives *hesterno*."

To White's statement I would only add, reiterating what I have said above (Antithesis 1, pages 19-20 and note 8), that *extrema nocte* is not 'late at night', but 'very late at night; just before dawn', and that the reading provides a close and neat connection in time between **A** and **B**, while preserving the opposition between them.<sup>27</sup> (On this second point in particular, see Antithesis 1 above and my answer to Objection 7 below.)

Cairns' own reply to the first objection is roughly the same as White's. As for the second, Cairns himself suggests (339) that "There are two possible approaches to this problem, if the unity of the elegy is to be upheld". The first is that *hesterna*... *nocte* in the first line could mean 'the previous night', and the whole of **A** refer to a night some time before the time of writing. As Cairns notes (339), this is highly dubious and in fact unparalleled.<sup>28</sup> Cairns' second (and preferred) solution is that the humanist emendation of *non* to *nox* in the last line should be rejected and the double negative taken as the equivalent of a single negative (as he shows, this is possible, though unusual, Latin).<sup>29</sup> Cairns does not even mention the third, and best, solution, Heinsius' *extrema* in the first line. This suppression of the reasonable suggestions of others seems to me to take conservative criticism rather far: two easy emendations in a 42-line elegy are hardly too many in a text as corrupt as Propertius'.

3. Cairns (338):

"In A Propertius addresses Cynthia (1). In B he speaks of Cynthia in the third person."

White's answer to this objection (as previously stated by Butler and Barber) seems sound, as far as it goes:<sup>30</sup>

"This argument is easily met by a listing of the many parallels in Propertius of abrupt changes of person: 1.3.22, 1.17.15, 2.9.52, 2.12.17, 2.17.17, 2.25.9, 2.26.43, 3.7.11, 4.5.8. Let us examine one of
these. In 2.12.1-12 the poet presents a typical description of Cupid and explains the significance of his wings and arrows. Propertius' own sufferings at the hands of Cupid are discussed in the next two couplets. All references to the god are in the third person: *puerilis imago manet* (13), *ille perdidit* (14), *euolat* (15), *gerit* (16). Suddenly, in line 17, the poet complains directly to Cupid: *quid tibi iocundum est siccis habitare medullis?* The change is from third person to second person, and abrupt. Any argument which is based on an abrupt change of the person addressed is deprived of validity by the prevalence of this practice in Propertius."

To this I would only add that White shows that a change of person addressed is possible (and common in Propertius), but gives no reason why it is necessary, or at least appropriate, to make this particular change at this particular point in this poem. I hope I have shown in my own analysis how it is necessary: see Antitheses 9 through 11 in particular.<sup>31</sup>

4. Cairns (338):

"In A Propertius addresses Cynthia as mea lux (1) when he recounts his adventure with the Cupids. These words are terms of endearment. But at the end of B (42) Propertius says that Cynthia is estranged from him."

I have listed this as part of Antithesis 9. It goes closely with 10, the shift from *haec* to *illa*, as I have mentioned above, as well as with the change from the pleasant tone of A to the nasty tone of B (Antithesis 8). It is part of the whole antithetical structure of the elegy. Cairns' own reply, though different, is also true and helpful (341): "This argument only holds good if the address *mea lux* is an

indication of mutual affection. But in all three Propertian uses of the phrase . . . . only Propertius' feelings are indicated."

5. Cairns (338):

"In A the Cupids claim that Cynthia hired them to bring Propertius to her (20) and that she is ready to welcome him to her favours (15 ff.). But in B Cynthia reacts in a most unfriendly fashion to Propertius' arrival (31 ff.) and ends by rejecting him."

What is interesting here is the extreme credulity of scholars faced with the statements of these unpleasant boys. Whether they are minor pagan deities or figments of the poet's drunken and disordered imagination, we are hardly entitled to assume that their statements can be taken as factual. Cairns, in his reply (341) calls them "biased not factual": this is putting it mildly. I have discussed this point above (pages 27-29), in connection with the ambiguity of *i nunc* and the complementary differences between the Cupids' words in 15-18 and Cynthia's in 35-38.

6. Cairns (338):

"In A we are given no hint that Propertius is not completely confident in Cynthia's affection for him. But B begins with Propertius' 'spying' on her and wondering if she has been unfaithful to him (23 f.)."

The poet's 'complete confidence' is the confidence of a drunk and a lover, which is to say, a double fool. In addition, we are given sufficient hints that all is not well, both in the Cupids' rude actions, which bely their pleasant promises, and in their single-word characterizations of lover and beloved: he is *ineptus* (14) and she *irata* (9). Both words look forward to **B**.

### 7. Cairns (338):

"In B (23 f.) Propertius seems to be stating as the reason for his entering Cynthia's house that he 'wanted to go and see if she was sleeping alone' (*et uolui, si sola quiesceret illa, / uisere*). But the whole tenor of A is that Propertius is an invited and expected komast. The further reason given in 23f. appears unnecessary and even incompatible with the first reason given in A, no matter on what literal or metaphorical level these reasons should be understood."

There are several things wrong with this statement:

a. As mentioned above (pages 27-28), while si can undoubtedly be used as a colloquial equivalent to *utrum* (as in 2.3.5), there is no need to take it so here. It is easier to take the line, with Richardson, as meaning 'I decided to visit her, if she were resting alone'. Checking whether she has company is the necessary precondition for a visit, not its purpose.<sup>32</sup>

**b.** The Cupids say that he has been "invited", and that Cynthia is expecting him, but Cynthia herself never says so. The question of the veracity of the Cupids, mentioned above in my reply to Objection 5, needs to be considered. In addition, if Heinsius' *extrema* . . . *nocte* is correct, it could well be true that Cynthia was

waiting up for him, but gave up and went to bed, due to the lateness of the hour. Whether she went to bed alone, or accompanied by a substitute, is another question. The tone of her speech (31-38) certainly suggests that she had been waiting up for him most of the night, and that he didn't show up until far too late, but that is what she would say, whether it is true or not.

**c.** The phrase "no matter on what literal or metaphorical level these reasons should be understood" is asking for trouble.

White's answer to this objection, however (his and Butler and Barber's second), is less satisfactory: he suggests<sup>33</sup>

"... that the reader is required to understand between lines 22-23 an unexpressed passage of time during which some unmentioned event occurs. [At line 23] ... we surmise that there has been a passage of time ... from night to morning, though we are not told specifically 'the night passed.' [We further surmise] that instead of going straight into the house to Cynthia, he stumbled into the vestibule and fell asleep there. When he awoke, his first thought was that, since he had failed to appear the previous evening, Cynthia may have called in another lover. This explains away the apparent inconsistency ... that the poet goes to spy on his sweetheart even though he has been told that she is waiting for him; ... for all he knows, the situation may well have changed completely in the course of the night."

There are several difficulties with this explanation. The main problem is the lack of any time available: as mentioned above, *extrema* . . . *nocte* (1) and dawn (*mane* 23) are immediately adjacent. The explanation is also gratuitous: surely these "unmentioned events" should be at least hinted at? An honest lacuna would

be preferable to White's analysis. And once again we have the scholarly credulity which would believe even a gang of marauding Cupids. Finally, White's mistranslation of si contributes to the confusion: there is no need for a change of purpose if si means si rather than *utrum* (see pages 27-28 above). A more serious problem is that White, as in his reply to Objection 3, confines himself to showing how the changes from **A** to **B** are possible, without showing how they are necessary or appropriate.

8. Finally, we arrive at the last of the objections raised. Cairns (338):

"In A Propertius is a fugitiuus . . . In B there is no trace of this role."

As Cairns notes in his own reply (342), "On the level of common sense,  $\dots$  [this] is hardly surprising: a runaway slave who has been caught and taken back to his owner is no longer a runaway". On the more literary level, the situation is more complicated. Cairns notes (343) that "there are no reminders of free status in B to draw the reader's attention to the change". But I think we can put it more strongly than that. I have said above (page 25) that the mood of B destroys that of A, that the poet's dreams are shown to be empty and false. But in another way, they are shown to be true: it becomes clear in B that *seruitium amoris* is not just a pretty metaphor. Cynthia treats Propertius as a slave throughout: he is helpless in the face of her abuse, she apparently slaps his face when he tries to kiss her (*opposita propellens sauia dextra* 39), and her cruelty is unchanged at the

time of writing (42).<sup>34</sup> **B** is partly a reversal of **A**, and partly a translation into different terms.

Elegy 2.29 is one of the most symmetrical, close-knit, and carefully constructed of all Augustan poems. It is also a good example of what I take to be wrong with much twentieth-century scholarship on Propertius: in their eagerness to avoid the easy alterations *hesterna* to *extrema* and *non* to *nox*, editors will either explain away the most peculiar contradictions, or they will cut the elegy into pieces and rearrange it to their heart's desire.<sup>35</sup>

#### **Appendix:** Arrangements of Propertius 2.29

The chart at the end of this appendix includes a representative, and fairly complete, sample of the editors, commentators, and other scholars who have expressed an opinion on the unity of Propertius 2.29. They are assigned to classes I through VI, depending on their degree of conservatism or radicalism on the question of unity. Class I contains the most unadventurous of the conservatives, who will print anything that has manuscript authority, without much regard to whether it means anything, while Class VI contains the most ferocious of the radicals, who are willing to hack the elegy in pieces, and insert bits of others, in an attempt to make appropriate sense of it. The others are distributed into the four classes in between. I am, of course, aware, that the arguments of scholars, like manuscripts, must be weighed rather than counted, and that the popularity of a particular solution is not a point in its favor, or against it, for that matter. Still, the general trends on display are quite interesting.

Classes I through III contain the conservatives of one degree or another, who print 2.29 as a single elegy, as it is in all of the earlier manuscripts. Class I print *hesterna* in line 1 and *non* in line 42, because both are in the manuscripts, although the latter is very difficult, and the former conflicts with the sense of the last line, even if we read *non* there. Class II print *hesterna* in 1 and *nox* in 42, thus following the consensus of the dividers (classes IV-VI) on both points, but

without worrying about the conflict between the two lines, which has caused the dividers to divide. (Postgate is asterisked because he prints something slightly different: *hesterno modo cum potu sub nocte uagarer*.) Class III contains those scholars who are willing to indulge in a small amount of emendation in order to preserve the unity of the elegy. They therefore print Heinsius' *extrema* for *hesterna* in 1, which removes the difficulty in times, along with *nox* in 42. This is the position I have argued for in this chapter.

Classes IV through VI contain the radicals of one degree or another, who print 2.29 as two elegies, divided after line 22. All of them read hesterna (with the manuscripts) in 1, and nox (against them) in 42, agreeing in both of these decisions with the mainstream conservatives of Class II. Class IV go no further than this.<sup>36</sup> Class V, in addition to dividing, also posit a lacuna after line 10. Class VI is more miscellaneous: it contains those few who rearrange the elegy more drastically, and not in the same ways. Richmond divides the elegy, moves the two halves apart, and marks a lacuna (of precisely four lines) at the beginning of **B** (which he calls i.17), in addition to the one after line 10 of **A** (which he calls i.20). Although it is odd to see Richmond outdone in radicalism, it has happened not once but twice. Goold, the most recent editor, divides the elegy after line 22, and inserts 2.2.9-12 after line 26 (though he does not posit a lacuna after 10). Richardson had already gone even further, inserting 2.30.1-12 after line 10, as well as 2.2.9-12 after line 28. However, I have placed Richardson in classes II and VI simultaneously, since he reads hesterna in 1 and nox in 42, and does not divide. He thus contrives to be even more radical than Goold in his transpositions, while following the conservative consensus in other respects.

What is interesting about this chart is the trend over time. The 'moderate conservatives' of Class III dominated the nineteenth century, but have died out entirely since, except for White 1961. The 'moderate radicals' of Class IV, along with their more radical fellows in Class V, have dominated, though less completely, most of the twentieth century. But when we get to the last fifteen years, the consensus, such as it was, collapses, and we find that only the extremists of Classes I, II, V, and VI remain: Richardson contrives to straddle both extremes, and the two most recent editors, Fedeli and Goold, occupy the two most extreme positions. It is enough to make one despair of progress in scholarship.

Year	Conservatives		ives	es Radicals		
	Ι	II	III	IV	V	VI
1777		Barthius				
1780		Burman				
1816			Lachmann			
1827		Jacob				
1843			Hertzberg			
1850			Keil			
1853			Paley			
1854			Rossbach			
1880			Baehrens			
1880			Palmer			
1905		Postgate*				
1907	Phillimore					
1911			Enk CC			
1912		Butler				
1920				Rothstein		
1928						Richmond
1929		Paganelli			_	
1933		<b>N</b> 1 11			Butler-Bar	ber
1946		Balcells		~ •		
1954				Schuster		
1960			111 . 101		Barber	
1901			White 196	1		
1902					~•	
1905				Tovar-Bell	tiore	
1904				LUCK		
1905				Heim	37	
1900				Leievre PI		
1077				Camps II	Ciandina I	T
1077		Richardson	n		Giardina I	.I Dishandran
1977	Cairns 107	7		••••••	****************	Richardson
1977		,		Davis 107	7	
1979				Davis 17/	' Hanslik	
1979		Williams F	ТоТ		I I GII SIIK	
1984	Fedeli					
1989					•	Goold
						COOLD

ι.

.

## Notes to Chapter II

<sup>1</sup> White 1961.

- <sup>2</sup> Enk CC, 169-71 and Enk II, 368.
- 3 Williams FoT, 131-34 and Cairns 1977, 337-44. Although Williams' discussion is the most recent (1979), I will not be referring to it in what follows, because I have not found it very useful. He is somewhat confused on the times, saying "His speech to her tells of 'last night', but the time of delivery is the morning" (132), but then quoting lines 41-42 and translating "from that time I have not had a happy night" (133). He does not mention Heinsius' extrema, but tries to evade the contradiction in times by making the narrative of A "a part of another narrative", that is, B (132). This seems to me untenable: there is no hint of any 'poem-within-a-poem' effect other than the change of person. Another detail is telling: "his own intentions were unfaithful before he was arrested, as he lets slip (14)" (132). But the words in line 14 are the cupid's and do not tell us anything directly about the poet's motives. Of course, Propertius as poet is quoting the Cupids saying these nasty things about himself as narrator, but that does not prove that they are speaking the truth, even if we assume, without argument, that they are fictional. All in all, the difficult structure of this elegy needs more analysis than the three pages Williams devotes to it.
- <sup>4</sup> Some editors call them '29' and '29a', but I will follow Cairns and Barber and call them A and B, to avoid confusion.
- <sup>5</sup> Butler-Barber 242, ad 2.29A.
- <sup>6</sup> Sullivan EPSP, 57.
- <sup>7</sup> The number of antitheses is not fixed, and the total could undoubtedly be increased or decreased by redefining them. For instance, 3, 6, 7, and 8 could be divided, or 9 and 10 combined. There is also some overlap.
- <sup>8</sup> The translation "morning" is ambiguous and perhaps misleading. Just as *extrema nocte* does not mean "late at night", but specifically "very late at night; just before dawn", so *mane*, at least in this passage, means not "morning" but "very early morning; dawn". It is early enough for the poet to expect to find Cynthia still in bed. This is also what the word means in Propertius' only other use (3.10.1), where it is accompanied by a reference to the red glow of sunrise (*sole rubente* 3.10.2): see Fedeli III, ad loc., for a full discussion.

- <sup>9</sup> These are all in **B2**. We will see other instances where **A** is opposed to **B2**, rather than all of **B**. Antitheses 7 and 8 are particularly good examples.
- <sup>10</sup> Note that we are not told how he got in: the contrast between the two locations seems to be more important than the connection.
- <sup>11</sup> To take a single instance, where the three speeches in A (8-9, 12-20, and 22) all begin with pentameters, and one of them ends in a hexameter, the single speech in B (31-38) fills precisely four couplets with one sentence each.
- <sup>12</sup> The *pueri* of **A** are obviously *Cupidines*. They have also been shown to be *pueri minuti* or *deliciae* by Slater, following Birt and Scaliger (Slater 1974), and *fugitiuarii* by Cairns (Cairns 1971). This multiplication of metaphors seems to be unique in Propertius. The fact that the poet is no longer a *fugitiuus* in **B** has been used as an objection to unity: see my discussion below (page 37).
- <sup>13</sup> As Camps II notes (ad loc.), "the connection with *soluerit* is in the fact that her hair is perfumed".
- <sup>14</sup> The meaning of *uisere*, si is discussed on pages 27-28 below.
- <sup>15</sup> It is the third objection in both Butler-Barber's and Cairns' lists: see pages 17-18 and 32-33 respectively.
- <sup>16</sup> I do not mean that this is Cynthia's attitude toward Propertius in all of the poems, still less in real life (as if we could tell), but that it is her attitude in this poem, and in quite a few others.
- <sup>17</sup> I would not care to press the fact that the three *ob* words are distributed through the three parts of the poem (A, B1, and B2).
- <sup>18</sup> This is a more precise redefinition of Antithesis 6 above.
- <sup>19</sup> Enk II (ad loc.) gives several instances of *i nunc* as threat or warning, while listing this one as a command ("nil nisi iussum"). I would say rather that it combines the two shades of meaning.
- <sup>20</sup> Richardson, 299.
- <sup>21</sup> Sullivan 1961, 1.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

- <sup>23</sup> Interestingly, Smyth records that these two passages include three of the very few couplets in this elegy that have ever been athetized by one scholar or another: "15-18 alienos esse censet Fontein . . . 37-38 spurios esse censet Sandstrom".
- <sup>24</sup> Perhaps also (3) Wandering-Fixedness, (7) Poetry-Prose or Floweriness-Crudity, (8) Dream-Waking or Pleasantness-Unpleasantness, and (11) Apartness-Togetherness.
- <sup>25</sup> Butler-Barber's three objections correspond to items 2, 7, and 3 in Cairns' list, and Enk's four to items 2, 7, 3, and 6, respectively.
- <sup>26</sup> White also offers an alternative explanation: that *ex illo* in 42 is causal, "on account of that [quarrel]", rather than temporal. While this cannot be absolutely ruled out, I agree with the consensus of commentators in preferring the other one.
- <sup>27</sup> The phrase extrema prope nocte occurs in Cicero's <u>Aratea</u> 33.81-82 (*Tum sese Orion toto iam corpore condit / extrema prope nocte*...). Soubiran (Cicéron, <u>Aratea. Fragments poétiques</u>, ed. Jean Soubiran, Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres', 1972), translates the phrase "vers la fin de la nuit". Other parallels are later than Propertius and not as close, but *nocte sub extrema* has the same meaning in Lucan 5.734 and Valerius Flaccus 5.140. Though furthest from Propertius' wording, Silius 4.88-89 provides the most explicit context: *Iamque sub extremum noctis fugientibus umbris / lux aderat, Somnusque suas confecerat horas*. None of this should be particularly controversial: it is difficult to see what extrema nox or extremum noctis <u>could</u> mean except 'just before dawn'.
- <sup>28</sup> Richardson's approach is slightly different. He takes **B** as a later comment on **A**: "The apology would have been written on the day of the incident-- or purport to be; the rest of the poem would have been written later." (II.29. Introductory Note, p. 295). This is a desperate measure, since the contradiction between *hesterna*... *nocte* and *ex illo* is the only hint of any difference in the time of writing: Heinsius' simple emendation is surely preferable. Richardson's next sentence is more satisfactory: "The two are put together to complement one another and must not be separated, but when he speaks for her ears and when he speaks for ours it will not be in the same voice."
- <sup>29</sup> He also suggests that *felix* in the sense required is only used of person, and that *felix nox* would have sacral connotations, which are not what the context demands: "*felix* is never applied to a night of love in elegy: it is applied to the lover who wins his beloved or to the girl who is 'complaisant'" (Cairns 1977, 339). I find this line of argument totally unconvincing. The word has a broad range of uses. Propertius himself uses *felix* of his fortunate rival's

elbow (1.16.33), and more pertinently, of the broken *concordia* between himself and Cynthia which he hopes to restore (3.6.41). Why should he not use it with *nox*?

