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*Latin Elegy as a Genre of Dissent:* An investigation into the amatory elegies of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, intended to substantiate the thesis that these works are characterised by a sceptical and critical outlook on the undertakings, achievements, and ideals of the Augustan state to an extent which suggests that they became a medium for the expression of feelings of mistrust and dissent directed towards the new regime. A chapter is devoted to an examination of Propertius' fourth book and contains arguments to the effect that this collection represents a reaffirmation of an unwillingness to identify himself with the imperial cause. The research is conducted in four main areas dealing with literary, social, political, and moral issues and an attempt is made to demonstrate that the elegists reflected opinions and advertised ideas which conflicted with official interests in these spheres, and that antagonism towards the social designs of the state was a factor which stimulated the development of the process whereby they described the progress and nature of their affairs in metaphorical terms whose primary significance pertained to the very fields in which the government showed social concern. Their disinclination to applaud the principate was matched by a distaste for verse which performed this service and their attitude in this respect manifested itself in the way in which they parodied the conventions of the work of those who applied their literary talents to paying tribute to the new order. The evidence of the elegies is set within an historical context both in an endeavour to interpret such passages whose import is subsequently found to be germane to the enquiry and also for the purposes of assessing the impact which aspects of the genre would have had upon the contemporary Augustan reader and gauging the feelings which we may reasonably suppose these aroused in official quarters.
TO MY PARENTS
NOTICE

Copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.
Gratiarum Actio

To the Department of Education and Science I express my gratitude for having given the financial support which allowed me to devote my attention to this field of research. At a time of national economic difficulties one appreciates even more keenly a provision of this nature.

I owe my thanks to Professor J. P. Hallett for having given permission to obtain a copy of her unpublished Harvard dissertation, a work which added greatly to my interest in the last book of Propertius' elegies.

To my supervisor, Mr. R. J. Dickinson of the Classics Department at Durham, whose enthusiasm for the elegists has been a driving force in my project, I am indebted most of all. At our regular meetings (the serious business of which was often tempered by refreshment taken beforehand) I received much helpful criticism which often led me to reassess and modify my thoughts or seek further evidence to back up a claim which did not have wide support or appeared to be interpreting material in a new light.

I would also like to thank Professor Townend for tracing to source some information which I required for my notes.

The staff of the Inter-Library Loan desk of Durham University Library provided me with an efficient and indispensable service in obtaining articles and books essential for my research and for this I am much obliged as I am also for the Library having arranged and sponsored my visit to the Lending Division of the National Library to consult periodicals.

I am grateful to an obliging relative, Clive Koerner, who gave much of his time in preparing by far the larger part of a draft copy in type, and who modestly suggested that I should omit any reference to his aid in this respect, and finally I wish to acknowledge the diligent typing service afforded by Joi Barnes who took a genuine interest in the content of the work.

Elyth, Northumberland,
July, 1977
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREWORD</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE LITERARY ASPECT OF ELEGIAC DISSIDENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoterics and Elegists</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Horatian Reaction</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage and Recusatio</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius' Error: The Disadvantages of Patronage</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messalla and Tibullus</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Novel Recusatio (Propertius 2.10)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius' View of Vergil's Literary Career</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius' Attitude to Horace</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid and Artistic Emancipation</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Elegist as Vates: Aim and Motive</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note References for Chapter One</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTIUS BOOK 4. RECANTATION OR REAFFIRMATION?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and Motive</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ara Maxima</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actian Apollo</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter Feretrius</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpeia and Arethusa</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Dead</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Alive</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertumnus</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acanthis and Related Matters ........................................ 248
Conclusion ....................................................................... 251
Note References for Chapter Two ................................. 253

(Volume Two)

CHAPTER 3
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL DISSENT IN THE ELEGISTS

Part One The Rejection of 'Ambitio' in Latin Elegy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus, Tibullus and Poetic Capitalisation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seeds of Elegiac Intransigence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recalcitrance in Ovid</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Theme of Withdrawal in Propertius and Ovid</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibullus' Philosophical Basis for Retreat</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of Disillusion in Tibullus</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Two Elegy and Political Recrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius and the Parthian Question</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Propertian View of Actium</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Political Import of Tibullus 1.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irony and Levitas in Tibullus 2.5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Political Echo in Tibullus 1.1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Military Metaphor as Political Nequitia</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius: Amor Armatus</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius: Amor Triumphator</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibullus</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note References for Chapter Three ................. 123
# CHAPTER 4

**IRREVERENCE AND IMMORALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immorality: Counter-indictment in Elegy</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegy and the Rural Ethic</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Orbitas' versus 'Ubertas'</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom and Repression</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Inversion and 'Servitium'</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of Marital and Related Terminology and its Implications</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note References for Chapter Four</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

272
ILLUSTRATIONS
(Vol. I)

Statue and coins representing Juno Sospita; photograph reproduced from K. Latte: Römische Religionsgeschichte.

Facing page

An 'aureus' of 16 B.C.; photograph reproduced from H. Mattingly: Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum.

224

226
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.C.</td>
<td>Acta Classica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J.P.</td>
<td>American Journal of Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.F.L.N.</td>
<td>Annali della Facoltà di Lettere della Università di Napoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Carmina Epigraphica ed. F. Buechler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.H.</td>
<td>Cambridge Ancient History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.L.</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum ed. T. Mommsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.</td>
<td>Classical Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Q.</td>
<td>Classical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>Classical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.R.</td>
<td>Greece and Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.R.B.S.</td>
<td>Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S.C.P.</td>
<td>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Roman Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.L.S.</td>
<td>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae ed. H. Dessau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.L.I.</td>
<td>Litterature Latine Inconnue (vol.2) H. Bardon (see bibliography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.C.D.</td>
<td>Oxford Classical Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C.P.S.</td>
<td>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pf.</td>
<td>Pfeiffer, R. Callimachus (see bibliography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E.A.</td>
<td>Revue des Études Anciennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E.L.</td>
<td>Revue des Études Latines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.P.</td>
<td>Revue de Philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.O.</td>
<td>Symbolae Osloenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.A.P.A.</td>
<td>Transactions of the American Philological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.S.</td>
<td>Wiener Studien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the past thirty years or so there has been increasing interest in the attitudes of the elegists towards verse, life, society and politics for reasons which, although they are not entirely clear, we can tentatively attribute in part to the erosion of a long standing and rather nineteenth century idea that our attention should be claimed by serious noble and edifying works, as well as the disappearance of a prudery which may have acted as a bar to the closer investigation of their works. In addition, it is understandable that an age which is itself marked by scepticism criticism and dissent should be more responsive and attentive to such elements which are to be found in amatory elegy and indeed drawn towards them. Belonging to such an age, perhaps we are in a better position to analyse and assess the work of the elegists in the fields which I have mentioned, a view taken by Sullivan in a recent book on Propertius: "our insight into the nature of Augustan politics and literature has been sharpened by our own experiences in the past several decades...."

The author goes on to pay tribute to Syme's famous study of the political and social upheavals which revolutionised Rome during the lifetime of the elegists, a publication which has helped us to put the literature of this period in perspective. It is against a historical background that I have conceived my enquiry, particularly in the third and fourth chapters and to a considerable extent in the second, while the first chapter which is preoccupied with the significance of the elegists' approach to patronage, literary conventions and aesthetic ideals, also takes account on occasion of historical considerations. Numismatic evidence is adduced for a new
interpretation of a passage in elegy 4.8 of Propertius discussed in
the second chapter, and throughout my work arguments are often
supported by chronological, archaeological and religious factors.
An apparently straightforward statement by an elegist can assume a
new complexion when viewed in the light of such external contemporary
evidence. This approach is after all recognised as a valid means of
advancing our understanding and appreciation of, for instance,
Vergil's Aeneid. (3) Just as this epic would in effect be judged
only as a narrative composition without an appreciation of the
political climate which appears to have coloured many incidents and
details which feature in it, so too amatory elegy is liable to be
regarded much as a record of emotions and events and judged according-
ly, whereas it is my belief that the contemporaries of the elegists
would have been in a better position to appreciate a dimension of
their work to which the modern cursory reader is apt to be less
attuned. In this way, the social historian of the Augustan age is in
a good position to sense the tension in elegy between a world with
its preference for uninhibited moral freedom and the life divorced
from public obligations and affairs of state on the one hand, and
the reality of the demands which the new regime was making on its
citizens on the other, for these 'elegiac' aspirations are remote and
indeed opposed to what we know to have been an official policy of
moral rearmament and social engineering designed to ensure the
efficiency and perpetuation of the nascent empire. The more obvious
expressions of dissent and scepticism which occur in the elegies are
what I take to be instances of a release of the tension arising out
of the underlying conflict between the ideals of the elegiac world
and those of the Augustan state.
It is friction of this sort which I regard as having been a spur to the development of certain aspects of the genre. In forming concepts to portray their way of life and relationships the elegists often employ metaphorical language whose primary meaning attaches to real life and the activities, customs and institutions of the actual Roman world, so the idea of the 'militia amantis' for example, exploits a vocabulary relating to the military life and the outward symbol of its success, the triumph. The elegists are, however, unanimous in decrying this sort of career and its associated values at a moment when the emperor was anxious to attract members of their social order into serving the state in a military capacity, and consequently the metaphorical use of martial imagery in verse which is opposed to heroic ideals as well as the grander types of poetry which would applaud them, has the effect of undercutting the spirit of military endeavour which the state sought to encourage in the interest of defending and sustaining itself. The process must have seemed not so much as excusatory (the elegists protest that they are not wasting their energies by opting out of military life and devoting themselves to amatory affairs) as provocative and mockingly subversive. Moreover, by reworking the language of 'castra' which was an epical theme, the elegists emphasised their divergence from a tradition in Roman literature which was now being exploited to accommodate the praises of the emperor and his line.

Similarly, the elegists draw upon terminology which is properly descriptive of monogamous relationships to describe their own affairs, but since the elegiac life-style is by and large incompatible with the domesticity of married life, this represents what I think would have struck the Augustan reader as a somewhat defiant and insolent
adaptation of language, taking into account the fact that the state was making an attempt backed up by the force of law to enforce marriage, a social strategy dictated primarily to reverse a decline in the numbers of the citizen body in an effort to maintain the strength of the army as well as promote good morality. The intrigues of the elegiac affair reflect a morality which diverges from that which was officially upheld and epitomised by the institution of marriage which the state was recommending. Not least this appropriation of terminology could be regarded as provocative in the way in which the status of the characters who are party to the affairs, and those who are affected by them, remains ambiguous; the reader can be misled into imagining that adulterous affairs are being described, for such words as 'vir' and 'uxor' are used in such an indeterminate way - Propertius for example calls Cynthia his 'uxor' (2.7.) - that when the elegist advises his mistress to deceive her 'vir', we cannot be certain whether the person referred to is a rival who presently possesses her, or rather her husband. If the latter is the case, and some scholars place this interpretation on the word, then the advice which is being tendered constitutes an incitement to what had become under Augustan law a serious criminal offence. If modern scholars can regard the elegists as representing the pursuit of such adulterous intrigues then we can easily appreciate how an Augustan reader, who may not have possessed the biographical information which could have corrected his opinion, might also have been misled. Such intimations of immorality were probably sufficient to cause annoyance in official circles, and indeed one of the charges brought against Ovid's 'Ars Amatoria', which continues in much the same vein as the 'Amores' was that it advised
'matronae' to stray from the straight and narrow; Ovid argues that this is a misunderstanding, but the very ambiguity to which I refer was likely to have been a factor which gave rise to the charge or a convenient element which lent itself for the purposes of incrimination. Ovid's elegiac affairs have every appearance of being fictitious and hence the ambiguity and misunderstanding become more acute since in his case there would be a total lack of biographical information which might have corrected a wrongful impression. This, as well as a bolder use of words suggestive of an illicit affair(8) were quite possibly aspects of his verse which brought such a harsh verdict upon him.

Even the notion of the 'servitium amoris' can sometimes be seen to possess social and political overtones.(9) In demoting themselves to servile status, albeit in a metaphorical way, in verse which frequently registers an unwillingness to pursue the sort of careers which the emperor was eager to encourage among men of their station, the elegists seem to be underlining their rejection of claims upon their potential as citizens to contribute to the welfare of the state, as well as suggesting that they owe their 'fides' to a 'puella' rather than to the state. In addition, the idea draws upon a vocabulary which had furnished catchwords for the leaders of factions and their opponents in a political war of words. I shall suggest that the appearance of such words in connection with this idea, particularly in elegies where the spheres of amatory experience and national events and politics are juxtaposed, would have reminded the contemporary reader, who through experience of recent events would have been inclined to attach to them a political significance, that the political 'servitium' of which they had been warned to
beware had not been evaded but was still with them.

The student of literature, however, rather than of social history is doubtless better equipped to appreciate the motive behind another notable case of an appropriation and adaptation of diction and conventions by the elegists, that is the way in which they apply the 'vates' concept to their own verse. Here I shall argue against Newman's assessment(10) of this feature of elegy and propose that the elegists did not misunderstand, as is claimed, the inner meaning of this august concept which had been developed in particular by Vergil and Horace in verse which treated national, patriotic themes, but rather that the supposedly indiscriminate appearance of the concept in contexts which were hardly suited to its original serious official and political purposes is symptomatic of the desire of the elegists to parody the machinery of the concept and detract from its original solemnity, rather than of ignorance on their part as to how in its genuine form it should operate and to what end.

Again, it is our knowledge of the backgrounds to Augustan poetry and the evidence afforded by the verse itself which will help us towards an understanding of the elegists' attitude to patronage and the significance of the elegiac 'recusatio'. In the case of Propertius the system of patronage seems to have caused what I believe were unforeseen problems which Tibullus did not encounter in his experience of the system, and this I would attribute to his discontent on finding that Maecenas was seeking to channel his talent away from amatory themes and into public and national ones; the scope of the elegiac couplet was not bound to be limited to amatory themes for in Greek it had on occasion even been used as a vehicle
for political propaganda and Callimachus, for whom Propertius had 
high regard as Maecenas could not have failed to notice, had 
written some elegies of an epinician nature. In Latin, Ennius had 
recorded the praises of Scipio Africanus by means of the epigram 
and so it can be readily appreciated that Maecenas may have thought 
that his elegist would be willing and capable of using the elegiac 
couplet to compose verse which would pay serious tribute to the 
Augustan achievement. We know that the patrons of both elegists 
wrote verse in a light vein towards which their protégés would have 
been sympathetic, but I shall maintain that Propertius misjudged the 
character of Maecenas in assuming that his eccentric behaviour and 
frivolous compositions spoke of one who would not press his poets to 
attempt serious themes of a national and public character; it was 
only after Propertius had made his entry into Maecenas' circle that 
the verse of the other two famous poets who belonged to it began to 
take a more serious turn in expressing enthusiasm for the new regime. 
Whereas Maecenas had always been a staunch supporter of the emperor 
and a strong advocate of empire, the patron of Tibullus, on the other 
hand, never disguised the fact, even after Actium, that he was an 
ardent admirer of the republic in defence of which he had fought 
against Octavian. It is, then, understandable that Messalla should 
have been less inclined to elicit a response from Tibullus which 
would be favourable to the Augustan regime. I suspect that 
Propertius would have been more at home among the poets of Messalla's 
circle, but had considered it wiser at the time to seek to fulfil 
his ambitions as an elegiac poet by making an entry into a literary 
milieu which as yet lacked a specialist in this genre. Thus I 
explain the Propertian 'recusatio' as the reaction of one who was 
surprised and bewildered when he found himself called upon to
advertise and pay tribute to the new state towards which, as the evidence of the elegies suggests, he remained sceptical. In a special study of Propertius' last book of elegies, I shall seek to establish that he did not abandon this attitude in writing poetry which has often been construed as constituting such a tribute, and I shall also attempt to demonstrate how, in the first of the aetiological elegies proper, Propertius refers obliquely to Maecenas who had recently fallen from favour, in a way which bespeaks sympathy for his fate, a reversal of fortune which fed the poet's scepticism towards the new regime of which the last book is a continuing expression.(11)

It is generally accepted that a degree of animosity rooted in a spirit of poetic rivalry existed between Propertius and Horace, and since Propertius often voices his dislike of the grander sort of verse which would deal with national themes and this was a conception of poetry towards which Horace appears to have been well inclined, it is likely that this was also a factor which contributed towards the discordant feelings between the two. It is usually assumed on the other hand that Propertius took a kindly view of Vergil and his epic master-work. The evidence for this opinion is derived from the last elegy of Propertius' second book, but when I investigate this particular poem (12) I shall put forward the view that he is in fact taking to task the author of the Aeneid for committing himself to the composition of the sort of verse to which, as I have mentioned, he took exception, and this is consonant with his thinking on this species of literature as found in his 'recusationes'. With regard to the penultimate elegy which was perhaps intended to be conjoined with this last elegy, there are grounds for suspecting that
Propertius may be taking a critical view for similar reasons of the
epic works which Varius Rufus had executed in praise of the emperor
and his adoptive father. Ovid, I believe, recognised that the
elegist in Maecenas' circle had encountered problems; in Amores 3.1,
in which Ovid imagines that claims are being made on his own talents
I suspect that by utilising language which evokes the subjects of
patronage, official poetry and the 'recusatio', he is alluding to
the plight of Propertius while emphasising his own independence and
perfect freedom to pursue his own literary inclinations. One receives
the impression that Tibullus' literary relations with the patron who
had encouraged Ovid's early efforts in poetry were such that he was
permitted much of the freedom which Ovid prized and for which
Propertius had to struggle.

The arguments advanced concerning the motives which appear to
have determined the elegists' creative adaptation of terms, and
their development of the concepts to which I have referred, are
essentially to the effect that their evolution was dictated largely
by feelings of frustration and antagonism towards aspects of Augustan
society and politics, life and letters. The attitudes which are
distilled in such concepts and which give rise to inventiveness in
the use of language are investigated more closely within the wider
scope of this enquiry.

I have spoken of the elegists' disregard for the military
career and this will be seen to be symptomatic of a general reluctance
on their part to respond to the emperor's policy of drawing men of
their social rank into the service of the state. I hope to demonstrate
how this social indifference is matched by a negative and critical
perspective on Augustan politics. I shall examine, for example,
Propertius' thoughts on the Parthian question and his retrospective view of the battle of Actium, a victory for Octavian which in many ways represents the cornerstone of the new imperial edifice. Tibullus had the opportunity in his verse of relating Messalla's achievements to the wider framework of Augustus' 'res gestae' but this he seems to have studiously avoided, his intention being, as I shall suggest when I examine elegy 1.7, to credit Messalla with a public and political eminence rivalling even that of the 'princeps'. This neglect of imperial matters as well as a flippant and humorous approach in elegy 2.5 to the Aeneas legend and the cult of Apollo, figures with whom Augustus had come to be closely associated, are I believe an indication that Tibullus was reluctant to identify himself with the new order and its ideals and myths. In this the poet may well be reflecting the circumspect reserve which his patron Messalla appears to have felt towards the system which had supplanted the republic, of which he continued to be a confirmed admirer; in this respect I would agree with the author of the most recent commentary on Tibullus who detects "political as well as stylistic sympathy" between poet and patron based on a mutual regard for the old order. (13) The silence of Tibullus on the subject of Messalla's service in fighting for the cause of Octavian at Actium is notable in view of the fact that he has advertised his patron's major undertakings with this exception, and I think it can be attributed to his sensing that Messalla felt acute regret that he had compromised his republican ideals in helping to secure a victory which closed the door for all time on the republic. Well may the statement of the emperor that Messalla had fought as valiantly for him at Actium as he had erstwhile fought against him at Philippi have rankled in his mind, (14) and his resignation from office in 26 B.C. could represent the outcome
of a self-examination of his political beliefs. The theme of the Golden Age in Tibullus has often been interpreted as the means by which the poet pays tribute to the Augustan 'pax' but I shall contend that it does not optimistically herald the dawn of a new age but is rather a backward glance, referring to a past which was essentially superior to the present and that this retrospection is bred of a pessimistic outlook on contemporary affairs which was not alleviated, as it was for some, by faith in the ability of the 'princeps' to settle them. Below I shall adduce a further reason for supposing that his vision of rural peace is not to be understood as an indirect compliment to the pacification effected by the emperor. It should become evident that the philosophical vein (15) which permeates Tibullus' description of the ideal existence reflects the philosophical interests of his patron, and seen within an historical context there is a case to be made for the view that this element has an affinity with the Epicurean philosophy whose adherents had recently become less aloof from politics in manifesting hostility to the opponents of the republic.

Above I mentioned that Tibullus showed scant respect for two central figures from the world of myth and legend with whom the destiny of the emperor was thought to be linked; such irreverence and even overt criticism is evident in the elegies of Propertius and Ovid both of whom accuse Romulus of having instigated immoral conduct in the city, an indictment which contains an attendant irony for the latter day counterpart of the mythical founder of the city, as the emperor was content to be known, was intent on improving morality as they were only too aware. As for Ovid, I would instance here the way in which the divine genealogy of the imperial family often provides him with material for mirth, for he was quick to notice an amusing
contradiction in the fact that the author of the campaign for moral improvement claimed descent from Venus whom of all divinities those who were intent on behaving in an immoral fashion would regard as the one who patronised their activities. Whereas Propertius tends primarily to criticise the traditional Roman gods, in Tibullus and Ovid we find prominence given to the foreign deities of Egypt whose rites met with official disapproval mainly for political reasons arising from the conflict between East and West which came to a head at Actium; apart from the devotion shown to Isis by the elegists' 'puellae', Tibullus assigns an important role to Osiris in a way which is intended to compliment Messalla in elegy 1.7, the political significance of which I have alluded to above, and Ovid makes an appeal to these and other oriental deities in Amores 2.13 which becomes even less innocent in view of the argument which I shall advance to the effect that in conceiving the subject of the elegy he had in mind a poem of Horace which contains a petition of a social and political nature to the gods who enjoyed official favour, and that the circumstances of this elegy are deliberately calculated to afford a striking contrast with the Horatian work which is inspired by national sentiments. I should also add that as well as these bizarre cults, astrology also occupies a place in the elegist's world; Propertius in particular excuses his way of life on grounds of astrological and kindred influences and the relevance of this to my enquiry is again that the elegist is implicated in a superstition which had provoked official censure.

A fair amount of what I regard as political dissent in Ovid centres around his condemnation of the values and code of behaviour which in his own day were thought to typify the ancestral Roman whose
life had been largely devoted to agriculture and whose fabled qualities of fortitude, resourcefulness and strict morality, bred of toil on the land, were held up as worthy of emulation by the model Augustan citizen - an idealisation to which the emperor appears to have subscribed and which is evident in the prose history of Livy and especially in the verse of Vergil and Horace whose work is often informed with a strong element of patriotic antiquarianism which serves as the vehicle of its expression. In his attacks upon 'rusticitas', for such is the term which he uses to describe the 'old morality' or the rural ethic as I shall refer to it, Ovid impugns the boorish prudery of those whom he considers the hypocritical champions of outmoded virtues. Ovid defends a preference for 'cultus', that is the opportunities afforded by modern society for the enjoyment of urbane pursuits, a general sophistication and moral flexibility, aspects of life which would have no place in a society governed by 'rusticitas', and in arguing his case lays emphasis on the fact that his preference does not entail any regard for materialism and ostentation, for the reason as I see it, that he wishes to expose the inconsistent thinking of those advocates of the rural ethic who on the one hand profess admiration for the simple and unadorned life of the Roman of old while on the other welcome the lavish monumentalisation of the city initiated by the emperor to impress upon citizens the need for religious and moral regeneration. As for Propertius, while he is not directly outspoken in his criticism of the primitive rustic virtues to the same degree as Ovid it is evident that he was not inclined to commend ancient ways after the fashion of Vergil or Horace, not even in Book 4 to which, as stated above, I have devoted special attention. He was aware that any hopes that his contemporaries might adhere to a high code of behaviour deriving from an earlier age
were misplaced and futile. In fact in my final chapter I shall scrutinise his approach to moral issues and endeavour to show that he was of the opinion that the state itself was rendering the problem of immorality even more acute by pursuing policies which did not create a social environment conducive to the amelioration of moral standards. With reference to my earlier remarks to the effect that Tibullus' idyllic vision of a peaceful existence in the country and the theme of the Golden Age were not a subtle way of paying tribute to the emperor's achievement in pacifying the world, I shall forward the view that his 'laudes ruris' are not of the same order as the praises of rustic life in Vergil and Horace, for in the verse of the latter two poets the praises frequently embody statements of a decidedly nationalistic and patriotic tenor which often acclaim the emperor and his rule, whereas the rural theme in Tibullus is never politicised in this way. Horace in particular often maintains that the rigours of the country life produced the martial vigour which had contributed substantially to Roman greatness, but for Tibullus an important aspect of this life is that it offers a refuge from a world dominated by the heroic ideals which Horace praises on numerous occasions. I doubt very much whether Ovid would have regarded Tibullus' elegies as manifesting the sort of 'rusticitas' which he stigmatised. His predecessor, of whom he speaks with respect - they shared a common friendship with Messalla - cannot be credited with having esteemed the country life for its potential to instil a stricter morality (morals in Tibullus are indeed often questionable) and a hardy stock of men well suited to wield weapons, as it often is in verse written in official vein. The frequent echoes of Vergil's work in Tibullus' descriptions of rural life serve not to remind me, as they do many, of similarities between the two poets, but rather of
the differences; Tibullus may even be intimating that one can recite the praises of the country without political intonations. Nor do I think that Tibullus' dream of a retreat into country life bears direct comparison with Horace's expressions of delight in being able to enjoy the pleasures of his country haunt which we find in his personal rather than his institutional poetry; the rural life has a particular appeal for Tibullus for in it he sees the prospect of being able to evade on a more or less permanent basis the pressures of a regular career, while Horace poked fun at those who toyed with such a plan. It is probable that Vergil and Horace regarded themselves as occupied in work which could serve the interests of the state and that they thought of this as a valid alternative to contributing to its welfare in a more active and practical capacity, hence the latter might well have looked upon his gift of a rural homestead as a reward for showing that he was willing to serve the state with his literary talents. The retreat which Tibullus envisages, however, I see as symptomatic of the reluctance of the elegists in general to engage themselves actively for the good of the Augustan state and since it appears that Tibullus was as unwilling as Propertius and Ovid to place his literary talents at its disposal we can appreciate how a poet like Horace, who thought of himself as usefully engaged, might have considered the escapist rural theme in Tibullus to be symbolic of an overall negligence towards the serious issues which affected it; to opt out of an active life devoted to serving the state would no doubt have been excusable from his point of view provided that he had compensated for this negative attitude by making a positive contribution to promoting its interests by usefully applying his artistic talents. He probably regarded not only Tibullus as doubly reprehensible on these accounts but also
Propertius towards whom he seems to have felt a similar antipathy, as well as Ovid, whose talents were displayed so late in Horace's literary career that we can only gauge what might have been their estimation of each other's work from the evidence of Ovid's poetic output which suggests that he felt even less respect for Horace's work than Propertius did. The adverse feelings harboured by Horace towards Tibullus (for I shall argue that such feelings did exist) stem, I believe, from the disfavour in which he held the politics of his patron Messalla and with which the elegist probably sympathised. (16)

In assessing the genre of amatory elegy as a whole, I place importance on the fact that it had strong connections with the poetry written by the neoterics towards the close of the republican age and that the elegists inherited a tradition of invective which had been a feature of their verse and which had often taken the form of overt political criticism. Of course undisguised criticism of this sort was more dangerous under the rule of the 'princeps' who had virtually plenipotentiary powers and the genre may have appealed to the elegists because its basic amatory theme apart from having been prominent in neoteric verse, which would in itself have recommended it to poets like themselves who had neoteric sympathies, would also have allowed them in the first instance to preserve a neutrality with respect to the new regime. The elegists, however, no less than the neoterics, were bound to hold political views and these emerge in various ways which give the lie to any idea that they suffered from political inertia which in any case would have been looked upon with suspicion by their contemporaries as they could not have failed to realise. (17) In fact the genre which one might have expected to have afforded little comment on Augustan life, letters, and politics,
least of all comment of a critical nature, is represented by verse which I believe betrays an anti-Augustan bias to a remarkable extent. I think that this critical perspective on Augustan affairs became even more acute as the state began to coerce the very life-style which is portrayed in amatory elegy, a pattern of behaviour more in keeping with the relative moral freedom of the last days of the republic than with the reactionary puritanism which marked the Augustan principate. I think it is fair to say that the genre mirrors a social and political negligence which was not uncommon among men of similar social standing to the elegists, that is members of the 'ordo equester', both under the republic and the principate. But since the more recent political system took it upon itself both to coerce what we may call the elegiac life-style and remedy the social and political indifference shown by their social order as a whole, and also gave the impression - through one of its leading spokesmen with an interest in literary matters as well as through a poet favourably disposed towards it who was concerned with the question of the utility of literature - that the genre was less worthy while it failed to identify with its own cause, it was perhaps inevitable that these factors should have had some effect on the content of the elegists' verse; they were responsible in my view for generating in elegy a tension which acted as a stimulus to the evolution of concepts which I described earlier, embodying feelings of reaction towards the influence of the state in various spheres, and for provoking comment of an adverse nature on official interests in matters literary, social, political, religious, and moral, to an extent which, in my opinion, characterises amatory elegy as a genre of dissent.