- <sup>30</sup> White 1961, 223. Cairns' argument is similar (Cairns 1977, 341).
- <sup>31</sup> There is one complication that White does not discuss. Abrupt shifts from third to second person are easily paralleled: shifts from second to third are much rarer, so White's parallel in 2.12 does not prove quite as much as he wishes. Most of the instances he lists are shifts from third person to second, and at least one, 2.9.52, is also textually dubious, to say the least. However, even dismissing all those, we are still left with 1.17.15 and 4.5.8, both of which seem secure enough.
- <sup>32</sup> It is true that she calls him a spy (*speculator* 31), but his spying would be equally offensive to her, whether it is the primary motive for his visit, or only a necessary preliminary.
- <sup>33</sup> White 1961, 225.
- <sup>34</sup> As Cairns notes, "there are no reminders of free status in B to draw the reader's attention to the change" (Cairns 1977, 343).
- <sup>35</sup> J. T. Davis' interpretation (Davis 1977, 65-75) is perhaps a special case. He interprets 2.29a and 2.29b as a matched pair, like Ovid's Cypassis elegies (<u>Amores</u> 2.7-8). I find his examination of each half, and in particular the parallels between them, generally quite convincing. But it seems to me that the connections between the two halves are so numerous and so intricate that Heinsius' *extrema* in line 1 is not too high a price to pay for unity. The argument for division really turns on that single word, and Propertius' text is far too corrupt for a single word to bear such weight. (I might add that I consider all of his other Propertian examples, 1.8a-b, 1.11-12, and 2.28, to be single elegies, and I have Hodge-Buttimore I on my side in the first two cases, and most recent scholars in the third. Although Ovid undoubtedly wrote matching pairs of elegies, Propertius preferred to write single elegies in antithetical form.)
- <sup>36</sup> I have omitted from the list several scholars who divide the elegy, but do not offer any opinion as to the readings of lines 1 and 42. They include Ites (DPE, 47-48), Sullivan (EPSP, 57), Juhnke (1971, 101-02 and 113), and Wille (1980, 265). No doubt all would fall into Classes IV and V, though I cannot say which. Thus the balance of opinion tilts more strongly towards the side of division that the chart can show.

<sup>37</sup> Although he prints no complete text, Lefèvre defends division at 138 n 17, and prints 1-4 with *hesterna* on 33, and 41-42 with *nox* on 138.

.

Chapter III

.

# Antithesis as a Structural Principle II

Elegy 2.6-7

.

.

.

A

Non ita complebant Ephyraeae Laidos aedis,	
ad cuius iacuit Graecia tota fores;	
turba Menandreae fuerat nec Thaidos olim	
tanta, in qua populus lusit Ericthonius;	
nec quae deletas potuit componere Thebas,	6.5
Phryne tam multis facta beata uiris	
quin etiam falsos fingis tibi saepe propinquos,	
oscula nec desunt qui tibi iure ferant.	
me iuuenum pictae facies, me nomina laedunt,	
me tener in cunis et sine uoce puer;	6.10
me laedet, si multa tibi dabit oscula mater,	
me soror et quando dormit amica simul:	
omnia me laedent: timidus sum (ignosce timori)	
et miser in tunica suspicor esse uirum.	
his olim, ut fama est, uitiis ad proelia uentum est,	6.15
his Troiana uides funera principiis;	
aspera Centauros eadem dementia iussit	
frangere in aduersum pocula Pirithoum.	
cur exempla petam Graium? tu criminis auctor,	
nutritus duro, Romule, lacte lupae:	6.20
tu rapere intactas docuisti impune Sabinas:	
per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor.	
felix Admeti coniunx et lectus Vlixis,	
et quaecumque uiri femina limen amat!	
templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis,	6.25
si cuiuis nuptae quidlibet esse licet?	
quae manus obscenas depinxit prima tabellas	
et posuit casta turpia uisa domo,	
illa puellarum ingenuos corrupit ocellos	
nequitiaeque suae noluit esse rudis.	6.30
a gemat, in terris ista qui protulit arte	
turpia sub tacita condita laetitia!	

6.5 deletas N2, F?, P: delectas N1F1: disiectas Schrader: deiectas Gebhard
6.12 quando Alton: cum qua O: cum quae Dousa
6.31 in tenebris Fontein
6.32 turpia van Herwerden: orgia Ruhnken: iurgia O

	non istis olim uariabant tecta figuris:	
	tum paries nullo crimine pictus erat.	
	sed nunc inmeritum uelauit aranea fanum	6.35
	et mala desertos occupat herba deos.	
	quos igitur tibi custodes, quae limina ponam,	
	quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?	
	nam nihil inuitae tristis custodia prodest:	
	quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est.	6.40
ab	nos uxor numquam, numquam diducet amica:	
	semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.	6.42
B	gauisa es certe sublatam, Cynthia, legem,	7.1
	qua quondam edicta maestus uterque diu,	
	ni nos diuideret: quamuis diducere amantis	
	non queat inuitos Iuppiter ipse duos.	
	'At magnus Caesar.' sed magnus Caesar in armis:	7.5
	deuictae gentes nil in amore ualent.	
	nam citius paterer caput hoc discedere collo	
	quam possem +nuptae perdere more faces,+	
	aut ego transirem tua limina clausa maritus,	
	respiciens udis prodita luminibus.	7.10
	a mea tum qualis caneret tibi tibia somnos,	
	tibia, funesta tristior illa tuba!	
	unde mihi patriis natos praebere triumphis?	
	nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit.	
	quod si uera meae comitarem castra puellae,	7.15
	non mihi sat magnus Castoris iret equus.	
	hinc etenim tantum meruit mea gloria nomen,	
	gloria ad hibernos lata Borysthenidas.	
	tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus:	
	hic erit et patrio sanguine pluris amor.	7.20

6.35 sed nunc immeritum Luck : sed non immerito! O (dist. Brandt, Rothstein)

6.41-42 ad initium sequentis elegiae transfert Havet, ad finem eiusdem Scaliger, alibi alii

- 6.41 diducet Lachmann : deducet Volscus : seducet Birt : me ducet O
- 7.1 nouam elegiam incipit O, coniunxi es Schrader : est O

7.2 maestus Alton : stemus O : flemus s

7.8 more O: amore uel in ore s

7.13 nouam elegiam incipit O, coniungunt editores patriis O: Parthis Ruhnken : Latiis Heinsius

7.20 patrio O : proprio Baehrens : Partho Burman sanguine O : nomine Postgate

Elegies 2.6 and 2.7 are separated in all of the early manuscripts (which also divide 2.7 at line 13), and have always been considered separate elegies by editors. Nevertheless, there are several reasons why they must constitute a single elegy, as printed above, which I call 2.6-7. (For ease of reference, I have labelled lines 1-40 of 2.6 as "A", 2.7 as "B", and the connecting couplet, 2.6.41-42, as "ab").

The structure of the elegy is antithetical, with the strongly contrasted sections A and B connected by couplet ab, which sums up the differences between them. Although, as we saw in Chapter II, elegy 2.29 is also antithetically constructed, 2.6-7 differs in several important ways. Where 2.29 was built on a whole series of interlocking antitheses, 2.6-7 is built on just one, and the antithesis is one of attitudes, rather than situations. In addition, the two parts, with their two attitudes, are more clearly separated from each other, with a more abrupt transition: this is no doubt why the manuscripts and editors are so unanimous in favor of division.

Antithetical poems, in which the poet expresses two opposed and even mutually exclusive attitudes more or less simultaneously in order to express a paradox or dilemma, are by no means rare in Latin verse. No doubt the most famous is Catullus 85, with its excruciating combination of love and hate. The whole antithesis is summed up in the first three words: *odi et amo*. The same antithesis

is the theme of Catullus 72 (particularly lines 5-8) and 75, to look no further. However, the antithesis to which Catullus devotes his longest and most elaborate elegy, poem 68, is rather different: not love versus hate, but passionate love versus respectable marriage. This antithesis also lies behind several Propertian elegies and pairs of elegies, including ours. C. Macleod, writing of Catullus 68, puts it well:<sup>1</sup>

"On the one hand there is a view of his love as equivalent to that of a wedded couple, though an ill-starred and unsatisfied one; on the other, as a mere amour which is happy enough within its limits, but cannot make the claims of marriage on its participants and has to leave room for an occasional escapade. In the one view there is Catullus' possessiveness and seriousness, in the other his urbanity and resignation. Similar contrasts of the two sorts of love also find expression in Propertius. In 2.32 the poet passes from the one attitude to the other; in 3.21-2 he sets himself, the lover going abroad to escape from his love, against Tullus returning to enjoy the benefits of the home-country and of marriage; and in 4.7 and 11, in the figures of Cynthia and Cornelia, he makes his greatest confrontation of the two relationships."

Of those Macleod mentions, elegy 2.32 is the most important for my purposes,

and its shape is worth setting out in some detail. As Camps puts it:<sup>2</sup>

"The poet begins by complaining of Cynthia's absences from Rome, which he suspects are a cloak for amorous escapades; but then his mood changes, and he concedes or pretends to concede that such escapades are venial and that fidelity to a single man would be abnormal in Roman women of his time, or indeed in any women of any time since the end of the golden age."

The shift from criticism to justification comes around line 25, on which Camps notes:<sup>3</sup>

"Here begins a justification of Cynthia's conduct, in antithesis to all that has gone before; and this justification is not on the ground that she is innocent of amorous adventures, but that these are after all venial and defended by precedents in legend (and, as is added later in 43 ff., by the *mores* of contemporary Rome)."

I would argue that the shift actually begins at line 21:

sed de me minus est: famae iactura pudicae tanta tibi miserae, quanta meretur, erit.

The precise location of the shift from condemnation to justification is arguable, but it is important to notice that there is such a shift, and that it comes somewhere around one-third of the way through the 62-line elegy.

Elegy 2.32 has avoided division by the fact that the two attitudes within it are juxtaposed rather than combined, and the change from one to the other is gradual.<sup>4</sup> Elegy 2.6-7, a similar elegy near the other end of the same book, has not been so lucky.

The whole which results from the combination of 2.6 and 2.7 is, like 2.32, designedly antithetical, and expresses the two sides of Propertius' feelings about his relationship with Cynthia, with the contradiction summed up in the pivotal couplet **ab**:

nos uxor numquam, numquam diducet amica: semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris. In the first half, which I have called A (2.6.1-40), the poet begins by comparing Cynthia to Lais, Thais, and Phryne, the most famous courtesans of the ancient world (1-6), and then spells out the implications of the exempla by complaining of the number of her lovers and her always-open door (7-14).<sup>5</sup> Next he inserts some Greek and Roman exempla (15-22) illustrating the dangers of unchastity, the Trojan war, the Centauromachy, and the Rape of the Sabines, and some Greek exempla (23-24) of chastity, Alcestis and Penelope. Next he passes on to Horatian reflections on lewd wall-paintings and the decline of religious observance (25-36), finally returning to Cynthia with an expression of hopeless jealousy (37-40). What ties this rather rambling sequence together is the theme of jealousy, "not bitter and immediate, but vague and all inclusive",6 the light-hearted tone with which it is expressed, and the husbandly persona which is adopted throughout: "he speaks to her as a wife by whose behavior he is troubled".<sup>7</sup> That the poet's persona is the jealous husband rather than the jealous lover is shown by the emphasis on guarding Cynthia's home and keeping her safe inside it, and the moralistic tone with which he lectures her on religion, morality, and art. In the second half, which I have called B (2.7), he expresses his and Cynthia's shared relief at the repeal of legislation that would have separated them by forcing him to marry (1-3), gloats over the princeps' lack of control over lovers (3-8), paints a sad picture of his fate if he does marry (8-12), and continues with a rejection of his duty to produce sons who will be soldiers (13-18), returning to Cynthia in the last couplet (19-20). What ties 2.7 (B) together is the poet's "defiance of ordinary Roman values", and the "extravagance, even shrillness", with which he does it.<sup>8</sup> The contrast between **A** and **B** may be summed up as follows: in **A**, the poet plays a comically exaggerated jealous husband, abusing Cynthia as if she were his wife for her sluttish ways, while in **B**, he plays a comically exaggerated Bohemian lover, swearing eternal passion even to death, and refusing all patriotic and paternal duties, most particularly procreation of children.

The paradox of the poet's love is most succinctly expressed in the connecting couplet, **ab**, quoted above. This can be taken to mean not so much that Cynthia will be both lover and wife to him, but that she will be neither: her status in his eyes is ambiguous and cannot be reduced to the one or the other. (It is significant that he does not say "no <u>other</u> wife" or "no <u>other</u> girlfriend" will separate us: either phrase would imply that Cynthia fell into the same category, but her status is unique, and cannot be reduced to either the one or the other.<sup>9</sup>

The first advantage of unification is that it makes sense of the opposite exaggerations of parts A and B, each of which is quite out of character for Propertius. A is anti-Catullan and anti-elegiac (the two adjectives are equivalent here): Propertius not only sides with the *senes seueriores* of Catullus 5, and the *senes* . . . *duri* of Propertius 2.30, whose aim in life is to prevent young lovers from having any fun, he seems to have become one of them. And the attitude depicted is not only unlike what we would expect, but like some things we wouldn't expect: the closest parallel for the passage about decrepit temples is Horace, of all people, in the last of the Roman Odes (Carmina 3.6, especially

lines 1-4).<sup>10</sup> **B**, by contrast, is out of character in being explicitly anti-Augustan. Propertius, at least in his first three books, is certainly no Augustan, and urbane mockery of the official program is frequent, and sometimes, as in 2.1, develops quite a nasty edge. But even his references to the sack of Perusia and Augustus' other atrocities in 1.21-22 and 2.1 contain no open defiance.

What I am suggesting is that Propertius in elegies 2.6 and 2.7, taken as a single poem, is doing something very like what he is doing in 2.32, though in this case he does not pass gradually from his husband-role to his lover-role, but juxtaposes them, with only a single paradoxical couplet to connect them. Moreover, the two parts of our poem are more humorously exaggerated than the two parts of 2.32: where 2.32 balances "possessiveness and seriousness" against "urbanity and resignation", as Macleod puts it, 2.6-7 balances pompous possessiveness against flamboyant defiance: we might say that the seriousness of each of the two parts of our poem is exaggerated to the point of humorlessness, for humorous effect.<sup>11</sup>

It may be significant that several scholars find themselves discussing 2.6 and 2.7 in close proximity, without apparently intending anything by the collocation. For instance, Williams (TORP), examining the question of Cynthia's citizen status and profession, discusses 2.6 on page 530 and 2.7 on page 531 (though several other elegies are referred to briefly in between). Stahl, in his long discussion of 2.7 (LW, 140-56), finds occasion to mention 2.6 twice (143-44 and 144 bottom), again mostly with reference to the question of Cynthia's legal status. Finally,

Lyne (LLP, 79) seems for a moment to be about to define some special connection between the two: after referring to **2.6** ("which throughout views Cynthia as a wife") and quoting the last couplet, he says:

"The lines not only of course illuminate Propertius' feelings for Cynthia; they are also socially and politically provocative, against a background of legislation to enforce marriage: cf. 2.7 . . ."

But he does not define any further what the connection between the two poems may be: apparently their contiguity, and the peculiar appropriateness of the quoted couplet to both, is, in his view, coincidental.

The second advantage of unification is that it makes sense of this connecting couplet, which I have called **ab** (2.6.41-42):

nos uxor numquam, numquam diducet amica: semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.

This ringing declaration has been quoted in isolation many times for the light it supposedly sheds on Propertius' view of his relationship to Cynthia. Editors have also transposed it to at least six different locations (which is probably not a record, but still significant). The full list is of some interest:

post 2.6.24	Richmond
ante 2.7.1	Havet
post 2.7.12	Hetzel
post 2.7.18	Richardson
post 2.7.20	Scaliger
post 2.18.34	Fürstenau

The couplet has been moved to both beginning and end of 2.7, as well as two points in between: thus there seems to be a widespread feeling that the couplet goes at least as well with **B** as with **A**. Taking it as the connecting link between two parts of the same elegy will allow it to be taken equally with both. Havet's transposition, to the beginning of 2.7, which has been defended most recently by Luck,<sup>12</sup> is actually a boundary-change rather than a change in line order: my proposal to unify 2.6-7 makes Havet and Luck half-right, in that they connect the couplet to 2.7, and half-wrong, in that they sever it from 2.6.

The third advantage of unification is that it solves what may be called the political problem in **B** (2.7). This elegy has been quoted repeatedly as a source (in fact, the only source) for Augustan attempts at marriage laws as early as 28 B.C.: most fully by Gordon Williams.<sup>13</sup> Two recent papers add new, and apparently irreconcilable, twists to the standard interpretation. First, Francis Cairns argues that the whole poem is insincere: that the poet's arguments are so weak, his persona so unsympathetic, and the tone of the elegy so full of "shrillness and hysteria", that the poem must be read as obliquely endorsing the Augustan program.<sup>14</sup> Although Cairns seems to have won few converts, he has put his finger on some peculiarities, for instance that Propertius boldly defies a law that has already been repealed. Second, E. Badian, in an article entitled "A Phantom Marriage Law", has cast grave doubts on the very existence of any specific marriage legislation at this early date, whether passed and then repealed, or proposed and then withdrawn without being passed. Briefly, he suggests that the

law to which Propertius refers was neither Augustan nor moralistic, but was one of the irregular money-raising provisions of the Triumvirate, that it applied special penalties to bachelors or the childless, that it was commonly evaded, so that substantial cumulative penalties would have accrued to those who had not been paying it, and that it was repealed in the "general abolition of irregular Triumviral ordinances as from the end of 28".<sup>15</sup>

Taking 2.6-7 as a single elegy allows us to accept the more plausible parts of Cairns' arguments, while accepting Badian's revision of the political and legal background. We can follow Cairns in taking 2.7 as comically exaggerated, though not perhaps insincere, without going all the way with him by reading it as any sort of endorsement (oblique or otherwise) of the Augustan program. Propertius has other aims in view, and I take it that this poem is actually more about the complications of his feelings toward Cynthia than about Augustus. That is, we can take the comic exaggerations of 2.7 as balancing the comic exaggerations of 2.6, in order to express a more complicated truth, rather than as calling attention to their own insincerity in order to say the opposite of what they appear to say.<sup>16</sup> Taking 2.6 and 2.7 as a single elegy allows us to reconcile some of the apparently irreconcilable aspects of Cairns' and Badian's respective interpretations of 2.7. (In passing, we may note that it is inadvisable to use either Propertius 2.7 or the last couplet of 2.6 as evidence for Augustus' moral legislation or Cynthia's marital status, without considering them in the context of the poem, and of Book II as a whole. Settling the boundaries between the elegies is a crucial prerequisite.)

The fourth advantage of unification is that it makes sense of a number of specific details in the elegy. Some of these are significant connections of words or ideas across the supposed boundary between **A** and **B**, and these help to tie the elegy together. Others are textual questions, where the unity of the elegy offers guidance in choosing between variants. The second type of argument is semi-circular, in that we are using unification as an argument for particular textual choices, while the neatness of the textual choices is itself an argument for unification. However, as we will see, many of the textual choices can be recommended on other grounds as well, and I think that it is significant that I have come to the same conclusions on most of these textual points as Stahl, but on different grounds.<sup>17</sup>

1. The theme of *limina* is appropriately varied in the two parts of the elegy. In A, Propertius complains about Cynthia's not keeping other men outside of her *limen* (2.6.23-24, 37-38):

felix Admeti coniunx et lectus Vlixis, et quaecumque uiri femina <u>limen</u> amat! quos igitur tibi custodes, quae <u>limina</u> ponam, quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?

In **B**, he depicts himself (hypothetically) on the outside, and complains about not being able to get in through the *limina* which are now *clausa* (2.7.7-10):

nam citius paterer caput hoc discedere collo quam possem + nuptae perdere more faces, + aut ego transirem tua <u>limina clausa</u> maritus, respiciens udis prodita luminibus.

When the *limina* are effective, he is on the wrong side of them. Both passages are rather pathetic, the one in its helpless jealousy, the other in its (hypothetical) helpless regret.

2. Similarly, the word *inuitae* in the last couplet of A seems to anticipate *inuitos* in the second couplet of B, just seven lines later, and at the same point in the line. I quote the entire transitional passage (2.6.39-42 + 2.7.1-4):

nam nihil <u>inuitae</u> tristis custodia prodest: quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est.	6.40
nos uxor numquam, numquam diducet amica: semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.	6.42
gauisa es certe sublatam, Cynthia, legem, qua quondam edicta flemus uterque diu, ni nos diuideret: quamuis diducere amantis non queat <u>inuitos</u> Iuppiter ipse duos.	7.1

Just as a husband's guards are no use when a wife is unwilling to behave as she ought, so Caesar's laws are no use when lovers are unwilling to behave as they ought. The uselessness of coercion, which was a cause for complaint in A, is a cause for boasting in B. Propertius has switched sides, from being one of the coercers to being one of the coerced. 3. The form of the transitional couplet **ab** helps to tie the two halves together. The pivotal couplet is composed in an elegant, chiastic, and Hellenistic way (2.6.41-42):

### nos <u>uxor</u> numquam, numquam diducet <u>amica</u>: semper <u>amica</u> mihi, semper et <u>uxor</u> eris.

uxor in the hexameter and *amica* in the pentameter refer forward to  $\mathbf{B}$ , where marriage is rejected, while *amica* in the hexameter and *uxor* in the pentameter refer back to  $\mathbf{A}$ . To put it another way, the first half of each line of the couplet refers forward to  $\mathbf{B}$ , while the second half refers back to  $\mathbf{A}$ .

4. In the hexameter of the couplet just quoted, Lachmann's *diducet* seems preferable to the manuscripts' *me ducet* or the other proposals *seducet* and *deducet*, for two reasons.<sup>18</sup> The first applies whether we take 2.6 and 2.7 together or not: with *mihi* in the next line, *nos* must surely be taken as a true, not a poetic plural. In other words, the line cannot, in this context, mean "no wife or girlfriend will ever lead <u>me</u> [away from you]", taking *nos* as equivalent to *me*, but must mean "no wife or girlfriend will ever separate <u>us</u> [from each other]". This reason seems sufficient to me to ensure *diducet*, though editors have apparently not thought so.<sup>19</sup> Consequently, the second reason, which assumes a single elegy, may help to confirm the reading: this is to read *nos*... *diducet* in 2.6.41 to match *diducere amantes* in 2.7.3, just 4 lines further on.<sup>20</sup> In each case, it is Cynthia and Propertius who are the objects of the verb, at least by implication: in 2.6.41 he

says that no one (human) will separate them, and in 2.7.3 he generalizes to say that not even Jupiter could separate a pair of lovers unwilling to be separated. There are other compounds of *dis*- in the opening of **B**: *diuideret* in 2.7.3 and *discedere* in 2.7.7. These also help to tie **A** and **B** together.

5. In the first line of A (2.7.1), gauisa es certe sublatam, Cynthia, legem, Schrader's emendation es seems preferable to the est of the manuscripts, with Cynthia then taken as a vocative (with commas) rather than a nominative (without them). Again, there are two reasons, the first of which applies whether we take 2.6-7 as a single elegy or not. As Schrader points out in making his suggestion,<sup>21</sup> B is in direct address to Cynthia by line 9 (aut ego transirem tua limina clausa maritus 9, also a mea tum qualis caneret tibi tibia cantus 11), and there is no clear dividing-line for a shift in person: the words tua limina are left without a clear referent, unless Cynthia in line 1 is a vocative.<sup>22</sup> The second reason has to do with the symmetry of the whole elegy: reading es makes both A and B begin and end in direct address to Cynthia, and in fact the last couplet of A and the first and last couplets of B all contain her name in the vocative. (The first couplet of A does not, but instead contains the set-piece enrolling Cynthia in the 'Great Courtesans of the Western World' series.)

6. Like the linking couplet ab (2.6.41-42), the last couplet of the elegy (2.7.19-20) sums up 2.6-7 as a whole:

### tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus: hic erit et patrio sanguine pluris amor.

The first phrase, tu mihi sola places, refers mostly to **B**, where Propertius rejects the idea of another woman, while the second, placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus, refers mostly to **A**, where he denounces Cynthia's fondness for other men. The two halves of the hexameter are themselves tied together by the repetition in sola and solus, places and placeam, tu and tibi, mihi and the implied ego. The parallelism produces an effect very much like that of couplet **ab**: it is no doubt the similarity of the two couplets in their epigrammatic generalities that has inspired so many editors (most recently Goold) to follow Scaliger in putting them together by transposing **ab** (2.6.41-42) to follow 2.7.19-20.

7. Finally, the 2:1 ratio between the 40 lines of A and the 20 lines of B is worth noting, particularly in comparison with Elegy 2.32. That elegy, to which Macleod refers,<sup>23</sup> also proceeds from jealous husband to resigned lover. Interestingly enough, it also contains 62 lines, if the manuscripts can be trusted, and falls into two distinct parts. Though the division is not as clear-cut as that of 2.6-7, there are roughly 20 lines for the first part and 40 lines for the second. In other words, the earlier poem (earlier in the book, that is) is two-thirds husband and one-third lover, while the later poem is one-third husband and two-thirds lover. It is as if Cynthia has tamed Propertius in the course of the book, subduing him to his role as lover. This is the metaphor which he himself uses only a few pages before our elegy, when he compares enslaved lovers to bulls broken to pull the plough

ac ueluti primo taurus detractat aratra, post uenit assueto mollis ad arua iugo, sic primo iuuenes trepidant in amore feroces, dehinc domiti post haec aequa et iniqua ferunt.

In conclusion, elegy 2.6-7 is a single poem, semi-symmetrical in large-scale structure (20 + 1 + 10 couplets), though no particular pattern is visible within the two main parts. It displays Propertian antithesis in its purest form. We also have some instances of what I have called (Chapter I, page 8) Occamite reasoning: unification is recommended by the fact that it solves more problems of text and interpretation than it creates, both in the settlement of particular textual points, and in the major dispute between Williams and Badian on the Augustan marriage legislation. Finally, the transition between the two parts of the elegy, though done via a transitional couplet, is still quite abrupt.

## Notes to Chapter III

- <sup>1</sup> Macleod 1974, 87-88.
- <sup>2</sup> Camps II, 207.
- <sup>3</sup> Camps II, 212.
- <sup>4</sup> Although 2.32 is very nearly unique in Propertius II in having never, I think, been divided, it has suffered from all of the other abuse to which Propertian elegies are subjected. Baehrens posited lacunae at both ends, while Phillimore, Richardson, and, most recently, T. K. Hubbard, have followed the early manuscripts in combining it with 2.31. I am of two minds about this particular unification: however, even if 2.31 is included as part of the elegy, there is still an antithetical movement from 'husband' to 'lover' within the latter part of 2.31-32.
- <sup>5</sup> Richardson (226) calls 2.6 "an ingenious variation on the paraclausithyron, a complaint not against the locked door, but against the dorr that stands open, and not by night but by day".
- <sup>6</sup> Richardson, 226.
- <sup>7</sup> Richardson (226) applies this description only to the latter part of 2.6, but it seems to me to be true of the whole.
- <sup>8</sup> Both phrases are from Camps II, 97. I find Richardson's suggestion (229-30) that "he does it in such a way, from so moral and Roman a stand, that the princeps himself could hardly have taken offense" bizarre.
- <sup>9</sup> At one point, Richardson (226) comes rather close to my interpretation: "The fact is that a liaison does not fit the normal domestic patterns; the lover is at the same time an outsider and a husband, and it is this that P. puts before us here."
- <sup>10</sup> Cf. Enk II, 108-09 (ad 35, *uelauit aranea fanum*) for the parallels. Two other elegies in Book II also reverse the standard elegiac attitudes in different ways, but each is followed by an immediate return to elegiac standards. In 2.22a, Propertius brags about his new-found promiscuous love-affairs, but in 2.22b he is again Cynthia's whimpering slave: this is one of the principal reasons why 2.22 should be a single elegy, as Williams has argued (FoT, 149-53). In 2.23 and 2.24a, which again are likely to constitute a single poem, the poet brags about his new-found taste for common prostitutes, but in 2.24b he has again returned to his singular devotion to Cynthia. So 2.6 is peculiar not

because it begins by expressing anti-elegiac attitudes, but because these attitudes continue without contradiction right through to the end of the elegy (ignoring for the moment the enigmatic last couplet which I call **ab**).

- <sup>11</sup> Stahl (LW, 155) calls 2.7 "a poem of surprisingly and extraordinarily strong language". The same could be said of at least parts of 2.6, particularly the opening multiple simile (1-6), which does, after all, in a very literary way, call Cynthia a whore.
- <sup>12</sup> Luck 1979, 77-78.
- <sup>13</sup> Williams 1952 and TORP, 529-35, esp. 531-34.
- <sup>14</sup> Cairns 1979.
- <sup>15</sup> Badian 1983: the quoted words are on 94. I am ruthlessly compessing his conclusions: the whole article should be consulted. He attributes the basic kernel of his argument to a footnote of G. Ferrero. Besnier 1979 adds nothing to the standard account.
- <sup>16</sup> The frequent assumption that Propertius' compliments to Augustus contain concealed insults is plausible enough, given the political atmosphere of the time. Cairns' suggestion, in this case, that his insults conceal compliments is surely too bizarre to be entirely plausible.
- <sup>17</sup> Stahl (LW, 141) prints a text of 2.7 which differs from Barber's in four places, not counting punctuation. I agree with him in preferring Schrader's *es* in 1, and the manuscripts' *patriis* in 13 and *sanguine* in 20. When it comes to the fourth, *amore* in 8, I must confess complete puzzlement about the meaning of the line, however emended: I have read the various arguments in favor of *more*, *amore*, and *in ore*, and none of the three seems to me to give adequate sense.
- <sup>18</sup> The manuscript evidence points to either *diducet* or *deducet*. *me ducet* provides very poor sense, which suggests that *me* is an inept metrical interpolation after either *di* or *de* had dropped out by haplography.
- <sup>19</sup> Fedeli provides the kind of false parallel that proves the opposite of what the adducer thinks: in *at me ab amore tuo deducet nulla senectus* (2.25.9), *me* makes all the difference.
- <sup>20</sup> Luck (1979, 77) makes a similar point in arguing for the transfer of 2.6.41-42 (ab) to the beginning of 2.7 (B).
- <sup>21</sup> Schrader LE, 123.

<sup>22</sup> There is a possible complication in the unnamed speaker of the first three words of line 5, '*At magnus Caesar*.' On my interpretation, this must be Cynthia, rather than the anonymous reader. I see no difficulty in this: the whole of lines 1-12 seem to be addressed to her as much as to him.

<sup>23</sup> See page 52 above.
Chapter IV

<u>Two Triptychs</u>

Elegies 2.17-18 and 2.26-27

•

.

.

This chapter will deal with two separate cases, which share numerous similarities. Elegies 2.17 and 2.18 on the one hand and 2.26 and 2.27 on the other each constitute two elegies in the standard numeration and all (17 and 18) or most (26 and 27) of the earlier MSS; each is printed as three or four elegies in most recent editions, with 18 and 26 chopped up, while 17 and 27 are left alone. In each case there have been recent attempts to return to the standard numeration, by vindicating the unity of 18 (Nethercut and T. K. Hubbard), 26 (Macleod and Wiggers), or both (Williams and Lefèvre).<sup>1</sup> I will argue in this chapter that we should go further and unite each pair to form elegies 2.17-18 and 2.26-27. Neither of these suggestions is entirely original: the former follows a tentative suggestion of Williams, the latter one family of early MSS (Butrica's X), as well as Scaliger.

I will begin with 2.17-18, because it is the shorter and less complex of the two, and because it comes earlier in the book. The earlier manuscripts are unanimous, and the traditional numeration follows them: 2.17 is printed as a single elegy of 18 lines, 2.18 another of 38 lines. However, only a few of the more unadventurous editors follow them: most of the rest leave 2.17 unmolested, but divide 2.18 into two or three parts. As Richardson puts it: "It has been generally recognized that 2.18 is chaos, and editors divide it among two or three poems."<sup>2</sup> Most editors differ only in the number of parts into which they divide 2.18:<sup>3</sup>

17   18	Hertzberg, Paley, Postgate, Phillimore, Paganelli, Tovar-Belfiore
17   18а-b   18с	Lachmann, Baehrens, Palmer, Balcells, Schuster, Enk II, Fedeli
17   18a   18b   18c 17   18a   18b*   18c	Butler, Camps Butler-Barber, Barber, Giardina, Goold

Some, however, combine part or all of 2.17 with part (never all) of 2.18:4

17b-18a-b   18с	Rothstein⁵
17-18a-b   18с	Helm
17-18a   18b   18c	Luck
17-18a   18b*   18c	Hanslik

Williams defends the unity of 2.18, thereby supporting the traditional numeration with arguments, and further suggests tentatively that 2.17 and 2.18 may be a single elegy, saying of the latter: "This elegy may, in fact, be continuous with the preceding elegy, but that seems impossible to demonstrate."<sup>6</sup> I hope to show that Williams' tentative suggestion is quite correct, and that 2.17-18 constitute a single, complete, and continuous elegy of 56 lines. My text follows. For ease of reference, I have labelled Barber's divisions into separate elegies in the first column (17, 18a, 18b, and 18c), and my own, somewhat different, division into parts in the second column (A, B, and C, with linking couplets ab and bc):

## 17-18

17:	A	Mentiri noctem, promissis ducere amantem, hoc erit infectas sanguine habere manus!	
		horum ego sum uates, quotiens desertus amaras	
		expleui noctes, fractus utroque toro.	
		uel tu Tantalea moueare ad flumina sorte,	17.5
		ut liquor arenti fallat ab ore sitim;	
		uel tu Sisyphios licet admirere labores,	
		difficile ut toto monte uolutet onus;	
		durius in terris nihil est quod uiuat amante,	
		nec, modo si sapias, quod minus esse uelis.	17.10
		quem modo felicem inuidia admirante ferebant,	
		nunc decimo admittor uix ego quoque die,	
		nunc iacere e duro corpus iuuat, impia, saxo,	
		sumere et in nostras trita uenena manus.	
		nec licet in triuiis sicca requiescere luna,	17.15
		aut per rimosas mittere uerba fores.	
	ab	(quod quamuis ita sit, dominam mutare cauebo:	
		tum flebit, cum in me senserit esse fidem.)	17.18
18a:	B	assiduae multis odium peperere querelae:	18.1
		frangitur in tacito femina saepe uiro.	
		si quid uidisti, semper uidisse negato!	
		aut si quid doluit forte, dolere nega!	
18b:		quid mea si canis aetas candesceret annis,	18.5
		et faceret scissas languida ruga genas?	
		at non Tithoni spernens Aurora senectam	
		desertum Eoa passa iacere domo est:	
		illum saepe suis decedens fouit in ulnis	
		quam prius abiunctos sedula lauit equos;	18.10
		illum ad uicinos cum amplexa quiesceret Indos,	
		maturos iterum est questa redire dies;	
		illa deos currum conscendens dixit iniquos,	
		inuitum et terris praestitit officium.	

.

.

<sup>17.15</sup> nunc licet Beroaldus : nunc libet Guyet : nec libet Otto
17.13-14 post 16 transtulit Lachmann, post 2 Housman
18.1 nouam elegiam incipit O, priori elegiae 1-4 coniungunt multi, 1-38 dubitanter Williams
18.5 nouam elegiam incipiunt multi, lacunam inseruit Rossberg

		cui maiora senis Tithoni gaudia uiui quam grauis amisso Memnone luctus erat. cum sene non puduit talem dormire puellam, et canae totiens oscula ferre comae. at tu etiam iuuenem odisti me, perfida, cum sis ipsa anus haud longa curua futura die.	18.15 18.20
	bc	(quin ego deminuo curam, quod saepe Cupido huic malus esse solet, cui bonus ante fuit.)	
18c:	С	nunc etiam infectos demens imitare Britannos, ludis et externo tincta nitore caput? ut natura dedit, sic omnis recta figura est: turpis Romano Belgicus ore color. illi sub terris fiant mala multa puellae, quae mentita suas uertit inepta comas! deme: mihi certe poteris formosa uideri;	18.25
		mi formosa sat es, si modo saepe uenis. an si caeruleo quaedam sua tempora fuco tinxerit, idcirco caerula forma bona est? cum tibi nec frater nec sit tibi filius ullus, frater ego et tibi sim filius unus ego.	18,30
		ipse tuus semper tibi sit custodia lectus, nec nimis ornata fronte sedere uelis. credam ego narranti, noli committere, famae: et terram rumor transilit et maria.	18.35

18.7 at s : an O 18.23-38 separauit Kuinoel

Even leaving aside Williams' tentative remark, it must be admitted that this is not a totally unprecedented suggestion: none of the divisions within 2.17-18 is unanimous, though every editor accepts at least one, and most more than one of them. However, only Williams has suggested abolishing all of the divisions, including that between 17 and 18, and he, of course, considers the unification "impossible to demonstrate". So the question is still very much open, and the arguments offered for dividing and not dividing need to be examined.

By contrast with the last chapter, where there were no negative arguments to refute, here I am in the somewhat paradoxical position of having arguments for division that turn out on examination to be arguments for unity. Thus, part of the evidence that 2.18 at least should not be divided can be found in the arguments that Butler-Barber provide in favor of division:<sup>7</sup>

"The next 38 lines [= 2.18] according to the MSS. form one elegy. But (1) the first two couplets have no connexion with what follows. They are hardly capable of standing alone as a separate epigram. They may, however, be regarded either as a fragment or as the conclusion to xvii, sc. as reflections provoked by his misfortunes. On this view there is something to be said for transferring 21-2 (which form a very weak conclusion to xviii b) to follow 1-4 (Scaliger), punctuating the couplet as a question. Further (2) the opening to xviii B is very abrupt, and a lacuna must be postulated. (3) There is no connexion between 5-22 and 23-38, and a new elegy must begin at 23."

If we leave out the two bald assertions of lack of connection, to which we will return,<sup>8</sup> all of these arguments are actually reasons why 2.18 should <u>not</u> be divided. If 2.18a cannot stand alone, it should not be made to do so, and if 2.18b has a very abrupt opening and a very weak conclusion, that is no doubts because its opening and conclusion (quite possibly perfectly satisfactory) have both been brutally amputated.

We can go further with this type of argumentation. Leaving 2.18a and 2.18c to one side for the moment, part of the evidence that 2.17 should be connected at least with 2.18b can be found in Richardson's description of the latter, which he prints as a separate fragment, after transposing 2.17-18a to the end of 2.22b:<sup>o</sup>

"[T]he beginning of the poem must have suffered serious damage; we need to know much more of the occasion from which the poem springs before we can savor the exemplum. What evidence has there been that his mistress now finds the poet odious (the verb *odisti* in 19 is surprisingly strong)? Why does he call her *perfida* in 19? Why at his conclusion should he be able to pass the whole thing off with not much more than a shrug? Why should he emphasize his youth and Tithonus' age? A great deal more than what we find here is obviously required, and one might guess that what survives is rather less than half the original poem. ... In this unhappy state of affairs one can do little but print this as a fragment with the indication that it lacks a beginning. 2.18 in its whole state might have followed very well on 2.16, so I have left it there [after removing 2.17 + 2.18a]."

Richardson's first two questions are answered in 2.17, which needs to stay right where it is: the poet's mistress is *perfida* because she has broken a date (17.1-3):

mentiri noctem, promissis ducere amantem hoc erit infectas sanguine habere manus! horum ego sum uates, . . .