Finally, I must add a note on the modes of reference...
adopted in this work. In referring to works in article form, the
name of the writer with a standard abbreviation (where necessary) of
the title of the periodical with volume and year number are given in
the text as well as page references where I have quoted the article
or wish to draw attention to a specific point which it makes. More
rarely, I have mentioned the name of the writer, stating that I am
referring to an article and have given a numerical reference which
provides the reader with similar information as to the source of the
work; this information can be found at the end of the appropriate
chapter where the number assigned to each note corresponds to the
numerical reference in the text.

Where reference is made to a book, I have either named the
author and title of the work in the text, or on occasion I have
consigned the title to the notes using the numerical reference system.
In the case of books which are either definitive works or those to
which I refer frequently, I have often given only the author's name
and here the reader is to assume that the works referred to are those
against which I have set an asterisk in the bibliography. Regarding
the works of Postgate and Wilkinson which fall into this category,
the context will make it quite clear whether I am drawing attention
to the work on Propertius or Tibullus by the former scholar, or that
on Horace or Ovid by the latter. In citing the works of the elegists
I have used the Loeb editions of Ovid and Tibullus and E. A. Barber's
1. The neglect even now of *Amores* 2.13 and 14 of Ovid (the abortion poems) is a case in point. The only article on these elegies which I can trace is that by W.J. Watts (see bibliography). They are also much neglected in books on elegy and Latin literature in general. For the leaning towards more dignified verse see for example J.P. Sullivan in Arion 2 1966: "Some low estimations of Propertius' love poetry seem due to a critical preference for "public themes", the themes exemplified in Augustan poetry by the Aeneid and Horace's State Odes. Here the critics seem to be following a Roman taste, the predilection and admiration for "major" poetry such as epic over the soi-disant lusus and nugae of the elegiac and epigrammatic traditions" (p.6).


3. See for example the chapter entitled "Echoes of History" in W.A. Camps' *Virgil's Aeneid* pp. 95-104 and Appendix 5, pp. 137-43.

4. Tibullus' attitude to the soldier's life as it affected both Messalla and himself will be examined at several points in my third chapter where I hope it will become apparent that Tibullus, no less than Propertius and Ovid, disliked militarism, and that this was not merely a conceit which he indulged in his verse as it is thought to be by those who hold that he took pleasure in being actively involved in his patron's military career. The extent of his involvement and his own views on the subject
4. (cont'd) will also be examined in greater depth.

5. For example Propertius, as we shall see, represents his affair in monogamous terms while rejecting the thought of marriage, the male issue of which would be destined to complement the ranks of an army destined for the Parthian war.

6. I shall argue that the 'vir' is not a husband, but a rival, and that the use of the word represents the logical extension of the idea that the elegist possesses an 'uxor' who is simply his mistress. The rival who possesses a mistress can, by analogy, be regarded as having an 'uxor' and so qualified to be referred to as a 'vir', and since the character who is given this appellation is never a 'dives amator' who in effect purchases his favours, but one who appears to have rights based on mutual affection, this may have fostered the analogy for such is essentially the basis of the elegiac relationship.

7. We shall see, under the final heading of the fourth chapter that situations and advice which appear in the Amores, recur in the Ars Amatoria, in particular the suggestion that a 'puella' should deceive her 'vir'.

8. Ovid often prefers the word 'maritus' to 'vir' in referring to the man who enjoys the favours of the lady on whom he himself has designs, a point which I shall discuss at the stage of my enquiry indicated in note 7 above.

9. See for example M.C.J. Putnam's note on Tibullus, elegy 2.4. 1-2, in Tibullus: A Commentary; here he detects political overtones in the words used to express the idea of the
9. (cont'd) 'servitium amoris'.

10. J. K. Newman's assessment of the concept is the subject of his books *Augustus and the New Poetry* and *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*.

11. Since Propertius' last book contains much which is related to his earlier books I felt that I could raise the issue of his aetiological verse in a way which I did not feel would be justified in the case of the 'Fasti' of Ovid or indeed the 'Metamorphoses' both of which have been thought to contain either features which pay sincere tribute to the Roman heritage or compliment the emperor and his family, which I believe the amatory elegies omit to do. I refer on occasion to the 'Ars Amatoria' which exploits many ideas to be found in the 'Amores', and also the the 'Tristia' and the 'Epistulae ex Ponto' mainly for autobiographical information in the case of the two latter works. Obviously the compliments to the imperial family in the work of Ovid's exilic period cannot be taken as a guide to true feelings as they were basically a means to an end, namely, to secure the repatriation which he so earnestly desired. With respect to the 'Fasti' and the 'Metamorphoses' see the comments of G. K. Galinsky in *W.S. N.F.* 2 1969 pp. 83 (note 33) and 93 who draws attention to works - including the more well known book by B. Otis entitled *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, directing us in particular to p.278ff. - which take the view that even in his aetiological and epic poetry Ovid failed to take official themes seriously.

12. Elegy 2.34 of Propertius is the main subject of my enquiry under
12. (cont'd) the heading **Propertius' View of Vergil's Literary Career** in my first chapter.


14. For these remarks of Octavian see Plutarch Brut. 53.

15. I shall discuss echoes of Lucretius which I have detected in Tibullus' verse in my third chapter under the heading **Tibullus' Philosophical Basis for Retreat.** I suspect that Horace is alluding to the elegist's philosophical disposition as reflected in his work when he refers to him as 'sapiens' in *Epistles* 1.4.5; I shall also argue that the word 'silvae' with which Horace connects Tibullus in this same poem (line 4) also possesses philosophical connotations. These considerations make even more plausible the long standing belief that the Albius of the Epistle is to be identified with the elegist Tibullus, a point of some importance for my enquiry since objections to this identification have been raised in the past on the grounds that Horace would not have wished to speak of the elegist in the same breath as he refers to the tyrannicide Cassius of Parma (line 3). This objection assumes that relations between the two were cordial, a view which I shall call into question as I do when I have occasion to examine other Horatian passages which are thought to refer to Tibullus.

16. While the topic of political dissent in the elegists is prominent in the third chapter, and also in the fourth in so far as it compares the morality reflected in elegy with the
16. (cont'd) political interests of the state in this sphere, I have considered it more pertinent to raise the question of Messalla's politics within the context of the first chapter which deals with literary matters since political factors may have a bearing on the subject of patronage as it affected Tibullus, and they may also account in part for Horace's opinion of the elegist's verse.

17. Cf. the remarks of G. W. Williams in The Third Book of Horace's Odes, p. 9: "a serious political commitment is the leading feature of Augustan poetry." This statement could not in my view apply to amatory elegy, least of all a commitment to the cause of the Augustan regime, unless we identify the anti-Augustanism which I believe the genre exhibits as a political commitment; it does, however, serve to remind us that the elegists' contemporaries may have regarded with surprise or suspicion their failure to commit themselves.
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This section of my inquiry is devoted to demonstrating that the writers of Augustan elegy, by virtue of their choice of subject matter and aesthetic beliefs were, in general, out of tune with the development of an officially encouraged national poetry as practised by Vergil, Horace, and Varius Rufus under the aegis of Maecenas. Of course the problem is complicated by the fact that we know little of the workings of literary patronage in the years leading up and subsequent to Actium. I am aware that the whole question of official poetry is currently under serious scrutiny and I shall refer to articles which seek to minimise the degree to which the poets of Maecenas felt obliged to defer to their patron in this respect. First I shall assess to what extent the attitudes of the neoterics affected the elegists, who regarded themselves as the literary successors of those poets of the last days of the republic. This will involve an examination of Horace's attitude to the neoterics which largely explains his reaction to the elegists of his own day; I shall suggest that the elegists inherited a two-fold tradition from their precursors, one of satire and invective, and another which had exploited the psychology of the erotic. The former went underground so to speak but is realised in socio-political statements which are often quite forceful in the elegies of Propertius and Ovid. This will account to a certain extent for those elements of dissent which will be analysed in later chapters. The elegists no less than the neoterics held political opinions but unlike the latter who had enjoyed the 'libertas' of the republic the elegists had to tread more warily. For Tibullus, Messalla's circle must have represented a republican outpost in which he could pretend that the empire had changed nothing significantly; his elegies contain no praise for
Augustus whose name occurs nowhere in the 'corpus'. It is Messalla and his son who are the recipients of his laudatory elegies. Whereas in the earlier stages of the chapter I argue that Horace's feelings towards Tibullus were determined by artistic considerations, later I propose in more detail that there are grounds for supposing that Horace's antipathy was political in origin. Propertius would probably have found more congenial company in the circle of Messalla who apparently gave his protégés more freedom to write as they pleased, but Tibullus had already been established as a friend of Messalla and as an elegist from as early as 35 B.C., as will become clear, and consequently Propertius might have felt that he would have unwelcome competition, whereas the circle which enjoyed imperial favour lacked a specialist in elegy who might rival him. Propertius had won reknown with the Monobiblos and must have seen the possibility of Maecenas' patronage as offering a better opportunity to satisfy his ambitions. Finding that his verse did not meet with unqualified approval he became disillusioned, having misjudged Maecenas the man and occasional poet, imagining that his 'mollitia' spoke of one who would permit the same tendencies in others. At the time of his first coming within Maecenas' sphere of influence the tone of the verse which Vergil and Horace were composing was not so enthusiastic in its support for the regime as it was later to become and Vergil had yet to violate the Callimachean rule-book. From Maecenas' point of view, there were certain features resident in the elegiac tradition which he may have wished to exploit in order to promote a genus of elegy suitable to the Augustan court. Propertius compromised neither his artistic ideals nor his political point of view. It is commonly believed that a degree of animosity existed between Horace and Propertius while it is normally assumed that Vergil and Propertius must have had more regard for one another. I do not think Propertius' references to
Vergil are as complimentary as they are often thought to be. This will become evident when I examine elegies 2.3 and 2.34. Turning to Ovid, I shall propose that his modification of the Propertian 'recusatio' is not simply an exercise in parody but serves to underline his lack of dependence on the system of patronage. It is not merely Ovidian 'lusus', but an oblique criticism of Propertius for so much as contemplating the day when he might follow in the footsteps of Vergil and Horace. This will lead into a discussion of the elegists' use of the term 'vates' which in Augustan verse had come to be used to describe the poet who employed quasi-religious intonation to lend weight to verse of a national and patriotic character. The elegists had little sympathy with this practice.
In an article entitled 'Horace and the Elegists' (T.A.P.A. 76 1945) Otis referred to Latin amatory elegy as the "residuary legatee" of neotericism (p.180) and suggested the reason for Horace's disapproval of the movement can also explain his unfavourable view of amatory elegy. Horace was in favour of the major genres epic tragedy and lyric with their ability to express a sense of Roman grandeur, whereas the only group to oppose his ideals was that of the amatory elegists. I think that the elegists can be said not only to have reopened the neoteric debate over the criteria of poetry but to have conceived of its implications for wider issues, and to have employed with greater subtlety the tradition of social criticism which the 'poetae novi' had practised. Wimmel(1), commenting upon the seriousness with which the neoterics took their poetry, reminds us that we ought to be surprised at the paucity of statements of artistic intent to be found among their work especially in view of its innovatory character: "Es fällt auf, wie wenig programmatische Äusserungen..... von den Neoterikern auf uns gekommen sind, wenn man die Intensität daneben hält, mit der diese für Rom unerhörte Richtung im Sinn der Kallimachisch - hellenistischen Forderungen gearbeitet hat". The reason he adduces for their rarity has, as I see it, a fundamental bearing upon the cause for their frequent appearance in Propertius: "Doch fehlt im Grund den Neoterikern ein echter Gegner, ein ausgeformtes gegnerisches Prinzip, wie Kallimachos es bekämpfen musste - obwohl sie sich zu mancherlei Mächten in Opposition fühlten". Callimachus had met with personal opposition to his literary principles and the need to vindicate them found expression in passages scorching the literary aims of his detractors. No such quarrel of comparable bitterness as that between Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius arose among the poets of the late republic; their calumny
was reserved for politicians and private individuals whose behaviour annoyed them rather than their verse. This generation of poets who had experienced the civil-wars had enjoyed the liberty to do and write as they pleased, and while supporting the ideal of the 'Kleinform' preached by Callimachus, had felt no personal threat to their practices which might have given more than a purely literary significance to their 'programmatic' work. "So gehen die geringen programmatischen Stücke Catulli nicht über den Stand der Kallimischen Literareprogramme hinaus, sie sind nicht Zeugnis einer neuen Not, wie sie eine Generation später die Dichter bedrängte". The pronouncements on aesthetic matters of the successors of the neoterics in the following generation were to embody personal views transcending the world of letters. Bearing these points in mind we will be better equipped to appreciate how artistic considerations could reflect a poet's social and political standpoint. Furius Bibaculus for example abandoned neoteric scruples when he was won over to the cause of Julius Caesar and produced an epic, the 'Bellum Sequanicum' describing the success of his Gallic Wars, (Acron, ad Hor. Sat. 2.5.40, Macrobius Sat. 6.1.). Under Augustus also the writer of epic, as we shall see, was either committed or compromised with regard to the regime of the day. Our sources for the relation between neotericism and amatory elegy are primarily the works of Horace and the elegists themselves. Trankle (2) has shown the extent to which Tibullus Propertius and Ovid were indebted to the neoteric movement for much of their style and imagery. The works of Horace supply us with the reaction of one who sought to forge a new institutional poetry and because of the comprehensive nature of his pronouncements on literary matters, it is feasible on occasion to forward arguments on the basis of these. Such comments are extremely rare in the works of Vergil, hence we can derive little information from them regarding his view of the work of his
contemporaries. Vergil's juvenile verse however, some of which is almost certainly represented in the 'Appendix Vergiliana', and above all the Eclogues, show that he had more affinity with the poetic thought which eventually gave birth to Augustan elegy than did Horace. At that stage in his career Vergil was almost certainly associated with the neoterics who had gathered around Philodemus among whom were counted his life long friends Varius, Quintus Varus and Plotius Tucca; moreover he is said to have been taught Greek by the poet and grammarian Parthenius, a leading figure among the neoterics, who compiled stories about love adventures and dedicated the collection to Gallus providing him with themes for poetic composition. (3)

Indeed Gallus, a neoteric practitioner and the founder of post-Catullan erotic elegy appears in two of his Eclogues (6 and 10) and if we can believe Servius had been addressed in Bk. 4 of the Georgics, but following the subsequent disgrace and demise of Gallus the passage referring to him had been expunged and replaced by the epyllion on Aristaeus. In the tenth Eclogue of Vergil, Gallus is made to say that he will adapt the style and subject matter of the sort of verse which he is writing to accommodate the conventions of pastoral poetry (lines 50-1). He has been following the example of Euphorion of Chalcis in writing elegy and he intends to experiment with Theocritean and Vergilian modes of treating the erotic of which I think we can reasonably consider lines 31-69 to be an illustration on Vergil's part of Gallus' programme, one aspect of which aimed at treating the theme of frustrated love in a pastoral context. The correspondence of motifs in Propertius 1.6a.5.8 and Eclogues 10.46-9 suggest that Gallus actually carried out the project in his 'Amores' (5).

Servius is no doubt exaggerating when he claims of much of Vergil's Eclogue 10, 'hi omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus'. Nevertheless there is no reason why Vergil should not be presenting
us with an example of the 'color' of Callan elegy which was indebted not only to the pastoral tradition of Theocritus but to the work of Euphorion also. If this is the case then we can assign a place to Euphorion in the development of Augustan elegy. If an addition we can identify the Ciceronian 'cantores Euphorionis' (Cic. Tusc. 3.45) with the 'poetae novi' (Cic. Orat. 161) and 'ol υευορχον also called 'οι σπουδείας ζω ντες (Att. 7.2.1) then we have further reason for believing that love elegy originated in the neoteric 'school' of which Gallus was a member. That Propertius considered himself as following in the footsteps of the neoterics who pioneered the writing of the love poetry at Rome is evident from the following passages:

'ista mea fiet notissima forma libellis, 
Calve, tua venia, pace, Catulue, tua.'
(2.25.3-4)

'haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro,
Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma suae;
haec quoque lascivi cantarunt scripta Catulli,
Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena;
haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calvi,
cum caneret miserae funera Quintiliae.
et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus
mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua !'
Cynthia quin etiam versu laudata Properti,
hos inter si me ponere Fama volet.'
(2.34.85-94)

- where he sees himself as the latest in the series Catullus, Calvus, Varro Atacinus and Gallus, all of whom had written love poetry. Catullus and Gallus had employed the elegiac couplet and it is not unreasonable to suppose that Varro had sung the praises of Leucadia, and that Calvus had lamented the dead Quintilia in the same metre. Likewise Ovid (Trist. 2.4 27-70) seeking to excuse the content of his pre-exilic work declares that he had been following the example of earlier Roman poets who had written erotic verse. He includes the four poets mentioned by Propertius, and others, for instance Ticidas, epigrammatist
and author of a 'hymenaeus' who celebrated his mistress under the pseudonym Perilla and may have employed the elegiac couplet for the purpose. Ovid also names Memmius, the friend of the poets Catullus and Cinna, who invited them to Bithynia in 51-6 B.C. where he held a praetorship, and who was himself a writer of erotic verse according to Ovid, a detail of information borne out by Pliny the Younger (Ep. 5.3). This same Cinna who appears in Catullus 10.95 and 113, takes his place in Ovid's list; the erotic work in question may be his famous 'Smyrna' an epyllion treating the story of the princess' incestuous love for her father, though in addition to his famous Propempticon for Asinius Pollio we know that he wrote elegy of which four verses survive (Isid. Orig. 6.12). Wiseman (Cinna the Poet) has argued that it was this Cinna who brought Parthenius to Rome and that together they did more than most to found a 'neoteric school' (see pp. 44-56). We learn that Cornificius had turned to erotic themes. Syme (p. 251) may be right in supposing that he wrote elegy; Ovid could of course be referring to the erotic content of his epyllion 'Glaucus'. He is probably to be identified with the addressee of Catullus 38 and the same Cornificius who according to Servius (ad. Ec. 2.39) had maligned Vergil and appears in the Eclogues under the pseudonym Amyntas; there is a scholiastic tradition for the hostility of Cornificius towards Vergil evident in the 'Vita incerti auctoris' prefacing the edition of Vergil by Ruaeus (1687) mentioned by Hardie in the introduction to the O.C.T. Vitae Vergilianae (pp. iv-v). Ovid then mentions Valerius Cato the 'grammaticus' who drew around himself those with neoteric sympathies and to whom he became a sort of mentor. (6) It is possible that the 'Lydia', a lover's lament which immediately follows the 'Dirae' in the Appendix Vergiliana, is one of his erotic works which Ovid has in mind. Before concluding his list with the names of Gallus and Tibullus he includes
that of Hortensius the rival of Cicero in oratory to whom Catullus dedicates his 'Coma Berenices', (7) an obscure author Servius, and Sisenna translator of Aristides' Milesian Tales. In Amores 3.9 Tibullus recently dead is received in Elysium by Catullus, Calvus and Gallus. Here again practitioners of elegy are at home in the company of representatives of the 'poetae novi'. Propertius and Ovid obviously thought that they were carrying the torch of those earlier Roman poets of the Republic. However, compared with them, the Augustan elegists Tibullus and Propertius seem to have confined themselves to one particular category of verse.

Wiseman (8) reminds us that the poets of the neoteric movement experimented within the fields of satire, subjective poetry and epic in the Callimachean manner; Catullus and Furius Bibaculus followed in the steps of Lucilius and Varro in writing invective, while personal poetry was cultivated especially by Catullus and Calvus (9). The writer singles out the 'Dictynna' of Valerius Cato as a specimen of the 'epyllion', a few of which survive, the most famous being the Peleus and Thetis epyllion of Catullus (64). We are told that erotic elegy perhaps arose from an assimilation of elements from the traditions of personal poetry and Callimachean epic. In a sense, however, I think that satiric and invective verse can be considered personal poetry; we experience a sense of engagement with Catullus as a person when he directs his invective at the Caesarians or derides the mannerisms of his contemporaries just as we do when he reviles his rivals in love (10). Both types reflect personal involvement but by contrast with the Augustan elegists the neoterics were comparatively more outspoken. Calvus for example lampooned Pompey and Caesar and Furius Bibaculus' attacks upon Caesar were notorious, and Cinna before crossing over to the side of Caesar had spoken scathingly of him. Valerius Cato's interest in satiric
verse is reflected by his commentary on Lucilius; he seems to have attacked Horace (whose *Satire* 1.4 is a reply to this admirer of the 'inventor' of Roman satire) and wrote a 'libellus' called 'Indignatio' in which he rebutted the claim that he was a Gallic freedman and complained of the loss of his property under the Sullan appropriation of land for veterans. The 'Dirae', of which along with the 'Lydia' he is the most likely author, heaps curses upon the soldier who obtained the poet's land in this way. As for Varro Atacinus we know from Horace (*Sat. I.10.46*) that he wrote satire. Ticidas from whom along with Bibaculus and Cato the patron of Tibullus was later to disassociate himself doubtless inveighed against members of the establishment which was most likely the cause of Messalla's embarrassment (11).

The literary career of Cassius of Parma who wrote both erotic elegy and satire typifies neoteric interest in each of these fields. That a deeper political motive inspired their attacks on the Caesarians and that their lampoons are far from generic must be conceded. When Cassius of Parma turned his hand to drama his hero was Brutus who by murdering Tarquin effectively founded the Roman Republic. He was an assassin of Julius Caesar and fought on the side of Brutus and Cassius Longinus at Philippi, and thereafter espoused the cause of Antony against Octavian. I shall have more to say about Cassius later (12) when I examine *Epistles* 1.4, Horace's letter to Albius (Tibullus). In the year of his propraetorship in 57 B.C. Memmius had been politically opposed to Caesar but eventually joined his party as did the orator and poet Cornificius and Bibaculus. The poets who had lampooned both Caesar and Pompey gradually became reconciled with the former, not so much for political reasons but because it was not in Pompey's nature to forgive, and the moment of decision was drawing nearer (13). Republican 'libertas' was soon to
be stifled, and the tradition of outspoken comment was to come to an abrupt halt both in oratory and verse. Cicero fell foul of a political development which concentrated power in the hands of a clique, and likewise it was dangerous for a poet under the Augustan principate to question institutions and the 'mores' which they upheld through the medium of satire. Augustan equivalents of the 'carmina Bibaculi et Catulli referta cuntumeliis Caesarum' (Tac. Ann. 4.34) would have met with a harsh reaction; the satires of Horace are innocuous compared with the mordant invective of Lucilian satire which was often directed at prominent public officials, and the would be critic of contemporary society had to be more cautious and subtle in his approach. In the words of Syme "Nor would the times now permit political satire or free attack upon the existing order in state and society. Republican 'libertas', denied to the 'nobiles' of Rome, could not be conceded to a freedman's son." (p.254).

The elegists then, were the inheritors of a neoteric tradition which had practised verse of both a satiric and erotic nature; Lucilius with whom the neoterics appear to have had an affinity (see opening remarks of following section) had written four books of satire in the elegiac metre, Catullus frequently uses it for scurrilous purposes and the 'Ibis' of Ovid, an elegiac invective modelled on Callimachus' poem of the same name shows how the metre continued to serve the purposes of satiric expression. In the poems of the three major elegists, we shall discover that both amatory and satiric elements are blended in a way which often indulges the latter more so than the former. It is interesting that Thomas (Ovidiana, p.505) speaks of "the clearly satiric element in Ovid's manner" in discussing the debt of Juvenal to the works of the elegist, concluding that "It was in Ovid that he so often found what he himself wanted to express" (p.525).

I hope that by the end of my investigation it will be appreciated
that such a critical faculty was also possessed by the other two major elegists.

The fact that statements critical of the workings of society are found in their work is I believe an indication that they felt an inner compulsion to express them while at the same time being able to take refuge in the pose of an 'amator'. Ovid exaggerated this feature of erotic elegy in his Ars Amatoria which voiced even more strongly his criticism of social and moral conventions to be found in the Amores, but like Cicero, Ovid too became intolerable in the eyes of the potentate of his day. The subsequent eclipse of the elegiac genre after his banishment may not have been so much due to the fact that he had 'worked it to death' as many believe, but to the difficulty in writing on themes which were out of tune with the imperial programme of moral rearmament and necessarily involved a questioning of conventions. It is with such questionings both overt and suppressed that this thesis will be concerned, and I hope to reveal that the elegists realised that they were writing verse which amounted to something more than love poetry.

**The Horatian Reaction**

We have seen how the interests of the neoterics were mainly in the fields of satiric (I use the word in both its generic and wider senses) and erotic verse. Now Otis in his article on Horace and the elegists, in discussing Satires 1.10 argues that those who criticise Horace for failing to use Lucilian invective and graecisms are those who employed them more than any others namely the neoterics, and that Horace is attacking Valerius Cato and Furius Bibaculus and other members of the movement who used to meet in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine. In what was effectively a mutual admiration society over which Valerius Cato presided — the 'Latina Siren qui solus legit
ac facit poetas' as Bibaculus described him - poets could win re-known. Cato is spoken of as a 'grammaticus' by Bibaculus (14) and it is specifically the 'grammaticus tribus' which Horace scorns in Epistles 1.19.39-42, it being a cause of annoyance to them that he gave private recitations of his own verse before Augustus himself (ibidem. lines 43-5). I suppose that Horace's practice must have seemed to them somewhat passe and reminiscent of commissioned works written primarily to comply with the wishes of a patron (15). It is important to remember that Propertius is described as delivering a recitation of his elegies which Ovid heard during his attendance at a meeting of poets described in the Tristia which Otis overlooks:

'saeppe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes iure sodaliciai quo mihi iunctus erat' (4.10.45-6)

He has probably omitted to mention this passage because of the fact that Horace was present at the 'recitatio' (lines 49-50) and hence appears to approve of the practice by his participation. Admittedly Horace's presence needs some explanation which I will offer. In the passage from the Epistles quoted above Horace describes himself as loath to indulge in such a 'recitatio'. Books 1-3 of the Odes were published c.23B.C., and the first book of the Epistles c. 20.B.C. Possibly he did give a reading of some of his Odes (16) before a meeting of poets, these however may not have gone down well, and have caused him the annoyance expressed in the Epistles; the event probably confirmed his suspicion about the advisability of his taking part in a practice unsuited to the sort of poetry the Odes purport to be, that is didactic verse which is essentially 'utile' featuring the poet as priest as is especially evident in the 'Roman Odes'. Ovid in the Tristia is anxious to gain the favour of the emperor that he may return to Italy and since Horace was very close to Augustus it is not surprising that Ovid should have something nice to say about the poet
and his verse. I find that in the pre-exilic poetry there is no mention of Horace by Ovid. In fact in Amores 1.15 which lists poets' works which will become immortal Ovid includes those of Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Sophocles, Aratus, Menander, Ennius, Accius, Varro, Lucretius, Vergil, Tibullus and Gallus. Horace is excluded from this list whereas Vergil is mentioned. Yet Amores 1.15 is replete with obvious Horatian overtones deriving from Odes 3.30. For instance Ovid's 'Livor edax' (line 1) corresponds to Horace's 'imber edax' (line 3). 'Livor' is almost certainly a reference to the Callimachean 'Envy' and I believe that Ovid is hitting out at those, Horace included, who criticise the Callimachean ideal with regard to the minor genres.