This unreliability is apparently habitual, and that is itself evidence that she finds him odious (17.11-12):

quem modo felicem inuidia admirante ferebant, nunc decimo admittor uix ego quoque die. The beginning that **2.18b** lacks is **2.17** (plus, presumably, **2.18a**), and from it we know quite enough about the occasion from which the entire poem **2.17-18** springs. Elegy **2.18** "in its whole state" does indeed follow very well on **2.16**, if we take the "whole state" as including all of **2.18** and **2.17** as well: "what survives" after Richardson's depredations, that is, **2.18b**, is indeed "rather less than half the original poem". As for the shrug at the conclusion of **2.18b** (21-22):

quin ego deminuo curam, quod saepe Cupido huic malus esse solet cui bonus ante fuit,

this is very like the one a little before at the conclusion of 2.17 (17-18):

quod quamuis ita sit, dominam mutare cauebo: tum flebit, cum in me senserit esse fidem.

As we will see below, I take both of these two couplets as parenthetical and transitional, and label them **ab** and **bc** in my text. As for the *exemplum*, we will also see below that it does more than simply emphasize the poet's youth and Tithonus' age.<sup>10</sup>

I propose that we take 2.17-18 as a single elegy, with the Tithonus *exemplum*, the apparent climax of a poem, right in the center. The symmetrical structure of the entire elegy is worth noting (the number of couplets in each part is in parentheses):

A. A broken date 17.1-16 (8)

ab.	parenthetical couplet of resignation	17.17-18	(1)
B.	Exemplum: Aurora and Tithonus	18.1-20	(10)
bc.	parenthetical couplet of resignation	18.21-22	(1)
C.	Cynthia dyes her hair	18.23-38	(8)

Sections A and C are both Roman, contemporary, and realistic, thus contrasting with **B**, which is mythological and Eastern. (This symmetry is my reason for labelling the parts of the whole elegy 2.17-18 as A, B, and C, with linking couplets **ab** and **bc**. From here on, I will use these labels rather than 17, 18a, and so on.) The situation of the poet becomes clearer in each situation: the sequence of thought of the elegy might be called 'dramatic unfolding'.<sup>11</sup> In A, all we know is that Cynthia has broken a date, and that the poet is miserable about it: we are not specifically told that she is out with someone else (perhaps the Illyrian praetor of the previous elegy?) but suspect the worst.<sup>12</sup> In 17.17-18, which I have labelled **ab**, the tone shifts to resignation:

#### quod quamuis ita sit, dominam mutare cauebo: tum flebit, cum in me senserit esse fidem.

I have called this couplet parenthetical, because the tone is so different from what precedes: he turns from open and bitter complaints to a quiet statement of his resolve to resign himself to his situation, in the hopes that it will change.

The beginning of **B** (18.1-4) offer enigmatic reflections on silence:

assiduae multis odium peperere querelae: frangitur in tacito femina saepe uiro. si quid uidisti, semper uidisse negato! aut si quid doluit forte, dolere nega!

This is the most difficult passage in all of 2.17-18, which is doubt the reason for so many editors divide either before or after it, or both. We are told that someone has seen something, but that the poet will not say what. Instead he hints at the truth through the mythological *exemplum* of Aurora and Tithonus: from it we can gather that Cynthia thinks Propertius too old for her. Whether <u>she</u> has seen something (his first gray hair?) or <u>he</u> has seen something (Cynthia out with a younger man?) is not at all clear. T. K. Hubbard argues for the former hypothesis,<sup>13</sup> but I think, with the general consensus of scholars, that the latter is more likely: in any case, the two are not absolutely mutually incompatible. It seems to me that the most likely hypothesis is that what he has seen is her dyed hair, and that he attempts to restrain himself from abusing her for it: his attempts are at first successful (B), though he cannot resist telling a pertinent mythological story, but, after a pause (bc), he is unable to restrain himself, and lets loose with open abuse. The reader is kept in the dark in B about his complaint, which makes the revelations of C dramatically effective.

The story of Aurora and Tithonus (B: 18.7-18) is what might be called a 'divergent *exemplum*': it is the contrast between Cynthia and Aurora, the way Cynthia falls short of mythological standards, that is most to the point. A good parallel is in 2.9, which begins with a pair of extended Homeric *exempla* of

marital loyalty, Penelope (9.3-8) and Briseis (9.9-16).<sup>14</sup> These are followed by a summary couplet (9.17-18)

tunc igitur ueris gaudebat Graecia nuptis, tunc etiam felix inter et arma pudor.

The brutal contrast with Cynthia immediately follows (9.19-20):

at tu non una potuisti nocte uacare, impia, non unum sola manere diem!

Elegy 2.17-18 uses the same sort of contrasting myth, and the same transitional device, the *at tu* construction (18.19-20):<sup>15</sup>

at tu etiam iuuenem odisti me, perfida, cum sis ipsa anus haud longa curua futura die.

The three parts of the elegy are also tied together by verbal and thematic repetitions. Although only the connections between A, on the one hand, and B or C or both, on the other, are arguments for the unification of 17 and 18, I will also include the connections between B and C, partly for the sake of completeness, and partly because the unity of 18 is itself in dispute.

First, there are the specific connections between A and B. At the beginning of A, the poet is broken (*fractus* 17.4) by his lonely bed, while at the beginning of B, he is hoping that Cynthia's resistance will be broken (*frangitur* 18.2) by his silence.<sup>16</sup> In A, he has been abandoned by Cynthia (*desertus* 17.3), unlike

Tithonus in **B**, who was not abandoned (*non*... *desertum* 18.7-8) by Aurora. The vocative addressed to Cynthia in **A** (*impia* 17.13) sums up the way in which she is unlike Aurora, whose *pietas*, though not named, is described in detail in **B**.

Second, there are the specific connections between **B** and **C**. The most important is the general contrast between Aurora and Cynthia, which is signalled by *at tu* near the end of **B** (18.19), and emphasized by *nunc etiam* at the beginning of **C** (18.23). As Williams notes, "In line 23, *nunc etiam* picks up (20) *anus*: she is doing it 'even now' -- the time will come when she will be old and such aids will be necessary".<sup>17</sup> This point alone seems to refute the division of **18b** and **18c**. As Lefèvre notes, the theme of grey hair ties **B** and **C** together: "i due passi più estesi (la seconda e la terza 'parte') dell'elegia [=2.18] sono unificati in maniera decisiva dal tema dei capelli grigi".<sup>18</sup> There is a subtle detail in **C** which reinforces this. In **B** he says, among other things, "you will soon be old" (18.20), while in **C** he says "I have been a son and brother to you" (18.34): he does not claim to have been a father to her.<sup>19</sup>

Third, there are specific connections between the two outer parts, A and C. Some connections are matters of vocabulary. Each part begins with a use of the word *infectus* (*infectas sanguine* . . . *manus* 17.2, *infectos Britannos* 18.23). In each case a play on words may be suspected, not only "dyed, stained", but "spoiled, defiled". The first word of A (*mentiri* 17.1) is also taken up early on in C (*mentita* 18.28): the deceit of breaking a date is thus paired once more with the deceit of hair-dyeing. The next connection is thematic. Underworld punishments are mentioned in each: in A, the deserted lover suffers worse tortures than Tantalus or Sisyphus (17.5-8):

uel tu Tantalea moueare ad flumina sorte, ut liquor arenti fallat ab ore sitim; uel tu Sisyphios licet admirere labores, difficile ut toto monte uolutet onus;

while in C, he wishes these tortures upon the inventor of hair-dyeing (18.27-28):

illi sub terris fiant mala multa puellae, quae mentita suas uertit inepta comas!

(At least these words look as if they ought to refer to the *prima inventrix*. On the other hand, since he does not say *quae prima*, they could also be taken to refer more generally to Cynthia herself, and all women like her, to be punished after death for their wicked cosmetic deceits.) Finally, rumor and reputation have contrasting roles in the two parts. In A the poet tells how he was envied by all for his (former) good fortune (17.11):

quem modo felicem inuidia admirante ferebant, nunc decimo admittor uix ego quoque die.

while in the last couplet of **C** he warns Cynthia that *Rumor* will not allow her to evade him completely (18.35-36):

credam ego narranti, noli committere, famae: et terram rumor transilit et maria. It becomes clear that she is still not on intimate terms with him: that is why he has to rely on *fama* and *rumor*. This point demonstrates, if there were any doubt, that the whole elegy is a 'monologo interno', in Lefèvre's terms. He addresses Cynthia, though he is apparently not with her in these lines, nor, quite possibly, anywhere else in the elegy. I see no way to decide whether we are to take the whole situation as a developing one, or just Propertius' reaction to it. In the first case, we would think of the poet as catching sight of Cynthia from afar, with her new blonde locks (and a new friend?), at either the beginning or the end of **B**. In the second case, the elegy would be a developing monologue of complaint, where he is in possession of all the information from the start, but only blurts it out as his self-control fails.

Finally, there are also some connections across all three parts, and these are, as we might expect, the most important. The first is, of course, the theme of Cynthia's unfaithfulness: from *Mentiri noctem* in the first words of A (17.1), through the vocative *perfida* in B (18.19), to the pathetic *mi formosa sat es, si modo saepe uenis* in C (18.30). What we might call the negative image of this is the theme of the bed: from Propertius' lonely and half-empty bed in A (*fractus utroque toro* 17.4<sup>20</sup>) through the charming bedroom scene of Tithonus and Aurora in B, to Cynthia's guardian bed in C (*ipse tuus semper tibi sit custodia lectus* 18.35). Finally, it may not be reading too much into the poem to find an implied temporal progression, from the poet's lonely night in A, through the portrait of the Goddess of Dawn in B, to the implicitly broad-daylight disillusionment of C.

The case of 2.26-27 is similar to that of 2.17-18, though more complicated.<sup>21</sup> Here the earlier manuscripts are not unanimous. These are two elegies in the traditional numeration, and either one, two, or three in the manuscripts. Again the smaller of the two parts (2.27) is not further subdivided (though some editors insert a lacuna after line 8), while the larger (2.26) is generally divided into two or three parts. As with 2.18, most editors differ only in the number of parts into which they divide 2.26, though some waffle by inserting lacunae without dividing:<sup>22</sup>

26-27		Scaliger
26   27	(FLP)	Hertzberg, Paley, Phillimore, Paganelli, Tovar-Belfiore, Fedeli <sup>23</sup>
26а-b   26с   27	(N)	
26a   26b-c-27	(X) <sup>24</sup>	
26a   26b-*-c   27 26a   26b-c   27		Butler-Barber, Balcells, Barber*, Hanslik Lachmann, Baehrens, Palmer, Postgate, Butler, Schuster, Enk II, Luck, Helm
26a   26b   26c   27		Camps II, Giardina II*, Goold
26a   26b-*-26c-27		Rothstein
26a-b-*-c   *27		Richardson*

The unity of 2.26 has been defended at length by Macleod, Lefèvre, Williams, and Wiggers, and Macleod's defence has convinced Fedeli to return to the standard numeration in his recent (1984) edition with the words: "carmen unum esse ostendit Macleod".<sup>25</sup> However, despite the support of MS family X for the union of 26c with 27, and the august patronage of Scaliger for the union of 26 and 27, no one in the last century or more (except R. E. White in his dissertation) has defended 2.26-27 as a whole.<sup>26</sup> I hope to show that Scaliger is right, and that 2.26-27 constitute a single, complete, and continuous elegy of 74 lines.<sup>27</sup> In the text that follows, my literary sub-divisions correspond nicely to the standard textual divisions. The question is not where to divide the elegy but whether to divide it into parts or into separate elegies:

#### 26-27

26a:	Α	Vidi te in somnis fracta, mea uita, carina	
		Ionio lassas ducere rore manus,	
		et quaecumque in me fueras mentita fateri,	
		nec iam umore grauis tollere posse comas,	
		qualem purpureis agitatam fluctibus Hellen,	26.5
		aurea quam molli tergore uexit ouis.	
		quam timui, ne forte tuum mare nomen haberet,	
		atque tua labens nauita fleret aqua!	
		quae tum ego Neptuno, quae tum cum Castore fratri,	
		quaeque tibi excepi, iam dea, Leucothoe!	26.10
		at tu uix primas extollens gurgite palmas	
		saepe meum nomen iam peritura uocas.	
		quod si forte tuos uidisset Glaucus ocellos,	
		esses Ionii facta puella maris,	
		et tibi ob inuidiam Nereides increpitarent,	26.15
		candida Nesaee, caerula Cymothoe.	
		sed tibi subsidio delphinum currere uidi,	
		qui, puto, Arioniam uexerat ante lyram.	
		iamque ego conabar summo me mittere saxo,	
		cum mihi discussit talia uisa metus.	26.20

26b:	ab	nunc admirentur quod tam mihi pulchra puella seruiat et tota dicar in urbe potens! non, si Cambysae redeant et flumina Croesi, dicat 'De nostro surge, poeta, toro.' nam mea cum recitat, dicit se odisse beatos: carmina tam sancte nulla puella colit. multum in amore fides multum constantia predest:	26.25
		qui dare multa potest, multa et amare potest.	
26c:	B	seu mare per longum mea cogitet ire puella, hanc sequar et fidos una aget aura duos. unum litus erit sopitis unaque tecto	26.30
		arbor, et ex una saepe bibemus aqua; et tabula una duos poterit componere amantis, prora cubile mihi seu mihi puppis erit.	
		omnia perpetiar: saeuus licet urgeat Eurus, uelaque in incertum frigidus Auster agat; quicumque et uenti miserum uexastis Vlixem, et Danaum Euboico litore mille ratis; et qui monistis duo litora cum ratis Argo	26.35
		dux erat ignoto missa columba mari. illa meis tantum non umquam desit ocellis, incendat nauem Iuppiter ipse licet. certe isdem nudi pariter iactabimur oris: me licet unda ferat, te modo terra tegat.	26.40
		sed non Neptunus tanto crudelis amori, Neptunus fratri par in amore Ioui: testis Amymone, latices dum ferret, in aruis compressa, et Lernae pulsa tridente palus; iam deus amplexu uotum persoluit, at illi	26.45
		aurea diuinas urna profudit aquas. crudelem et Borean rapta Orithyia negauit: hic deus et terras et maria alta domat. crede mihi, nobis mitescet Scylla, nec umquam alternante uacans uasta Charybdis aqua;	26.50
		ipsaque sidera erunt nullis obscura tenebris, purus et Orion, purus et Haedus erit. quod mihi si ponenda tuo sit corpore uita, avitus bic pobis pon inhonestus orit	26.55
		callus mic novis non minunestus ein.	26.58

.

.

26.21 nouam elegiam incipit Burman 26.29 nouam elegiam incipit N

85

27:	С	at uos incertam, mortales, funeris horam	27.1
		quaeritis, et qua sit mors aditura uia?	
		quaeritis et caelo Phoenicum inuenta sereno,	
		quae sit stella homini commoda quaeque mala?	
		seu pedibus Parthos sequimur seu classe Britannos,	27.5
		et maris et terrae caeca pericla uiae;	
		rursus et obiectum fles tu caput esse tumultu,	
		cum Mauors dubias miscet utrimque manus;	
		praeterea domibus flammam domibusque ruinas,	
		neu subeant labris pocula nigra tuis.	27.10
		solus amans nouit, quando periturus et a qua	
		morte, neque hic Boreae flabra neque arma timet.	
		iam licet et Stygia sedeat sub harundine remex,	
		cernat et infernae tristia uela ratis:	
		si modo clamantis reuocauerit aura puellae,	27.15
		concessum nulla lege redibit iter.	

XXVII priori continuant X, s, Scaliger, Rothstein
27.7 fles tu Housman : fletus N : flemus FLP : fletis s : fletur Gwynn
27.8 post hunc uersum lacunam stauit Havet
27.9 metuisque Mueller
27.14 seruat s : soluat Broekhuyzen

This elegy is, like 2.17-18, a triptych, but differs in being asymmetrical. Part A depicts the poet's nightmare, in which Cynthia is saved from drowning by a poetic dolphin. Between A and B comes the transitional passage ab (=26.21-28), which "must mark a new development in the story":<sup>28</sup> the dream of A, presumably reported to Cynthia, has had its intended effect, and she has decided to stay in Rome with the poet. Part B continues from this success with a kind of fantasy or daydream, in which the poet envisages the two of them sailing away together, safe and inseparable. We see that it was not a voyage that terrified him, but her leaving him.<sup>29</sup> Part C is a generalized rhetorical statement about the power of

love, in which the dead lover, already seated in Charon's boat, is restored to life by his beloved's voice (27.13-14). In this context, we can hardly help but take the lover as Propertius, at least to some extent, and the beloved who calls out to him as Cynthia. The transition from **B** to **C** makes this likely. From contemplating death with Cynthia at the end of **B** (26.57-58), he begins **C** by addressing his readers as *mortales* (27.1): *at uos, mortales* implies *ego immortalis* : they do not know when and how they will die, but he knows that he will die only die from his beloved's neglect or hostility, and that she can call him back whenever she pleases.<sup>30</sup> (This point, and the fact that Propertius' role in **A** and **ab** was specifically as a poet, not just a lover, makes it tempting to suppose that the dead soul of **C** is also a poet, and that his beloved rescues him from oblivion by reciting his verse. But perhaps this is reading too much into it.)

The whole elegy is built on the 'voyage of life' metaphor, which becomes more explicitly metaphorical as the elegy proceeds: Cynthia is shipwrecked in A, the two of them are sailing together in B, and the dead lover is an oarsman on Charon's boat in C. The first voyage, in A, seems real enough, though the shipwreck is only a dream: **ab** shows that Cynthia was thinking of leaving town. The voyage in B is at least as much metaphorical as literal: although there is nothing to prevent Cynthia and Propertius from going on a cruise together, this one is peculiar in several ways: no specific itinerary is mentioned, no time-limit is set to the voyage, and the lovers face dangers, such as Scylla and Charybdis (26.53-54), which were not likely to be found in the Mediterranean in the Augustan Age. And of course the voyage across the Styx in C, if not precisely metaphorical, is entirely separated from the world of the living.

In each of these three sections, the situation is to some extent unreal: A is explicitly a nightmare, B something like a daydream, and C a rhetorical flight of fancy ending in the Underworld. In each case, the situation depicted is conditional, as we are told of something that <u>may</u> interrupt each and turn it into its opposite. Arion's dolphin goes to the aid of the drowning Cynthia in A (26.17-18), but we are not told whether she is rescued, since the poet wakes up first. The possibility of shipwreck is a major theme of B (particularly 26.35-44), dismissed as unlikely (26.45-56), but finally admitted as an acceptable risk (26.57-58). Finally, the dead lover in C <u>may</u> be rescued, <u>if</u> the voice of his beloved should call him back (27.15-16):

# si modo clamantis reuocauerit aura puellae, concessum nulla lege redibit iter.

In this elegy, success is always threatening to turn into disaster, and disaster hoping to turn into success.

The life-or-death nature of these disasters and successes is worth emphasizing. Apartness and togetherness in this elegy are closely associated with death and life, and this helps to confirm the presence of the 'voyage of life' metaphor. Note that he calls Cynthia *mea uita* in the very first line (26.1). This epithet would be more appropriate to the end of C, where his rescue from Hades depends on her, but it is found at the beginning of A. If we take 2.26-27 as a single elegy, this is a subtle instance of ring-composition.

As in 2.29,<sup>31</sup> one of the most important differences between the parts is that Propertius and Cynthia are apart in A, together in B, and apart again in C. This brings us to what I take to be the major theme of the elegy, the mutual dependence of lover and beloved, of poet and subject. Martial's comment is subtler than we might expect in an *apophoreton* (14.189):

#### Monobiblos Properti

#### Cynthia, facundi carmen iuuenale Properti, accepit famam, non minus ipsa dedit.

Martial not only equates Propertius' subject and his book, he makes subject and poet mutually dependent. Just as the poet cannot expect his works to survive without an appropriately immortal subject to write about, so his subject, whatever her beauty and charm, cannot expect her fame to survive without a competently immortal poet to portray it.<sup>32</sup> Poet and subject are also depicted as mutually dependent in the catalogue which ends **2.34** and the book: Varro and Leucadia, Catullus and Lesbia, Calvus and Quintilia, Lycoris and Gallus, Cynthia and Propertius, the particular literary canon which Propertius aspires to join only accepts applicants in pairs: one poet, one subject, two lovers.