It is with the neoteric movement in Roman literature that poets first became preoccupied with the theme of love. Admittedly the theme occurs as part of the fabric of Terentian and Plautine comedy but there it is in no way bound up with the experience of the author who is in any case adapting to a large degree Greek originals, and though the characters are depicted as taking their emotion seriously, it is that very seriousness which is a contributory factor in generating a comic effect. The Augustan elegists however, made a profession of subjectivity in amatory matters which the neoteric poet par-excellence Catullus had fostered in his own elegies by developing a trend found in the epigrams of Lutatius Catulus, Valerius Aedituus and Porcius Licinus at the beginning of the first century B.C. (13) While their verse had Greek precedents it is of importance for it reveals the poets treating amatory topics in the metre of elegy from a personal point of view, though we cannot be sure they are referring to their own actual experiences. It is however significant that both Aedituus (Morel. p.42) and Catullus (51) have both been inspired by the same Sapphic poem - in fact the earlier poet has made more free use of it in addressing it to Pamphila who might easily have been his
mistress. Laevius wrote six books entitled 'Erotopaignia'. He has been thought to be in many ways the predecessor of Catullus as an Alexandrian and his work is again indicative of a growing interest in amatory verse. Catullus subtly gave to such poetry the seriousness normally associated with Roman social and political practices; key words such as 'amicitia', 'fides', 'officia' and 'foedus' invest his emotion with an earnest reserved previously for the workings of Roman social etiquette (18), and the elegists who follow Catullus borrow his terminology for much the same reason. In a later chapter I shall discuss how the elegists fly in the face of Augustan social morality, but here I wish to show how Horace can be said to have been opposed to the concept of a 'serious' poetry devoted to amatory matters. In Epistle 1.19 as we saw above, Horace speaks out a propos neotericism and the latter-day adherents of the movement. It is in the context of this same Epistle that the author also criticises the seriousness with which his opponents took their occasional verse. (see esp. 'nugis addere pondus' line 42) and as we can gauge from his attitude to love elsewhere I think he is in all probability referring to the seriousness with which they treated the emotion; Horace took a playful, detached, and sometimes cynical view of love, a point made by several scholars. Wilkinson (Horace and His Lyric Poetry) speaks of his "amused interest in the psychology and situations of love" (p.50) and Commager (The Odes of Horace) remarks that "His imagination was excited less often by the extremes of happiness or despair of lovers than by their self-contradictions, illusions, or deceptions" (p.141) and also detects in his amatory verse "a parody of the habitual agonies of the elegiac poets" (p.153). Even when referring to an amatory situation as it affects himself he can describe it in terms which are "formal to the point of parody" (id.p.152). Williams, on an amatory Ode writes: "Above all, the poet composes in detachment as it were, so
that he achieves an ironic and humorous presentation..." (The Third Book of Horace's Odes, p.79). It is more evident in the Odes that he was personally in disagreement with the Lebensanschauung which we find expressed in elegy, for instance Odes 2.9 is addressed to Valgius who has turned amatory elegist:

"Tu semper urges flebilibus modis
Mysten ademptum, nec tibi Vespero
surgente decedunt amores
nec rapidum fugiente Solem

..... desine mollium
tandem querelarum, et potius nova
cantemus Augusti tropaea
Caesaris et rigidum Niphaten,

..... (Odes 2.9.9-12, and 17-20)

The description of Valgius' verse as 'flebiles modi' and 'querelae' is not particularly complimentary and we are justified in interpreting it as averse critical comment in view of the fact that 'semper urges' is tantamount to saying that the subject matter of elegy is too restricted with the result that the writer is obliged to reiterate a theme already well worn; Valgius ought rather to broaden his poetic horizon and become socially aware as a commentator on Augustus' military achievements. Horace saw himself as an 'Alcaeus redivivus' in his socio-political lyric verse, and he would certainly have shared, I think, Quintilian's attitude to the work of Alcaeus: 'sed et lusit et in amores descendit, maioribus tamen aptior' (Quint. Inst. Orat. 10.1.63); Alcaeus' love-songs are of a lower order than the poetry in which he turns to political themes. It is my opinion that Propertius could be disagreeing with Horace with reference to this Ode in elegy 2.34:

'desine et Aeschyleo componere verba coturno,
desine, et ad mollia membria resolve choros.'

(2.34.41-2)

Propertius advises Lynceus to abandon (desine) the grand style in favour of elegy and its gentle (mollis) measures. This is a reversal
of Horace's advice to Valgius who was urged to relinquish (desine) his softer effeminate (mollium) laments and write elevated poetry. Horace must have thought Valgius 'maioribus aptior' and one who was frivolously wasting his talents writing 'lusus' to which he was adding 'pondus' which is implied in his description of elegy as 'flebiles modi' and 'querelae'. Similar in tone to this Ode, is that addressed to Albius. Later in this chapter I will draw evidence together to maintain that in Odes 1.33 Horace is attacking not only the sort of poetry which Albius writes but also his political affiliations and that he is in fact Tibullus the elegist whom Horace also addressed as Albius in Epistles 1.4 the protege of Mesalla towards whom Horace harboured suspicion on account of his political past. (19) For the moment it is important to bear in mind the Horatian attitude to elegy qua poetry in Odes 1.33. Here again Horace speaks in somewhat derogatory fashion about the genre:

'Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
immitis Glycerae, neu miserabiles
decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior
laesa praeniteat fide'
(lines 1-4)

Such verses are 'miserabiles' and Horace intimates that Tibullus should act his age when he says that he has been beaten by a younger rival for the favours of Glycera (lines 3 - 4). The process of composing elegiac verse is described in unpraiseworthy terms by the verb 'decantare'. Lewis and Short on 'decanto' acknowledge the meaning of the verb as having a depreciative connotation. However, with reference to Horace's use of the verb in this Ode they comment "without the unfavourable idea 'miserabiles elegos'" (with respect to the object of the verb). They can only have been misled by their preconceptions of the relationship between Horace and Tibullus. The Thesaurus Linguae Latinae rightly reserves judgment relating it
neither 'in malam partem' or 'in bonam partem'.

Otis (art. cit.) is of the belief that Horace in Epistles 1.4 by associating Tibullus with Cassius of Parma the murderer of Julius Caesar, was deliberately attempting to discredit elegy and its writers. Postgate does not believe that the Albius of the Epistle is the same Albius as the elegist Tibullus for this very reason, because he does not think that Horace would implicate Tibullus with anyone who was so manifestly politically suspect. Otis' article appeared a year before the stimulating article by Carcopino on the military and political career of Messalla which demonstrates why antipathy existed between Horace and Messalla. Charlier has demonstrated how the Albius of Epistles 1.4 and Satires 1.10, which refers obliquely to him, are one and the same person, and in the section of this chapter dealing with Messalla and Tibullus I shall seek to allay his doubt that this person is to be identified with the Albius of 1.33. By assimilating the evidence of Carcopino and Charlier and by adding my own suggestions I hope to make more plausible the argument of Otis that Horace was not, as he is often credited to be, the friend of Tibullus.

Central to Otis' thesis is the belief that Horace's dislike of the neoterics accounts for his disdain for elegy. Messalla had been on intimate terms with neoterics and elegists alike, and in view of the disfavour into which neotericism had fallen largely because of its use of political invective in republican days which was no longer acceptable under the empire, he felt constrained to dissociate himself from Bibaculus, Cato and Ticidas to safeguard his position: 'Eosdem litteratores vocitatos Messala Corvinus in qua epistola ostendit, non esse sibi dicens rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum Ticida quidem aut litteratore Catone' (Suet. Gramm. 4).
Following Immisch, Otis argues that Horace is criticising the tolerance of Messalla and Pollio towards those opposed politically to Augustus, and this renders more sensible the way in which Horace dismisses the work of Tibullus as juvenile and emotionally indulgent. If we accept for the moment that Tibullus is the addressee of Epistles 1.4 where the poet is said to be composing poetry rivalling the 'opuscula' of Cassius of Parma ('scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat' line 3) then Horace is diminishing yet again the significance of Tibullus' occupation as an elegiac poet. It is quite the opposite of flattery to suggest that a poet is attempting to rival the minor occasional verse (opuscula) of one who in the eyes of the establishment was a traitor. Finally, it is well known to students of elegy that Horace in his account of various genres in the Ars Poetica omits any mention of erotic elegy and lists only the use of the couplet for 'querimonia' and the expression of thanks of one who is 'voti compos'.

Horace's silence may represent disapproval stemming from a hope that Roman poets would adhere to classical Greek genres which automatically excludes the subjective Latin amatory elegy. It may also be symptomatic of the sort of disdain with which he fails to acknowledge the poetic achievement of Gallus and Propertius. In all likelihood he considered elegy unsuitable as a medium for promoting moral and social reform. A Horatian antipathy towards elegy is readily discernible in Epistles 2.2:

"Carmina compono, hic elegos. Mirabile visu caelatumque novem Mavis opus! Adaspe primum quanto cum fastu, quanto molimine circum spectemus vacuam Romanis vatibus aedem"  
(lines 91 - 4)

Postgate has argued convincingly that in lines 91-101 Horace has Propertius in mind. By describing elegy as 'caelatum novem Mavis opus' Horace is echoing the hyperbolic terms in which Propertius
spoke of his verse in elegy 3.2:

'at Musae comites et carmina cara legenti et defessa choris Calliopae meis'

(lines 15-16)

and in elegy 3.5:

'me iuvat in prima coluisse Helicona iuventa Musarumque choris implicuisse manus'

(lines 19-20)

Line 94 of the Epistle reminds one of Propertius assertion of enjoying the favour of Palatine Apollo at the time of the formal acquisition of his works by the Palatine library (Prop. 3.1.38). In using the words 'fastus' and 'molimen' (line 93) Horace might be alluding to what a critical reader may have regarded as pretentiousness in the elegist's claims for his verse; alternatively it can be interpreted as portraying a personal refinement and self-importance suggested by Propertius' slow and measured gait (cf. elegy 2.4.5-6).

The Epistle continues -

'mox etiam, si forte vacas, sequere et procul audi quid ferat et quare sibi nectat uterque coronam'.

(lines 95-6)

Here the elegist is credited with weaving a crown for himself and this motif is recurrent in Propertius, for example:

'mollia, Pegasides, date vestro serta poetae: non faciet capiti dura corona meo'

(3.1.19-20)

'non iuvat e facili lecta corona iugo'.

(4.10.4)

That the writer of elegy referred to here is no other than Propertius
becomes virtually certain for only a few lines later Horace writes:

'Discedo Alcaeus puncto illius; ille meo quo quis?
Quis nisi Callimachus? Si plus adposcere visus,
fit Mimnermus et optivo cognomine crescit'.
(lines 99 - 101)

Propertius fits exactly this description of a Roman elegist who called himself the Roman Callimachus as Horace had called himself the Roman Alcaeus (23) for in the programme elegy of Bk. 4 Propertius had awarded himself this title:

'mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,
ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris
Umbria Romani patria Callimachi!'
(4.1. 62 - 4)

He had also championed Mimnermus as superior to Homer in matters of love:

'plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero
carmina mansuetus levia quaerit Amor'
(1.9 11-12)

Butler and Barber suggest that Horace was annoyed that Propertius had borrowed turns of phrase deliberately reminiscent of his Odes and that "he had no desire to be associated with Callimachus the other model of Propertius" (p.xxiv). Propertius' borrowings from Horace's lyric verse draw mainly upon those Odes which are involved with questions affecting the Roman state and where Horace is at his most pontifical. He must have felt that by reworking such serious elements of his poetry Propertius was showing a disregard for the welfare of the society to which both belonged.

I must return briefly to the problem raised by the omission of amatory elegy in the Ars Poetica. Higham (C.R.48 1934 pp.105-16)
has referred to those epigrams in which Antiphanes criticised Callimachus and his grammarian followers and maintains with reason that Horace, by employing similar language, is attacking the Alexandrians and 'grammatici' of his own day who won greater acclaim by adapting Alexandrian models than he did with his own work. Moreover, when Horace speaks scornfully of the 'aquae potores' (Epp. 1.19) there is a strong case for believing that once again he is reacting with hostility to the same movement, for the evidence suggests that the exponents of Callimachean and Alexandrian literary practice were known as 'water-drinkers' (see Butler & Barber p. xlii, Higham art. cit. p. 110). In the Ars Poetica Horace's silence over amatory elegy may be explicable in the light of the source and back-ground to the poet's guide to literary technique; Horace is apparently siding with the views of Neoptolemus, in particular the belief that verse should be instructive in a moral sense as opposed to Philodemus' ideas on literature which had gained popularity in Horace's own day, contrary views which form part of the discussion of Wilkinson in an earlier article on Philodemus (G.R. 2 1932, pp. 144-51) which supports this point in the light of new evidence for his ideas on literature. Philodemus whose own compositions included amatory epigrams had attracted a circle of neoteric poets including Gallus around himself, and he would have favoured amatory elegy which did not seek to be morally edifying. The Horatian neglect of the genre in the Ars Poetica could well have been dictated by such considerations; Moreover, in terming elegy, such as he recognises, as 'exigui elegi' (line 77) Horace may well be using the adjective to express an adverse value judgement, suggesting that the elegiac metre lacks the dignity and respect commanded by the hexameter (cf. Wilkins, ad loc. cit.)

Later (24) I will look more deeply into the significance
of *Satires* 1.10.87-8 where Horace tells us that he will not mention the names of certain impartial critics of his verse but there I will be preoccupied with the elegist Tibullus; the passage has been cited by Otis (art.cit.p.182) who is surprised that in naming the leading figures in the previous lines the poet has omitted any mention of Gallus whose fame as an elegist must have been secure by the time Horace was writing. Gallus was on friendly terms with Augustus in these earlier days and Horace could not have been overtly discourteous to the elegist, with the result that his disapproval was voiced tacitly.

We have seen how Horace ignored Propertius. In ignoring Gallus and the genre of love elegy we must recognise that his motive may have been similar. It was largely dictated by his harbouring a discordant feeling towards a poetic school to which the elegists were favourably disposed. This feeling is voiced quite forcibly in *Satires* 1.10 where he refers contemptuously to Calvus and Catullus whom the 'ape' saw fit to model himself upon: quo neque pulcher/Hermogenes umquam legit, neque simius iste/nim praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum. (lines 17-19). Now Propertius shares with the 'simius' an affection for these neoteric poets which he expresses in language strongly reminiscent of this Satire:

'haec quoque lascivi cantarunt scripta Catulli...
haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calvi'.
(2.34.87 and 89)

- and he was as interested in 'doctrina' as the 'bore' in *Satires* 1.9 who interjected 'docti sumus' (line 7). Even if we cannot prove the theory of Volpius that the 'bore' and the 'ape' are in fact Propertius we should have to concede that the elegist esteemed 'doctrina' highly, there being numerous instances in his work of an
approbatory usage of the word. A major reason for Horace's annoyance with Propertius was, in all likelihood, the fact that the elegist shared their neoteric love of 'doctrina'. The objection on chronological grounds to Volpius' theory is not entirely convincing. The Satires in question are normally dated to about 35 B.C. and Butler and Barber assign the year of Propertius' birth to the year 43 B.C. or any year until about 48 B.C. Propertius could have accosted Horace as described in Satires 1.10 at the age of twenty having already lost his parents; which is consistent with the claim of the 'bore' (cf. 'omnis composui', line 28). In 4.1.127-34, Propertius tells us that soon (mox) after assuming the 'toga virilis', which would be between his fourteenth and sixteenth years of age (see Butler and Barber p.xx), he abandoned his legal studies for literary pursuits. The temporal aspect of 'mox' (line 131) may signify no more than "thereafter" (see Butler and Barber. ibid.) and entail no time lapse which would support my view that he began versifying at an early age, but allowing a time lapse of four years we can surely admit the possibility of Propertius' being involved in writing elegy at twenty years of age in 35 B.C.. The historical background to elegy 1.8 is the Illyrian war of 34 B.C., the earliest dateable event alluded to in the Monobiblos. The composition of this elegy could have occupied him in 33 B.C. but this does not rule out an earlier date for the composition of those elegies whose chronology is a matter of conjecture. It is not unreasonable to suppose that he was working on them in 35 B.C. as early as his encounter with Horace. Extensive treatment of evidence in support of the theory is to be found in an article by Hermann (R.E.A. 35 1933 pp. 281-292). For the sake of brevity I would single out one detail which had attracted my notice independently. In elegy 3.23.1, the tablets on which Propertius wrote to his mistress are called 'doctae' which may
indicate that he versified upon them (see Butler and Barber ad. loc. cit.). In the concluding couplet he writes

\[
\text{'i puer, et citus haec aligua propone columna} \\
\text{et dominum Esquiliis scribe habitare tuum'}. \\
\]

which has every appearance of being an allusion to the concluding line of \textit{Satires} 1.10:

\[
\text{'i, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello'}.
\]

It would appear that Propertius is giving the 'puer' of Horace a new task to perform in connection with his affair with his mistress; he was most likely to have been a go-between who is now told to advertise a reward for the return of the lost tablets. Propertius does not seem to have forgotten the Satire in which Horace spoke scornfully of Calvus and Catullus, both of whom were eminent examples of the 'doctus poeta', an ideal with which the elegists were in sympathy (cf. Cat. 65.2; Tib. 1.4.61; Lyg. 3.4.45; Prop. 1.7.11., 2.13.11; Ovid. 2.4.17., A. A. 2.281). The 'bore' is eager to gain an introduction to Maecenas, and if he is indeed Propertius, this would represent his position during work on the Monobiblos when he had not yet secured his patronage but was already making overtures to him as we shall see under the next heading but one of this chapter. With the prospect of a learned 'bore' intruding into his literary milieu, Horace replies to his boast of 'doctrina': \textit{hil mi officit, inquam/ditior hic aut est quia doctior} (lines 50-51); he does not set great store by this quality. However, in the light of statements in the \textit{Ars Poetica} (lines 416-41) that precision and skill are prerequisites for the writing of poetry (cf. also 'saepe stilum vertas' \textit{Sat.} 1.10.72, and 'labor scribendi recte' \textit{Sat.} 1.4.13), faculties held in high regard by the neoterics, being part and parcel of the conception of the 'doctus poeta', it is probable, in the words of Commager
that in Horace "'Doctus' now has a perjorative sense, largely through its specialized association with the neoterics". It was surely the end to which they put these means with which he took issue for the Alexandrian ideal was also based upon a rejection of the major genres (see Brink, pp.159-60) which, at Rome, involved a concomitant dismissal of elevated and heroic subjects on Roman themes which were traditionally encompassed by the genres of epic and tragedy - the 'fabula praetexta' which had as its theme events in Roman history. It was significantly enough, a specialist in these two genres, Ennius, whom Cicero had defended against neoteric criticism: 'o poeta egregie, quamquam ab his cantoribus Euphorionibus contemnitur'. (Tusc. 3.45). His admiration for the poet was almost certainly founded upon his ability to write the sort of lofty celebratory poetry on behalf of which he speaks so eloquently in the Pro Archia and which he himself practised in praising the achievements of his consulship (De consulatu meo) and in the heroic poem about Marius. Horace differed from Cicero only in so much that he thought that Ennius ought to have applied more polish to his work, and thus found himself alienated from the equivalent of the neoterics of his own day, the elegists, whose references to the annalistic tradition in verse in general manifest the low opinion in which they held it; Propertius names Ennius twice, and the context in which he does this demonstrates the point clearly (see below). The passage which is cited to show Horace's belief that Ennius' verse is sometimes careless is found in Epistles 2.1, but Bentley following Porphyrius maintains that 'leviter curare' (line 51) may not refer to Ennius' carelessness but his being free from care as to the fate of his work, that is, the phrase means no more than 'securus esse', for Horace is saying that popular opinion holds Ennius in high regard at a time when many were 'fautores veterum' (see Wilkins, ad loc.cit.).
to reject such themes as suitable topics for his own verse. In line 5 (sup. cit.) Propertius may, I propose, have had Epistles 1.19 in mind where Horace wrote -

'Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma prosiluit dicenda.'

(lines 7-8)

- in the context of his taking issue with the 'water-drinkers', those who saw themselves as being in the Alexandrian tradition and to whose criticism the Epistle replies. By rejecting verse on Ennian lines in words that evoke this Horatian passage, Propertius places himself in the opposing camp. For Propertius, Ennius' draught from the Hippocrene (line 2) represents inspiration for work on the grand scale but the inspiration for his elegiac verse is symbolised by an initiation scene in which Calliope moistens his lips with water (ora Philitea nostra rigavit aqua, line 52). Butler and Barber (p. 269) observe that here Propertius is contrasting this water with the 'magni fontes' from which Ennius drank in line 5, and thus rather than perpetuate the distinction between wine drinking and water drinking to signify inspiration for epic and minor Alexandrian genres he simply differentiates between heavy draughts of waters of inspiration and a form of baptism. To this I would add that even if Ennius were to become a water-drinker of sorts, Propertius would still be abstemious by comparison; the writer of epic is athirst (sitiens) and taking into account Ennius' preoccupation with military conflicts I suspect there might be the implication that he was blood thirsty (sanguinem sitiens), which gains even more point when we remember that in the Horatian passage quoted above Ennius is strikingly portrayed as taking part in the conflicts which he describes (ad arma prosiluit). In asserting that his 'parva ora' is incompatible with 'magni fontes', Propertius is utilising the language
to reject such themes as suitable topics for his own verse. In line 5 (sup. cit.) Propertius may, I propose, have had Epistles 1.19 in mind where Horace wrote -

'Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma prosiluit dicenda.'
(lines 7-8)

- in the context of his taking issue with the 'water-drinkers', those who saw themselves as being in the Alexandrian tradition and to whose criticism the Epistle replies. By rejecting verse on Ennian lines in words that evoke this Horatian passage, Propertius places himself in the opposing camp. For Propertius, Ennius' draught from the Hippocrene (line 2) represents inspiration for work on the grand scale but the inspiration for his elegiac verse is symbolised by an initiation scene in which Calliope moistens his lips with water (ora Philitea nostra rigavit aqua, line 52). Butler and Barber (p. 269) observe that here Propertius is contrasting this water with the 'magni fontes' from which Ennius drank in line 5, and thus rather than perpetuate the distinction between wine drinking and water drinking to signify inspiration for epic and minor Alexandrian genres he simply differentiates between heavy draughts of waters of inspiration and a form of baptism. To this I would add that even if Ennius were to become a water-drinker of sorts, Propertius would still be abstemious by comparison; the writer of epic is athirst (sitiens) and taking into account Ennius' preoccupation with military conflicts I suspect there might be the implication that he was blood thirsty (sanguinem sitiens), which gains even more point when we remember that in the Horatian passage quoted above Ennius is strikingly portrayed as taking part in the conflicts which he describes (ad arma prosiluit). In asserting that his 'parva ora' is incompatible with 'magni fontes', Propertius is utilising the language
with which Horace referred to Ennius in the Satire when he said that the 'os' of the true poet could tune itself to heroic themes - 'magna sonaturum', and when in line 40 of the elegy he quotes the injunction of Calliope: 'nec te fortis equi ducat ad arma sonus' the use of the word 'sonus' in conjunction with 'arma' reminds us I think, of how the 'os magna sonaturum' of Ennius was applied to 'arma' in Horace's vivid picture of Ennius rushing into battle. It is clear that Propertius is repudiating epic and heroic themes in contrasting his own career with that of Ennius, and in using the phrase 'hirsuta corona' in connection with his poetry (4.1.61) is being uncomplimentary to him on stylistic grounds in a way which recalls Catullus' criticism of the rudeness of the Annals of Volusius: 'pleni ruris et infacetiarum/annales Volusi...' (36.19-20). Distaste for annalistic verse as expressed by Catullus is symptomatic of neoteric thought on poetry which had led Cicero to defend Ennius against his neoteric detractors. Horace was in a similar position with regard to the sort of criticism found in Propertius whose views on poetic theory are in line with the Alexandrian concept of poetry held by his predecessors the neoterics. His admiration for Ennius' work did not wane, for even in the last book of Odes published about 13 B.C. where he speaks of the power of his verse to confer immortality (Odes 4.8), it is Ennius alone, whose name he holds up as an example of one whose work possessed this ability. In the concluding section of this chapter I will explain how Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid were at variance with the idea of employing verse to advertise the achievements of a patron or prominent public figure, a practice which was being promoted in Augustan verse by the new concept of the poet as 'vates'. In lines 25-8 of the Ode under discussion it is as a 'vates' that the poet confers the immortalising 'laudes' already mentioned as a distinctive characteristic of Ennius'
verse (line 20). It is exactly this type of laudatory annalistic verse towards which Propertius is unequivocally ill-disposed:

'multi, Roma, tuas laudes annalibus addent, qui finem imperii Bactra futura canent'
(3.1.15-16)

This statement occurs in an elegy which is an affirmation of his Alexandrian credo, and in the succeeding lines Propertius requests the Muses to award him 'mollia sarta' as opposed to a 'dura corona' (lines 19-20). The former stands for 'mollis versus' (cf.1.7.19) just as the latter is used to refer to 'duri versus' (cf.2.1.41) and when he speaks of the 'hirsuta corona' of Ennius (4.1.61) we are, I believe, meant not only to think of his lack of sophistication from an Alexandrian point of view, but also to remember that it is a 'dura corona' suited to the martial tenor of epico-annalistic verse in marked contrast to the peaceful nature of his own elegy (cf.'quod pace legas'.line 17).

On the literary level Propertius is opposed to the type of verse which Ennius wrote and is indulging in the same sort of criticism on stylistic grounds which we can imagine the neoterics levelled against him as they fought for recognition of their small scale works. His distaste for national epic is evident as early as the composition of the 'recusatio' 2.1, well before Horace paid tribute to Ennius in Odes 4.8. and defended him in Epistles 1.19., and so Horace must have been conscious that Propertius was fundamentally opposed to celebratory poetry in the grand style not only for artistic reasons but for political ones also (see next section of this chapter). Propertius, as an inheritor of neoteric ideals, voices his dislike of the Ennian approach to literature, and in this respect Horace is in a position similar to Cicero who defended Ennius against his neoteric detractors. This is probably a major reason for Horace's
antipathy towards Propertius as discussed earlier in this section in connection with Epistles 2.2. As we saw, it was with the 'Callimachus Romanus' that Horace took issue, and it may, I suspect, be more than coincidence that Propertius commented adversely on Ennius in the couplet preceding that in which he awards himself the title of Roman Callimachus in elegy 4.1. (lines 61-64, see above on 4.1).

With regard to Tibullus, his silence over questions of poetic theory embraces this particular area of dispute, but we are justified in supposing that he would have considered himself as belonging to the Callimachean school of thought to which Propertius adhered rather than to any traditional Roman literary movement. That Tibullus is decidedly Alexandrian in his approach to his work is becoming more widely recognised; an important contribution to this awareness has been made by Bulloch (P.C.P.S. 72 1973, pp.71-89) who details thirty eight instances where Tibullus echoes Alexandrian poets, of which twenty five are direct allusions to Callimachus. Tibullus may not boast his Alexandrianism as loudly as Propertius, but for the receptive reader well versed in Callimachus, Aratus and Theocritus, his allegiance on the literary level to Alexandria is unmistakable. There are many ways in which Tibullus reveals that he has as little sympathy for the poet who exercises an 'os magna sonaturum' but he does this without entering into literary feuds; this will become apparent as I investigate Tibullus' attitude to wider issues in this work as a whole.

Ovid's references to Ennius emphasise his lack of technical refinement. He is described as 'arte carens' in Amores 1.15.19 and Ovid was no doubt aware of the literary quarrel which had been carried on from Cicero's day when earlier in the same elegy Callimachus'
name appears as one whose fame was secured through the technical expertise with which he wrote:

'Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe;
quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet'
(lines 13-14)

Of natural gifts for poetry (ingenium), Ovid thinks that Callimachus had few; it is as a major exponent of artistic subtlety (ars) that he is to be esteemed, and it is surely this aspect of Tibullus' work which constitutes the foundation of his renown when Ovid speaks of the elegance of his verse:

'donec erunt ignes arcusque Cupidinis arma,
discentur numeri, culte Tibulle, tui'

Later in elegy 3.9 we will again meet Tibullus referred to as 'cultus' in the company of Calvus and 'doctus Catullus' (lines 61-66) which lends support to this view that it is Tibullus use of 'ars' which will immortalise his elegy. Ovid as an elegist would naturally side with Tibullus in the event of an argument over the merits of 'ars' as opposed to 'ingenium', the latter of which Horace had singled out as the essential quality belonging to a poet, pointing to Ennius to illustrate his meaning. I suspect that it may be not altogether fortuitous that Ovid describes his own hopes for literary immortality in terms similar to those used for Callimachus (cf. 'toto semper orbe canar'. line 8, with 'semper toto cantabitur orbe', line 13).

In 2.4, Ovid is compared with Callimachus by an admirer of the Amores and the elegist ironically allows this person to judge Callimachus' work as rough and ready (rustica. line 19) beside his own well wrought verse. The irony resides in the fact that in 1.15, as we saw, Callimachus is the master of 'ars' whereas in the same elegy Ovid tells us that Ennius is deficient in this commodity (Ennius arte carens. line 19). If Callimachus is 'rustic' compared with Ovid,
how infinitely more rude must Ennius be when his work is compared with the sophistication of the Amores! Again, in the Tristia, Ennius is called 'arte rudis' (2.424) and when excusing his own verse for its dubious morality he claims that the Roman 'matrons' will find a similar content in the Annals than which nothing could be less sophisticated: 'sumpserit Annales - nihil est hirsutius illis.' (2.259). Propertius applied the epithet 'hirsutus' to Ennius' poetry in 4.1 (see above) and Ovid is probably thinking of his lack of artistic precision as well as the boorish innocence of Rome of olden days which forms part of the background to the Annals.

In conclusion, I wish to make a few remarks about the use of the words 'ars' and 'ingenium' as they appear in Horace and the elegists. Newman (Augustus and the New Poetry, pp.380-1) observes that in Satires 1.4 Horace held up 'ingenium' as the distinguishing characteristic of the poet who has little in common with the neoterics, and is impressed by the number of occasions upon which Propertius draws attention to his 'ingenium' rather than the 'ars' by which he set great store, as elegy 3.1 for instance, testifies. 'Ingenium', as Newman points out, was originally an adjunct of the 'vates' concept as Horace understood it, but he began to lay more stress on 'ars' as traditional exponents of 'ars' - which includes primarily the elegists who ascribed to the Alexandrian canon of poetry - began to misuse the concept. (25) Newman believes that the elegists misunderstood the concept, but in the last section of this chapter I shall argue that they indulged in deliberate parody of the device, and by using the word 'ingenium' with respect to verse which had no need for the workings of vatic inspiration they mocked its usage as we find it in Vergil and Horace. For Horace 'ingenium' was to be applied to elevated themes which is the meaning underlying the phrase 'os magna sonaturum': the insistence on 'ingenium' in this sense
reappears in *Ars Poetica* 323 in conjunction with the 'os rotundum' which leads us back to the 'os profundum' of Pindar (Odes 4.2. 7-8). With regard to these latter Horatian statements, Wilkinson (*Horace and his Lyric Poetry*) writes "in effect he subscribes to the doctrine of the sublime" (p.89), which his chapter on the attitudes of Horace to poetry substantiates. Horace must have been annoyed to find the elegists calling 'puellae' their 'ingenium' which must have seemed to him a doctrine of the ridiculous. The neoteric aversion to the grand manner in literary matters is evident in elegy, notably in the 'recusatio', but also in the distortion of the new poetic fiction which was dear to Horace who had grounds to react to the writers of the genre because their neoteric sympathies were opposed to his own poetic ideal of elevated poetry with a constructive political and social import.
Comparing Tibullus and Propertius and their literary circles Davies (G.R. 20 1973) states "... whereas Tibullus can both panegyrate his patron and write love-poetry without feeling any tension between the two roles (here he quotes Prop. 2.1.17-20, and 25-6) Propertius was aware of the difficulty of fulfilling his obligations to praise Augustus and celebrate patriotic themes within the context of his chosen medium. He resorts to the popular literary device of recusatio" (emphasis mine) (p.30.) I take a different view of the "device" and would propose that the 'recusatio' in Propertius (viz.2.1. 17-56; 3.3; 3.9; 4.1.7ff.) was a phenomenon unknown in earlier Latin elegy (26) and that its appearance in the work of Propertius can be attributed to the circumstances which Davies has outlined, which required that the poet should indulge the request of his patron and write eulogistic verse of a patriotic tenor. The Propertian 'recusatio' unlike its Horatian counterpart (see below) is largely what it purports to be and not, in my opinion, merely a literary conceit disguising the motive for its composition. If as Davies goes on to suggest the Propertian 'recusatio' is in effect a form of 'praeteritio' which is the implication of the statement "By the very act of enumerating the deeds of Augustus which the love-elegist is incapable of adequately praising, he finds a means of giving that self-same praise" (ibid.), this minimises the tension which I regard as responsible for provoking the 'recusatio' and renders less sensible the innovation which I would attribute to a strong conflict of interests in the poet's mind. It is in any case difficult to see how in Propertius 2.1, to which the article refers, 'praeteritio' of a complimentary nature can be operating when the references evoke the darker side of the emperor's achievements:
'nam quotiens Mutinam aut civilia busta Philippos
aut canarem Siculae classica bella fugae,
eversosque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae'

(2.1 27-9)

- where the horrors of the civil wars in which the emperor had taken part are hardly calculated to afford him praise especially in view of the fact that the preceding two poems at the end of the Monobiblos recall how Propertius had lost his kinsman Gallus in the Perusine war of 41 B.C. to which line 29 of the quoted passage refers. It is the task of this work as a whole to substantiate the contention that Propertius does not enumerate with admiration the achievements of Augustus while ostensibly professing to be unwilling to treat the subjects to which he alludes. His uncompromising stance towards national themes is seen to advantage in his last book, the area of enquiry in the subsequent chapter. In assessing the Horatian 'recusatio' scholars have commented on the degree to which Horace, in such compositions, performs the service for which he claims he is unsuited. Commager (Odes of Horace) on Satires 2.1, Epistles 2.1, Odes 1.6, 2.1, 2.12, 3.3, and 4.2 remarks "Rejections of epic become themselves epic" (p.114)..."he itemizes what he repudiates...the classic example of the man who manages to eat his cake and have it too" (p.116); likewise Wilkinson (Horace and his Lyric Poetry) on Odes 4.2. writes "his self depreciation is ironical" (p.89) and on Epistles 2.1 "having ironically shown what he can do, Horace professes that he cannot do it." (p.91), and Frankel (Horace) makes observations to the same effect (see esp.pp.397-8 and 438). If the Horatian 'recusatio' did in fact amount to an outright disclaimer, we would still be left with many of his compositions which are paeans to the Augustan state and the same applies to the poetic output of Vergil. Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid however, did not surrender their talent in this way. We must account for the prominence of this type of elegy in Propertius.
We have no grounds for assuming that a 'recusatio' appeared in the 'Amores' of Gallus, whose life speaks of a man more preoccupied with raising a monument to his own greatness than with concerning himself about the praise of others. The instances in Propertius are confined to the latter three books probably because the success of the Monobiblos (33-28 B.C.) brought the poet to the attention of Maecenas and it is from that stage onward that the poet rejects the idea of abandoning the sort of verse which had won him a reputation, in order to undertake the task of writing about the 'gens Julia' of which the emperor was the chief surviving heir:

'Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores,
unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber.
nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos'

(2.1.1-2. ibid. 41-2)

Tibullus on the other hand had been the friend of Massalla before the publication of his first book of elegies in about 26 B.C. After the battle of Actium, Messalla was sent by Octavian to settle affairs in the East and in 28 B.C. he successfully put down a revolt of Aquitanian tribes for which he was duly granted a triumph in 27 B.C. Tibullus had been a member of Messalla's 'cohors' destined for the East but had fallen ill at Corcyra preventing him from participating further (1.3.1-4), and claims to have played an active part in the Aquitanian expedition ('non sine me est tibi partus honos'. 1.7.9.). Their intimacy is most evident in 1.5 where Tibullus imagines Messalla paying Delia and himself a visit at their country home. The programme elegy in which poet and patron are already associated, announces to Messalla the type of poetry which he intends to write (1.1.53-6); unlike Propertius, Tibullus must never have felt the need to express himself in a 'recusatio' and we have no reason to suspect that Messalla tried to influence the work of the poet. If the
experience of Tibullus was similar to that of Ovid in his relationship with Messalla then he probably found his patron content to foster, without personal interference, the development of his literary talent, for in the letter to Messalinus the son of Messalla, Ovid described the patron of Tibullus as a friend, and one who stimulated and encouraged his abilities:

'nec tuus est genitor nos infitiatus amicos, 
hortator studii causaque faxque mei.'

(Ovid Pont. 1.7.27-8)

Of interest regarding the nature of patronage and the wider implications of the choice of erotic elegy as a field of composition, is the article of Dalzell (Phoenix 10 1956 pp.151-62) with which I take issue. The author of the article is anxious to show that there was no opposition between the circle of Messalla and Maecenas and that the latter did not encourage Vergil, Horace and Propertius to write court poetry, this being inconsistent with the temperament and literary proclivities of Maecenas himself. Much of our knowledge concerning Maecenas' character is derived from Seneca who had an axe to grind, so it is unsafe to deduce that the man was incapable of directing others to more serious undertakings in the field of letters from the evidence for the frivolity of his character found in a hostile source. Under the following heading of this chapter I shall argue that Propertius, like the author of the article, may have misjudged Maecenas' capability in this respect. Dalzell seeks to play down the conventional view of the role of Maecenas as one who directed his proteges towards the writing of court poetry and thus intimates that Messalla and Maecenas had so much in common in giving freedom to their poets to experiment according to their literary propensities; but if this is the case then we should again ask why does the 'recusatio' feature so prominently in Propertius and not at
all in Tibullus? The Propertian 'recusatio', as has been recognised, possesses a wider significance than its Callimachean ancestor, the reply to the Telchines, which prefaced the second edition of the Aitia, and which constitutes a rejection of artistic criteria to which this Alexandrian was opposed. Clausen (G.R.B.S. 5 1964 pp.181-96) discussing the Callimachean nature of the 'recusatio' found in Vergil's sixth Eclogue points out that the subject of Roman epic was war and that Vergil's refusal to write epic (tristia condere bella) was not simply a decision based upon aesthetic considerations but an indication of the poet's moral stance when encountered with the problem. (28) Vergil at this stage had yet to experience a change in his outlook which would reconcile him to a genre with which he was out of tune. This is exactly how I see the 'recusatio' in Propertius. Above I spoke of how the 'recusatio' 2.1 followed immediately upon the two closing elegies of the Monobiblos. Clausen has related Propertius 1.22.1-5, in which the poet reminds us of the horrors of the Perusine siege to a feeling towards war much like that experienced by Vergil in Eclogues 6 and correctly implies that the Propertian 'recusatio' also expresses a moral inquietude. I would further this argument by saying that I detect in 2.1 an echo of 1.22:

'si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra,
Italae duris funera temporibus,
cum Romana suos egit discordia civis'  
(1.22.3-5)

Propertius mentions the graves of those who had perished in the Perusine war recalling how it had caused a scene of death in Italy during the stern (duris) days of civil conflict (discordia). Now in 2.1 he writes (lines 41-2)

'nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos'

In 1.22 his value judgment regarding the period of the civil wars is
expressed with the help of the adjective duria. In 2.1 verse such as Maecenas probably suggested the poet might compose (dealing with the 'gens Julia' - see above) is described as durus and in this same elegy Propertius refers to the civil wars which were fought at Mutina and Perusia (lines 27-9) the latter of which as we have seen is named in 1.22. It is as though his disposition (praecordia) which was unfavourable towards stern verse (duro versu) had been determined by his experience of the hostilities (discordia) during those stern days (duris temporibus). Moreover I do not think it fanciful to see in the use of the verb 'condere' (line 42) an indication that Propertius is alluding to its use in line 7 of the Eclogue under discussion where Vergil refuses to narrate the military achievements (tristia condere bella) of Varus. Propertius in his first 'recusatio' is reminding Maecenas that there was a time when Vergil could not have treated such subjects and that he is similarly disposed towards giving an account of the vicissitudes of the 'gens Julia'. In this way the 'recusatio' 2.1 can be said to reflect more than the artistic scruples of the poet towards the new themes which he sees as the alternative to the writing of erotic elegy. His experience of the miseries of war appear to have coloured his attitude towards the sort of verse which would deal with the wars and achievements of the emperor (cf. bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris. line 25). It is hardly surprising that in 4.1 Horos should dissuade Propertius against a similar enterprise outlined in lines 39-48 with an appeal in lines 127-30 to the miseries suffered by the poet's family during the civil upheavals which may have contributed to his father's death. Propertius had a long memory, and even towards the end of his literary career he speaks of his personal misfortune caused by the confiscation of his ancestral estate for distribution among the veterans of Octavian and Antony in 41 B.C.: 
'nam tua cum multi versarent rura iuvenci,
abstulit excultas pertica tristis opes'
(4.1.129-30)

In 1.7 Propertius had written what may be loosely called a 'recusatio'. (29) It possesses none of the appeals to the Alexandrian theories of art, and is not so much a refusal as a pronouncement on his motives in writing love poetry: it is practical in that it will influence his relationship with his 'domina' (line 6), it is intended to be didactic (lines 13-14) and it will win him reknown (lines 9-12 and 21-4). He contrasts his own poetry with the epic of Ponticus, the subject of which is purely legendary, being a Thebaid featuring the quarrel of Eteocles and Polyneices (lines 2 and 17). The wars which Propertius in 2.1 claims that he would treat - he rejects outright those from Greek myth and history and the annals of republican Rome (lines 17-24) - if he were so inclined, all belong to the poet's lifetime and were decisive for the success of the emperor's cause; thus the 'recusatio' 2.1 amounts to a refusal to write contemporary panegyrical poetry featuring the emperor (lines 25 and 42) and Maecenas himself (line 35). Unlike 1.7, the 'recusatio' 2.1 has political as well as literary connotations which is attributable I suspect to personal misgivings about the civil wars and his circumspect frame of mind towards the 'princeps' in his military capacity. In addition to political considerations I see the recurrence of the recalcitrant element in Propertius' work as arising from a miscalculation on his part of the intentions of Maecenas in gathering around him poets of particular promise. Before attempting to discover what aspects of Maecenas' patronage may have been responsible for causing Propertius to express reservations and indulge in soul-searching - which I consider to be symptomatic of his being aware that he had acted without due thought to the drawbacks - we might profitably ask ourselves why the elegist Tibullus felt so at home
under the patronage of Messalla.

The account given by Davies of the circle of poets around Messalla reminds us that the atmosphere which prevailed within that group was amiable and intimate as is especially evident from the appearance of no less than six genethliaca in the 'corpus Tibullianum', two each by the so called 'Auctor de Sulpicia' (3.11 and 12) and Sulpicia herself (3.14 and 15), and two by Tibullus (2.2 and 1.7. 49-64 in which it would appear that his patron celebrated triumph and birthday on the same day). 1.7 as well as being a poem which celebrates Messalla's birthday also commemorates his Aquitanian triumph of 27 B.C., and the blending of the two themes (30) clearly shows that the poet was closely bound to his patron in a way which is reminiscent of the relationship between the poet as a 'cliens' of a 'patronus' in the days of the Republic. (31) The indications lead us to believe that Messalla's own verse was written in a light vein. The 'Elegia in Messallam' (Catalepton 9) informs us that Messalla had written verse in Greek with pastoral and amatory themes in the manner of Theocritus which the author claims to have translated into Latin, (lines 13 - 20) and had also sung the praises of a 'puella' (lines 23 - 38). The recurrent themes of love and the countryside in the elegies of Tibullus might reflect the subject matter of Messalla's own literary creations, and we cannot rule out the possibility that Messalla praised the unknown 'puella' in the metre of elegy. Moreover, we cannot be sure that the assertion of Pliny the Younger (Epp. 5.3.5) that Messalla wrote erotic verse is merely an expansion of the evidence of Catalepton 9. It is, then, understandable that Tibullus should have felt attracted to the milieu of one who had drawn those themes which were to be the dominant features of his own verse, and have found congenial company among the love elegists Lygdamus and Sulpicia.
Propertius on the other hand had been content to remain unpatronised while working upon his first collection of elegies. He must have been aware that both Vergil and Horace had by now become firm friends of Maecenas to whom the latter appeals for support while engaged with work upon the Odes in which he set out to achieve pre-eminence in Latin lyric verse. The closing lines of Odes 1.1:

'......si neque tibias
Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton,
quodsi me lyricis vabibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vertice.'
(lines 32 - 6)

- tell us that if the Muses grant their aid, and if Maecenas favours his verse, then the success of his lyric output is assured. The closing lines of Propertius 1.8b. are in my opinion an echo of this Horatian passage:

'sunt igitur Musae, neque amanti tardus Apollo,
quis ego fretus amo: Cynthia rara mea est!
nunc mihi summa licet contingere sidera plantis;'
(lines 41 - 3)

Herein Propertius declares that the object of his verse is to win the favour of Cynthia with the aid of the Muses and Apollo. The Ode under discussion is in effect a dedicatory poem prefacing the collection comprising Bks. 1 - 3 published in 23 B.C., but containing material dating from 31 B.C. The initial word employed is the name of his patron. Likewise Propertius opens the Monobiblos with the name of Cynthia. (Cf. also 'sidera' in the concluding line of the Ode and the same word in a similar position in the elegy). However, in the passage quoted, Propertius hopes to win through his poetic ability a 'puella' and not a 'patronus'. Solmsen and Salvatore D'Elia in their discussions upon Horatian echoes in Propertius' elegies have surprisingly not included what I consider to be a case in point. (32) For both Horace and Propertius, literary success confers stardom, but the achievement
of the elegist is already (nunc. line 43) secured, but without the sacrifice of his independence, and on the strength of his own ability. Though the introductory and concluding two lines may have been added later when Horace resolved to dedicate his lyric poems to Maecenas, this may have been done while Propertius was working upon the Monobiblos.\(^{(33)}\) It is more plausible that Propertius had in mind the complete Ode as it has come down to us, and integrated his allusion to it while occupied with the composition of 1.8, than that Horace went to the trouble of contriving addenda parodying Propertius' claims. The we are probably witnessing first of many cases where Propertius arrogates Horatian imagery to enhance the status of the elegiac genre and at the same time register his disregard for the sentiments and conventions which gave rise to it in the lyric genre practised by Horace. In the Tristia (4.10. 45-50) Ovid relates how in his youth he heard Propertius, Ponticus, Bassus and Horace recite their verse. The indications are that Ovid heard Horace recite his Odes; 'numerosus' would be an apt description of his polymetric skill as found in the lyric poetry and 'Ausonia carmina culta lyra' would again suitably describe the Odes rather than the Epodes or Satires. At such a 'recitatio' Horace may have delivered Ode 1.1 in the form in which we have received it, in the presence of Propertius who on this reckoning subsequently reacted in elegy 1.8 to Horace's expression of dependence upon his patron thereby giving us a foretaste of the independence which he on the other hand was to guard jealously throughout his career without compromise. Propertius did however become involved with Maecenas, but only because he hoped that he might enjoy the twin advantage of material support and complete literary autonomy. He recognised that Horace had surrendered the latter.

In dealing with aspects of the 'recusatio', this section has been a preamble to further investigation of poems of this type, which
will be referred to where their content is relevant to various angles of enquiry in this and subsequent chapters, and the topic of patronage will also be raised on occasion, notably in the section immediately following.

Propertius' Error: The Disadvantages of Patronage

Lucot in his article 'Mécène et Propère' (R.E.L. 35 1957 pp.195-204) explains how Propertius sought to attract the attention of Maecenas in the Monobiblos. I shall briefly state the argument before drawing my own conclusions. In 1.2.1 - 6 Propertius recommends natural simplicity as an aid to beauty rather than the aid of cosmetics:

'Quid iuvat ornato procedere, vita, capillo
et tenuis Coa veste movere sinus,
aut quid Orontes crinis perfundere murra,
teque peregrinis vendere muneribus,
naturaeque decus mercato perdere cultu,
nec sinere in propriis membra nitere bonis?

(1.2. 1 - 6)

We know that Maecenas wrote a eulogy of Octavia, the sister of Octavian, of which a fragment has survived viz. 'pexisti capillum naturae muneribus gratum' (34). The work almost certainly belongs to the years between 40 and 32 B.C. during which Octavia was the wife of Antony, and Maecenas' compliment upon her natural beauty must have been widely known in literary circles. Though 'muneribus' is syntactically separated from 'naturae' in the Propertian passage, the two words are nevertheless immediately adjacent, as they are in the fragment from Maecenas. Propertius is telling Cynthia that there is no advantage to be won in sporting an elaborate coiffure, and recalling the words written by Maecenas in praise of the natural beauty of Octavia's hair. The cycle of poems dealing with Cynthia are thus introduced in 1.2 with a pointed appeal to Maecenas' own writings and
Lucot infers from this that "Par-dessus Tullus, dédicataire du livre, c'est Mécène que, dès le début, Properc veut toucher" (p.197). Likewise the collection of poems closes with an appeal to Maecenas on a more personal level. In reply to Tullus, the poet says that Umbria was his birthplace (1.22.1 - 2 and 9 - 10). In lines 3 - 9 Propertius describes the horrors of the siege of Perusia which resulted in the death of his kinsman Gallus whose dying words are recorded in 1.21. In 1.22 the poet emphasises that Umbria lies close to the Etruscan town of Perusia. Lucot, observing that Propertius uses the adjective 'Etruscus' three times in these elegies (in 1.21.2 and 10, and 1.22.6) bases his argument as to its significance here, upon the circumstances of the only other instances of its usage, in 2.1.29 and 3.9.1. These later elegies are both addressed to Maecenas and in 1.21 and 22 it is plausible that Propertius may at that early stage of his career have sought the favour of Augustus' patron of letters - "on peut donc penser avec vraisemblance qu'ici encore la répétition, en des vers si voisins, du mot 'Etruscus' constitue un appel à l'Etrusque Mécène, une 'captatio benevolentiae'" (p.198). Lucot left unnoticed a line in 2.1 which reminds Maecenas of the compliment which Propertius paid him in 1.2.1-6 quoted above. The couplet immediately succeeding this passage:

'crede mihi non ulla tuae est medicina figurae: nudus Amor formae non amat artificem.'

(1.2.7-8)

is recalled in the 'recusatio' at the beginning of the second book to which Nethercut (S.O.27 1972 p.86) has drawn attention, the relevant line being

'solus Amor morbi non amat artificem'

(2.1.58)

I note that the penultimate word in the hexameter 1.2.7 viz. 'medicina' appears in the same position in the hexameter 2.1.57, which lends
further support to the correspondence detected by Nethercut, who concludes that Propertius, in referring Maecenas to elegy 1.2, reminds him of their mutual interest in 'elegiac' subjects. In this way I think that the elegist shows his determination to continue with his pose as an elegiac lover. Propertius, then, was misled into thinking that Maecenas' own literary interests and lifestyle suggested a patron who would be continually sympathetic to his profession as a poet of love. I suspect that his further use in 2.1 of the language of the 'captatio benevolentiae' in 1.2 is a reminder to Maecenas that he was looking for a prospective patron of erotic elegy and that just as natural beauty is best without artificial interference, so he can only give of his best when left to his own devices to write the sort of poetry which is naturally in accord with his 'fata' (2.1.17) and his 'praecordia' (2.1.41). We can gauge the strength of the 'recusatio' 2.1 by a further observation of Nethercut (ibidem) who detects a bold tone of defiance in Propertius' use of 'exempla'. Just as it would be impossible to relieve the torment of the Danaids or Prometheus (lines 67-70), and, I should add, that of Tantalus (line 66), any attempt to reform Propertius would also be seeking to work ὀδύνη.