Finally, there are two small interpretative problems in 2.27 that can be solved if we take the elegy as a unity. First, all of the commentators on the second couplet of C (27.3-4)

#### quaeritis et caelo Phoenicum inuenta sereno, quae sit stella homini commoda quaeque mala?

point out that the Phoenicians invented astronomy, whereas the Chaldaeans invented astrology, so that Propertius has apparently confused the two in calling astrology the invention of the Phoenicians. Camps suggests: "It may be that the two ideas are merged in the poet's mind".<sup>33</sup> I would add that the confusion makes perfect sense within a 'voyage of life' metaphor: astrology is the astronomy of the soul. This helps to tie C together with A and B, where the nautical metaphors are so much more explicit.

The second is the Stygian boat of 27.13-14:

iam licet et Stygia sedeat sub harundine remex, cernat et infernae tristia uela ratis: . . .

For the idea that the dead souls are obliged to row Charon's boat, the commentators refer to Propertius (4.7.26), Vergil (Aeneid 6.320), and other passages.<sup>34</sup> But none of the commentators makes much of the sail: taken together with the oarsmen, it suggests that this is not a rowboat but a full-scale galley, with the dead soul as galley-slave. This macabre detail again again seems to be designed to make the underworld scene of C fit with the 'voyage of life' metaphor

of parts A and B.35

Both of these peculiarities of 2.27 can be explained by supposing that 2.26-27 constitute a single elegy: they are consequently arguments for unity. They are minor points in themselves, but add to the cumulative force of the argument.

We may conclude with a short comparison of 2.17-18 and 2.26-27. Both are triptychs, both are arranged Apart-Together-Apart, but the elegies differ in which characters are apart and together. In 2.17-18, it is Propertius and Cynthia who are apart in A and C, contrasted with Tithonus and Aurora who are together in B. In 2.26-27, Propertius and Cynthia are separated in A and together in B, while the generalized lover and beloved are together in C. In 17-18 the outer parts are both realistic, and opposed to the mythological middle, while in 26-27 the first two parts are dreams or nightmares or fantasies, while the last is a generalized rhetorical statement. Thus, each has a more complicated scheme than the two diptychs discussed in the previous chapters, 2.29 and 2.6-7.

### Notes to Chapter IV

- <sup>1</sup> On 2.18: Lefevre 1976, 44-47, Williams FoT (1979) 146-49, Nethercut 1980, and TKHubbard 1986; on 2.26: Macleod 1976, 47-51, Lefèvre 1976, 47-51, Williams FoT, 129-31, and Wiggers 1980.
- <sup>2</sup> Richardson, 263.
- <sup>3</sup> Here and below, I use Barber's numeration to make things clear: 18a = 18.1-4, 18b = 18.5-22, and 18c = 18.23-38. The vertical bar shows where the division is made, and an asterisk after 18b means that the editor marks a lacuna there.
- <sup>4</sup> Richardson is the most idiosyncratic of all, if we omit Richmond as beyond idiosyncracy, and transposes 17 and 18a to a later point in the book, as well as inserting a lacuna before 18b:

16 | \*18b | 18c | . . . | 22a | 22b-17-18a

- <sup>5</sup> '17b' because he transfers 17.1-4 to the end of the preceding elegy, 2.16.
- <sup>6</sup> Wiliams FoT, 146.
- <sup>7</sup> Butler-Barber, 221 -- their divisions into 'a', 'b', and 'c' are the same as Barber's.
- <sup>8</sup> See pages 77-79 below.
- <sup>°</sup> Richardson, 264.
- <sup>10</sup> See pages 78-79 below.
- <sup>11</sup> As T. K. Hubbard puts it, referring only to **2.18**, "The cause of the *querelae* is progressively revealed by the lines that follow" (TKHubbard 1986, 293).
- <sup>12</sup> Cairns' idea (Cairns 1975) that 2.17 is a paraclausithyron seems to me to be wrong, though it does borrow komastic themes. Lines 3-4 clearly imply that he spends the night alone in his own bed after she fails to show up. So, either she was supposed to visit him, and did not, or else he was supposed to visit her, and returned home in disgust when he found that she was not home. In either case, his ensuing complaints do not seem to constitute a *paraclausithyron*.
- <sup>13</sup> TKHubbard 1986, 292.

- <sup>14</sup> Butrica (MTP, 188-90) argues cogently for the transposition of 2.9.1-2 to the end of 2.8.
- <sup>15</sup> Note that the related *quid si* contruction also occurs in both elegies: 2.9.29-30 and 2.18.5.
- <sup>16</sup> His statement is generalized, but surely refers primarily to her.
- <sup>17</sup> Williams FoT, 148. He should have said 'will come <u>soon</u>': <u>haud longa</u>... die (18.20).
- <sup>18</sup> Lefevre 1976, 46.
- <sup>19</sup> This is noted by T. K. Hubbard (TKHubbard 1986, 298). I should add here that while Hubbard's defence of the unity of **2.18** is welcome in itself, as far as it goes, his methodology, with its talk of silence as a "pregnant semiotic modality", "sign-production (encoding) and sign-interpretation (decoding)", and so on, seems to me less than useful. Enk's note is more interesting (Enk II, 262): "Nonnulli viri docti quaesiverunt, num Cynthia maior natu esset Propertio, cum hic sermo sit de filio. Non opinor." Nor do I: the lines seem to me to have more to do with the theme of the elegy than with Cynthia's chronological age.
- <sup>20</sup> The last two words are difficult. As Camps notes (Camps II, ad loc.), "this must refer to tossing on both sides of, i.e. all over, the bed; in Ov. Am. iii, xiv, 32 cur pressus prior est interiorque torus? one side of the bed is prior torus, the other side interior torus. It may be that there were two mattresses, but I do not think we know about this."
- <sup>21</sup> Wiggers (1980, 22) calls the task of analyzing 26, and particularly 26a, "awesome", which seems a bit much.
- <sup>22</sup> I use Camps' numeration rather than Barber's for the parts of 26 since he subdivides further: 26a = 26.1-20, 26b = 26.21-28, and 26c = 26.29-58. The asterisk before 27 means that the editor marks a lacuna there, and an asterisk is also used to show that the editor marks a lacuna in the middle of the elegy: thus 26b-\*-c means that the editor prints 26b and 26c as a single elegy, but with a lacuna between lines 28 and 29. The manuscript evidence is provided, in parentheses. For completeness, I have also put an asterisk after the editor's name, if he puts a lacuna after 27.8: no one divides there, so 27 has no 'a' and 'b'.
- <sup>23</sup> Macloed, Lefèvre, Williams, and Wiggers can presumably be assigned to this group as well, since they defend the unity of 26, and the internal unity of 27

is not in doubt.

- <sup>24</sup> Butrica's X is the lost parent of six manuscripts which he calls vrumsc: of these none except v (after correction) divides 27 from 26, but most (mruc, and v in the margin) divide 26c-27 from 26a-b: see Butrica MTP, 68 and 75.
- <sup>25</sup> Fedeli, ad 2.26.21-28.
- <sup>26</sup> Papanghelis (LD, 80 n 1) reports that R. E. White defended the unity of 2.26-27 in his dissertation, Some techniques of development in Propertius and their bearing on poem division (University of North Carolina, 1958). Unfortunately, I only noticed this after it was too late to get hold of it.
- <sup>27</sup> I might add, for what it is worth, that I had concluded that the two elegies should be united some years ago, before reading Butrica and consulting Burman, and before I knew that there was any manuscript or editorial support.
- <sup>28</sup> Macleod 1976, 131.
- <sup>29</sup> Richardson (286) makes the connection between A and B explicit, taking them a "two reveries, one unconscious and capricious, the other wakeful and deliberate, in balance against each other".
- <sup>30</sup> Richardson's remarks on this point are useful. As he puts it (289-90), 2.27 is "obviously fragmentary . . . The beginning is intolerably abrupt . . . Only the end of the poem lives up to the finesse we expect of P., and it seems to require something to balance it at the beginning. I suspect that what we have here is not more than half a poem, perhaps no more than a coda . . .". This is all quite sound: if we take 2.26-27 as a single elegy, then 27 is the coda to 26, and the transition between the two is clear enough.
- <sup>31</sup> See Chapter II, particularly page 25.
- <sup>32</sup> As Wiggers notes (1980, 124), "the dolphin episode implies that Cynthia survives because she is the subject of Propertius' poetry, which is itself immortal". But she does not mention the other side of the interdependence, since it is not really spelled out until 27, which she takes as a separate elegy.
- <sup>33</sup> Camps II, ad 2.27.3.
- <sup>34</sup> Enk II, ad loc., provides the details.
- <sup>35</sup> The phrase *sub harundine* might be taken to work against this idea. Enk II (ad loc.) explains "sub calamis palustribus qui ripam, cumbam, hominem in

ea sedentem tegunt", and it is obviously easier for a *cumba* to be overshadowed by tall reeds than a full-scale ship. However, such illogicalities of scale are more acceptable in the Underworld than elsewhere.

.

.

Chapter V

# The Opening of Book II

Elegies 2.1-2 and 2.3a

•

~

We expect the first poem in an ancient book to set the tone for the rest. Given the character of the other elegies in Book II of Propertius, we might expect the opening elegy to be long, discursive, and allusive, and elegy 2.1 does not disappoint these expectations. As with most of the other elegies in Book II, the difficulties of elegy 2.1 have led to major surgery of various sorts, and the unity and continuity of the whole are very much in question. Damon and Helmbold go the furthest:<sup>1</sup>

"The first elegy, as it stands in our MSS, is a long, rambling affair whose inexplicable transitions and wide fluctuations in tone suggest unmistakably that it was put together from a number of sources. Lines 1-16, 17-46, 47-56, 57-58 may all be from parts of quite different poems. The same is more or less true of 2.2 and 2.3."

However, although Heimreich obelizes 17-38, and Tremenheere and Carutti insert whole pages of text between 16 and 17,<sup>2</sup> it is not the abrupt change of address at line 17, from a generalized plural readership to Maecenas, and of subject, from praise of Cynthia to *recusatio* of epic, that has caused the most problems. It is the unity and continuity of the following 62 lines (1.17-78), the address to Maecenas, that are most disputed. Many (including, for instance, Barber) mark a lacuna after line 38, and some (most recently Goold) follow Housman in inserting 3.9.33-34 in the supposed gap. Other editors have begun new elegies with line 47 (apparently first proposed by Ballheimer in a text of Photius), with line 57 (Heimreich), or both (Ribbeck).<sup>3</sup> Although division of **2.1** is now out of

style, and no twentieth-century editor (with the exception of O. L. Richmond) has gone so far as to divide the elegy, these ideas are not yet discredited: for instance, G.O. Hutchinson, in an otherwise very sensible article published in 1984, comes out for the division at line 47.<sup>4</sup> What is worse is that those editors who do not divide the elegy have great difficulty specifying just what ties it together, in particular what ties the *recusatio* of 1.1-46 to the gloomy musings of 1.47-78. As Papanghelis puts it in the most recent treatment:<sup>5</sup>

"Discussion of 2.1 has always centred upon the relationship between ll. 1-46 and 47-78: how does the rapturous troubadour of the first part stand to the gloomy lover of the second?"

I will quote just a few of the more recent opinions on this point, beginning with Wimmel, as the earliest (1960) and in some ways the most useful. Although Wimmel sees that the entire address to Maecenas is apologetic and Callimachean, his explanation of the connection between the two halves is less satisfactory: as Papanghelis puts it, Wimmel "views the second part as a *captatio misericordiae* calculated to counterbalance the arrogance and complacency of the first by rousing sympathy for the poet, mortally endangered because of his love life."<sup>6</sup> The problem with this is that the delicate feeling (Wimmel's "mit feinem Gefühl"<sup>7</sup>) of this ending seems inconsistent with the vicious allusions in 1.27-29: Horace might be genuinely sorry enough about recusing epic to go on at excessive length about his incapacity, but Propertius is not so sincere. To put it another way, if the assertion of independence in the first half was too strong, all he had to do was revise it before publication: Wimmel acts as if Propertian elegies were public improvisations.

Kühn's explanation is similar. Writing in 1961, he takes the second half as compensating for the possible perceived arrogance of the first half by its "brooding on the harassments of love life" (the phrase is again Papanghelis'):<sup>8</sup>

"Der zweite Teil wirbt, wieder bei Maecenas, um Verständnis für das eigene Lebensideal, bringt also eine Verteidigung des Grundes, aus dem die erotische Dichtung erwächst, der leidensschaftlichen Hingabe an eine Frau, um schliesslich in einen starken Appell an das Mitempfinden überzugehen, das der Adressat der Widmung dem unglücklichen Dichter gegenuber fühlen soll und in dem natürlich alle Einwände gegen die gesellschaftliche Aussenseiterstellung zum Schweigen kommen sollen."

The first problem with this explanation is that it contradicts Propertius' own argument: if the life of love is so thoroughly unpleasant, why <u>not</u> give it up for a career as Maecenas' house epic-poet? The second problem is shared with Wimmel: he could have written the first half differently, and if it were more polite and tentative, he wouldn't have to take it back. However, neither of these objections is totally convincing: as for the unpleasantness of the life of love, he does specifically say that he can't help it; as for the two contrasting halves, a polarly ambiguous poem might be thought in some ways more convincing rhetorically than a tastefully simple and consistent one.<sup>9</sup> However, the third problem, also shared with Wimmel, is fatal: both assume that Propertius is sincerely distressed by his inability to write epic. We will see below (pages 110-12) that the supposed appeal for Maecenas' sympathy is (particularly in

1.71-78) ironic, and deeply contemptuous.

Wiggers makes the first half impersonal, and the second personal, which does not get us very far.<sup>10</sup> Williams offers a "series of metonymic movements", but gives no particular reason why the poet should shift metonymically at any particular point. Apparently he sees this elegy, like so many others, as a kind of stream-of-consciousness ramble.<sup>11</sup> Stahl, who is alert to the political side throughout, and aware that Propertius was no friend of Maecenas, makes the two halves represent rejection of epic for love, and inevitability of love: he can't help his rejection. This is true as far as it goes.<sup>12</sup> Finally, Papanghelis makes the connection by more or less equating love and death in a sort of nineteenth century decadent 'Liebestod'.<sup>13</sup>

Now, although I find all of the arguments offered so far variously unconvincing or insufficient, I do think that Wimmel, Kühn, Wiggers, Williams, Stahl, and Papanghelis are quite right in defending the unity of **2.1**: the difficulty is to find the key.

However, before spelling out my own solution to the problem of the unity and continuity of 2.1, I would like to introduce a second problem which may not seem to be related: this is the question of the boundaries of the second elegy in the book. As we will see below, a few editors combine 2.2 with 2.3, and many argue about the boundary between 2.3 and 2.4. No one, however, doubts that 2.1

(however problematical, and however many pieces it may be divided into) and **2.2** (however far it extends) are separate elegies.

I would like to raise the stakes a bit by tentatively suggesting that, not only should 2.1 not be divided, but 2.1 and 2.2 should be combined to form a single elegy, which I will call 2.1-2. I will further argue that the last five couplets of 2.3 should be removed, leaving the remainder (2.3a) as the second elegy in Book II. My preferred text of 2.1-2, 2.3a, and 2.3b is this:<sup>14</sup>

#### 1-2

Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores, unde meus ueniat mollis in ora liber? non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo: ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.	
siue illam Cois fulgentem incedere +cogis+,	1.5
hac totum e Coa ueste uolumen erit;	
seu uidi ad frontem sparsos errare capillos,	
gaudet laudatis ire superba comis;	
siue lyrae carmen digitis percussit eburnis,	
miramur, facilis ut premat arte manus;	1.10
seu cum poscentis somnum declinat ocellos,	
inuenio causas mille poeta nouas;	
seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu,	
tum uero longas condimus Iliadas;	
seu quidquid fecit siue est quodcumque locuta,	1.15
maxima de nihilo nascitur historia.	
quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent, ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus, non ego Titanas canerem, non Ossan Olympo	
impositam, ut caeli Pelion esset iter,	1.20
,	

1.1 ad finem prioris elegiae coniunxit N

nec ueteres Thebas, nec Pergama nomen Homeri,	
Xerxis et imperio bina coisse uada,	
regnaue prima Remi aut animos Carthaginis altae,	
Cimbrorumque minas et bene facta Mari:	
bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris, et tu	1.25
Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores.	
nam quotiens Mutinam aut ciuilia busta Philippos	
aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae,	
euersosque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae,	
et Ptolemaeei litora capta Phari,	1.30
aut canerem Aegyptum et Nilum, cum atratus in urbem	
septem captiuis debilis ibat aquis,	
aut regum auratis circumdata colla catenis,	
Actiaque in Sacra currere rostra Via;	
te mea Musa illis semper contexeret armis,	1.35
te sumpta et posita pace fidele caput:	
Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles,	
hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden	
sed neque Phlegraeos Iouis Enceladique tumultus	
intonet angusto pectore Callimachus.	1.40
nec mea conueniunt duro praecordia uersu	
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos.	
nauita de uentis, de tauris narrat arator,	
enumerat miles uulnera, pastor ouis;	
nos contra angusto uersantes proelia lecto:	1.45
qua pote quisque, in ea conterat arte diem.	
laus in amore mori: laus altera, si datur uno	
posse frui: fruar o solus amore meo!	
si memini, solet illa leuis culpare puellas,	
et totam ex Helena non probat Iliada.	1.50
seu mihi sunt tangenda nouercae pocula Phaedrae,	
pocula priuigno non nocitura suo,	
seu mihi Circaeo pereundum est gramine, siue	
Colchis Iolciacis urat aena focis,	
una meos quoniam praedata est femina sensus,	1.55
ex hac ducentur funera nostra domo.	

<sup>1.31</sup> atratus Baehrens : attractus N (ex attractus corr.), AP1 : atractactus F : tractus P2 1.36 te Lachmann (teste Hertzberg) : et O 1.38 sic punxi ut aposiopesin, lacunam notant multi, nouam elegiam incipit Ribbeck 1.45 uersamus Volscus (1482) : uersantes O

.

omnis humanos sanat medicina dolores:	
solus amor morbi + non amat + artificem.	
tarda Philoctetae sanault crura Machaon,	
Phoenicis Chiron lumina Phillyrides,	1.60
et deus exstinctum Cressis Epidaurius herbis	
restituit patriis Androgeona focis,	
Mysus et Haemonia iuuenis qua cuspide uulnus	
senserat, hac ipsa cuspide sensit opem.	
hoc si quis uitium poterit mihi demere, solus	1.65
Tantaleae poterit tradere poma manu;	
dolia uirgineis idem ille repleuerit urnis,	
ne tenera assidua colla grauentur aqua;	
idem Caucasia soluet de rupe Promethei	
bracchia et a medio pectore pellet auem.	1.70
quandocumque igitur uitam mea fata reposcent,	
et breue in exiguo marmore nomen ero,	
Maecenas, nostrae spes inuidiosa iuuentae,	
et uitae et morti gloria iusta meae,	
si te forte meo ducet uia proxima busto.	1.75
esseda caelatis siste Britanna jugis.	
taliaque illacrimans mutae iace uerba fauillae:	
'Huic misero fatum dura puella fuit.'	1.78
liber eram et uacuo meditabar uiuere lecto:	2.1
at me composita pace fefellit Amor.	
cur haec in terris facies humana moratur?	
Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tua.	
fulua coma est longaeque manus, et maxima toto	2.5
corpore, et incedit uel Ione digna soror.	
aut cum Dulichias Pallas snatiatur ad aras.	
Gorgonis anguiferae nectus operta comis	
qualis at Ischomacha I anithaa ganus haroina	
Contauris media grata raning mara	3 10
+ Marauria satis + fortur Rashaidas undis	2.10
virgingum Prime composition latur	
ungineum dinno composuisse latus.	
desig tunicae nonono norticibust	
tuaeis tunicas ponere uerticidus:	<i>.</i>
nanc utinam laciem nolit mutare senectus,	2.15
etsi Cumaeae saecula uatis agat!	
1.58 non amat uix sanum : num notum amat?	

.

i

1.78 nouam elegiam incipit N1 2.1 nouam elegiam incipit MSS. praeter N1, editores, coniunxi

'Oui nullam tibi dicebas iam posse nocere, haesisti, cecidit spiritus ille tuus? uix unum potes, infelix, requiescere mensem, et turpis de te iam liber alter erit?' quaerebar, sicca si posset piscis harena 5 nec solitus ponto uiuere toruus aper: aut ego si possem studiis uigilare seueris: differtur, numquam tollitur ullus amor. nec me tam facies, quamuis sit candida, cepit (lilia non domina sunt magis alba mea; 10 ut Maeotica nix minio si certet Hibero, utque rosae puro lacte natant folia), nec de more comae per leuia colla fluentes, non oculi, geminae, sidera nostra, faces, nec si quando Araba lucet bombyce puella 15 (non sum de nihilo blandus amator ego): quantum quod posito formose saltat Iaccho, egit ut euhantis dux Ariadna choros, et quantum, Aeolio cum temptat carmina plectro, par Aganippaeae ludere docta lyrae; 20 et sua cum antiquae committit scripta Corinnae, carmina +quae quiuis+ non putat aequa suis. num tibi nascenti primis, mea uita, diebus candidus argutum sternuit omen Amor? haec tibi contulerunt caelestia munera diui, 25

haec tibi ne matrem forte dedisse putes.

1 nullum O, corr. Heinsius

- 2,4 sic punxit Richmond
- 3 cognoscere F1P
- 5 quaerebar scripsi : quaerebam O
- 10 sunt s : sint O
- 11-12 post 16 Housman
- 22 carmina quae quiuis O : carminaque Erinnes Volscus, Beroaldus, alia alii
- 23 num FP : non N : nunc s
non non humani sunt partus talia dona: ista decem menses non peperere bona. gloria Romanis una es tu nata puellis: Romana accumbes prima puella Ioui, 30 nec semper nobiscum humana cubilia uises; post Helenam haec terris forma secunda redit. hac ego nunc mirer si flagret nostra iuuentus? pulchrius hac fuerat, Troia, perire tibi. olim mirabar, quod tanti ad Pergama belli 35 Europae atque Asiae causa puella fuit: nunc, Pari, tu sapiens et tu, Menelae, fuisti, tu quia poscebas, tu quia lentus eras. digna quidem facies, pro qua uel obiret Achilles; uel Priamo belli causa probanda fuit. 40 si quis uult fama tabulas anteire uetustas. hic dominam exemplo ponat in arte meam: siue illam Hesperiis, siue illam ostendet Eois, uret et Eoos, uret et Hesperios.

#### **3**b

His saltem ut tenear iam finibus! aut mihi, si quis	45
acrior, ut moriar, uenerit alter amor!	
ac ueluti primo taurus detractat aratra,	
post uenit assueto mollis ad arua iugo,	
sic primo iuuenes trepidant in amore feroces,	
dehinc domiti post haec aequa et iniqua ferunt.	50
turpia perpessus uates est uincla Melampus,	
cognitus Iphicli surripuisse boues;	
quem non lucra, magis Pero formosa coegit,	
mox Amythaonia nupta futura domo.	

27 sunt partus F1P : partus sunt NF2 45-54 elegiae sequenti transferunt Schrader et Lachmann, separant alii

The suggestion to combine elegies 2.1 and 2.2 is, so far as I have been able to determine, original, though we will see that there is some slight manuscript

support. The separation of 2.3a from 2.3b is not: since the Aldine edition of 1502, nearly as many editors divide as not. However, as we will see, the two questions are interrelated, and I will have to deal with the second in order to solve the first. There is a further related issue that I will not be dealing with directly: most editors who remove 2.3b from 2.3a prefix them to 2.4, and I think they are right to do so. The others leave the lines as a highly unsatisfactory ten-line fragment.

However, before turning to the question of the unity of 2.1 and 2.2, we will begin with the question of the unity, or perhaps I should say the internal unity, of the address to Maecenas (2.1.17-78): by this I mean that this passage, though not a whole elegy, should not be divided.

The main problem with the address to Maecenas which constitutes the bulk of **2.1** (lines 17-76) is what the first half (lines 17-46) has to do with the second half (lines 47-78). I propose to examine this *apologia* first, before turning to its relation with the passages which come before and after it (2.1.1-16 and **2.2**).

After the 16-line introduction, in which he explains to the general public why he writes love-elegy, Propertius abruptly turns to address Maecenas by name in line 17, and continues to do so right through to line 78.<sup>15</sup> Maecenas is named again in line 71, which is one of the things that helps to round off the passage as a unified whole. The structure of the first half, up through line 46, is clear enough and relatively uncontroversial, and can be dealt with fairly summarily. Here he explains why he will not write epic. This is a standard *recusatio* -- Wimmel uses it as his model of the genre -- though nastier than most. Propertius begins with lists of the mythological and historical topics that he would <u>not</u> sing, even if he could (lines 17-24), followed (lines 25-38) by the topics that he would sing, if he could, the praises of Caesar and his trusted sidekick Maecenas. The contemporary topics in lines 27-30 are chosen for maximum offense: more a list of crimes and atrocities than of battles.<sup>16</sup>

The praises culminate in the splendidly inane bombast of lines 35-38:

te mea Musa illis semper contexeret armis, te sumpta et posita pace fidele caput: Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles, hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden --

before breaking off with something very like an aposiopesis (39-42):

sed neque Phlegraeos Iouis Enceladique tumultus intonet angusto pectore Callimachus, nec mea conueniunt duro praecordia uersu Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos.

This completes the first phase of the train of thought started in line 17: 'I would if I could', he said there, and now he illustrates his purported incapacity by throwing in the towel in mid-sentence. (In passing, I should add that editors all have trouble with this passage, marking lacunae, or transposing a couplet all the way from Book III<sup>17</sup> to fill the supposed gap between 38 and 39, but there is really no problem if we assume an aposiopesis and punctuate accordingly.<sup>18</sup> sed is the standard word for resuming an aposiopesis,<sup>19</sup> and the only thing odd about this particular instance is that lines 35-38 form a syntactically complete sentence. But they are so obviously incomplete in thought that this does not seem to be much of an objection.)

In the next four lines (43-46), the poet begins, ever so subtly, to shift his ground. The form of the priamel, with its commonplaces on the differing interests of men, tends to suggest that his aversion to epic is possibly a matter of choice rather than incapacity. With its mention of soldiers and sailors, shepherds and farmers, it also prepares us for the joke on *militia amoris* in the next couplet (47-48), in which the first four words are one of the most famous phrases in Propertius:

# <u>laus in amore mori</u>: laus altera, si datur uno posse frui: fruar o solus amore meo!

Although commentators point to the shock-effect of these lines, particularly in the contrast with *honestum est pro patria mori*,<sup>20</sup> the full meaning of the famous phrase seems to me to have been misconstrued. Most commentators assume that *in amore mori* means 'to die in love', that is, to be loyal to Cynthia until death. Propertius is to be the male equivalent of the Roman matron who is *uniuira*.

This is no doubt true, as far as it goes. Papanghelis adds an important twist: he suggests that the words also mean 'to die for love', that is, 'to die in love' as if love were a battle. He points to the witches in 1.51-56 as showing that lovers may well die for love.<sup>21</sup> I would add a third meaning, at least as important in this context: it is Propertius' life as a poet that is in danger. By abandoning any hope of immortality as an epic poet, and turning to writing in the trivial and short-lived genre of love-elegy, Propertius is making it certain (or so he claims) that he will not be remembered as a poet. He knows this, but cannot help his choice. That is, the address to Maecenas in 2.1 is a kind of 'poetic suicide-note', a declaration of poetic suicide, in which Propertius says goodbye to any chance of fame as a serious poet.<sup>22</sup> The words *laus in amore mori* mean, among other things, 'it is glorious to reject glory in favor of love': Propertius makes the ultimate romantic gesture of throwing away his entire (poetic) career for Cynthia. But the lines are oxymoronic: he expects to win glory by his rejection of (conventional military) glory. So all of his talk about poetic suicide, here and below, is as insincere as his preceding professions of incapacity. The continuation, laus altera, si datur uno / posse frui: fruar o solus amor meo!, means that it will be even more glorious if Cynthia's love for Propertius should turn out to be as great as his for her.

Passing over most of the second half of the address to Maecenas, with its three sets of mythological *exempla* (51-70), we come to the Callimachean funeral rites which end Propertius' address to Maecenas (1.71-78) and provide the climax of the poet's *recusatio*. There are several features here which only make sense if

interpreted as referring to a metaphorical and poetic funeral, rather than a literal one. Nearly every word has significant Callimachean connotations. This fact is important in that it shows that the *recusatio* does not end at line 46, but continues, by implication, right through to line 78. On 1.71-78, Camps notes that "the thought of death . . . recurs, conceived now . . . as result of the tormenting malady which is love".<sup>23</sup> However, the connection is more organic than that: this is not only the poet's literal death (caused by his beloved's unkindness), but his metaphorical death as a forgotten, because non-epic, poet. His refusal to write epic means a refusal of the immortality Maecenas has offered him on behalf of Augustus. He will die unknown because of this refusal. Only Maecenas, knowing that he might have written epic (this is, I think, implied here, in contradiction of 1.17-46) will remember him, at least for a short time, as a potentially immortal epic poet. In a further ironic twist, made explicit at the end of the last elegy in the book, 2.34, he hopes to be immortal as a love poet, despite or rather because of his refusal of epic. That is, these lines are a contrary-to-fact fantasy, like the list of possible topics from contemporary history in 1.25-38, though not quite as malicious.

The theme of poetic suicide is put in a very Callimachean way in 1.72, *breue in exiguo marmore nomen ero*. The poet's name is brief because it takes up little space on the monument, since he will accomplish nothing worth noting.<sup>24</sup> The monument is narrow because it need only be wide enough to fit the bare name 'Sextus Propertius', without any titles, because it will be cheap (Propertius will not be rich enough to afford more), and because the Callimachean poet prefers the narrow to the wide in all contexts. (The apparent self-deprecation conceals a boast: he knows, even if Maecenas does not, that his little elegies are far more likely to live than the contemporary epics of Maecenas' court poets.)

۰.

Because the tomb (and Propertius' memory) would not be worth a special trip, the poet has to count on Maecenas happening to be in the neighborhood (*si te forte meo ducet uia proxima busto* 1.75) before he has been too long dead to be remembered at all. A great man such as Maecenas would not care to go too far out of his way to visit the tomb of such an insignificant acquaintance as Propertius. Maecenas will only make the visit if he happens to be in the neighborhood soon after Propertius' death (the *fauilla* of 1.77 *taliaque illacrimans mutae iace uerba fauillae* are warm ashes): after that he will have completely forgotten him. Propertius does not even expect Maecenas to get out of his chariot: he can toss a few tearful words right from his seat (*iace uerba*). I take it that 'drive-in grave-visiting' would have been as offensive to ancient as to modern tastes. The poet's ashes are mute because his verses will not outlive him, even by one day, and because, again, there are no titles on his tomb.<sup>25</sup>

The last line of the funeral-scene, 'Huic misero fatum dura puella fuit' (1.78), takes the place of the carved epitaph that we would normally expect in this context: instead of the dead man speaking via his epitaph, here a survivor speaks one short line about him, in which neither the dead man's name, nor his mistress' name, nor his poetry, is mentioned. Insofar as he will be remembered at all, it will be for the unusual nature of his death, as if he had been struck by lightning or eaten by a bear, or perhaps we should say murdered by his girlfriend.

Cynthia is Propertius' *fatum* in two or three ways: not only the hypothetical cause of Propertius' death, but also his true (and unavoidable) subject. There is a small pun here, since *fatum* is etymologically 'thing spoken'.<sup>26</sup> She is a *dura puella* because she is cruel enough to cause his death, and inflexible and desirable enough to be inevitable: we might say that she is not only 'fatal' but 'fated'. This helps to prepare for the theme of divinity in 2.2: it is as if she were a cruel goddess ordering his death.

The address to Maecenas ends by returning to Cynthia, both Propertius' true subject and the cause of his future oblivion, or, more correctly considered, the cause of his true glory (as we will see most clearly at the end of the book, in **2.34**). This return to Cynthia takes us back to the beginning of **2.1** (lines 1-16): in this sense it may be said to round off **2.1** as an apparently complete whole. The imagined death of the poet also finishes off the poetic-suicide theme, and that is what ties together the *recusatio* of 1.17-46 with the gloomy personal musings of 1.47-70. At the same time, this return to Cynthia, treated as a cruel goddess, leads right in to the subject of **2.2**.

We must now look more closely at the relation between the address to

Maecenas (2.1.17-78) and the passages immediately before and after (2.1.1-16 and 2.2.1-16). The question of how the *recusatio* of 1.17-78 fits in with its context is equivalent to the question of the boundaries of the first elegy in Book II. Here is where we return to my proposal that 2.1 and 2.2 constitute a single, continuous, and (as we will see) symmetrical elegy of 94 lines. It must be admitted that this is a fairly bold suggestion: the transition from 2.1 to 2.2 is very abrupt, and, so far as I have been able to determine, no editor has ever doubted that the two are separate elegies. The abruptness of the transition is the reason why my suggestion must remain tentative: despite the several strong arguments for unity, the transition is a sticking-point, and I am not entirely convinced myself. However, the question of the transition will be deferred to the very end of this chapter, pages 129-32: I hope to convince the reader that the two elegies <u>should</u> be united, before turning to the question of whether they <u>can</u> be.

This editorial unanimity comes despite the fact that there is some slight manuscript support for unification. N<sub>1</sub> (the first hand of N, the oldest manuscript) does not divide the elegies, and N<sub>2</sub> (the second hand) begins a new elegy at 1.78, the last line of 2.1, which is, of course, impossible, since the line is a pentameter. Editors assume, plausibly enough, that the scribe intended to begin the new elegy at the following line, 2.2.1, but the mistake is not encouraging. Further, neither N<sub>1</sub> nor N<sub>2</sub> divides Book II from Book I. In other words, both are wrong at the beginning of the elegy, and N<sub>2</sub> is wrong at the end. It may therefore be foolish to suppose that N<sub>1</sub> can be trusted as to the end of the elegy: it is certainly wrong at plenty of other places, as I have argued in Chapter I above. In any case, the divisions marked in the manuscripts are highly unreliable, so there is no reason why 2.1-2 should not be united, if they can be shown to go better together than apart.

Moreover, the boldness of my suggestion offers some advantages. Since no editor doubts that 2.1 and 2.2 are separate elegies, none offers any argument as to why they should be so. I can thus offer my own positive arguments, without having to dispose of anyone else's negative arguments beforehand.

Some scholars have made remarks on 2.1 and 2.2 that tend to point in the direction of unity, without however taking the crucial step. To mention a single instance, Joy K. King, in the fullest separate treatment of 2.2, "Propertius 2,2: A Callimachean 'multum in parvo'", attempts to demonstrate<sup>27</sup>

"that 2,2 not only can be understood as a unity but that it provides an important supplement to 2,1 in outlining Propertius' poetic program for Book 2. It illustrates in practice the Callimachean principles the poet says in 2,1 inspire his poetry, and it demonstrates Propertius' originality in applying the Callimachean poetic program specifically to love."

I would go further than 'supplement', but it is useful to have King go that far.

The connections between the first sixteen lines of 2.1 and the sixteen lines of 2.2 are the most significant. There are obvious similarities in the overall

structure and contents of the two passages. Each is eight couplets long: although few scholars any more divide 2.1 after line 16, everyone marks a sharp transition, with the abrupt change of address from the vague and plural readers of 1-16 to the singular Maecenas of 17-78 (quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent 2.1.17). Thus 2.1.1-16, no less than 2.2, is a well-defined poetic movement of eight couplets. Each passage is principally devoted to a catalogue of praises of Cynthia: in 2.1 her human qualities are listed, one per couplet, beginning with the third couplet and continuing to the end, while in 2.2 she is explicitly compared to a list of goddesses (and one human heroine), also one per couplet, beginning in the third couplet, and continuing not quite to the end. Finally, each passage begins from the question of why Propertius writes. This is obvious from the first word of 2.1.1-16 (quaeritis), but is also true of 2.2, if the latter passage is understood correctly: taken quite literally, it says that he is unable to live without loving Cynthia, but the implication is that he is also unable to live without writing about his love. To Propertius, loving and writing love-elegy are equivalent, and his attempt to escape from the one involved escaping the other as well.<sup>28</sup>

All this is suggestive enough: although self-contained passages eight couplets long, catalogues in couplet-by-couplet form, the praises of Cynthia, and explanations of why he writes are all found elsewhere in Propertius, the combination of all four in each of these passages and in such close proximity is certainly enough to make us suspect that the two passages are closely related to each other. We could go further, and argue that they are so similar that they ought to bear the same relation to the passage in between. That is, considerations of symmetry would incline us either to combine 2.1 and 2.2 into a single symmetrical elegy, 2.1-2, in A1-B-A2 form, or to divide 2.1 at line 17, so that 2.1a, 2.1b, and 2.2 would form a set of three related elegies.<sup>20</sup> Since the latter hypothesis has been tried, and seems unlikely, the former is worth investigating further.

The connections between 2.2 and the opening of 2.1 (lines 1-16) go much further than the general similarities already mentioned, and include some subtle verbal and thematic details. We will begin with the simple verbal repetitions. In the third couplet, we find *incedere* in 2.1.5 and *incedit* in 2.2.6: each is used of Cynthia, and the word only occurs once elsewhere in Propertius. Each of these couplets also includes a form of *totus: totum* in 2.1.6, *toto* in 2.1.5. The fourth couplet of each passage ends with the word *comis* (2.1.8 and 2.2.8).<sup>30</sup>

These repetitions are unobtrusive enough: a more elaborate set of verbal resemblances is found at the beginning of each passage. In the first couplet of **2.1**, the hexameter (2.1.1) ends with *amores*, and the pentameter (2.1.2) with *liber*:

#### Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur <u>amores</u>, unde meus ueniat mollis in ora <u>liber</u>?

In the first couplet of 2.2, the pentameter (2.2.2) ends with *Amor*, while the hexameter (2.2.1) begins with *liber*:

#### *liber* eram et uacuo meditabar uiuere lecto; at me composita pace fefellit <u>Amor</u>.

The resemblance in the positions of the words in the lines could not be much closer than it is, given the quantities of the words involved. Although liber ("book") and *liber* ("free" or "child") are, of course, entirely different words, with unconnected meanings, Horace puns elaborately on the two in Epistle 1.20.<sup>31</sup> In fact, he does so without actually using one of the words (*liber*), so the pun must have been a fairly obvious one to readers of Augustan verse, despite the difference in quantities. If *liber* and *liber* are less alike than they appear in our texts, Amor and amores are more so, since there was, of course, no difference in capitalization in the ancient text. We may add that Amor is himself a liber in another sense, since the god of love is generally portrayed as a child, while Propertius' amores (or Amores<sup>32</sup>) themselves constitute a *liber*. In fact, there may conceivably be as many as three bookish puns in 2.2.1-2. The first is that already mentioned, on *liber* and *liber*: the poet was free (or thought he was) because he had made his love into a book. The second is on lectus (2.2.1), which can be a couch for writing, a *lectus lucubratorius*, as well as for sleeping and making love. The poet's bed was empty, and so was his writing-desk.<sup>33</sup> The third pun, which I would call possible rather than probable, is in the word *composita* (2.2.2), which can mean "composed", in the literary sense, as well as "pretended". These puns do not add up to a fully worked-out metaphor, as in Horace, Epistle 1.20, but the concentration of ambiguously bookish terms seems intentional.

Finally, there are striking resemblances in the contents of the respective seventh couplets. In 2.1.13-14, we have a naked Cynthia wrestling with the poet, and their activity explicitly compared with the composition of the <u>Iliad</u>:

#### seu <u>nuda erepto</u> mecum luctatur <u>amictu</u>, tum uero longas condimus Iliadas;

In 2.2.13-14, we have three naked goddesses at the Judgment of Paris, explicitly (and to their disadvantage) compared to Cynthia:

#### cedite iam, diuae, quas pastor uiderat olim Idaeis <u>tunicas ponere</u> uerticibus!

Although the Trojan War, Cynthia, and nudity are all among Propertius' favorite topics, I do not believe that he mentions all three in the same couplet elsewhere.