If Lucot is correct, we can assume that Maecenas did not approach a poet who had shown no signs of interest in the possibility of enjoying the benefits of patronage, but one who had known misfortune and was looking for security. I think we must remember that in addition to the loss of a kinsman, Propertius' immediate family had seen their ancestral estate seriously diminished by the appropriation of lands for apportionment among the veterans of Antony and Octavian. Propertius must have known that Vergil's estate had suffered similar depredation and that the author of the Eclogues had obtained a position of security under the aegis of Maecenas, and like Tityrus had reason
to feel grateful for the restoration of his land. Horace too had had his farm confiscated, but his admittance into the circle of Maecenas' friends eventually resulted in his being presented with the famous Sabine farm in 34-3 B.C. At the time of the composition of the Monobiblos (33-28 B.C.) Propertius had before him concrete proofs of the advantages of Maecenas' favour. At this stage however, Vergil had yet to engage himself in the writing of the Aeneid, and Propertius had already been working on his first book for three years when Horace undertook work on his first book of Odes (30 B.C.). The elegist, as mentioned earlier, must have shared feelings similar to Vergil towards the misery of war, and the theme of frustrated love, not only of Vergil's pastoral characters, but of Gallus himself was also surely a further feature of the Eclogues with which Propertius could feel a strong poetic affinity. Horace's Epodes and Satires published in 41-30 B.C., while having much less in common with the world of elegy, may nevertheless have given Propertius the impression that a poet of Maecenas' circle was largely free to write whatever pleased him. Propertius would certainly have sympathised with the sentiments of Epodes 1.16 over the Perusine War. The early work of Horace reveals to us a poet primarily involved in criticising people and society. In the introduction to his translation of Horace's Satires, Professor Rudd remarks that "in the ten years after Philippi, Horace never wrote a word in praise of Octavian. The poetry of that period indicates that his disillusion with politics was complete. It is only in the latest Satires and Epodes, which were written in the year after Actium, that he speaks of the future emperor at all". Propertius must have felt equally pessimistic and sympathised to a degree with the Horace of this early period. The jingoism of the 'Roman Odes' of Bk. 3, and Bk. 4, the concern with the perpetuation of 'res Romanae' in the Carmen Saeculare, the Letter to Augustus (Ep. 2.1) in which
Horace propounds the social function of poetry and upholds the standards of Augustan verse, were later works which mark a developing engagement with the ideology of Augustus' administration. This was never to be the experience of Propertius not even in his last book which is often thought to contain evidence for a change of political outlook. Propertius who more than any other poet uses the name of Callimachus in support of his views on life and letters would have had little reason on artistic grounds for feeling that he would be a literary misfit in the milieu of Maecenas at this early stage in his career. Propertius' poetic bête-noire was epical panegyric which constituted for him a contravention of Callimachean artistic tenets and a social commitment which he found personally unacceptable. While Propertius was busy with the Monobiblos the Georgics of Vergil were being composed (36-29 B.C.). The Alexandrian tradition was favourable to the works of Hesiod whose didactic 'Works and Days' served as a model for Vergil who was also influenced by Aratus, Eratosthenes and Nicander. Of Aratus, Callimachus had a high regard, describing him ως πολυμαθη και ἀνιστόν ποιητήν (Fr. fr. 460) and at the same time praises the Hesiodic style of his Phainomena: ὁσίδον το τύλειμα καὶ δ' θρόνος. Χαίρετε λεπταὶ βιότες, Ἀρτίτου σύμβολον ὄρμυπνης. (Epist. 27). Hesiod, while shepherding his flock on Helicon had encountered the Muses, who claimed that they were able to inspire poets to write the truth about things as well as convincing lies, and presented him with a laurel branch exhorting him to sing of the past and future (Theog. 30ff). Callimachus too met the Muses at the same location where they explained the αἰτία, the origin of things - and Vergil places Callus in this same tradition when one of the Muses introduces the elegist to Linus who presents him with the pipes of Hesiod and invites him to tell the 'origo' of the Grynean Grove:
'hos tibi dant calamos, en accipe, Musae,
Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.
his tibi Grynei memoris dicatur origo,'

(Verg. Elogues 6.69-72)

The point I wish to make is that Propertius would not have been
daunted in his desire to gain the protection of Maecenas simply
because the most famous poet in his circle, having abandoned verse of
a largely amatory complexion, was preoccupied with a Hesiodic theme
which in the early stages at least was largely suggested by the poet's
own love of 'res rusticae' evident in the Eclogues, and owed little
to official interference seeking to win Vergil's support for a
programme of agrarian rehabilitation. It is likely that those passages
in the Georgics which are encomiastic in their treatment of emperor
and country - the prelude to Bks. 1 and 3, the conclusion of Bks. 1
and 4 and the praise of Italy in Bk. 2 - were added when the bulk of
the poem had been completed; Vergil is writing six or seven years
after he had begun work on the poem when he speaks of 'tua, Maecenas,
haud mollia iussa' in Bk. 3.41 as Wilkinson in his article on the
intentions of the Georgics has pointed out (G.R.19 1950 p.21). He
denies that this mention of 'iussa' should be taken as evidence that
the work was officially inspired but I think it significant that both
the national elements and the address to Maecenas belong to a period
when work on the poem was well advanced. Wilkinson questions the
nature of the pressure, but as this address to Maecenas and the encomia
are later additions we have grounds for believing that the later parts
of the work referred to represent the wishes of Maecenas. Surely
'haud mollia iussa' implies more than "Maecenas is holding him to
finishing his present task" when in the following line Vergil claims
that his patron's encouragement is a prerequisite for lofty under-
takings, 'te sine nil altum mens incohat', on which the poet is more
explicit in lines 46-8 where he states that he intends to eulogise
the military achievements of the emperor 'mox tamen ardentis accingar
dicere pugnas / Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos /.
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar'. Propertius realised
correctly, I think, that Vergil's original motive for treating such
a theme consisted of a wish to write on a subject which was close to
his heart and to please a patron who had an interest in matters
agrarian (see the discussion of Maecenas' character with regard to
the Vertumnus elegy in my chapter on Propertius Bk. 4). If at the
time of the composition of the Monobiblos, the Georgics as Propertius
knew them lacked the additional passages of encomium, then he might
have thought with excuse that a poet of Maecenas' circle had carte-
blanche in determining the sort of verse he might write. It is
possible that it was before and during this transitional stage, when
Vergil began to indulge the wishes of Maecenas that he should include
elements serving to impart a more national character to the poem, that
Propertius formulated his opinion of the atmosphere prevailing in
Maecenas' literary circle. However, by the time he had attracted the
attention of the emperor's minister and was contemplating a second
book of elegies the climate had changed and I would attribute this in
part to a policy for social consolidation following the battle of
Actium in 31 B.C. to which Maecenas could easily have been party.
Fränkel (Horace) inclines to a similar view regarding the later
passages of encomium when he writes "It is likely that Virgil, and
probably Caesar and Maecenas as well, were convinced that easy-going
optimism was dangerous and that, when peace and order seemed to be
restored, the terrifying picture of civil war with all its misery
and degradation should once more, in the poet's powerful vision, be
brought before the nation. "(p.288).

Vergil's continued fascination with the elegist Gallus
would have reassured Propertius that his own work would meet with
sympathy. (37) Gallus appears in *Eclogues* 6 and 10 and there is some evidence for believing that Vergil accorded him a position of prominence in the original draft of Bk. 4 of the Georgics; Servius on 4.1 informs us that the poet removed the 'laudes Galli', because of Augustus' anger over Gallus' behaviour in Egypt, for which he substituted the Aristaeus epyllion (4.315-558). However, after the publication of Propertius' first book of elegies in 29 B.C. - the latest date we can assign to an elegy of Bk. 1 is 30 B.C., the year of the proconsulship of L. Volcacius Tullus (38) probably the uncle of the Tullus mentioned in 1.6 - Vergil began work on the Aeneid which was to occupy him for the next ten years until his death (29-19 B.C.). Lines 3-4 of 2.3:

'vix unum potes, infelix, requiescere mensem, et turpis de te iam liber alter erit.'

- indicate that work upon Bk. 2 commenced almost immediately after the publication of Bk. 1. It is understandable that it should open with an elaborate refusal to write epic when the elegist realised that Vergil was about to dispense with 'deductum carmen' and become an Apollonius Rhodius 'redivivus' neglecting the advice of Apollo in *Eclogues* 6.3-5 to which until now he had adhered. In assuming that Maecenas' capricious life-style spoke of a man who would be content to allow a poet over whom he had influence to pursue themes which were remote from the more serious issues afflicting the Augustan state, Propertius showed himself to be a weak judge of character. A modern critic has fallen into the same trap: "Such then was Maecenas: an Epicurean to the core, a man fond of good living and of good company, devoted to his own comfort, very ready to escape responsibility, somewhat disillusioned about public life, not over scrupulous in matters of personal morality. It was this man, we are told, who descended from his shining palace on the Esquiline and asked the poets to sing about the good old days of Republican Rome and the
virtues of primitive frugality! Personally I am not inclined to believe it." (Dalzell, art. cit. p.153).

It is in the context of Propertius' mistaken impression of Maecenas' character that I think we should interpret the following:

'Maecenas, eques Etrusco de sanguine rogum, intra fortunam qui cupis esse tuam, quid me scribendi tam vastum mittis in sequor? non sunt apta meae grandia vela rati.' (3.9.1-4)

'at tua, Maecenas, vitae praecepta recepi, cogor et exemplis te superare tuis.' (ibid. lines 21-2)

'parcis et in tenuis humilem te colligas umbra: velorum plenos subtrahis ipse sinus.' (ibid. lines 29-30)

In this 'recusatio' from Bk. 3 Propertius maintains that his unwillingness to abandon love poetry and deal with more ambitious subjects to which Maecenas is directing his talent has much in common with his patron's reluctance to further his own career. (lines 2 and 29-30). His philosophy of life (vitae praecepta) and pattern of behaviour (exempla) seem to the poet inconsistent with a request that he should venture upon an ambitious literary project. Propertius, as I stated earlier, probably hoped that he might recover through Maecenas' influence some of his estate which had been lost owing to the confiscation of land. Both Vergil and Horace had already been rewarded with land when they had been accepted in the emperor's circle of friends. Propertius hoped to combine the advantages of security with the opportunity to determine his own literary development, but was deceived by the levity of Maecenas' own verse and his quiescent disposition into thinking that he could continue writing in a subjective and socially negligent manner. We are told however, that Octavian's minister could act with resolution when the situation demanded, and then lapse back into leisurely and feeble luxury; 'vir ubi res vigiliam exigeret, sane exsomnis, providens atque agendi sciens, simul
vero aliquid ex negotio remitti posset, otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens' (Vell. Pat. 2.88). Moreover, it was Maecenas who, according to Dio (52. 14-40) countered the advice of Agrippa to the emperor that he should restore the republic, and persuaded him instead to consolidate his position and lay the foundations of empire. That the poets closely associated with the emperor and Maecenas were on occasion pressed to produce work in which the 'mores animique virorum clarorum apparent' seems almost certain from Horace's letter to Augustus (Epp. 2.1) where he describes how promising poets come to the notice of the emperor who secures them from want and puts them under some obligation to write: 'simul atque carmina rescieris nos fingere commodus ultro / arcessas et egere vetes et scribere cogas' (lines 226-9). Dalzell believes that such compulsion consisted simply of a requirement that the poets continue with the work which had brought them to the attention of the emperor (ibid. p.156) but Horace is clearly speaking of a pressure to write laudatory verse and he goes on in lines 245-50 to name Vergil and Varius as poets who obliged the emperor in this way and received rewards. It is not reasonable then to interpret the compulsion brought to bear on Propertius as a request that he carry on writing in the vein of the Monobiblos; the 'recusatio' on this reckoning would amount to shadow-fighting. It would be inept for Propertius to allege that Maecenas had been exhorting him to abandon love-themes if in truth he had been allowing or encouraging him to pursue them further.

It is worth considering the possibility that Maecenas thought that a poet who was reluctant to abandon favourite themes or attempt an alternative genre of verse might nevertheless be willing to make modifications within his chosen field to accommodate features relevant to the climate of Augustus' court. Callimachus had demonstrated in his 'Nemean Victory' and the 'Victory of Sosibius'
(Pfeiffer, frgs. 383 and 384) that elegiac as opposed to lyric verse could be a suitable vehicle for epinician poetry of an encomiastic nature, and Catullus had dedicated the translation of Callimachus' 'Coma Berenices' (66) to Hortensius and had demonstrated how court poetry, albeit belonging to the reign of Berenice II the widow of Ptolemy III, could be written in Latin elegiac measures. One of Catullus' most intricate elegies (68) while dealing with the poet's love affair with Lesbia, expresses thanks to Allius for certain 'officia' in an encomiastic passage. Propertius also addresses his friends in the Monobiblos and it would not have been unreasonable to hope that once accepted into the entourage of Maecenas, a new set of friends might feature in his work and that his gratitude would temper his lack of interest in the wider issues of the Roman state, as found particularly in the cycle of elegies addressed to Tullus, who is probably to be identified with the nephew of Augustus' consular colleague in 33 B.C. (39) Had not Vergil been successful in blending erotic with national themes in the Eclogues, introducing us to his friends and enemies and alluding to questions of the day? Augustus' minister may have hoped that once Propertius had won his favour that his thanks might manifest itself in verse, but such hopes were immediately dashed. I shall briefly enumerate the reasons which I believe account for Propertius' recalcitrance before enquiring deeper into the bond between Messalla and the elegist Tibullus.

Camps, on Propertius 2.1.17 where the name of Maecenas appears in the corpus for the first time, is led to speculate upon the nature of the tie between poet and patron, and doubts whether Propertius' claim of enjoying his favour in lines 74-5 is any indication that their relationship was a close one: "...it is not clear that Propertius was ever intimate with Maecenas. In the next
book it is noteworthy that the elegy 3.9 which is addressed to him is not positioned, as a dedication probably would be, at the beginning of the book; and in Bk. 4 Maecenas is no longer mentioned."

Notwithstanding what I shall have to say about Maecenas in my chapter about Propertius' last book where I argue that the decline of Maecenas' fortunes due to political intrigue provoked the poet's sympathy, the observation of Camps deserves attention, and I shall discuss Propertius' status within the circle of Maecenas in the light of Lucot's article which looks at the problem in greater detail.

The most plausible reasons which I consider can best explain the distance between the two are (a) 'two are company but three are a crowd' that is Vergil had known Maecenas for seven years previous to Propertius' commencing work on the Monobiblos and Horace for five years. Propertius would naturally have felt cautious in such circumstances. (b) a feeling of disappointment that Maecenas was not entirely happy with his plan to continue writing erotic elegy without acknowledging the benefit of the new order. (c) a lack of sympathy for the artistic ideals of Vergil and Horace. (d) personality problems with Horace whom he never mentions and vice versa (see above on Horace Satires 1.4); Horace was very close to Maecenas (40) and disagreement between them would have aggravated Propertius' relationship with his patron. (e) Propertius was not so dependent on the system of patronage as Vergil and Horace, being in a position to afford a greater degree of detachment by virtue of his personal resources as a member of the 'ordo equester' (see the section of my third chapter dealing with the rejection of 'ambitio' in the elegists.). Of these Lucot adduces (d) and to a lesser extent (a). Camps favours (e) when he says "Propertius would not need a patron. He was of equestrian family (4.1.121 and 131) and despite loss of part of his patrimony in the confiscations of 41 B.C. he evidently still had adequate means;
this is implied by his way of living, and by the terms in which he refers to his 'poverty': 2.24.38 non ita dives; 2.34.55 parva domi fortuna relicta." (ad loc.cit.). I would not single out to the exclusion of others any of these reasons, all of which could, I believe, account for the distance between Propertius and Maecenas. It is conceivable that they all contributed to Propertius' hopes to preserve his autonomy within a system of patronage. By comparison Tibullus and Ovid made no such miscalculations and met with no problems, largely, I suspect, because they were not beholden to such an ardent supporter of the principate whose enthusiasm no doubt prompted him to direct the talents of Vergil and Horace for political reasons. In the pages which follow it will be seen that Messalla the patron of Tibullus and the 'fautor' of Ovid shared little of this enthusiasm, hence he felt no call to promote ideologies through the medium of literature. I will propose that Tibullus must have shared his republican outlook, having been associated with him as a poet earlier than is usually thought, a relationship which incurred for him the disapproval of Horace who held Messalla in suspicion for political reasons. Ultimately I think it is to Tibullus' own lack of sympathy for the new order that we can attribute what we may call a subdued 'recusatio' which involved a failure to apologise for not introducing the emperor as subject of his verse. It was on account of this attitude on the part of both Messalla and Tibullus that Horace sought to discredit them as we shall see.

Messalla and Tibullus

The patron of Tibullus unlike that of Propertius had been a staunch supporter of the republican cause and had joined the senatorial party under the leadership of Cassius after the assassination of Julius Caesar. After Philippi he became a supporter of Antony and
transferred his allegiance to Octavian only when Cleopatra's
behaviour boded ill for the political success of Octavian's rival.
In so doing he had hoped that Octavian would restore the republic
(Dio. 47.33.3-4, Vell.Pat. 2.71.1, Appian B.C. 4.38.136). Carcopino
(R.P.20 1946 pp.96-117) has lucidly shown how Octavian distrustingly
overlooked Messalla in the years between Philippi and Actium in
confiding the more important duties to Statilius Taurus and Agrippa:
"Evidemment, si tant de responsabilités et de pouvoirs accumulés
manifestent le crédit dont Taurus jouissait auprès d'Octave, l'inaction
à laquelle le triumvir d'Occident a simultanément reduit Messalla
prouve le peu de confiance qu'il lui accordait alors." (art.cit. p.105).
Even after Actium Messalla's actions spoke of a man with strong
republican sympathies, of one who was a devotee of Brutus and whose
feeling for republican practices dictated his resignation from his
post as 'praefectus urbis', and of one who claimed always to have
fought for the just cause: "Jusque sous l'Empire, Messalla, et c'est
à sa louange, ne cessera de professer une sorte d'idéal républicain
qui lui a dicté sa démission de la préfecture de la ville et à laquelle
les Anciens ont rendu hommage. Notamment, il n'a jamais caché le culte
qu'il vouait à la mémoire de Brutus: félicité, au soir d'Actium, par
Octave, qui avait suivi avec autant de surprise que d'admiration les
prouesses qu'il avait accomplies au cours de la journée, il revendiqua
l'honneur de sa vaillance à Philippes, et il se refusa fièrement à
désavouer le passé: il était resté, se borna-t-il à répondre
'conséquent avec lui-même, puisqu'il avait pour principe de lutter
toujours pour la plus juste cause!' " (art.cit. p.103). (41) Carcopino
detects a political significance in Horace Satires 1.10 which belongs
to the years before Actium. In lines 81-3 Horace names Plotius Tucca,
Varius Rufus, Maecenas, Vergil and Valgius Rufus and others as friends
who readily approve of his literary efforts whereas in lines 84-8 the
poet appeals to Asinius Pollio, Messalla, L. Calpurnius Bibulus, Servius, Furnius and the half brother of Messalla, L. Gellius Popicola, as candid impartial critics of his work intimating that they were not altogether acceptable in court circles: "l'on conçoit que son énumération ne trahisse, comme il s'en vante - ambitione relegata -, 'aucune arrière - pensée ambitieuse', aucun esprit d'intrigue, si les critiques dont il recherche le suffrage n'étaient point, officiellement, trop bien en cour" (art. cit. p. 114). It is by virtue of their being outside the court circle that Horace can guarantee their unbiased opinions. He examines the political affiliations of the impartial critics whom Horace names and concludes that they had all been supporters of Antony, and it is among such company that Horace has placed Messalla in lines 84-8: "En vérité, Messalla se trouve, dans la prosopopée d'Horace, en plein milieu d''Antoniens' entouré de partisans qui, abstraction faite de Pollion, demeuré à Rome, semblaient tous, par leur exemple, l'inviter à rallier leur chef à son tour" (p. 115). Following Lejay in dating the Satire to 35 B.C. a year before the publication of the first book, Carcopino proposes that Horace is reflecting the inactivity of Messalla on the eve of his return to Antony at Alexandria when he refers to him as an orator, above all else, in line 28. After the defeat of Sextus Pompeius in Sicily (36 B.C.) Agrippa was rewarded by Octavian with a golden crown to be worn during triumphs. Others were awarded with the title of 'imperator' (see Syme p. 238) but Messalla received only an augurship. That this was no great distinction by comparison can be inferred from the fact that after Actium the emperor conferred no less than 170 priesthoods upon his supporters (Res Gestae 25.), a detail which could profitably have been included in the article. Thus we can attribute Messalla's departure for Alexandria, as proposed by Carcopino, to a feeling that he was being overlooked by Octavian.
It was only after the quarrel with Antony and the pamphlets which Messalla subsequently wrote against him - the 'De Antonii Statuis' and the 'Contra Antonii Litteras' (Charisius 1.104.18, ibid. 129.7) that Octavian felt that he could depend on his support.

An article by Charlier (Études Horatienes 1937, pp. 53-64) has shown how the Albius of Epistles 1.4. could easily be one of the poets whom Horace alluded to as candid critics of his work in Satires 1.10. If this is Albius Tibullus the elegist as I claimed earlier, then in the light of what Carcopino has said concerning Messalla and the other impartial critics in Satires 1.10, it is possible that Tibullus was a friend of Messalla at this early stage and shared his political persuasions. This would have the advantage of rendering sensible Horace's mention of the name of the tyrannicide Cassius Parmensis in association with that of Tibullus. First of all we know that Bks. 1 - 3 of the Odes of Horace span the years 31 - 23 B.C., and Epistles Bk. 1 were composed during the years 24 - 20 B.C. If we assign Ode 1.33 addressed to Albius to the year 23 B.C. and Epistles 1.4 likewise addressed to Albius, to 20 B.C., then we must admit with Charlier that the addressees of the Ode and Epistle who share the same name are in fact one and the same person, as the works were written almost contemporaneously: "Toutefois, il paraittrait difficile d'admettre que, dans deux receuils distants de trois années, deux pièces addressées chacune à un Albius ne concernassent pas le même correspondant" (Charlier, art, cit. p. 60). Charlier then turns his attention to line 1 of Epistles 1.4:

'Albi, nostrorum sermonum candide iudex'

where Horace calls Albius an impartial critic of his satires, and this line constitutes the bridge to Satires 1.10.84 ff. where Charlier sees an allusion to the same person. He is incorrect in assuming
that 'candide' implies a favourable judgment upon the Satires on the part of Albius. "L'Albius de l'Epître 1.4 a, lors de la publication des Satires d'Horace, jugé favorablement celles - ci."

The note on this line in Wilkins' edition of the Epistles is clear on the sense of the adjective; "candide: 'fair', not necessarily favourable, but unprejudiced; opposed to 'niger', as we find the word used in Satires 1.4.85". Now in Satires 1.10.81-3 Horace had listed those who approved of his work, and in lines 84 - 90 those who could pronounce impartially upon it as we saw earlier:

"ambitione relegata te dicere possum, 
Pollio, te, Massalla, tuo cum fratre, simulque vos, Bibule et Servi, simul his te, candide Furni, complures alios, doctos ego quos et amicos praudens praetereo: quibus haec, sint quallacumque, arridere velim, doliturus, si placeant spe deterius nostra."

The Albius who is described as the 'sermonum candide iudex' in Epistles 1.4 could in Charlier's opinion be one of the 'complures alios' alluded to in this passage from Satires 1.10. Before making any deductions I would emphasise that the use of the word 'candide' in line 86 of the Satire is further support for Wilkins' note on the Epistle, for it is impartial opinion (cf. 'ambitione relegata' line 84) to which Horace is appealing in contrast to the approval and praise (cf. 'probet' line 82, 'laudet' line 83) conferred upon his work by the persons named in lines 81 - 3. I must also make it clear that Charlier, while maintaining that the Albius of Odes 1.33 and Epistles 1.4 is one and the same person and is alluded to in Satires 1.10, does not believe that the elegist Tibullus is being referred to, the main obstacle for him to such an equation being the fact that the subject of Tibullus' elegies according to Odes 1.33 is a lady called Glycera whose name does not appear in the 'corpus Tibullianum'. It can be argued however, that the nameless mistress
who is spoken of in Tibullus 3.19 and 20 might be the Glycera of Horace Odes 1.33. (See O.C.D. under Tibullus on 4.13 and 14 i.e. 3.19 and 20 for this view.) If we accept this, it would fall in with Charlier's view that the Albius of the Odes and Epistles had been composing verse as early as Horace's reference to him in the Satires (i.e. before Actium), for it has often been thought that the elegy and epigram which appear at the end of the 'corpus Tibullianum' were juvenile works. In this respect I would quote Smith (The Elegies of Albius Tibullus) who has shown that Postgate's reservations concerning Tibullan authorship of the elegy are not entirely convincing: "It seems most reasonable therefore to suppose that it is a chance survivor from an earlier stage of his development, and that it was kept back by the author himself because it did not measure up to the higher standards of his critical and creative maturity." (p.519). I think that the argument is chronologically sound. Both Postgate and Smith (42) assign Tibullus' birth to as early as 55 - 54 B.C. The poet could have been making his first essays in elegy and epigram at the age of 19 in 36 B.C., and have been one of the impartial critics associated with Messalla in Satires 1.10. Bks. 1 - 3 of the Odes span the years 31 - 23 B.C.; Odes 1.33 could then, belong to 26, the year in which Tibullus' first book was probably published, elegy 1.7 being written to commemorate the triumph of Messalla in 27 B.C. The statement of Ovid in Tristia 2.463 - 4 that -

'legiturque Tibullus et placet, et iam te principe notus erat.'

- would suit the year 26 B.C. In lines 447 - 62 Ovid is obviously summarising Tibullus 1.5 and 1.6 where the elegist had taught his 'domina' to deceive her 'vir' only to find that she has turned his teaching to his own disadvantage. The temporal qualification 'iam te principe' would be particularly appropriate to the year following
27 B.C., in which the republic was 'restored' and the emperor became its chief citizen. We should be cautious not to attribute too much significance to Ovid's implication in 'iam notus' that Tibullus was famous for his Delia elegies even before the settlement of 27 B.C.. Ovid is anxious to excuse his 'duo crimina' (Tristia 2.207) and it is to his advantage, I think, to derive the influence of Tibullus as a 'praeceptor amoris' from the most remote date if only to show how Augustus tolerated verse similar to his own in the earlier stages of his rule. In Tristia 4.10.51-4 -

"Vergilium vidi tantum: nec avara Tibullo
tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae,
successor fuit hic tibi, Galle, Propertius illi;
quartus ab his serie temporis ipse fui."

- Ovid regards Propertius as the successor of Tibullus as an elegist. As noted above the latest dateable event in Tibullus' first book belongs to the year 27 B.C. Yet in Propertius' case the proconsulship of L. Valcacius Tullus in Asia in 30-29 B.C. affords us with the most recent date in the Monobiblos, whose publication is assigned to the year 28 B.C. If, as is widely thought, Tibullus' first book was published in 26 B.C., how are we to accept Ovid's claim that Tibullus preceded Propertius in the succession of elegists? I suspect the answer must reside in the fact that Tibullus had actually composed elegy of some description prior to Propertius' showing practical interest in any sort of verse. We cannot with any degree of certainty date any elegy of the Monobiblos earlier than 33 B.C. the year following the Illyrian campaign which forms the background to 1.8. Likewise regarding Tibullus Ek. 1 we can only say that 1.7 was written after 27 B.C. as mentioned above. In 1.3, Tibullus' illness detains him in Corcyra preventing him from continuing his journey to the East as a member of the 'cohors' of Messalla; Messalla's praefecture in the East postdated Actium but whether it was prior or subsequent
to the Aquitanian campaign is unknown. The Monobiblos then, has every appearance of being an earlier work than Tibullus' first book, yet 'successor fuit.... Propertius illi.' I accept Charlier's hypothesis that Albius is alluded to in *Satires* 1.10. The reference to Glycera as the mistress of Albius in *Odes* 1.33 led the author of the article to question whether the addressee could be Tibullus the elegist as her name does not appear in his works. Yet on his own reckoning Albius was writing before Actium and was qualified to pass literary judgment on Horace's work. We can imagine how Tibullus wished his fame to rest exclusively upon the two books of his maturity rather than upon a juvenile 'Appendix Tibulliana'. Horace speaks of a younger rival of Albius who is more successful with Glycera, which immediately suggests that Tibullus should be approaching middle-age if Horace's statement is to make sense, and it may be objected that this is at variance with our biographical information about the poet which calls him an 'adolescens' and a 'iuvenis'. However, the import of *Odes* 1.33 is similar to that addressed to Valgius (2.9), that Albius like Valgius should turn to fresh themes preferably connected with Augustus, if the analogy be permitted (cf. 2.9.17-20), and cease harping upon the subject of lost loves. At an age of thirty (in 26 B.C. which would, as suggested above, be a suitable date for the composition of *Odes* 1.33) Horace might reasonably advise Albius that he should be outgrowing the passions of youth. According to the epigram of Domitius Marsus, Tibullus was a 'iuvenis' when he died (mors iuvenem campos misit ad Elysios). The 'Vita' informs us that 'obiit adolescens'. Even if the latter authority is drawing upon a source independent of the epigram, a thirty year old would easily qualify for the title 'adolescens', the entry in 'Lewis and Short' presenting evidence that the term can be applied to those up to forty four years of age. 'Iuvenis' likewise is equally vague, being
applicable to those between the ages of twenty and forty years. (43)

There is then no serious reason why we should not identify Albius of Odes 1.33 with Tibullus the elegist.

Albius, as we have seen is the same person in the Epistle and the Satire. There is a lack of conclusive evidence to invalidate our equating him with the Albius of the Ode. If we regard the Albius of the Ode as the elegist Tibullus, then his literary career and association with Messalla dates from an earlier period than is usually thought. The Albius of the Epistle and Satire were both critics of Horace's verse as Charlier demonstrated, and if we accept Carcopino's hypothesis, he is one of the critics whom Horace places outside the court circle as politically dubious characters. If we accept this argument then I think that Horace's motive in the Epistle in linking the name of Tibullus with the tyrannicide Cassius of Parma, the detractor of Augustus (Suet. Aug. 40) on whose orders he was murdered, becomes comprehensible, for it can be seen as a further attempt on Horace's part to embarrass Tibullus and Messalla on account of their coolness towards the political settlement of Augustus and a lack of enthusiasm for the regime manifested by a total silence with regard to the emperor in the elegies of Tibullus. The main reasons which have been forwarded to prevent an identification of Albius with Tibullus in the Ode are that the subject is described as being thwarted by a younger rival as a suitor of Glycera, which would suggest that Albius is approaching middle-age. I have pointed out how Tibullus was approaching middle-age and shown that this is not at variance with his being called a 'iuvenis' and 'adolescens' in the Vita. The objection that Tibullus nowhere mentions a mistress by the name of Glycera can be met simply on the grounds that the name is probably a pseudonym with a play on words from the Greek meaning 'honey' and is of a similar order to Licymnia the 'sweet-songed' a name used as a disguise
for Terentia, wife of Maecenas in *Odes* 2.12. (44) Glycera may after all be an earlier love of Tibullus belonging to the days when he wrote elegies 3.19 and 3.20. A further objection that Tibullus' protestations of straitened means in the elegies are inconsistent with the god-given wealth attributed to him by Horace in *Epistles* 1.4.7 can be explained by the very hostility which he seems to bear towards the elegist, for in my third chapter it will be seen that Horace could be telling his readers that Tibullus' pose as one living in reduced circumstances should not be taken seriously. (45) The Horatian attitude to the genre of elegy can now be seen as determined not only by artistic considerations but by political ones also.