It must be admitted that not every couplet of 2.1.1-16 has any obvious connection with the corresponding couplet of 2.2. However, the fairly numerous resemblances that do occur are found, in each case, in corresponding couplets, and this seems unlikely to be coincidental.

At this point, the reader may well wonder whether the similarities between the first sixteen lines of 2.1 and the whole of 2.2 suffice to prove that they are the opposite ends of a single elegy. Could not one argue, with Richardson, that they are the beginnings of two successive elegies? Why could not Propertius have

written his first two elegies as a pair, beginning each with a parallel passage? I see no reason why adjacent elegies should not begin from the same point and then go off in different directions: the elegies that open Book III seem to do just that.<sup>34</sup> However, if the poet were doing so, there is no reason why the two beginnings should be of the same length, and match each other at corresponding points. Nevertheless, more evidence would not be out of place.

We will begin with symmetry. The elegy resulting from union of 2.1 and 2.2 is pleasingly symmetrical in structure, and the symmetry extends further than the simple A1-B-A2 structure outlined above (page 115). To avoid suspicion that I have adjusted my sub-sections to make them more symmetrical than they otherwise would be, I will start from the paragraphs marked by Luck and Camps. I have chosen these two, simply because they are the only recent editors who provide this useful service. In the following chart, P means that the editor begins a new paragraph with the line listed, --- that he begins a new elegy:

	Luck	Camps	Hendry
1.1	Р	Р	Р
1.17	Р	Р	Р
1.25	Р		Р
1.27		Р	
1.39	Р	Р	Р
1.47	Р	Р	
1.57	Р	Р	Р
1.71	Р	Р	Р
2.1			Р
23	P		

I agree with Camps against Luck at 2.3, and with Luck against Camps at 1.25/27: in the latter case, Camps puts the paragraph at the grammatical dividing-point, the end of the sentence, Luck, more plausibly, at the change in subject from those the poet would not sing even if he could, to those he would if he could. Both, of course, print 2.2 as a separate elegy: I make it a separate paragraph. The only other place in which I differ from both is 1.47: since this is the central couplet of the elegy, it does not mark a turning-point, though I do not make a new section there.

As I read it, the elegy is a symmetrical triptych, with the middle section, containing the address to Maecenas, nearly twice as long (31 couplets) as the outer two combined (8 + 8). The central address to Maecenas (1.17-78) is an interruption of his praises of Cynthia, but not without effect: the praises are stronger, that is, more explicitly divine, after than before. In 2.1.1-16, the style is hymnic, but Cynthia is not explicitly compared to a goddess. In 2.2, she is explicitly, and favorably, compared to Juno, Athena, Ischomache, Brimo, and, by implication, Venus. To some extent, these differences correspond to the differences in the two halves of 1.17-78: Cynthia's human qualities are described in 1.1-16, and the *exempla* in 1.17-46 are historical and contemporary: the *exempla* in 1.47-78 are all mythological, and so are the praises of Cynthia in 2.1-16.<sup>35</sup>

The address to Maecenas is itself symmetrically arranged, and the whole elegy

may be further subdivided as follows:

1.1-16	(8)	Praise of Cynthia as his Muse
1.17-24 1.25-38	(4) (7)	Subjects he would not sing, even if he could Subjects he would sing, if he could
1.39-56	(9)	But he can't love vs. war as subjects
1.57-70 1.71-78	(7) (4)	<i>Exempla</i> of curability and incurability Callimachean funeral rites
2.1-16	(8)	Praise of Cynthia as a goddess

(The vertical spacing shows how the major parts are further subdivided into parts of parts. The number of couplets in each section is given in parentheses.) I consider this pattern, like the parallels between the outermost parts of it, highly unlikely to be fortuitous, and another point in favor of the unity of 2.1-2.

This symmetry is combined with a sort of dynamic unity, whereby the whole opening of Book II, not just 2.1-2, but 2.3a, is tied together by the gradual unfolding of the theme of Cynthia as goddess. The theme is introduced in the second couplet (1.3-4):

non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo: ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.

The comparison is ambiguous: not a Muse, or a god, but a girl. Is the girl merely substituted for a god, bringing the elegy down to earth, or is she herself exalted

to divine status herself? The hymnic style in the immediately following praises (1.5-16) suggests the latter.<sup>36</sup> The ambiguity of *omnis <u>humanos</u> sanat medicina dolores* (1.57) points in the same direction. In the funeral-scene (1.71-78), the last line at least implies Cynthia as goddess. The theme becomes explicit in 2.2, and continues into 2.3a, as we will see below. (This ambiguity perhaps explains why Cynthia is not named until 2.5: it would damage the effect.)

Elegy 2.1 is incomplete in two different ways. To complete the *recusatio* of epic, Propertius' Callimachean principles must be shown in action, and King has shown how the stylistic and thematic details of 2.2 do just that.<sup>37</sup> But the substance of 2.2 also provides a necessary supplement to 2.1: we turn from the poet's (deeply ironic) poetic death, to the divine qualities of his mistress. The immortality of his subject implies the immortality of the poet, and shows (if it needed to be shown) that the funeral-scene is ironic: the undisguised statement of this fact will wait for the last elegy in the book.

We need now to widen the focus and examine the position of elegy 2.1-2 in Book II, and in particular its relation to the following elegy. We will see that this will help to strengthen the arguments so far made for the unity of 2.1-2. The problem with the following elegy is that its boundaries are disputed at both ends. As I mentioned above (page 100), a few editors wrongly combine 2.3 with 2.2, others, in my opinion rightly, remove the last five couplets (2.3b), either printing them as a separate fragment, or prefixing them (as I do) to 2.4. I will take up the second problem, the division of 2.3a from 2.3b, first, since it is less fundamental to my argument and can be disposed of fairly quickly. (I do not propose to give a complete interpretation of 2.3a, only enough to show that it is one, and how it relates to 2.1-2.)

There is no manuscript support for the division of 2.3 at line 44: nevertheless I take it to be quite certain. There is a great deal of editorial support: those who prefix 2.3b to 2.4, a suggestion which goes back to the Aldine edition of 1502, include Schrader, Lachmann, Baehrens, Rothstein, Enk II, Luck, and Helm, while those who treat the lines as a separate fragment, a suggestion which goes back to Lemaire (1832), include Hertzberg, Postgate, Butler-Barber, Schuster, Giardina II, and Fedeli. However, this list is not as imposing as it seems, when we consider that there are even more editors who do not divide 2.3, and that these include some, such as Palmer, Barber, Camps II, and Goold, who are by no means committed to defending the traditional numeration. In any case, editors of Propertius tend to be much readier in detecting divisions, even wrong divisions, than unities.

The change in subject and tone from 2.3a (=1-44), with its extravagant praises of Cynthia, to 2.3b (=45-54), with its abject devotion to Cynthia, does not prove that the elegy should be divided, either, though it points in the right direction: I hope that my discussions of 2.29 and 2.6-7 in Chapters II and III above has shown that enormous changes of tone within a single elegy are possible. The fact that 2.3b shares its subject and tone with 2.4 (and perhaps 2.5) does not prove it, either: 2.1-2 and 2.3a, for instance, have a great deal in common, but they are still, as we shall see, separate elegies.<sup>38</sup> The fact that Propertius, unlike Horace, does not elsewhere end an elegy still 'inside' a myth does not prove it, either: it is part of the reason why 2.3b should be combined with 2.4, but that does not necessarily mean that it must necessarily be separated from 2.3a.<sup>39</sup> Though all of these are useful points, what clinches the question is the juxtaposition of the last couplet of 2.3a (43-44) and the first of 2.3b (45-46):

siue illam Hesperiis, siue illam ostendet Eois, uret et Eoos, uret et Hesperios. his saltem ut tenear iam finibus! aut mihi, si quis acrior, ut moriar, uenerit alter amor!

If read as a continuous passage, as most editors print it, and as I have printed it here, the two couplets are ludicrously incongruous. In 43-44, the poet refers to the furthest peoples of the known world, the *Hesperii* and *Eoi*, peoples whose very names imply that they are not actual tribes but poetic boundary markers.<sup>40</sup> In 45-46, he continues with the words *his saltem ut tenear iam finibus!*, "may I at least be held within these bounds!". In the immediate context, this must mean "may I at least be held within the bounds of the known world". As a joke, it is inept, as an expression of fear of death, or a veiled threat of suicide, it is even more so. On the other hand, if lines 45-46 begin a new elegy, they can be taken quite naturally to refer to the entire situation of the preceding elegy, particularly its opening lines, and mean "may I at least be held within the bounds <u>of this</u> <u>love</u>". Taken with the rest of the couplet, this is what the words must mean, anyway: it is precisely the superficial connection that has caused the wrong division. I take the division of 3a from 3b to be quite certain.

Turning now to the division of 2.3a from 2.2, I have all of the manuscripts and nearly all of the editors (except Scaliger and Richardson) on my side, so it looks as if I would not need to say much else. However, it seems to me that the nature of the beginning of 2.3a is not only appropriate to the beginning of an elegy, but to the beginning of an elegy that is the second one in its book: the argument for dividing 2.3a from 2.2 is also a further argument for uniting 2.1 and 2.2. This argument, which is complicated by textual difficulties, is based on the use of anonymous interlocutors in the first four lines of 2.3a. These characters pop up at least three times in Book II of Propertius and once in Book III. They seem to represent the objections of the reading public, and they are made to ask indirect questions to open 2.1-2 and, with it, Book II:

> Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores, unde meus ueniat mollis in ora liber?

and to open 3.13:

Quaeritis, unde auidis nox sit pretiosa puellis, et Venere exhaustae damna querantur opes?

The interlocutors' questions are directly quoted to open 2.24:41

### 'Tu loqueris, cum sis iam noto fabula libro et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro?'

and in our elegy, 2.3a. This is where the textual problems come in. As Barber, among others, prints them, 2.3.1-4 are statements, and Propertius goes on in the next couplet to ask either himself or someone else (quaerebam, "I was asking", 2.3.5) whether a fish can live out of water, and so on. The comparisons in 5-6 seem to be offered as equivalents to the questions in 1-4: asking Propertius to refrain from loving and writing about love is like asking a fish to live out of water. There are two problems here. First, the two couplets in quotation marks must be questions:<sup>42</sup> the parallel passages, where the interlocutors are quoted or referred to, show this.<sup>43</sup> Second, lines 1-4 are clearly addressed to Propertius. They cannot be spoken by Propertius to himself, because quaerebam can hardly mean "I was asking myself" without "myself" being expressed in any way.44 Consequently, the questions in lines 1-4 must be ascribed to the anonymous interlocutors, quaerebam is wrong, and we should replace it with quaerebar or perhaps quaerebas or even quaerebant: almost any form of quaerere would be better than quaerebam. I prefer these options in the order listed, since the parallel passages quoted above show that the interlocutor is generally referred to in the second person, and is plural when his number is specified at all: since quaerebatis does not scan, it seems best to make the verb passive.<sup>45</sup>

Now, in each of the four passages quoted, the anonymous interlocutors are reacting to what they have just seen or read. The other three, at least, all begin

elegies. In 3.13, his question is inspired by 3.12.46 In 2.24, his question is a sarcastic reply to the poet's words in 2.23, in which, contradicting his usual persona, he recommends common prostitutes. In 2.1, it is the appearance of a new book so soon after the first that causes the interlocutors to ask their rude questions: they show no knowledge of the contents, except that it is about love, and so have presumably read only the title and author on the outside of the roll. (The phrasing suggests that the title of Propertius' book was either Amores, or a longer phrase containing the word: Ovid would then have lifted his title, along with so much else, from Propertius.) In 2.3a, the interlocutors' words seem to be a response to the substance of 2.1 and 2.2 together. Here they are better informed: they know not only that Propertius is writing once more on love, but that he has written a shameful (turpis 2.3.4) book, and that he is once more a hopeless slave of Cynthia (haesisti, cecidit spiritus ille tuus 2.3.2), which is not quite the same thing. In each of the other cases, the objection comes immediately after what is objected to: if 2.3a is to be an immediate objection to the theme of Propertius' second book, it seems to me that it should be the second, and not the third, elegy in the book: and this provides a further argument for the unity of 2.1-2.

However, this is not the only connection between 2.1-2 and 2.3a. They are closely related in subject and in structure: the two halves of 2.3a are related to each other in much the same way as the two outer parts of 2.1-2. The first half of 2.3a (2.3.1-22), like the first sixteen lines of 2.1-2 (2.1.1-16), begins with the

question of why Propertius writes love-poetry, and moves on to a listing of Cynthia's human qualities. In the first elegy, the list is couplet-by-couplet, while in **2.3a**, it is arranged more intricately and irregularly, as a priamel with parentheses. The characteristics selected for praise are mostly the same: her hair, her silk dress, and her singing are all mentioned in both. The second half of **2.3a** (2.3.23-44), like the last section of **2.1-2** (2.2.1-16), is devoted to praises of Cynthia as if she were a goddess or epic heroine. Again, the earlier elegy provides a simple, though very obscure, couplet-by-couplet list, while the later one provides a more discursive description. The most striking point of contact is the subject of Jupiter's rapes, which are mentioned in passing in **2.1-2** (*Juppiter, ignosco pristina furta tua* 2.2.4)<sup>47</sup> and are a major theme of **2.3a** (2.3.29-32):

gloria Romanis una es tu nata puellis: Romana accumbes prima puella Ioui, nec semper nobiscum humana cubilia uises; post Helenam haec terris forma secunda redit.

As V. Schmidt has pointed out,<sup>48</sup> the second half of 2.3a begins (23-32) with a parody of the Fourth Eclogue, with Cynthia substituted for Vergil's Messianic child: the lines just quoted are the climax of this section. There are some verbal repetitions: the participle *nascenti*, the phrase *decem menses*, and references to gifts (*munera* in Propertius, *munuscula* in Vergil) occur in both. But Propertius surpasses the claims of his model in one respect. Vergil's child will share the bedroom of some goddess or other (*dea* . . . *dignata cubili est* 63): Cynthia will share the couch of Jupiter himself (*Romana accumbes prima puella Ioui* 30).

And for *iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna*, we have *post Helenam haec terris forma secunda redit*: it is not *Iustitia*, but Helen, who is reincarnated in Cynthia. This mention of Helen takes us back to the subject of **2.2**.

In sum, 2.1-2, if we were to remove the central address to Maecenas (1.17-78), would be the same shape as 2.3a. That is, the shape of 2.1-2 is A1-B-A2, while the shape of 2.3a is A1-A2. In each case, A2 takes the theme of A1 to a considerably higher plane. So we see that Propertius does in fact begin the first two elegies in Book II from more or less the same starting point. But the two successive elegies with parallel beginnings are not 2.1 and 2.2, but 2.1-2 and 2.3a. The endings of the two elegies are also parallel, as they are not on any other scheme.

Finally, widening the focus yet further, taking 2.1-2 and 2.3a as single, complete elegies makes the first two elegies in Book II precisely the same lengths (47 and 22 couplets respectively) as the last two, 2.34 and 2.33. This point is arguable, in that it assumes that both of the latter are single complete elegies, that none of the four has any couplets missing or interpolated, and that Book II is a single book, and all of these points are very much disputed. On the other hand, the pleasing symmetry is itself a further argument for the unity and integrity of these four elegies and of the book. The symmetry extends to the shapes of two of the elegies: 2.33, like 2.3a, falls into distinct and equal halves: however, the design of 2.34 is asymmetrical, and does not resemble that of 2.1-2.

We will end with the obvious objection: <u>can</u> **2.1-2** be a single elegy, or is the transition between **2.1** and **2.2** too abrupt to be permissible? This is a question to which no clear answer is possible.

Although the transition from the last lines of 2.1 to the first lines of 2.2 is undeniably abrupt, it is no more so than several others in Propertius. Unfortunately, nearly all of these have themselves been used as excuses for dividing the elegies in which they occur. In fact, so many divisions have been proposed in the text of Propertius that it is no longer possible to come up with totally indisputable parallels, and we will have to look at some disputed transitions. One good example of an abrupt transition in Propertius comes at line 1.17 in our elegy: the poem suddenly shifts from praises of Cynthia to a political and poetic recusatio, and the plural readers of 1.1-16 are forgotten, as the poet turns to address Maecenas. Division of the elegy at this point is now generally rejected, even by the more radical editors. However, the closest parallels are in elegies usually divided. There are at least two other instances of transitions by means of bald statements in the imperfect. One is in 2.29, where mane erat, et uolui, si sola quiesceret illa / uisere in line 23 has inspired most editors to divide the elegy at that point: I hope that my discussion of 2.29 in Chapter II has rebutted that notion, to the degree that I can use it as a parallel here. Another example is 3.24-25, which is a single elegy in the A tradition (manuscripts FLP, but not N) and in both of Fedeli's texts,<sup>49</sup> but is divided in two in the traditional numeration, followed by nearly all other editors. The ring-composition in the first and last lines (*tuae*  $\dots$  formae 3.24.1, formae  $\dots$  tuae 3.25.18) seems to guarantee the unity. If 3.24-25 is a single elegy, then the transition (3.25.1-2), with its recall of earlier times,

#### risus eram positis inter conuiuia mensis, et de me poterat quilibet esse loquax

is very similar to that in 2.2.1-4. Note that all three transitions (2.1-2, 2.29, and 3.24-25) involve imperfect indicatives. I hope this will suffice to show that the transition from 2.1 to 2.2, though very abrupt, is not too abrupt for Propertius, and that we are free to combine them into a single elegy.

However, if the reader is still unconvinced, we can always call 2.1 and 2.2 a matched pair (or 2.2 the necessary supplement to 2.1). I hope that I have shown that the match is rather closer than the reader suspected. However, before giving up on unity, there are two other lines of argument, both rather speculative, that could be tried.

First, J. F. Miller has argued<sup>50</sup> that the imitations of the new Gallus fragment (2-7) in 1.16-17 of our elegy show that the fragment is part of a single elegy rather than a collection of separate quatrains. This argument can also be used the other way around: the fact that adjacent passages of Gallus are being imitated in 1.16 and 1.17 is part of the evidence that 1.1-16 and 1.17-78 are not

separate elegies, if there is anyone left inclined to doubt that. It is a very speculative point, but it is possible that 1.71-78 and 2.1-4 are also tied together by allusions to Gallus or some other work now lost, and that only the lack of so much Augustan literature prevents us from seeing it.

The second argument also makes use of the Gallus fragment. The general assumption of classical scholars seems to be that ancient books consisted of poems, and were not otherwise subdivided, and that ancient poems consisted of lines, which might be grouped into couplets or (in Horace) quatrains, but were not otherwise grouped into larger wholes. Now, modern poets write sonnet-sequences and other such groups of poems on a smaller scale than a whole book, and they also divide their poems into parts larger than stanzas or couplets, and number and label these parts as they please. The actual evidence (as opposed to the modern assumptions) for ancient practice is very skimpy indeed, as well as highly debatable, but the Gallus fragment (our only Augustan evidence) suggests that Augustan poets may also have divided their poems into parts. If so, we could argue that Propertius 2.1-2 was somehow marked, with some such symbol as the curly H of the Gallus manuscript, as a whole consisting of distinct parts, despite the abrupt transition at 2.2.1. Such marks would have been lost along with the punctuation, apices, and title of the book. The same argument might usefully be applied to other Latin poems which consist of parts that must be taken together, but can only go together rather loosely: for instance Catullus 68.