**A Novel Recusatio (Propertius 2.10)**

Because elegy 2.10 seems to announce that Propertius will abandon love-poetry and celebrate the exploits of Augustus, some scholars have believed that the elegy marks the beginning of a new book. This was notably the view of Lachmann, but Postgate, while dividing the book at this point expresses uncertainty: "It is a very vexed question whether it is the introduction to a fresh book. If it is, it must be regarded as a false start, as only one poem in the book, (29, the opening of the temple of the Palatine Apollo) has anything to do with Augustus". (46) An excellent article by Nethercut (S.O.47 1972 pp. 79-94) has demonstrated that the elegy is in fact a 'recusatio', and that it is, for reasons of symmetry and sentiment, the corollary of 2.7. One would be mistaken in supposing that Propertius was proclaiming a new literary programme. The essential points of Nethercut's argument are that 2.7 and 2.10 are comparable in length and each contain three groups of six verses, the former concluding with two verses, the latter eight verses (3 x 6 + 2 and 3 x 6 + 8). In each elegy the last group of six are concerned with
"war and fame in the east". In each, the couplet 13 - 14 relates to Parthia, (the author must obviously favour the reading 'Parthia' instead of 'patriis' at 2.7.13) and while 2.7 continues to deal with the 'castra puellae' (line 15), 2.10 treats the 'castra' of the emperor. The couplet 19 - 20 of each elegy summarises what has preceded, and both elegies conclude using the word 'Amor'. 2.10 is more or less equidistant between 2.7 and 2.14, with 92 lines separating it from the former, and 88 lines from the latter. Now in 2.7 Propertius had dissociated himself from Augustan military policy and dedicated himself to Cynthia but in 2.8 and 2.9 a rift had occurred between the two and in 2.10 he threatens to switch his allegiance to the camp of Augustus. Following Wimmel, (47) Nethercut ascribes both a temporal and causal sense to 'quando' in 2.10.8.

The overall import of the elegy is gauged accordingly; Propertius has time for Augustus since he is for the moment liberated from Cynthia and has absence of duty from her camp allowing him to flirt with the establishment without paying any true compliment. In 2.11 Propertius warns Cynthia that others will have to sing her praises while in 2.14 he is reinstated in her favour. 2.10 then, represents a threat to his mistress. That his projected excursion into national verse is not to be taken seriously becomes obvious in 2.14, which balances 2.7 around 2.10, for in that elegy the poet is reconciled with Cynthia:

'pulsabant alii frustra dominamque vocabant:
me cum habuit positum lenta puella caput.
haec mihi devestis potior victoria Parthis,
haec spolia, haec reges, haec mihi currus erunt."

(2.14.21-4)

By this time, as Nethercut remarks, "Propertius quite plainly looks ahead and sees, not the Parthians, but Cynthia..... When Parthia returned Crassus' standards, Propertius remained silent" (op. cit. p. 94). By way of corroborating Nethercut's appraisal of this cycle of elegies
I suggest that the following four lines (25 - 8) of 2.14 viz.

'magna ego dona tua figam, Cytherea, columna,
taleque sub nostro nomine carmen erit:
HAS PONO ANTE TVAS TIBI, DIVA, PROPERTIVS AEDIS
EXVVIAS, TOTA NOCTE RECEPTVS AMANS.'

should also be compared retrospectively with 2.10.19 - 24

'haec ego castra sequar; vates tua castra canendo
magnums ero: servent hunc mihi fata diem!
at caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis,
ponitur haec imos ante corona pedes;
sic nos nunc, inopes laudis conscendere carmen,
pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus.'

In the passage from 2.10 Propertius declares that he will laud the exploits of Augustus' Parthian 'castra' as outlined in lines 11 - 18 and that his verse will constitute his own humble offering (ponetur.... ante.....pedes.....) to his greatness. However, in 2.14 the poet's recapture of Cynthia is more important than the recovery of Crassus' standards as we have seen, and so ironically it is Venus (line 25) who in actuality receives the offering of verse (carmen, line 26) inscribed upon a column before her temple (pono....ante....aedis).

An attempt to explain 2.10 in terms of a 'sincere' reappraisal on Propertius' part of his relationship with the regime as a patronised poet would be misguided, rather he is aiming at effect, keeping both Cynthia and the reader in suspense. The subsequent elegies demonstrate that the latter view is preferable and that the poet has soon forgotten his threat to become a bardic reporter of the emperor's achievements.

There remains for consideration however, a vexed passage, the final couplet, which shows, I believe, that by the end of the elegy the threat to Cynthia has already weakened as Propertius has become conscious of the true implications of the proposition in the opening lines:

'nondum etiam Ascræos norunt mea carmina fontis,
sed modo Permessi flumine lavit Amor.'

(2.10. 25-6)
Nethercut does not take into account these lines in which Propertius is in all probability alluding to *Eclogues* 6 of Vergil in which Callus is led by one of the Muses away from the river Permessus (line 64) and up Mount Helicon where he is received by Linus and presented with the pipes which the Muses once gave to Hesiod ('Ascraeo...seni' line 70). Linus then bids him sing of the origin of the Grynean grove 'his tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo' (line 72). Camps' note on 'Ascraeum... nemus' in Propertius 2.13.4 refers us back to Propertius' allusion to *Eclogues* 6 in 2.10.25 where we find 'Ascraeos ...fontes'. However I feel uneasy about his remarks as to how we should interpret the meaning of the adjective in both cases: "Love has bidden him 'sojourn in the Ascraean grove' as an elegiac poet. In 2.10.25 it was implied that this kind of poetry did not deserve the name 'Ascraean'; but now it does" (p.116). In 2.10 Propertius describes an alternative to love-poetry, that dealing with heroic themes in epical style, implied by the 'magnum os' of line 12, as opposed to the 'angustum pectus' of 2.1.40, but rejects such themes and style. In 2.13.3 - 4 'Amor' is credited with having dissuaded him against such a departure:

```
hic me tam gracilis vetuit contemnere Musas, 
iussit et Ascraeum sic habitare nemus,
```

Camps errrs, I think, in contrasting 'Ascraeos...fontes' with 'Permessi flumine' in the last couplet of 2.10. That the latter is a reference to erotic verse I do not dispute, but by assuming that the 'Ascraeos ...fontes' symbolise the heroic-epical sort of composition envisaged in lines 1 - 24, the issue is unnecessarily complicated. 'Amor' in 2.13 advises Propertius not to despise the 'gracilis ...Musas' that is non-epical verse, and to confine himself to the 'Ascraeum...nemus' and so we are justified in considering love poetry compatible with Ascraean verse. Camps has seen this as inconsistent with what he
thinks does deserve the name 'Ascraean', that is the non-erotic themes proposed in 2.10 and thus he construes 'Ascraean' as a term used to describe favourably whatever type of verse the poet contemplates writing, whether epical, which does deserve this name, or erotic which "did not but now does". Butler and Barber similarly found the evocations of Ascra in 2.10 and 2.13 contradictory and are forced to conclude that "Apart from this passage Ascra seems to have no special significance for Propertius, since in 2.13.4 it is Love himself that bids Propertius 'dwell in the Ascraean grove' ". Against this I would argue that just as in 2.13 'Amor' considered the 'Ascraeum nemus' congenial to the writing of love poetry, then 'Amor' in 2.10 should possess some close affinity with the 'Ascraeos fontis'. If this view is taken, then Propertius is not using the word indiscriminately. 2.10.25-6 and 2.13.3-4 take us back to Gallus as he appears in Eclogue 6, and it is probable that in the former couplet the contrast is not between heroic and erotic verse but two types of Callan verse which are contrasted with the projected heroic work in the preceding lines. Propertius is not simply saying that he intends to experiment in the future with heroic verse but that he has yet to explore the wider possibilities of verse such as Gallus practised before he might contemplate a change. Gallus had wandered by the river Permessus and ascended Helicon to receive the Ascraean bard's pipes; The nature of Gallus' poetic output is a perennial subject of controversy but there are grounds for supposing that he experimented not only in the writing of love elegy but also turned to aetiological verse which seems to be implied in the words of Linus in line 72 of the sixth Eclogue, and he may have written epyllia as suggested by the preface of Parthenius' 'Love Adventures' addressed to Gallus; indeed Skutsch believed that Silenus' song in this Eclogue is a catalogue of such epyllia by Gallus. Recently however, Ross (Backgrounds to Augustan
Poetry) has taken the view that Gallus confined himself to writing 'amores' and that in the Eclogue he is not being initiated by Linus into aetiological verse: "the 'Ascræos fontis' and the 'flumine Permæssi' are the same waters." (p.120 note 1); "if there is any reasonable conclusion to be drawn from the testimonia, it is that Gallus wrote only elegy." (p.48). Ross argues that Linus' words imply no distinction between two such different types of Gallan verse, that this mistaken view arises from the misinterpretation of Propertius 2.10.25-6 as referring to distinct sorts of verse (p.32). He admits that the 'amores' of Gallus probably made sophisticated use of myth and aetiology (p.48) and realizing that the adversative 'sed' in the Propertian couplet may expect us to understand two opposing statements (p.119) concludes that the sense is "'I have not even written Gallan elegy, but Love (my own subjective, amatory form of elegy) only has bathed in the Permessus.'" (p.120) Ross, then, rules out the possibility of a generic distinction in favor of a contrast between the 'color' of Gallan and Propertian elegy based on the degree to which the personality of the poet is immanent in his work, but this is surely a strange way for Propertius to lay claim to originality for 'modo' - 'only just' has a depreciative as well as a temporal significance; the fact that Propertius did go on to write aetiological poetry is in itself a fair indication that in the elegy under discussion he was thinking in terms of a new departure into a different category of elegy and not simply of a retrospective assessment of the achievements of Gallan elegy and his own work to date. Since, as I hope to show in my next chapter, the aetiological elegies of Book 4 can hardly be regarded as sincerely nationalistic or considered full of praise for feats of heroism, it is probable that these represent the type of poetry which he contemplates in the final couplet of 2.10 and contrasts with the heroic verse of lines 1-24.
The force, then, of 'nondum etiam' in 2.10.25 is 'not yet even', that is Propertius has not yet even explored the further possibilities of elegy. It does not mean that he has yet to attempt national verse as his next priority.

The elegy began with a feeling of immediacy 'sed tempus' as though he were about to launch himself into composing heroic verse, but this has its counterpart in the closing line where I propose that 'sed modo' has the effect of postponing even later the day when he might celebrate the emperor's achievement. He has only just recently (modo) become involved with love elegy implying that it still remains for him to explore the avenues of this type before attempting aetiological elegy in the footsteps of Callimachus and Gallus. As for heroic / national verse which was apparently of immediate concern at the outset of the elegy, Propertius has cleverly relegated it to the distant future. As we saw earlier, the mood which inspired the opening of the elegy probably had its origin in a deterioration of his relations with Cynthia and the poem as a whole can be regarded as one of several which mark a progress from despair which culminates in the restoration of a harmonious rapport between both parties. The final couplet of 2.10 is in effect an escape clause which extricates him from any commitment as he realises that he is only threatening Cynthia and does not intend to adopt the plan which he has outlined. In toying with official themes to further the better interests of his amatory affairs, Propertius has produced a novel and subtle form of 'recusatio'.

Propertius' View of Vergil's Literary Career

Was Propertius paying a sincere tribute to Vergil's Aeneid in lines 61-6 of elegy 2.34?
'Actia Vergilium custodis litora Phoebi,
Caesaris et fortis dicere posse ratis,
qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma
iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus.
cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai!
nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.'

It would be easier to place this interpretation upon the passage if it were unrelated to the context in which we find it in the poem. According to the MSS., elegy 2.34 comprises 94 continuous lines. Butler and Barber (p. 255) while admitting that no conclusive argument can warrant subdivision, favour a break after line 24, but reject a further break after line 58. In support of Butler and Barber could be added the fact that it is common for Propertius to suffix to an elegy a detached concluding couplet which reflects aphoristically upon the whole, or expresses the feelings of the poet who is 'voti compos', whereas the construction of lines 55-8 ('aspice me....ut regnem') is completely integrated and lines 57-8 do not constitute such a detached couplet. While favouring a separate elegy beginning at line 25 and ending at line 94, the argument below which centres around Propertius' address to Lynceus, and its bearing upon Vergil's work, is not seriously invalidated if the section dealing with Lynceus (lines 25-58) were to stand separately. The contrast between two such adjacent elegies would be significant in itself. First of all we must ask whether Lynceus is a purely fictional character or whether the name disguises the identity of a contemporary poet. In the Monobiblos, Propertius introduced us to Ponticus (1.7 and 1.9) and Bassus (1.4). Ovid (Tristia 4.10.47) speaks of an epic poet named Ponticus, and a writer of iambics Bassus, as members of a circle of fellow poets which also included Propertius who is mentioned in almost the same breath (ibid. 45-6). It is as an epic poet that Ponticus appears in the Monobiblos and with whose verse and life-style Propertius compares his own, maintaining that an elegist's life-style
and verse are preferable. Propertius suggested that he should abandon epic themes and become an elegist since he has fallen in love:

\[
\text{plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero: carmina mansuetus lenia quae} \text{rit Amor. i quaeso et tristis istos compone libellos, et cane quod quaevis nosse puella velit!}'
\]

(1.9.11-14)

Likewise Lynceus has yielded to love (2.34.25) and Propertius recommends that he should reject tragedy and practise a smaller and more exacting verse in keeping with his new passion:

\[
\text{desine et Aeschyleo componere verba coturno, desine, et ad molis membra resolve choros. incipe iam angusto versus includere torno, inque tuos ignis, dure poets, veni.'}
\]

(2.34.41-4)

However, I sense a difference in Propertius' approach to the poetry of Ponticus and Lynceus. While calling Ponticus' epic 'tristes libellos' (1.9.13) Propertius is careful not to open the Alexandrian-neoteric debate over poetic standards. Ponticus, as I have noted, appears to have been a friend of the elegist and may have been upset by the suggestion that his work was inferior and less exacting. However, in the section of 2.34 devoted to Lynceus and his poetry, Propertius advises the poet that his efforts would be better employed if he were to follow the example of Philetas and Callimachus:

\[
\text{tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan et non inflati somnia Callimachi.'}
\]

(2.34.31-2)

The implication is that Lynceus is 'inflatus' which as well as meaning inspired by the Muses to write epic poetry can mean bombast and turgid. The repeated 'desine' (lines 41 and 42) conveys a sense of urgency lacking in 1.9. In line 43:

\[
\text{incipe iam angusto versus includere torno'}
\]

we have again a reference to the 'ars tenuis' practised by the
followers of Callimachus, the 'angustus tornus' echoing the 'angustum pectus' which belonged to Callimachus:

'sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus
intonet angusto pectore Callimachus....'
(2.1.39-40)

The adjective only appears twice with respect to questions of art, and the later instance possesses Callimachean overtones once more. In fact Propertius' directive to Lynceus is almost certainly based upon a Callimachean fragment which describes the Lyde of Antimachus in uncomplimentary terms:

\[ \text{Lýðò} \text{ καὶ παχοὶ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορὸν} \]
(Pf.frag.398)

The adjective at the end of this line describes a product which has been finely turned on a lathe - Τόρονς and when Propertius uses the Latin equivalent for this noun viz. 'tornus' he, like Callimachus, intends us to think of the tool as a symbol of the application of exacting standards and precise use of words to the composition of verse on the small scale. I consider it hardly accidental that in the hexameter appearing immediately after the couplet in which Propertius uses this word, the name of Antimachus should occur -

'tu non Antimacho, non tutior ibis Homero'
(2.34.45)

For Callimachus as for Catullus, the name of Antimachus was a byword for turgid and unrefined verse on the large-scale:

'parva mei mihi cordi monumenta Catonis
at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho'
(Cat.95.9-10)

The recipient of Propertius' advice is having the Callimachean and neoteric rule-book thrown at him, but is the Lynceus to whom it is addressed entirely a creation of Propertius' imagination? Boucher (R.E.A.60 1958 pp.307-22) affords good grounds for believing that Lynceus is a pseudonym for Varius Rufus. The lynx was one of those
animals thought to have drawn the chariot of Bacchus hence the phrase of Vergil 'Quid lynces Bacchi variae' the adjective being the equivalent of the Greek in the phrase βαλκτε λύκες. The fact that Lynceus' name is mentioned alongside those of the great poets of the past is in itself indicative of the addressee's historical existence: "2.34 est un grand debat sur l'elegie et l'epopee, et c'est un catalogue des poetes. Un tel privilege ne pouvait etre accordé qu'a une celebrité litteraire...." Boucher emphasises that lines 33-45 and 51-4 constitute a catalogue of poetical works belonging to Varius. Of these I shall mention only the 'Thyestes' which would explain the 'coturnus Aeschyleus' of line 41, and the 'De Morte' which would be consistent with the resume of philosophical speculations on the universe and death in lines 51-4. The argument is convincing but Boucher does not account for the famous 'Panegyricus in Caesarem Octavianum' of Varius nor does he ask why Propertius does not allude to it. In his article he quotes Bardon (L.L.I.2 p.28) who says that we should be surprised at Propertius' failure to mention the Panegyricus: "Propère a exalté en termes magnifiques l'Eneide, au moment où paraissait le poème que Varius consacrait à Auguste....assurément le silence de Propère (sur Varius et son épopée) peut surprendre." (Boucher art. cit. p.311). Boucher answers this by stating that if Lynceus is Varius then Propertius does acknowledge the poet's most recent work, but in his analysis of the catalogue of Varius' works he fails to discover an allusion to the 'Panegyricus' so that Bardon is strictly correct. I will show that the 'Panegyricus' was published before elegy 2.34 and that Propertius must have been acquainted with it, and offer my own explanations as to his silence with regard to the same. First of all, the scholiasts maintain that Horace is quoting directly from the 'Panegyricus' in Epistres 1.16.27-9 (cf. Morel. p.101). We can date the Epistle no
earlier than 27 B.C. for Horace refers to the emperor as 'Augustus' in line 29. In Propertius 2.34. 91-2:

'et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua!

- Gallus is described as recently dead which dates the elegy to the year 26-25 B.C. Even if it is objected that lines 25-8 addressed directly to Lynceus-Varius are earlier, it would be unsafe to assign them to any year before 28 B.C. Elegies 7 and 31 of Bk. 2, if they belong to the years 27 B.C. and 28 B.C. respectively, represent the earliest work in the book, and the latter could easily belong to 24 B.C.

The evidence thus supports the view that the 'Panegyricus' appeared in 28 B.C. or earlier and that Propertius must have been familiar with it. This being the case, it is conspicuous by its absence in Propertius' catalogue of Varius' works. It is possible however, that Propertius addressed the poem to Varius while he was actually engaged upon its composition, and his injunctions in lines 41-4 (desine....desine....incipe....veni) can be interpreted as exhorting Varius to abandon the grand style. It is as though the elegist were assuming the role of Apollo, as found in the preface to the 'Aitia', reiterating the advice which he had formerly given to Callimachus and which was later given to Vergil, which is distilled in lines 41-2 and 43 as I explained above. Wimmel is of a similar opinion: "Mit dem in desine v.41 and 42 liegenden Eingriff übernimmt Properz selbst die Rolle des hindernden Apollo".(52)

Propertius then advises Varius to abandon tragedy and epic and intimates that his epical 'Panegyricus' in praise of the emperor is not in the best of taste. I would draw attention to the fact that while Horace admired Varius as a writer of epic in the context of a 'recusatio' (Odes 1.6), Propertius far from paying tribute to his abilities in this direction, recommends that they would be better employed in the writing of elegy:
'tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan
et non inflati somnia Callimachi.'

(2.34.31-2)

My remarks about elegy 2.34 and Odes 2.9 made above (53) to the effect that Horace and Propertius seem to have engaged in a war of words (notably in their use of the verb 'desino' in the imperative and the adjective 'mollis') as to the relative merits of epic and elegy, are relevant to this wider issue of Propertius' attitude towards the work of Varius and Vergil. In Odes 1.6 Horace praised Varius as an epic poet and Propertius might well have had Horace's poem in mind when he berates Varius in 2.34.

In Odes 2.9 which advises Valgius to abandon elegy and write heroic verse in praise of Augustus' military prowess, Horace, as I endeavoured to show, was directly echoed in Propertius' advice to Varius to abandon epic in favour of elegy. The indications are that Horace and Propertius were in disagreement over the poetic worth of the genres of elegy and epic, but did Propertius mitigate his distaste for epic as practised by Varius when Vergil became a practitioner in the very same genre? To discredit Varius in Augustan Rome must have been tantamount to discrediting Vergil himself, so closely were their names associated. In lines 25-58 Propertius contrasts his own career with that of Lynceus, and in 59-84 with that of Vergil. In associating the two poets with one another he had in mind the real-life relationship between Varius and Vergil which is attested to in the works of Vergil himself and of Horace. The latter linked the name of Varius with that of Vergil as epic poets best suited to sing the praises of the emperor (Epp. 2.1.245-50) and had a high regard for his epic genius (Odes 1.6, Sat. 1.10.43). In Eclogues 9.35 Vergil acknowledged his talent, and appears to have been his friend in these early days, for Horace relates how he
secured an introduction to Maecenas through Vergil and Varius (Sat. 1.6.54 ff.). This event is normally assigned to the year 39 or 38 B.C. when Vergil had completed much of his pastoral verse. It is in the company of the two friends that Horace made the journey to Brundisium (Sat. 1.5.40) and he had become the friend of Varius by the time that the 'bore' accosted Horace on the 'Via Sacra' (Sat. 1.9.22-3). According to Acron (ad Epp. 1.16.27-9) Vergil quotes from Varius' work in lines 621-2 of the Aeneid Bk. 6, and appointed both Varius and Plotius as his literary executors. Propertius reminds Vergil of the high esteem with which he held Varius in the Eclogues; after enumerating Vergil's work to date in reverse order, the Aeneid, Georgics and Eclogues, Propertius states:

'non tamen haec ulli venient ingrata leganti,
sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit.
nec minor hic animis, ut sit minor ore, canorus
anseris indocto carmine cessit olor.'

The former couplet is suggested by Eclogues 6.9-11

'.................si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis
captus amore leget, te nostrae, Vare, myricae,
te nemus omne canet...............'

and the latter by Eclogues 9.35-6

'nam neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna
digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores.'

where Vergil had likened his poetic song to the cackle of a goose among tuneful swans - a self-effacing metaphor with which he pays tribute to the poetry of Varius and Cinna who are the 'olores'.

The interpretation which we put upon Propertius' adaptation of Vergil's tribute depends upon the point of reference of 'haec' in line 81 of the elegy. Here I accept the view of Butler and Barber and Camps that a reference to Propertius' erotic work is to be understood. Camps translates lines 83-4 as "and here too the sweet-voiced swan triumphs over the cackling goose, even though he cannot make so
loud a noise" (ad loc. cit. p.232). Now in lines 67-76 Propertius regards the Eclogues as the erotic verse of Vergil and I believe that in lines 83-4 Propertius is asserting that whereas Vergil had conceded that such verse was inferior to that of Varius, he on the other hand will not allow such an unfavourable comparison to be made between his own love poetry and that of Varius, thereby subtly restating his judgment upon Varius' large-scale works as expressed in lines 27-46. The writer of elegy takes to task the writer of bucolic verse for the tone of apology and deferment toward the major genres. The writer of love themes, though he has chosen a less lofty genre (ut sit minor ore) is in truth the swan whose art is superior (nec ....cessit olor) to that of the writer of major genres whose work lacks refinement and who is the goose among poets (anseris indocto carmine). I propose that according to Propertius, Varius was in reality the 'anser' and Vergil the 'olor' when he dealt with love in the Eclogues. Boucher (art.sup.cit.p.308) is, on the other hand, of the opinion that in lines 61-2, and 65-6 Propertius is implying that Vergil is a greater writer of epic than Varius, though with regard to lines 83-4 he believes, mistakenly in my opinion, that Propertius is simply playing Vergil's 'anser' to Varius' 'olor' - "'anseris (= Propertii par assimilation au Virgile de la neuvième Bucolique, jeune poète personnel et encore peu connu) indocto carmine cessit canorus olor (= Varius)!". I concede that Propertius considers Vergil greater than Varius but my contention that he reverses the comparison in Eclogues 9 calling the pastoral and erotic poet Vergil and also himself the love elegist 'olor' as opposed to Varius who is called 'anser', would lead me to think that Propertius is berating Varius even more by claiming the superiority of his own elegiac work than he is by intimating that Vergil can write better epic. As I have indicated Propertius considers Vergil's love poetry preferable
to his epic, and the consequence of this is that Propertius is better occupied than either Vergil or Varius for he has not abandoned the poetry of love.

This elegy is, as should by now be clear, opening a debate over the relative status of elegy and epic at a time when Vergil had become seriously involved with the most famous Roman epic of all:

'cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai! nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.'
(lines 65-6)

Vergil is writing an epic greater than (maius) the Iliad, and Propertius warns Roman and Greek writers of epic that they are obliged to yield (cedite) to a master of epic who out-classes them. Though Propertian elegy may be thought to be less inspired and lofty (minor ore), it does not yield (nec cessit) to the traditional supremacy of epic which the elegist calls 'indoctum carmen' the cackle of a goose. Just as Propertius had adapted Eclogues 9.35-6, so, as I see it, has he used Eclogues 6.9-11 (sup.cit.) for the purposes of his literary debate. In the prefatory twelve lines of Eclogue 6, Vergil had politely declined to sing the praises of Quintilius Varus, pleading like Callimachus, that he was adhering to the advice of Apollo (Cynthius, line 3). This is our earliest instance of the literary 'recusatio' in Latin verse, and represents the early stage of Vergil's career when the combined erotic and bucolic themes while adhering to Callimachean principles of art. In 2.34.61-80, Propertius sketches the career of Vergil. Lines 61-6 concern the Aeneid, 67-76 the Eclogues, 77-8 the Georgics. Lines 79-80:

'tale facis carmen docta testudine quale Cynthius impositis temperat articulis'

are best taken with 81-4 referring again to the Eclogues. Lines 81-2 are evidently an echo of Eclogues 6.9-10 as we saw above, and since Vergil in lines 3-5 of the same Eclogue narrates the advice
of Cynthius (line 3), I think it is plausible that Propertius in lines 79-82 is reminding him that whereas he has now undertaken epic in writing the Aeneid, there was a time when he would have dismissed the possibility of doing so. Moreover Vergil's earlier work is called 'carmen doctum' or more specifically 'carmen docta testudine' in line 79 and this contrasts with the 'indoctum carmen' of line 84 referring to the tragic epic tradition to which Vergil and Varius (the real 'anser'), unlike Propertius, was willing to defer. When in line 25 Propertius announced that Lynceus had fallen in love at last:

'Lynceus ipse meus seros insanit amores'

- it is possible, though by no means certain, that behind the statement Propertius may be referring to some elegiac work of Varius. Though Boucher quotes this line in conjunction with the notice of Porphyriion on Horace Odes 1.6 which described Varius as 'et epici carminis et tragoediarum et elegiorum auctor, Vergilii contubernalis' he does not conclude that Propertius could be commenting on the fact that Varius was dabbling in elegiac verse at the time of the composition of the elegy, but it would make the comparison of the careers of the two epic poets even more striking, with Vergil turning from bucolico-amatory verse to epic, and Varius taking up amatory verse and putting aside epic. Boucher (art. cit. pp. 320-1) maintains that Propertius deprecates Varius' aptitude for epic poetry for the purpose of enhancing Vergil's worth in this field, but this traditional view that Propertius is complimenting Vergil is not entirely warranted. On my appraisal of the elegy, Propertius is reminding Vergil that he has foregone the Callimachean standards and themes of his earlier work with which as an elegist he had an affinity. The penultimate couplet:
'et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus
mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua'.
(lines 91-2)

- also reminds Vergil that he is turning his back on the neoteric and elegiac tradition symbolised by Gallus whose personality was dominant in the Eclogues, and if we accept the word of Servius, in the Georgics as well. Ultimately, we are no more justified in taking seriously the comparison of Vergil's epic with that of Homer than we are in taking Propertius' words literally when he spoke of the 'Thebaid' of Ponticus as rivalling the genius of Homer in 1.7.1-3. Elegy 2.34 should be recognised as a reaffirmation and defence of the literary worth of elegy in the face of the acclaim with which the Aeneid was greeted.