## Notes to Chapter V

- <sup>1</sup> Damon-Helmbold 1952, 220. (I do not know whether '58' is a typographical error for '78', or they have already taken 59-78 as somehow even more entirely other.)
- <sup>2</sup> Tremenheere inserts the whole of 2.10, and Carutti 2.13.1-16: I know these suggestions only from Smyth.
- <sup>3</sup> These are again taken from Smyth: I cannot believe that the details would repay first-hand investigation.
- <sup>4</sup> Hutchinson 1984, 100 n 12.
- <sup>5</sup> Papanghelis LD, 20.
- <sup>6</sup> Papanghelis, <u>ibid</u>.
- <sup>7</sup> Wimmel 1960, 17.
- <sup>8</sup> Papanghelis, *ibid.*; Kühn 1961, 97.
- <sup>9</sup> I explain 2.6-7 this way: see Chapter III above.
- <sup>10</sup> Wiggers 1977, 338.
- <sup>11</sup> Williams FoT, 168-72: the quoted words are on 168.
- <sup>12</sup> Stahl LW, 170.
- <sup>13</sup> Papanghelis LD, 20-49, a chapter significantly entitled "Witches and Lovers".
- <sup>14</sup> Although I believe that 2.3b and 2.4 should probably be united, the point is irrelevant to the argument of this chapter, and 2.3b provides all the evidence we need for the division of 2.3a from 2.3b-4: therefore I have not quoted 2.4.
- <sup>15</sup> D. O. Ross discusses the differences between the different parts of the elegy (Ross BAP, 115-18), and sums up the differences between 1-16 and 17-40 like this: "The first 16 lines are concerned entirely with elegy: it is the poet's fascination with his mistress that is to distinguish his place within the Roman genre. At line 17 Propertius first addresses to Maecenas the proper refusal to write on subjects of Greek epic, old or new, or on corresponding themes of ancient or current history. Here begins an entirely new movement within the poem, which ought to be recognized as such. Propertius has left elegy

and turns to a more general consideration of Callimachean poetry . . .".

- <sup>16</sup> As Commager puts it (1974, 12): "An ingenious poet, but a savage one as well".
- <sup>17</sup> See page 96 above for Housman's transposition.
- <sup>18</sup> Stahl implies an aposiopesis, without actually using the word: "The *sed* (39) is needed to indicate Propertius' breaking away from his contrary-to-fact hypothesis and returning to reality" (Stahl LW, 166). Butler-Barber (ad loc.) mention the figure by name, only to dismiss it as "incredible".
- <sup>19</sup> Good examples in <u>Aeneid</u> 1.135 and 2.101, to look no further.
- $^{20}$  King 1980, 64, with notes 9 and 11, provides a useful summary.
- <sup>21</sup> Since Maecenas was a generation older than Propertius, but is still seen as outliving him, the death must be seen as premature, which is a point in favor of Papanghelis' idea and mine: the two are not mutually exclusive.
- <sup>22</sup> Commager (1974, 20-21) provides useful remarks on Propertius' use of the motif of a "quasi-sexual union in death"
- <sup>23</sup> Camps II, ad 71ff.
- <sup>24</sup> The phrase also perhaps means "<u>short-lived</u> renown".
- <sup>25</sup> King seems to me to underestimate the power and negativeness of the imagery, and with it Propertius' contempt for Maecenas: "He has achieved a *nomen*, albeit *breue in exiguo marmore*" (King 1980, 64).
- <sup>26</sup> The etymology is known to Varro (LL 6.52: *ab hoc tempora quod tum pueris constituant Parcae fando, dictum fatum et res fatales*), and is still accepted by the OLD, unlike most of Varro's suggestions.
- <sup>27</sup> King 1981, 1970.
- <sup>28</sup> As Hanslik (1970, 169) notes, 2.3.1-4 equate freedom from love with <u>not</u> writing, which comes to the same thing.
- <sup>29</sup> A possible parallel would be the way 1.7 and 1.9 enclose 1.8, and 1.10 and 1.13 enclose 1.11-12. (Whether 1.8 and 1.11-12 are each a single elegy, as I think, or two elegies, as editors other than Hodge-Buttimore I prints them, is irrelevant here.) But those are pairs of very different elegies, which are explicitly and dramatically related, which is not what we have here.

However, we will see below (page 132) that the choice between one and three may not be quite as clear-cut as it looks.

- <sup>30</sup> The form *coma* also occurs in 2.2.5, and *capillis* in 2.1.7.
- <sup>31</sup> See E. Fraenkel, <u>Horace</u>, 356-63, for full discussion.
- <sup>32</sup> A point in favor of reading majuscule *Amores* in 2.1.1 is that the word must mean 'love-poems' rather than 'love-affairs', since Propertius' love-affair was famously singular.
- <sup>33</sup> The same pun seems to be used earlier in this poem (2.1.45-46): nos contra angusto uersantes proelia lecto: / qua poet quisque, in ea conterat arte diem. Propertius' 'narrow couch' is primarily the place where he makes love to Cynthia, but secondarily where he writes his slender elegies.
- <sup>34</sup> Some editors combine 3.1 with 3.2 or 3.4 with 3.5, but the point still holds: whether 3.1-5 are five, four, or three elegies, they are still a set of adjacent elegies concerned with a single theme, Propertius' claims as a Callimachean poet rather than as a lover. The interconnections are explored most fully in Nethercut 1970.
- <sup>35</sup> The pattern is clear, though the two sets of *exempla* do not perform the same function in the elegy.
- <sup>36</sup> See King 1980, 63, notes 7 and 8: King calls her a 'veritable goddess'.
- <sup>37</sup> They also provide hideous textual and interpretative problems, which I do not propose to examine here. However, the fact that we cannot understand exactly what the *exempla* in 2.2.9-12 are doing is no reason to cut them out. After all, to take just one example, no one has come up with a generally accepted explanation of the *exempla* in Horace, <u>Carmen 1.12</u>, either with or without Cato in line 35, and no one suggests major surgery there. In our passage, Ischomache and Brimo, both apparently victims of divine rape, seem to be somehow standing in for Venus in the series Juno, Minerva, . . ., which leads up to the Judgment of Paris in 13-14.
- <sup>38</sup> Elegies 3.1-5, whether they are three, four, or five elegies, provide examples of adjacent elegies reworking similar themes: Propertius seems to like to do this sort of thing at the beginnings of books.
- <sup>39</sup> On the other hand, 2.3a + 2.3b + 2.4 has never been suggested as a viable elegy, and is rather on the long side, so this evidence also points towards division of 2.3a from 2.3b.

- <sup>40</sup> They are presumably the same peoples as the Spaniards and Scythians implied by the epithets in 2.3.11: *ut <u>Maeotica</u> nix minio si certet <u>Hibero</u></u>. But the change in names is significant: calling them <i>Hesperii* and *Eoi* makes explicit the geographic opposition, which also matches the opposition of colors in snow and cinnabar.
- <sup>41</sup> Some editors take the next couplet as part of the question: this seems dubious. Some also append either 2.24.1-10 or 2.24.11-16 to 2.23: if this correct, some of my argument below is weakened.
- <sup>42</sup> This punctuation goes back to Richmond.
- <sup>43</sup> Though not all of them are always punctuated as questions, the similarities among them suggest that they should be.
- <sup>44</sup> The only definite second person self-address in Propertius is in 2.8.17, and there he makes things perfectly clear with a vocative: *sic igitur prima moriere aetate, Properti?*
- <sup>45</sup> On the other hand, quaerebas may be the easiest paleographically: QUAEREBASSICCA > QUAEREBASICCA by haplography, and QUAEREBA then mistaken for QUAEREBA, that is, QUAEREBAM. However, a singular addressee would tend to suggest a particular reader, say Maecenas or Cynthia, so I still prefer the more generic plural, or, even better, the totally ambiguous passive quaerebar.
- <sup>46</sup> See Jacobson 1976.
- <sup>47</sup> The serious textual (*ignosco* or *ignoro*?) and interpretative difficulties in this line do not affect my point.
- <sup>48</sup> Schmidt 1972.
- <sup>49</sup> Both his Teubner text (Fedeli) and his separate text of Book III with commentary (Fedeli III).
- <sup>50</sup> Miller 1981.

Chapter VI

**Conclusion** 

.

•

.

.

Most of the conclusions of this dissertation are confined to particular elegies, though more general conclusions can be drawn from the examples given. In Chapter II, I hope to have convinced my readers that elegy 2.29 should not be divided, but that the manuscripts' *extrema* in the first line and *non* in the last must go. This is a return to the nineteenth-century consensus. In Chapter III, however, I have suggested something totally new, that elegies 2.6 and 2.7 should be combined. In each case, the elegy is constructed antithetically. Chapter IV deals with two more complicated cases, elegies 2.17-18 and 2.26-27, which are not diptychs but triptychs, with the parts related in more complicated ways. Finally, Chapter V deals with elegies 2.1-2 an 2.3a and their interrelationships. These are placed last because my results are only tentative, and because the shapes of these two (if they are two) elegies are even more complicated than the others.

Besides the particular results of the investigations in Chapters II through V, I hope to have shown some more general things:

1. That Propertius sometimes constructs his elegies in antithetical ways, and that this is a likely source of wrong divisions, since editors assume that sudden changes in situation or tone imply new elegies.

2. That the boundaries between the elegies in Book II of Propertius are even more questionable than usually thought, since new arrangements are still possible,

either entirely new, as with 2.1-2 and 2.6-7, almost new, as with 2.17-18, or old but neglected, as with 2.26-27.

3. That, as in the cases listed, if and when the boundaries are settled, there will be fewer, larger, and more complicated elegies than in any recent edition.

4. That there is plenty of work still to be done to settle these boundaries. This work will have to combine aspects of the conservative and radical schools. The conservatives are, in my opinion, quite right in rejecting wholesale transpositions of the sort indulged in by Postgate, Housman, Richmond, Richardson, and most recently Goold. However, the radicals are quite right in suspecting the traditional boundaries and also in suspecting the details of the text. A good text of Propertius would have many more emendations, most more than a century old, than any currently available, and more obeli, too, as well as fewer, longer, elegies.

## **Bibliography**

.

Alton 1935	E. H. Alton, "Temptamina Propertiana", Hermathena 49 (1935) 43-55.
Badian 1983	E. Badian, "A Phantom Marriage-Law", Ph 104 (1983), 82-98.
Baehrens	Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV. Recensuit Aemilius Baehrens. Leipzig, 1880.
Bailey	D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Propertiana, Cambridge, 1956.
Bailey 1952-3	D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "Some Recent Experiments in Propertian Criticism", PCPhS 1952-3, 9-20.
Balcells	Properci, Elegies, Text establert pel Joaquim Balcells, traducció de Joan Mínguez, Barcelona, 1946.
Barber	Sexti Propertii Carmina, recognouit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit E. A. Barber, Oxford, 1960 <sup>2</sup> .
Barthius	Sex. Aurel. Propertius. Varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus a Frid. Gotl. Barthio. Leipzig, 1777.
Besnier 1979	R. Besnier, "Properce (Élégies 2,7 et 7a) et la premier échec de la législation démographique d'Auguste", RD 57 (1979) 191-203.
Burmann	<i>Sex. Aurellii Propertii elegiarum libri IV</i> . Cum commentario perpetuo Petri Burmanni Secundi et multis doctorum notis ineditis. Utrecht, 1780.
Butler	<i>Propertius</i> with an English translation by H. E. Butler, Cambridge and London, 1912.
Butler-Barber	The Elegies of Propertius, Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, Oxford, 1933.

·
Butrica MTP	J. L. Butrica, The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius, Toronto, 1984.
Cairns 1971	Francis Cairns, "Propertius 2,29a", CQ ns 21 (1971) 455- 60.
Cairns 1975	Francis Cairns, Further Adventures of a Locked-Out Lover. Propertius 2.17, Inaugural Lecture, Univ. of Liverpool, 1975.
Cairns 1977	Francis Cairns, "Two Unidentified Komoi of Propertius: 1,3 and 2,29", Emerita 45 (1977) 325-53.
Cairns 1979	Francis Cairns, "Propertius on Augustus' Marriage Law (2,7)", GB 8 (1979) 185-204.
Camps II	Propertius. Elegies. Book II, edited by W. A. Camps, Cambridge, 1967.
Commager 1974	Steele Commager, A Prolegomenon to Propertius, Norman, 1974.
Damon-Helmbold 195	2 P. W. Damon and W. C. Helmbold, The Structure of Propertius, Book II, UCPCP 14 (1952) 215-54.
Davis 1977	J. T. Davis, Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius, Bern, 1977.
Enk CC	P. J. Enk, Ad Propertii Carmina Commentarius Criticus, Zutphen, 1911.
Enk II	Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber II, edidit P. J. Enk, Leiden, 1962.
Fedeli	<i>Sexti Properti Elegiarum Libri IV</i> , edidit P. Fedeli, Stuttgart, 1984.
Fedeli III	Properzio, Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie, Introduzione testo e commento di Paolo Fedeli, Bari, 1985.

Giardina II	Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber II, edidit, breui commenatrio instr. I. C. Giardina, Torino, 1977.
Goold	G. P. Goold, text of Propertius distributed on the PHI Demonstration CD Rom #1, "PHI Latin Texts".
Goold 1966	G. P. Goold, "Noctes Propertianae", HSCPh 71 (1966) 59- 106.
Hanslik	<i>Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV</i> , edidit R. Hanslik, Leipzig, 1979.
Hanslik 1970	R. Hanslik, "Properz 2,2, ein Liebesgedicht aus augusteischer Zeit", AAWW 107 (1970) 163-72.
Helm	Properz. Gedichte, lat. u. deutsch v. R. Helm, Berlin, 1965.
Hertzberg	Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor. ed. G. A. B. Hertzberg, Halle, 1843.
Hodge-Buttimore I	R. I. V. Hodge and R. A. Buttimore, <i>The Monobiblos of</i> <i>Propertius. An Analysis of the First Book of Propertius</i> , text, translation, and critical analysis of each poem, Cambridge/Ipswich, 1977.
MHubbard	Margaret Hubbard, Propertius, London, 1974.
TKHubbard 1986	T. K. Hubbard, "Speech, Silence, and the Play of Signs in Propertius 2.18", TAPhA 116 (1986) 289-304.
Hutchinson 1984	G. O. Hutchinson, "Propertius and the Unity of the Book", JRS 74 (1984) 99-106.
Ites DPE	Marcus Ites, "De Propertii Elegiis inter se Conexis", dissertatio inauguralis, Bielefeld, 1908.
Jacob	Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina, recensuit Fridericus Iacob, Leipzig, 1827.
Jacobson 1976	H. Jacobson, "Structure and Meaning in Propertius Book 3", ICS 1 (1976) 160-73.

į

\*

:

ł

Juhnke 1971	Herbert Juhnke, "Zum Aufbau des zweiten und dritten Buches des Properz", Hermes 99 (1971) 9-125.
Keil	Sex. Propertii elegiae. Edidit Henricus Keil, Leipzig, 1850.
King 1980	J. K. King, "Propertius 2,1-12; his Callimachean Second 'libellus'", WJA ns 6b (1980) 61-84.
King 1981	J. K. King, "Propertius 2,2. A Callimachean multum in paruo", WS 94 (1981) 169-84.
Kühn 1961	J. H. Kühn, "Die Prooimion-Elegie des zweiten Properz- Buches", Hermes 89 (1961) 84-105.
Lachmann	Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina. Emendavit ad codicum meliorum fidem et annotavit Carolus Lachmannus, Leipzig, 1816.
Lefèvre PL	Eckard Lefèvre, Propertius Ludibundus, Heidelberg, 1966.
Lefèvre 1976	Eckard Lefèvre, "L'unità dell'elegia properziana", in Atti del Colloquium Propertianum I, Assisi, 1977, 25-51.
Luck	Properz, Tibull. Liebeselegien, lat. u. deutsch v. G. Luck, Zurich, 1964.
Luck 1979	G. Luck, "Notes on Propertius", AJP 100 (1979) 73-93.
Lyne LLP	R. O. A. M. Lyne, The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace, Oxford, 1980.
Macleod 1976	C. W. Macleod, "Propertius 2.26", SO 51 (1976) 131-36.
Miller 1981	J. F. Miller, "Propertius 2,1 and the New Gallus Papyrus", ZPE 44 (1981) 173-76.
Nethercut 1980	W. R. Nethercut, "Propertius. 2,18. Kein einheitliches Gedicht", ICS 5 (1980) 94-109.

, ,

.

Otis 1965	B. Otis, "Propertius' Single Book", HSCPh 70 (1965) 1-44.
Paganelli	Properce. Élégies. Texte établi et traduit par D. Paganelli, Paris, 1929.
Paley	Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina. The Elegies of Propertius. With English Notes by F. A. Paley, London, 1853.
Palmer	Sex. Propertii libri IV. Recensuit Arthurus Palmer. London and Dublin, 1880.
Papanghelis LD	T. D. Papanghelis, Propertius: a Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death, Cambridge, 1987.
Phillimore	Sexti Properti carmina recognouit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit Ioannes S. Phillimore, Oxford, 1907 <sup>2</sup> .
Postgate	Sexti Properti carmina recognouit Iohannes Percival Postgate, in Corpus Poetarum Latinorum, London, 1894.
Richardson	Propertius, Elegies I-IV, ed. with intr. & comm. by L. Richardson, Jr., Norman, 1977.
Richmond	Sexti Propertii quae supersunt opera edidit nouoque apparatu critico instruxit O. L. Richmond, Cambridge, 1928.
Ross BAP	D. O. Ross, Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome, Cambridge, 1975.
Rothstein	Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius. Erklärt von M. Rothstein, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Berlin, 1920.
Scaliger	As reported by Graevius: <i>Catullus, Tibulls &amp; Propertius,</i> cum jntegris Commentariis Iosephi Scaligeri Ach Statii M Ant Mureti Iani Dousae Patris Filiique et Aliorum ex Musaeo Joannis Georgii Graevii, Utrecht, 1680.
Schmidt 1972	V. Schmidt, "Virgile et l'apogée de la louange de Cynthie (Properce 2,3,23-32)", Mn S.IV 25 (1972) 402-07.

F

144

.

Schrader LE	J. Schrader, Liber Emendationum, Leeuwarden, 1776.
Schuster	<i>Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV</i> , edidit M. Schuster, Leipzig, 1954.
Skutsch 1963	O. Skutsch, "The Structure of the Propertian Monobiblos", CP 58 (1963) 238-9.
Slater 1974	W. J. Slater, "Pueri, turba minuta", BICS 21 (1974) 133-40.
Smyth TC	W. R. Smyth, Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum, Leiden, 1970.
Stahl LW	HP. Stahl, Propertius: "Love" and "War", Individual and State under Augustus, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1985.
Sullivan EPSP	J. P. Sullivan, Ezra Pound and Sextus Propertius: a Study in Creative Translation, Austin, 1964.
Sullivan 1961	J. P. Sullivan, "Propertius 2,29,38", CQ ns 11 (1961) 1-2.
Tovar-Belfiore	Propercio. Elegías. Edición, introducción y notas de A. Tovar y M. T. Belfiore Mártire, Barcelona, 1963.
White 1958	Ronald E. White, "The Structure of Propertius 2,28: Dramatic Unity", TAPhA 89 (1958) 254-61.
White 1961	Ronald E. White, "Dramatic Unity in Propertius 1,8. 2,29. 2,33", CPh 56 (1961) 217-29.
White 1964	Ronald E. White, "The Unity of Propertius 2,34 and 3,20", in <i>Laudatores temporis actis. Studies in Memory of W. E. Caldwell</i> , Chapel Hill, 1964, 63-72.
Wiggers 1977	Nancy Wiggers, "Reconsideration of Propertius 2.1", CJ 72 (1977) 334-41.
Wiggers 1980	Nancy Wiggers, "Variations on a Theme; Nightmare and Daydream in Propertius 2,26", Latomus 39 (1980) 121-28.
Wille 1980	Gunther Wille, "Zum Aufbau des zweiten Buches des

	Properz", WJA n.s. 6 (1980) 61-84.
Williams TORP	Gordon Williams, <i>Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry</i> , Oxford, 1968.
Williams FoT	Gordon Williams, Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry, New Haven, 1980.
Williams 1958	Gordon Williams, "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals", JRS 48 (1958) 16-29.
Wimmel KR	W. Wimmel, Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit, Wiesbaden, 1960.

.

,

•