As I have proposed, in lines 67-76 Propertius approves of Vergil's Eclogues, but apparently only those dealing with erotic themes. By naming Thyrsis (line 68) we are reminded of Eclogues 7 and the amoeban song of Corydon and Thyrsis who alluded to their loves for Galatea and Alexis, Phyllis and Lycidas respectively; Tityrus' lament in Eclogues 1.32 ff. over the cupidity of Galatea, and his more recent love for Amaryllis, is evoked in lines 71-2. Lines 73-4 recall the frustrated love of Corydon for Alexis in Eclogues 2. The ten apples (line 69) used to win over a lover heark back to Eclogues 3.70 and the present of Menalcas to his 'puer'. In lines 75-6 Propertius claims that the Eclogues are popular reading with the 'puellae' of Rome, a further indication that he considered that they owed their merit to the prominence which they gave to amatory matters. As for Vergil's Aeneid, Propertius subtly voices reservations as we have seen and makes no exception to his dislike expressed in the 'recesitiones' for epical subject matter.

Propertius had already given his readers a foretaste of
his feelings about those elements in Vergil's non-erotic works which are concerned with the serious issues of national destiny. In elegy 2.3 Propertius has parodied one of Vergil's most elevated non-erotic pastoral poems, namely the fourth Eclogue. Cognisance of this fact will help to dispel the widely held belief that Propertius was deferring to Vergil's serious epic verse in 2.34. There is a strong soteriological element to be found in both the Georgics and Aeneid; Vergil's hopes that the Roman state would be redeemed were recorded with religious fervour for the first time in Eclogues 4. Propertius, not content to dissociate himself from serious epical themes in his 'recusationes' has little regard for such seriousness in the works of others. A curiously neglected article by Schmidt (Mnemosyne 25 1972 pp.402-7) shows beyond doubt that Propertius is reworking the imagery and diction surrounding the 'saviour' in Eclogues 4 to describe his own adoration of Cynthia. He believes that she is every bit as important as the wonder-child of Vergil's poem. I have tabulated the findings of Schmidt so that they can be readily appreciated. (see overleaf.)
Propertius 2.3

't non tibi nascenti primis, mea vita, diebus candidus argutum sternuit omen Amor?'

(23-4)

'haec tibi contulerunt cælestia munera divi
haec tibi ne matrem forte dedisse putes'  

(25-6)

'non non humani partus sunt talia dona
ista decem menses non peperere bona'  

(27-8)

'gloria Romanis una es tu nata puellis:
Romana accumbes prima puella Iovi
nec semper nobiscum humana cubilia vises'  

(29-31)

'post Helenam haec terris forma secunda reedit'

(32)

Vergil Eclogues 4

'tu modo nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum
desinet ac toto surget gens aurea mundo,
casta fave Lucina'

(8-10)

'At tibi prima, puer, nullo munuscula cultu
errantis hederas passim cum baccaro tellus
mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho'

(18-20)

'matri longa decem tulerunt fastidias menses'

(61)

'incipe, parve puer: qui non risere parenti,
 nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est'

(62-3)

'iam reedit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.'

(6)

Similarities of word and image between Propertius 2.3 and Vergil Eclogues 4 proposed

and discussed by V. Schmidt: 'Virgile et l'apogée de la louange de Cynthie'

The elevation of Cynthia to divine status completes a process which sought to exalt her beginning in 2.1.5-16, in which Propertius praised her unusual qualities and in 2.2.3 and 13-16 where she was compared to Juno and Pallas Athena and Ischomache and he wondered how such beauty could belong to the world of mortals. Propertius has couched her apotheosis in 2.3 in terms used to herald the divine child of the Eclogue. Schmidt was the first to detect the similarities which have yet to be assessed in dealing with the wider problem of Propertius' literary relations with Vergil. The nearest the author comes to such an assessment is when he quotes Solmsen: "La subtile délicatesse avec laquelle Properce réagit à un poème de Virgile, et l'utilise à ses propres fins correspond parfaitement à ce qu'il fit a l'égard de Tibulle et ce n'est pas pour rien que Solmsen écrivait: 'when we are dealing with the relations or rivalries of Augustan poets and with a person of the temperament and the ambitions of a Propertius, it is better not to be innocent' " (56). Propertius borrowed turns of phrase from the works of Horace and this fact seems to have caused the latter annoyance for he guessed what is probably true, that Propertius sought to deflate his work with the intention of inflating the importance of his own elegies. The process can also be observed with respect to elegy 2.3 and the work of Vergil. I would conclude that the supposition that Propertius enjoyed relations with Vergil while being totally estranged from Horace requires strong qualification. I feel that Propertius was always on the periphery of the circle and when he felt unable to make inroads and obtain the advantages which I outlined earlier, his attitude to the poets of Maecenas turned somewhat sour. It was for this reason that he voiced his belief in Callimachean ideals of art in connection with Varius' and Vergil's epic works which violated the canons of Callimachus. Finally the question might be asked why did Propertius need to write yet another
'recusatio' in the following book (3.9) if he had made it abundantly clear that he was out of sympathy with Vergil and Horace, and why had he not cut himself adrift by that time? I will meet this objection on chronological grounds; 2.34 postdates Callus' death in 26 B.C. and is probably the latest elegy of Bk. 2 as its position at the end of the book suggests. Camps fixes the composition of Bk. 3 reasonably between the years 25 and 20 B.C. and consequently it is conceivable that 3.9 was written shortly after 2.34 and was composed during the same period of crisis which caused Propertius to dissociate himself increasingly from Maecenas' sphere of influence.

Propertius' Attitude to Horace

The first three elegies of Bk. 3 are once more concerned with the standing of elegiac verse with regard to the annalistic tradition in Roman poetry and its associated national tone. In 3.1 Propertius proudly claims that he is innovating by tuning the elegiac metre inherited from the Greeks to harmonise with Italian thematic material and that he is an officiant of rites handed down from Callimachus and Philetas:

'Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in vestrum, quaeque, me sinite ire nemus.
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.'
(lines 1-4)

The aggravation which Horace felt on account of the elegist who styled himself 'Callimachus Romanus' must also have been occasioned by this and the subsequent elegy as much as by Propertius' outright claim to the title in 4.1.62-4 which I dealt with above in the context of Epistle 2.2. Propertius clearly intends his verse to be taken seriously for he appropriates for himself the dignified title of 'sacerdos' which Horace had used to describe his function as a lyric
poet involved with national themes in Odes 3.1 which introduces the 'Roman Odes':

'Odi profanum volgus et arceo;
favete linguis: carmina non prius
audita Musarum sacerdos
virginibus puerisque canto'
(lines 1 - 4)

Horace equates the status of the poet with that of a priest in order to give a sanction to the didactic temper of his lyrics which are directed to the first generation of Augustan Romans in their chaste years. Propertius too credits his verse with the ability to instruct the youth of Rome but chastity has no place in his teaching which is devoted to amatory matters:

'me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator,
et prosint illi cognita nostra mala.
tunc me non humilem mirabere saepe poetam,
tunc ego Romanis praeferrar ingenii;
nec poterunt iuvenes nostro reticere sepulcro
"Ardoris nostri magne poeta, iaces"
(1.7.13-14, ibid. 21-4)

Elegy 3.1 introduces Propertius as custodian of the rites associated with a cult of Callimachus and Philetas who represent his 'idols' but in 3.9 he imagines himself the living embodiment of their literary spirit at Rome for he arrogates the homage paid by the benefactors of the teaching derived from his models for himself and so his role transcends that of 'sacerdos':

'haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas,
meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant'
(lines 45-6)

Propertius outdoes Horace at a stroke by claiming divine status for himself, a privilege which the lyricist had reserved for the emperor and spoken of but rarely, for example in Odes 1.2. Both Horace and Vergil, the latter of whom only refers to Augustus as 'divi genus' in the Aeneid, seem to have tempered their statements regarding the emperor's divinity following Augustus' ruling against his own worship
at Rome. (57) Here however, we find Propertius calling himself a

 god while at the same time refusing to write verse which would be
 considered 'utile' in a social sense. Coming as the couplet does
 in the context of a 'recusatio' addressed to Maecenas it is Propertius' 
 way of saying that he does not intend to treat themes outlined in
 lines 47-60 for the benefit of the establishment as Horace was doing
 but to outdo him in a different way. Salvatore D'Elia (A. F.L.N. 2
 1952 pp.45-7) after carrying out an exhaustive study of the
 similarities between the two poets' work concludes that emulation
 and not imitation was the purpose of Propertius: "Properzio cioe non vuole
 imitare Orazio ma emularlo, come dimostra anche il fatto che espressione
 virgiliane sono riportate quasi 'ad litteram', mentre quelle oraziane
 vengono amplificate e mutate, servono cioe soprattutto da spunto"
 (art.cit. p.69); Propertius was not content simply to use Horatian
 diction in straightforward fashion, which was his approach to Vergil,
 but to beat him at his own game. Rivalry within a group of friends
 is not a healthy sign. Propertius must have been aware of the effect
 that his practice of 'capping' Horace's verse would have upon his
 relationship with the poet; I do not feel that he was being perverse
 without cause, enduring as he did the provocation of one who had no
 sympathy for amatory elegy as I sought to demonstrate early in this
 chapter. The echoes of Horace in Propertius are too numerous to
 discuss and before any conclusion can be drawn we must take into
 account the much wider issues of the society in which both poets lived,
 which will come within the scope of my work as a whole. Here I will
 conclude by pointing out that Propertius 3.1.1-4 echoes Horace Odes
 3.1.1-4 in that both poets claim that they are innovating and that
 they have a priestly responsibility towards their art. Elegies 3.2
 and 3.9 appear to contain a response to Horace's claims for his verse
 in the final ode of Bk. 3. In the elegy (3.2) and Ode (3.30), the
poets state that their verse will outlast the pyramids, but Propertius goes further in prophesying that his will survive the temple of Jove at Elis and the Mausoleum. Horace has raised a 'monumentum' to his poetic talent. Propertius too claims that his elegies are 'monumenta' though not simply to his own literary endeavour, but the 'puella' who inspired his song:

'Fortunata, meo si qua es celebreta libello!
carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae.'
(3.2.17-18)

His achievement is won independently and is not connected with Rome's institutions. Horace's greatness depends on and is allied with the continuity of Roman practices: 'usque ego posteras / crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium / scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex' (lines 7-9). The examples of Propertian echoes of Horace given above serve to show that the elegist thought that his work should receive equally serious attention. The transference of imagery from Horace as well as being an attempt to enhance the status of elegy can be interpreted as being part of a process of widening the scope of the 'recusatio'; the differences between the poetry of the lyricist and elegist is rendered more acute when the terminology and imagery associated with the former is rehabilitated to the latter.

The penultimate section of this chapter seeks to discover the motive behind Ovid's adaptation of the 'recusatio' in the Amores and his appropriation of Horatian imagery.

Ovid and Artistic Emancipation

We have seen how Propertius took his work seriously and was unwilling to abandon it at the bidding of Maecenas. In writing amatory elegy the poet could successfully ignore the realities of the new order and for this reason the genre no doubt recommended itself
to Tibullus and Propertius as it was destined to do for Ovid when he began his poetic career with the 'Amores'. His subsequent works, the Heroides, Ars Amatoria, Medicamina Faciei and the Remedia Amoris show a continuing preoccupation with erotic themes as was in all likelihood the case with his lost tragedy 'Medea'. In composing this dramatic work he must have satisfied a personal impulse to try his hand at something more adventurous. His experiment in this respect is in direct contrast with the career of Propertius who found himself instigated to compose more adventurous verse of a heroic nature which was not in keeping with his personal tastes. In Amores 3.1 Tragoedia bids Ovid commence work upon a tragedy, but the poet requests that he may postpone the task. By couching his description of the encounter with Tragoedia in language reminiscent of the 'recusatio' for epical poetry, and by casting her in the 'persona' of a patron directing the poet to more serious efforts, Ovid recalls the dilemma which Propertius faced. Ovid was free from pressure, such as had been placed upon his predecessor, to write panegyric poetry, and the effect of the poem is to show how Ovid actually possessed the sort of independence as an elegist that Propertius had longed for but could not entirely afford. Personal literary ambitions constituted the pressure working upon Ovid who in this poem shows how far removed he was from the conventions of court poetry, for as will be seen he touches upon the wider subject of the poet's role in society.

It is generally thought that in Amores 3.1 Ovid is casting into dramatic form, in straightforward fashion an altercation between a personified Tragedy and Elegy. I wish to examine some inconsistencies which I feel complicate such an interpretation and which when understood, clarify Ovid's motive for writing the poem. At first sight, the apparent inconsistencies might lead us to
question whether Ovid meant us to understand 'tragedy' in the narrow sense of the word, or the elevated style in general including even martial epic. The latter view would place the elegy directly in the tradition of the elegiac genre which often contrasts the writing of elegy with that of epic. However, for certain reasons that will become evident, Ovid's elegy is a modification of a tradition which borrows elements from the literary type which dealt with the antithesis between minor verse and epic. I shall attempt to demonstrate that Ovid employs epic diction in conjunction with Tragoedia, the overall effect being to parody the normal 'recusatio' which apologises for failure to write epic. Ovid's adaptation of the 'recusatio' for epic has the force of a protest against the tradition which conceded that epic was the most elevated and serious of all forms of poetic composition. Above all, Ovid demonstrates that he is independent of the system of patronage which prompted the 'recusatio' in the work of Propertius, and by personifying the claims of his own literary ambition for the future in the character of Tragoedia (who must represent his as yet unrealised wish to write the lost tragedy 'Medea'), he contrasts his own career with that of his predecessor. In doing this he recognised that the concession had not been sincerely meant but had been borne in a spirit of diplomatic deference to the wishes of a patron. Ovid appropriates the lofty phrases associated with epic in order to enhance the importance of tragedy, the composition of which he contemplates undertaking in the future, and in so doing he diminishes the importance, in his own estimation, of the epic as a vehicle of panegyric as his predecessors and contemporaries had considered it. For Ovid, the most solemn and dignified genre is tragedy:

'Omne genus scripti gravitate tragoedia vincit'

(Trist. 2.381)

However, when Propertius contemplates rising to an occasion he thinks
in terms of epic and its associated panegyric elements. Noteworthy in this respect is the 'recusatio' of Propertius, 2.1, where even if he were to undertake the writing of epic he would reject alternative subjects for that genre and concentrate on the achievements of Augustus - 'bella resque tui memorarem Caesaris' (2.1.17-26) - and in 2.10 which as we saw earlier was in fact a 'recusatio' he again contemplates a 'magnus opus' or more specifically a 'magni oris opus' (line 12) dealing with 'tumultus' (line 7), 'bella' (line 8) and 'basta' (lines 4 and 19) with Augustus as the subject of the epic. So far from bestowing praises upon a living person, the thought behind Ovid's contemplation of tragedy is rather the hope of fulfilling his personal ambitions and bringing renown to Tragedy as a genre. If praise is to be conferred, it will not be upon a patron or his friends. Tragedy will be the recipient of any praise that is to be awarded: 'nunc habeam per te Romana Tragoedia nomen' (line 19) and she effectively assumes the role of a patron who seeks to elicit such praise. I will now investigate the epic overtones of Ovid's description of Tragoedia. The garb of Tragoedia, in particular the 'cothurnus', might be regarded as an exclusive reference to the tragic genre. However, by Martial's day, the 'cothurnus' had become associated with epic - 'grande opus', specifically the Aeneid of Vergil:

'ad Capitolini caelestia carminu bell
grande coturnati pone Meronis opus'
(Martial, 5.7-8)

Now the final line of Ovid 3.1 reads:

'...dum vacat; a tergo grandius urget opus
(line 70)

Ovid thus refers to his tragedy as 'grande opus', a phrase usually referring to epic, for instance Propertius has 'magni nunc erit oris
opus' in the 'recusatio' referred to above (2.10.12) and Ovid may intend us to recall this as well as such expressions as 'parvus in ore sonus' meaning a lack of epic inspiration (Prop. 4.1.58) when in line 64 he writes:

'iam nunc contacto magnus in ore sonus'

Moreover Ovid uses the words 'maius opus' in describing tragedy:

'cessatum satis est - incipe maius opus'

(line 24)

We are meant surely, to recall the Aeneid Bk. 7, the invocation to the Muse before Vergil embarks upon martial epic proper:

'....maior mihi rerum nascitur ordo
maius opus moveo'

(Aen. 7.44-5)

Tragoedia in 3.1 is described as holding the 'sceptrum regale'. Now in Lucretius' poetry the epic poet par excellence, Homer, holds the sceptre:

'adde Heliconiadum comites, quorum unus Homerus
sceptrum potitus eadem aliiis sopitu quietest'

(luc. 3.1037-8)

In addition, the Palatine Anthology reveals a phrase \( \Sigma \kappa \pi \tau \rho \omicron' \omicron \nu \pi \eta \rho \sigma \) (Anth. Pal. 7.409.6). Next for consideration is the 'thyrsus' which again is normally held to be a reference to tragedy. Lucretius mentions the thyrsus in connection with the Pieridean Muses and his hopes for poetic fame through his successful use of hexameter, the epic metre:

'percussit thyrso laudis spes magna meum cor....'

(luc. 1.921)

So far, the argument from Tragoedia's dress which would affirm that Ovid seeks only to evoke the tragic genre is open to doubt. The tension in the conventional elegiac 'recusatio' is normally between
a demand to write epic and the desire to continue writing elegy,
and since there is no Muse exclusively associated with the composition
of epic whose 'uniform' could be easily recognised and used to comic
advantage by Ovid, one might be excused for believing that he means
us to think of epic as the relevant genre and that he chose Tragoedia
because she represented the highest style of poetic composition.
Such an interpretation would be false, yet the ambiguity might easily
lead one astray. As for the difficulty in assigning a particular
Muse to the process of epic composition, the Muse Calliope, often
considered the Muse of epic, is sometimes the Muse of lyric (Odes
3.4.1 f.), or of amatory poetry (Ovid Tristia 2,568) and rural poetry
(Columella R.R.10.225), and in Propertius 3.3.37 ff. she advises the
poet not to involve himself with this genre. It is Erato (in-
appropriate one might think) whom Vergil invokes when he is about to
undertake martial epic in the latter half of the Aeneid. Indeed, as
Williams points out (The Third Book of Horace's Odes) "There were
nine Muses but it was long after Horace's time that each was assigned
a particular branch of literature." (p.50). Did Ovid realise that a
certain amount of ambiguity might be inherent in his description of
Tragedy and especially in the directives which I will consider next?
Such ambiguity would immediately bring to mind the 'recusatio' for
epic and serve to emphasise Ovid's revolt from the convention which
he had already parodied in Amores 1.1. Deliberately ambiguous must
be Tragoedia's command that Ovid sing of the deeds of men,'cane
facta virorum', that is κανένα νυμφαίον, a manifest subject of epic. The
uses of the verb 'cano' in the context of epical panegyric are too
numerous to mention, in Latin literature. (58) Possibly the most
famous use of the verb in this sense, refers to epic, namely, 'arma
virumque cano' at the opening of the Aeneid. Propertius uses the
verb 'cano' with regard to epic in the 'recusatio' 3.9:

'te duce vel Iovis arma canam caeloque minantem...' (3.9.47)

Propertius has been talking of the subject for an imaginary epic and it is the achievements through 'arma' that would be the subject of any epic he might write. Returning to the Ovidian elegy which we are considering, there appears to be an allusion to the inspiration associated with the epic ἀουδός precluding the activity and motivation of the μοιητίς of tragic composition:

implibit leges spiritus iste meas

An example of 'spiritus' referring to divine epic inspiration is to be found in Cicero, Pro Archia 8.18 - 'poetam quasi divino quodam spiritu inflari'. Next I shall try to show that Ovid saw the distinction between the serious poetry of commitment in which the poet is called 'vates', and the poetry of personal fulfilment with out obligations to a patron or the community. This distinction is observed by Propertius (see for example 2.10.19-20) but is made more acute by Ovid in Amores 1.1 and 3.1. In 3.1.19 Ovid calls himself 'vates' (as he will do so again in line 67):

'saepe aliquis digito vatem designat suntam
atque ait "hic, hic est quem ferus urit Amor"'

I note (59) that the same sort of imagery is found in Horace with a similar use of vocabulary:

'totum muneris hoc tui est
quod monstror digito praeteruntium
Romanae fidicen lyrae'

(Odes. 4.3.21-3)

In lines 14 - 15 of this same Horatian Ode the poet thought of himself as 'vates':

'dignatur suboles inter amabilis vatum ponere me choros'

In both the Ovidian and Horatian quotations the poet is a 'vates'
whom the public points in either censure or acclaim. Horace is pleased to be pointed out as a poet who sings of facta virorum, for he imagines himself as a sort of Roman Pindar (the Ode is heavy with Pindaric imagery,) singing to the community concerning the accomplishments of men, and with this as his theme Horace wins public approval for satisfying their expectations of the vatic role. Because Ovid is writing of love while society expects him to be a true 'vates', he gains its disapproval. I shall have more to say about Ovid's use of the word 'vates' when I compare Amores 1.1 with 3.1.

3.1 draws the contrast between the elegiac genre, undertaken in youth for one's own amusement, 'lusit tua Musa' (line 27) 'iuventa' (line 28) 'cessatum satis est' (line 24), and tragedy, and not as we were led to believe through our knowledge of elegy, the epic genre. Herein lies the basis of Ovid's originality in his adaptation of the elegiac 'recusatio' for epic. Propertius looking to the future when he envisages giving up elegy and committing himself to singing Augustus' praises, calls himself 'vates':

'haec ego castra sequar; vates tua castra canendo
magnus ero: servent hunc mihi fata diem!'
(2.10. 19-20)

but this will only be feasible once his youth is spent. The idea of graduating to more serious work after one's youth has been spent in writing elegy is a common feature of the elegiac 'recusatio'. Again, in this Propertian elegy the poet writes 'setas prima canat Veneres, extrema tumultus' (line 7). Ovid makes no mention of graduating to write the sort of panegyrical epic that Propertius envisages, nor does he seek to excuse a reluctance to do so. Nevertheless, in Ovid's very first elegy, we learn that he had attempted martial epic:

'Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam
edere, materia conveniente modis'
(1.1. 1-2)
The elegy is adhering in main part to the tradition stemming from Callimachus where the poet is warned not to undertake a 'magnum opus', namely narrative epic. Ovid innovates with 'Amor' taking over the role of Apollo. In 3.1 Ovid innovates once more by having Tragoedia assume the 'persona' of a patron. Gods in 'recusationes' direct poets away from large works in the grand manner, towards more Alexandrian models, smaller works. Patrons direct them to larger more 'noble' efforts, and to this extent it is true that Tragoedia has more in common with a patron than with a divine agent such as 'Amor', who true to the tradition of elegy and smaller works such as Vergil's Eclogues, points the way to a style which is more 'tenuis - λεπτός'. Both 1.1 and 3.1 are linked together by a stylistic device which shows a little more clearly Ovid's attitude to the concept of 'vates' to which I said I would return.

In line 6 of 1.1 Ovid called himself 'vates' in his reply to Amor:

'Pieridum vates, non tua turba sumus'

In the same elegy at line 24, 'Amor' sarcastically repeats Ovid's protestation of vatic status by virtue of his being about to write epic:

'quod' que "canas, vates accipe" dixit "opus!"'

The same device is, I feel, at work in 3.1 where the situation is thrown into reverse and the poet sarcastically reiterates Tragoedia's use of the word 'vates' which she had employed in describing Ovid, for in line 19 she attributes this title to him.

'saepe aliquis digito vatem designat euntem'

In line 67 Ovid repeats the word when addressing Tragoedia:

'exiguum vati concede Tragoedia tempus'

In 1.1, 'Amor' quoted Ovid. In 3.1 Ovid quotes Tragoedia. The
similarity is interesting for it shows that Ovid realised that the word 'vates' was to be associated with something more serious, martial epic in 1.1 and tragedy in 3.1. (cf. Vergil Aen. 7.41 'tu vatem, tu, diva mone', where Vergil invokes Erato as he is about to commence martial epic and at this crucial point refers to himself as 'vates'). Ovid must have known the value which the term held for Vergil and Horace who had aligned themselves with the establishment. What could be more characteristic than for Ovid to use the term mockingly in each of these 'recusationes' neither of which is truly apologetic but rather humourously defiant. 3.1 is not simply a contest between elegy and tragedy. It is a tripartite struggle between elegy, tragedy and epic. Elegy and tragedy represent the poet's personal literary ambitions - the struggle to fulfil these ambitions will be resolved in time and lines 24, 28 and 67 emphasise this temporal aspect. Tragoedia's use of epic diction reminds us that there is another claimant, but an external one, for the poet's talent - the establishment with its system of patronage, and indeed the words of Tragoedia could easily be those of Maecenas encouraging Vergil to write the Aeneid or Propertius to apply his talent as an elegist in a similar direction.

I suspect that Ovid felt that Propertius, being under pressure from official quarters had set an apologetic tone in his 'recusationes' and thereby compromised his dislike of epic inherited from the neoterics.
In Augustan verse, the word which we occasionally meet for poet is not simply 'poeta' but 'vates'. The rehabilitation of the term in the work of Vergil after it had been discredited by Ennius and Lucretius and its subsequent reappearance in Horace and the other Augustan poets has been the subject of exhaustive study by Newman (The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry). He has described the nature of this process as "Alexandrian technique in the service of national civic poetry. Here is the essence of that Augustan experiment which was conceived in the mind of a young man with a rustic air from Mantua, and ended beneath the flashing rapier of Ovid's wit" (p.12). The practice was probably encouraged by Augustus himself; the pronouncements of Vergil and Horace upon aspects of the emperor's social reforms would carry greater conviction if they were delivered in quasi-religious tones imparting to them an almost oracular incontrovertibility.  

Newman's appraisal of the use of the term 'vates' in Vergil and Horace leaves little to which exception can be taken. I am not however, entirely convinced by his approach to the problem in the elegists, in
particular Propertius. I am, for example, wary of the following statements: "Propertius was willing to take up the new ideas but he did not really understand them" (p.86) and "He has accepted the theory that poets have a new dignity more reminiscent of the great days of Greece than of Alexandria, but he has failed to grasp that this dignity carries with it any particular social responsibility, and he is using the 'vates' concept along with references to Callimachus and Philitas as if it were merely part of the Alexandrian apparatus." (p.89). Pride in his 'ingenium' is the reason which Newman adduces for Propertius' apparent inability to appreciate the concept as a whole, this being a way of increasing his importance as a poet (ibid.). The author nevertheless, seems to gainsay this to a certain extent when he claims that even if the poet did not understand it properly he was not guilty of using the terms indiscriminately in 2.17 for example: "it seems impossible to follow those scholars who see in 'vates' at 2.17.3 the meaning 'poet'.... It would be impossible in the context of Book 2, after the meaning given to 'vates magnus' in the tenth elegy, to make 'vates' here refer to the writer of love elegy." (p.86). Yet as I shall endeavour to show, Propertius was capable, just like the other elegists, of using the term in a personal context which applied to himself as a writer of amatory verse. If we believe that he was attempting to make a serious contribution in his own way to the writing of national verse then we should have to confess that he was applying the terminology promiscuously in a way suggestive of a lack of comprehension as to the acceptable limits within which it ought to have been exercised. I believe that the elegists were quite aware of the value of the concept for Vergil and Horace and that they consciously borrowed vatic imagery for two major reasons. I think that they resented the inherent suggestion in vatic poetry that it somehow had a greater claim to be considered
serious literature; elegiac borrowings from the concept seek to invest the genre with an acceptability as verse in its own right. Moreover, being socially and politically unsympathetic on the whole to the new order, they were motivated to register their dissent over the literary school of thought which worked in its favour and developed the concept. In both cases there is to be found a strong element of parody which is found at its most extreme in Ovid who exaggerated the feature. As we shall see, they debunked one notable aspect of the concept in particular namely that of divine inspiration. As Palatine Apollo became a central figure for the 'vates', I propose first of all to assess the Propertian attitude to the god.

In Odes 1.31, Horace celebrates the opening of the new Palatine temple and confronts us with a picture of the poet-priest pouring libations to his patron god Apollo: 'Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem/vates? quid orat de patera novum/fundens liquorem' (lines 1-3) and later in Odes Bk. 4 he tells us how both his inspiration and technical ability as a poet depend upon the deity (cf. 'spiritus' and 'ars' line 29). It is in this Ode that he calls himself 'vates Horatius' (line 44) and looks forward to the day when the chorus of youths and maidens will sing his 'Carmen Saeculare' commissioned to be performed at the festival which Augustus held to mark the new era of prosperity which his reign had ushered in (cf. also A.P. 132-3 where he retrospectively calls himself 'vates' as the author of the hymn). Statements in Propertius' elegies on the other hand reveal that his relationship with the divinity was of a different order. In 2.31 he also refers to the new temple recently opened by the emperor: 'Quaeris, cur veniam tibi tardior? aurea Phoebi/porticus a magno Caesare aperta fuit' (lines 1-2). The elegy however is not concerned with Apollo as a patron of poets, but solely with his
appearance as represented, it seems, by Skopas' famous statue of Apollo Kitharoidos which was housed in the temple, and the lavish ornament of the edifice.\(^{(62)}\) If this was intended to be an essay by Propertius into the realm of verse meant to publicise, in a spirit of gratitude, an aspect of Augustus' peace-time undertakings, then it can hardly be credited with alluding to the wider significance of Augustus' intentions in honouring Apollo in this way. Propertius was fully aware of the reasons behind the god's recent elevation in the Roman pantheon as elegy 4.6 amply demonstrates. In my next chapter Propertius will be seen to treat the battle of Actium, Augustus and Apollo in a humourous vein, and not to have abandoned his scepticism of the earlier books toward the new Apollo which the emperor sought to create. Beyond Propertius' ignoring the implications of the foundation of the temple in 28 B.C. there are more substantial reasons for maintaining that the poet did not intend that elegy 2.31 should be seen as a poem detached and unrelated to his views expressed elsewhere. An article by Nethercut (T.A.P.A. \textbf{102} 1974) explains briefly (p.415) how 2.31 is not such an isolated elegy. Observing how Propertius often places elegies side by side intending them to be appraised as a pair, he proposes that 2.30 and 2.31 fall into this category.\(^{(63)}\) In the former, Propertius invites Cynthia to live with him on the slopes of Helicon where they will be accompanied by the Muses into whose order she will be received (line 37). This is, of course, Propertius' way of saying that Cynthia is the inspirer of his song which he states more explicitly in the closing line: 'nam sine te nostrum non valet ingenium' (line 40). Nethercut reminds us that this harks back to what Propertius said in 2.1:

\begin{quote}
'Non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo. Ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.'
\end{quote}

(lines 3-4)

- where Propertius denies that Apollo is the source of his inspiration.
This should suffice to alert us as to whether 2.30, in which he maintains that it is from Cynthia that he derives poetic inspiration, and which refers us back to his earlier rebuff of Apollo, appears by accident or design next to 2.31 which deals with the god. A further clue that their positioning is deliberate is to be found in the fact that 2.31 is also linked with 2.1: only three elegies have as their initial word a form of the verb 'quaereo'. Apart from 3.13 the only other incidences are to be found in 2.1 and 2.31 with 'quaeritis' and 'quaeris' respectively, and thus in reading 2.31 and 2.30 we are inevitably drawn back to 2.1 in both cases, as though the poet would have us remember that he does not owe his inspiration to Apollo, or as Nethercut puts it: "With Propertius' rejection of Apollo (in 2.1) thus fresh in our minds, we find him paying only passing service to the god's temple in 2.31. For Propertius, the important religious participation has already taken place in 2.30." (loc. cit.)

We can now better appreciate that Propertius is dispensing with the idea of a divine source of inspiration for his verse; the practice of invoking the heavenly Muses and Apollo was being resurrected in all its glory by poets wishing to honour the epic achievements of Augustus. Propertius, as we saw earlier (64) feigned a willingness to eulogise the exploits of Augustus in 2.10: 'vates tua castra canendo/magnus ero' (lines 19-20) using the key-word for the poet divinely inspired to perform such a task (cf. Musa, line 10, Pierides, line 12), and we have just observed how in 2.1 his 'puella' and not Apollo affords him inspiration. His awareness of this alternative of vatic composition lauding heroic feats allows him to make the amusing comment in 2.1 that amatory encounters with his 'puella' inspire him to write about heroic exploits of quite a different kind: 'seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu,/ tum vero
longas condimus Iliadas' (lines 13-14). Bearing this in mind, Newman's view that 'vates' in 2.17 cannot mean a poet, disregards the evidence that Propertius describes his personal poetry in terms of epic and eulogistic verse in general. His 'puella' is his Muse and theme, hence when he says 'horum ego sum vates, quotiens desertus amaras/explevi noctes, fractus utroque toro.' (2.17.3), he is stating that the trials and tribulations of love make him a poet.

In fact I shall be dealing below with the same notion in Tibullus who was most likely influenced by this development in Propertius. Ovid, as I have largely substantiated, made mock of the 'vates' called upon to praise the 'facta virorum' and also used it with reference to the writing of amatory elegy, and thus plays with a feature to be found in the work of his predecessors, about which I will have more to say below. Propertius uses the term scornfully in an erotic context in elegy 2.4: 'nam cui non ego sum fallaci praemia vati?' (line 15). On its usage here, Newman comments: "the adjective reminds us of the Ennian and Lucretian view of vates." (p.85), without drawing a conclusion, but seeing that Ennius had levelled criticism against 'vates' for their rapaciousness and chicanery and Lucretius denounced them for conjuring up false fears, (66) it could be said with reason that in speaking of himself as a source of profit (praemia) to the deceitful seer (fallaci) Propertius is renewing, in his own way, the attack which they had launched; at the least he is using 'vates' in a perjorative sense, and must have done so conscious that he was devaluing a word which was assuming greater importance in the verse of genuine supporters of the emperor. In Bk. 4 he uses it in elegy 6, lines 1 and 10, but in my next chapter I will demonstrate that the aition of the Palatine temple of Apollo is quite the reverse of a sincere incursion into patriotic verse and hence the religious
solemnity with which the topic is announced can be regarded as 'mock vatic'. The jocose spirit in which the whole poem was conceived prevents our attaching much importance to Propertius' pose as a 'vates' performing 'sacra' except as an amusing travesty of the conventions and intentions of serious vatic composition. Because of the reference to Callimachus and Philetas in lines 3-4 it is most likely that the 'sacra' of line 1 are of the same order as those spoken of in the first line of 3.1 which are also linked with the names of the poets of Cyrene and Cos, and just as in the later elegy Propertius styles himself a 'vates', so in the earlier composition he had given himself the title 'sacerdos' (3.1.3). The hieratic imagery of 3.1 is, however, applicable to his amatory verse which has scored a poetic triumph (line 11) and not to the sort of poetry in connection with which Horace had called himself 'sacerdos' in the poem which prefaces some of his most patriotic work (Odes 3.1.3). Propertius uses the device as a way of exalting his standing as an elegist and of claiming for his chosen genre recognition as a branch of poetry to be taken just as seriously as national epic and lyric. Moreover, since he is critical of the social and political order of his day throughout the elegies and particularly in 4.6 which features Apollo of the Palatine whose new cult promoted the 'vates' concept, I believe that his use of the device is a way of voicing his fundamental disregard for serious national verse, for it is utilised either in erotic contexts which are negligent of such serious issues or in a context such as we find in 4.6 where he indulges both in mockery and political criticism. In short, it is a method of taking issue with verse of a national character. Tibullus' second collection of elegies reveals that he has made an acquaintance with the concept which is not evident in the
earlier elegies. It is a prominent feature of 2.5, the background of which is an event which took place towards the end of the poet's life and which he celebrates in verse after the publication of Bk. 2 and probably about the same time as the publication of Bk. 3 of Propertius' elegies which we may assign to the years 25 and 22 B.C. respectively. (69) Propertius then, would appear to have influenced Tibullus in this direction rather than vice versa, and the scepticism of the former may have operated upon the latter who is likewise not uncritical in his attitude towards the role of the poet as a priest-like spokesman on national issues. Tibullus must have shared a feeling similar to that which led Propertius to berate this poetic fiction.

An important passage is found in 2.5:

'usque cano Nemesim, sine qua versus mihi nullus
verba potest iustos aut reperire pedes.
at tu, nam divum servat tutela poetas,
praemoneo, vati parce, puella, sacro
ut Messalinum celebrem, cum praemia belli
ante suos currus oppida victa feret,
ipse gerens laurus....'  (lines 111-17)

The first couplet is reminiscent of those expressions in Propertius which assert that his 'puella' sustains his 'ingenium' (2.1.3-4, 13-14; 2.30.40, see above, cf. also 2.17.3) and those found later in Ovid (2.17.34; 3.12.16). I do not share the opinion of Newman (p.98) that the 'poeta' and 'vates' of lines 13-14 are distinct from one another in meaning, with the former referring to the writing of poetry in general (the implication being that 'poeta' describes Tibullus in his capacity as a love poet), and the latter to such verse as he might write in the future about Messalinus, that is, vatic poetry in the sense that we have been discussing it. There are factors which complicate such a cut and dry assessment of the usage of the words in this elegy. Within the Sibyl's speech there are elegiac elements which undercut the solemnity of her prophecy, and there is an overall
contrast between Apollo's 'vates' the Sibyl, and Nemesis' 'vates' Tibullus. In line 63 the Sibyl declares 'vera cano', and when she has finished her speech Tibullus writes in line 65 'haec cecinit vates'. I notice that the verb is employed elsewhere in the elegy only in line 111 (sup. cit.) when Tibullus describes Nemesis as the theme of his verse: 'usque cano Nemesis', and just as the verb appears alongside 'vates' in line 65 I feel that he is using it again in connection with 'vates' in line 114. Before dealing with the elegists, Newman argued that 'cano' was "the appropriate word for a vates" (p. 28) but does not understand Tibullus to be using 'vates' in anything other than a non-erotic context: "It seems quite clear that a distinction is to be drawn between the initial poetae meaning 'poets in general' and vates sacer, whose special task it is to sing of victory in war" (p. 98). Tibullus, in my opinion, is saying that just as the Sibyl was the 'vates' of Apollo, so he is the 'vates' of another archer-god, Amor-Cupido (cf. lines 105-10) which is another way of stating that his passion for Nemesis is the motivating power behind his verse, a point made more explicitly in lines 111-12. Another indication that 'poeta' is being used synonomously for 'vates' is that it occurs in a heavily spondaic line (āt tū, nām dīvīm sērvāt tūtēlā poētās) appropriate for conveying a sense of the numinous attaching to the persona of the poet as priest. As a 'sacer vates' writing amatory poetry Tibullus has much in common with Propertius; both sought to elevate the status of the love elegist, the most extreme example of which is to be found in Propertius:

'haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas,
meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant.'

(3.9.45-6)

Here Propertius hopes for an apotheosis of the amatory elegist and the enjoyment of 'sacra' performed by the grateful beneficiaries of
of his writings, and earlier at 1.7.21-4 he foresaw the day after his death when he would be revered by the youth of Rome:

' tum me non humilem mirabere saepe poetam,
tunc ego Romanis praeferar ingenii;
nec poterunt iuvenes nostro reticere sepulcro
'Ardoris nostri magne poetae, iaces.' ''

In similar fashion Tibullus, looking to his old age, contemplates a following of youths to escort him who are desirous of learning from one who has access to the lore of the goddess Venus:

' tempus erit, cum me Veneris praecepta ferentem
deducat iuvenum sedula turba senem.'

(1.4.79-80)

For their peculiar insight into matters of the heart and their ability to offer advice, the elegists regard themselves as possessing an almost divine power. The divine authority which Horace felt when speaking as 'sacerdos' tendering advice 'virginibus puerisque' in Odes 3.1 was socially protreptic in that he was advocating restraint at a time when sexual 'mores' were particularly lax (see Odes 3.6.17-44). Elegy is didactic in the other direction and it is this aspect of the genre that I will subject to scrutiny in my final chapter. At this stage I wish solely to suggest that the elegists, by using vatic terminology, sought to give weight to their views on the importance of 'amor' on a personal and social level. For a 'praebetor amoris' to give himself such sacerdotal airs must have seemed perverse to those who had helped to evolve the concept of 'vates' for political and moral edification. When Ovid referred to Tibullus as 'sacer vates' (Amores 3.9.41) the distinction between these opposing approaches to the concept was not lost on him as Newman asserts (p.103). It is only if we fail to appreciate that the elegists adapted the concept for a different purpose that we can accuse them of a lack of understanding of the original idea behind its development. In elegy 2.10 Propertius had associated 'vates
magnus' with 'castra' (lines 19-20) that is the martial exploits of Augustus; it is with 'castra' that Macer is preoccupied in elegy 2.6 when Tibullus wonders whether 'Amor' grants a respite to those who involve themselves in this way, for if he does, the poet will also seek 'castra'. The behaviour of his 'puella' however, dashes any hope of this sort:

\begin{quote}
'magna loquor, sed magnifice mihi locuto
excutiunt clausae fortia verba fores'
\end{quote}

This situation in which the 'amator' finds himself locked outside the door of his 'puella' is to be found again in Ovid:

\begin{quote}
'ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos
ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores'
\end{quote}

Again the poet is subject to the whims of his beloved and this makes nonsense of Ovid's grandiloquent statement in the hexameter of the exalted station of himself as a poet. Likewise, in using 'magna' and 'magnifice' Tibullus may be thinking of the grand sort of poetry which deals with 'castra'. Indeed, it is highly probable that the Macer whom Tibullus mentions in this elegy is to be identified with the writer of martial epic styled as a 'vates' by Ovid: 'nec tibi, qua tutum vati, Macer, arma canenti/aureus in medio Marte tacetur Amor' (2.18.35-6). I suggest that there is thus a case for interpreting this Tibullan couplet in a literary sense. One thinks immediately of the contrast in Propertius between his own amatory verse and the epic of Ponticus (1.7; 1.9) and Lyceus (2.34), and Tibullus could be doing something not dissimilar. The Ovidian couplet can be seen as exploiting the tension found in the work of his predecessors between these polarised genres. The pentameter in the quotation from Tibullus mocks the pretensions of an essay into the realm of vatic verse and also ridicules his plan of turning to
'castra' as a 'remedia amoris'. Following Brink on Horace Satires 1.4.43-4 Newman maintains that 'magnus' began to be applied to the tenor of vatic composition and that it is this significance of the word to which Propertius is responding in 2.10. (pp. 43-4). In turning later to the Tibullan couplet quoted above he is led to comment: "Whether he would ever have found the role of vates in the strict sense congenial we may take leave to doubt. A couplet in the concluding elegy of this book ((viz. 2.6.11-12 sup.cit. )) seems an adequate summary of the probabilities." (p. 98) The answer surely resides in the fact that Tibullus never seriously toyed with the idea of becoming a 'vates' in the true sense of the word. We are dealing with a species of parody and not with a lack of insight into the tenor and proper application of a concept. It is to credit the elegists with little intelligence to say of Ovid for instance, who carried this trend to the point of travesty, "how completely the meaning of the word vates had in the last analysis eluded the self-styled purus Phoebi sacerdos " and how "he never grew up". (Newman, p. 103). In directing my attention away from Tibullus to Ovid, I would remind the reader that the humour and irony of Tibullus 2.5, which will have a retrospective bearing upon the poet's attitude to 'vaticana' is the subject of deeper investigation in my third chapter. (76)

In Amores 1.1 Ovid introduces us to himself as a 'vates', in the normal sense of the word (lines 6 and 24), who had been a writer of heroic hexameter epic (lines 1-3) but who now finds that his efforts in this field are being thwarted by 'Cupido'. In the previous section of this chapter I indicated that Ovid thereby attributed to the god the function of Apollo in the 'recusatio' who advises against the composition of epic and inflated vatic poetry.
It is essentially a humorous innovation and serves to announce the programme of the 'Amores' in so far as we know that we will be following the amatory experiences of an apostate and profligate 'vates'. Line 26: 'Uror, et in vacuo pectore regnat Amor.' is echoed later in elegy 3.1 when Tragoedia reminds Ovid the 'vates' (line 19) that his behaviour has aroused censure, and she quotes the words of a typical critic: 'hic, hic est, quem ferus urit Amor (line 20). By reducing the status of the 'vates' to a poet of 'amor' he is surely exhibiting another instance of the 'nequitia' upon which he prides himself.

Dipsas the 'lena' contemptuously calls Ovid 'i s t e v a t e s' (1.7.57) whose love poetry is no substitute for material gifts. Her advice to the poet's beloved that one who parts with his wealth to secure her affection is to be esteemed more highly than Homer ( qui dabit, ille tibi magno sit maior Homero. line 61) does not necessarily rule out poets as potential suitors. I suspect that Ovid may be crediting her with the antique view of the 'vates' as a bard who receives rewards for writing verse to order, and such a poet would be a suitable customer. He replies, in my view, to this criterion of poetic merit when in 2.1 he maintains that it would be profitless for him to be a poet of the Homeric school (lines 29-32) and then says:

'ad vatem, pretium carminis, ipsa venit.
magna datur merces; heroum clara valete
nomina; non apta est gratia vestra mihi!' 
(lines 34-6)

His experiment with an epical gigantomachy was upset by the conduct of his 'amica' (lines 11-18), and in the passage quoted above he abandons the idea of composing heroic verse because he has found success as a 'vates' turned love elegist. Whereas Dipsas had scorned love poetry and had advised the girl to shun poets who courted her with such verse and to welcome rich suitors instead, in 2.1 Ovid tells us that he has successfully won a 'puella' through the
intrinsic value of his amatory verse which has a purchasing power of its own (pretium, magna merces). Being a 'vates' writing elegy has its recompense. When Ovid, turning his back on heroic verse says 'non apta est gratia vestra mihi', he may be implying that he has no desire to enjoy the benefits and favour (gratia) of a 'vates' who writes eulogistic verse for the great (heroum clara nomina) unlike Varius Rufus, Vergil and Horace who did this and received rewards (see below on elegy 3.9).

I observed earlier that on the occasion when Propertius used 'vates' without reference to himself it had an uncomplimentary connotation (fallax vates), and we discover Ovid also disparaging the word when applied to others. Propertius did not use it in its new sense of a poet, but his slighting description of the term evoked the sort of criticism which had been levelled against 'vates' in its earlier sense and which those who desired to rehabilitate the word would be anxious to allay in order to lend dignity to the new title for a poet. In Ovid the depreciation centres around the literary meaning of the word for a bard concerned with mythical and contemporary topics, and so Ovid is overtly critical on this subject. Elegies 3.6 and 12 contain the evidence for this assertion. In the earlier elegy the 'amans', who is in fact the poet, finds himself separated by a torrential river from his 'domina' and wishes that he had at his disposal a super-natural means of conveyance. Realising his impotence in this respect, he rails against the false yarns of ancient bards:

'prodigiosa loquor veterum mendacia vatum;
nee tutil haec umquam nec feret ulla dies.'
(lines 17-18)

Later in elegy 12 the poet regrets that his verse has publicised the charms of Corinna. This gives him an opportunity once more for scorning the fictions of 'vates' in the antique sense:
He had preferred that his rivals pay no more attention to the claims of his verse than they would of those fanciful tales of the bards of old. Beginning at line 13 he contrasts the sort of verse he writes about Corinna with that written on legendary and historical themes and foreshadows lines 41-44 by saying that just as little credence is given to poetry of the latter type, so he had hoped that too much notice would not be taken of his elegies. I feel that Ovid is almost certainly including poetry featuring the deeds of the emperor (Caesaris acta. line 15) in the latter category of verse to which little credence should be attached when he says in lines 19-20

'nece tamen ut testes mos est audire poetas; /malueram verbis pondus abesse meis'. Here, 'mea verba' refers to the Corinna-inspired poetry which fostered his innate talent (Ingenium meum. line 16) and just as at line 21 he proceeds to give examples of subjects of mythical verse which should be taken cum grano salis, so his earlier statement that 'cum Thebe, cum Troia foret, cum Caesaris acta,/ingenium movit sola Corinna meum' (lines 15-16) distinguishes between these dissimilar sorts of poetry; in lines 41-4 (sup.cit.) he warns that we should not ascribe much belief to the stories narrated by 'vates' who exploit wide poetic licence (fecunda licentia vatum) and draws the parallel with his own verse which has been taken literally to his disadvantage. He warns against interpreting the work of 'vates' as having valid historical foundation (historica fides. line 42). Having classed the 'Caesaris acta' as typical subject matter for a 'vates', I suspect that Ovid is criticising the writers of panegyrical poetry on Caesar's 'res gestae' for allowing their fancy to distort the truth.
Elegy 3.9 written upon the death of Tibullus contains instances of the word 'vates' used again in an elegiac sense, but in a tone suggestive rather of a heroic 'vates' whose aim is to confer renown on the subject of his work. In this way Elegyia was honoured by Tibullus: 'ille tui vates operis, tua fame, Tibullus' (line 5) and Delia and Nemesis the recipients of his love poetry were similarly made famous and immortalised:

'durat opus vatum, Troiani fame laboris
tardaque nocturno tela retexta dolo,
sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia nomen habebunt.'

(lines 29-31)

The phrase 'opus vatum' is reminiscent of Horace's assertion in Epistles 2.1.248-50 that it is through the offices of the 'vates' that the qualities of distinguished men are proclaimed: 'nec magis expressi voltus per aenea signs/quam per vatis opus animique virorum/clarorum apparent.' Moreover Horace writes these lines after informing us that Vergil and Marius Rufus received 'munera multa' from Augustus (lines 245-7), citing the names of his fellow poets as examples of 'vates' who did the emperor a service. By emphasising the ability of the love poet to afford the same sort of honour to the subject of their compositions, the elegists underline the difference rather than the similarity between the elegiac and heroic 'vates', and it was a trend to be found in Propertius and Tibullus of which Ovid was conscious when in the passage quoted above the elegist is attributed a function and status on a par with the 'vates' as Horace defines the term. It was with Horace in mind that Propertius wrote elegy 3.2, though the sentiment underlying Odes 3.30 is radically different from that found in elegy:

'fortunata, meo si qua es celebrata libello!
carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae.'

(3.2.17-18)
Whereas the Ode concludes a collection of some of Horace's most patriotic poetry and expresses his confidence that his poetic 'monumentum' will survive while Roman institutions prosper, Propertius makes no reference to the continuity of Rome, for his verse was conceived for the greater glory of his 'puella' rather than 'res Romanae'. One is left, however, with the feeling that the elegist sought to exalt the station of himself as a poet and the function of his creations by an appeal to the boast of Horace.

It is the logical conclusion of this process when in 3.9 Ovid includes himself in the category of 'sacri vates' (line 17) and Tibullus is ranked a 'sacer vates' (line 41). The religious aspect of this description of the elegiac 'vates' is in keeping with the relationship with the divine enjoyed by the 'vates' in the sense of the new concept, but its use in the elegists runs counter to two notable aspects of the Augustan programme for reform. At a time when a religious revival was being officially backed, the use of the word in an erotic context must have been regarded as constituting a form of profanation of the quasi-religious solemnity with which we know Vergil and Horace had invested it. Moreover, the impiety is compounded by their adapting a term previously employed to lend authority to poetic utterances which favoured state interests, to verse which was essentially hostile to measures for improved morality which aimed at coercing the elegiac way of life. By applying vatic imagery to their amatory verse the elegists perverted the true dignity of the concept. Ovid's treatment of the appellation for the poet-priest is surely yet another instance of his 'nequitia'. His predecessors in elegy had begun the trend of demythologising the process of composition but he, even more than they, carried off the key word in the concept, subjecting it to humiliation by parading it in a framework for which
it was never intended. I end this exploration with a quotation from Newman on *Amores* 3.9 on Tibullus' death: "what Ovid wanted was to lavish praise on the dead man, and so a literary revolution had to be thrown on the funeral pyre with him" (p.103). I would qualify this by emphasising that Ovid as well as Tibullus and Propertius were not so lacking in perception that they failed to see that their modification of the revolution would be seen as a challenge to the new practice which it had established, and an attempt to parody the inner workings of the organ of its expression. They willingly sacrificed a major literary component of a type of verse towards which they were unsympathetic.

Ovid closes the 'Amores' by telling Venus (tenerorum mater amorum. 3.15.1) to seek a new 'vates', for he is about to abandon the genre of love elegy. He sees himself in the same tradition as Tibullus (in *Amores* 3.9) who was the 'vates' of Elegeia and whose death was mourned by Venus, and demonstrates that he has not consecrated his talent to lauding the new regime by entering into the spirit of the new concept as found in the circle of Maecenas.

We have seen how the term 'vates' is not always used in *bonam partem*, and that even when used to refer to themselves as poets of 'amor' the elegists depreciate it by applying it to poetry which the true 'vates' would have considered incompatible with the new dignity of the title. Of this they must have been fully aware and by deliberately misusing it manifest a fundamental disagreement with the motive behind vatic composition.
Note Reference for Chapter One


3. For Vergil's association with the neoterics in these early years see T. Frank, *Vergil: a Biography*, pp. 48-54 and for a useful discussion of the intellectual climate prevailing among the neoterics see L.P. Wilkinson in *G.R. 2* 1932 pp. 144-51.


5. The relevant passages being Propertius 1.8.5-8: 'tune audire potes vesani murmura ponti / fortis, et in dura nave iacere potes ? / tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas, tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre nives ?' which echoes Vergil, *Eclogues* 10.46-49: 'tu procul a patria (ne sit mihi credere tantum) / Alpinas a dura nives et frigora Rheni / me sine sola vides. a, te ne frigora laedant ! / a, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas !'

6. Our main evidence is derived from Suetonius *De Gramm.* 2.12: 'docuit multos et nobiles visusque est peridoneus praeceptor maxime ad poeticam tendentibus.' Bibaculus described him as 'Latina Siren, / qui solus legit ac facit poetas (id.ibid.4).

In both cases it is evident that Cato exerted a formative influence upon the poets of his generation.
7. Catullus, 66, introduced by the dedicatory elegy, addressed to (Hortensius) Hortalus.


9. Wiseman must be thinking of Calvus' elegiac work lamenting the death of Quintilia, referred to by Propertius (2.34.89-90) and Catullus (96).

10. Examples of invective aimed at Caesar and his followers are 29, 54, 57 and 93. He mocks mannerisms and behaviour in 17, 25, 33, 39 and attacks rivals for the affection of Lesbia in 37 (cf. also 40).

11. For Messalla's repudiation of these poets see Suetonius *De Gramm.* 4; I shall have further occasion to refer to this incident and to discuss the motive for his behaviour under the heading *The Horatian Reaction* in this chapter. While preserving republican sympathies, it is most likely that he was anxious not to be identified too closely with those who were hostile to the emperor or had been overtly critical of his adoptive father.

12. Under the heading *Messalla and Tibullus*.


15. Catullus followed the practice in dedicating his 'nugae' to Cornelius Nepos, but it has often been thought that he may have done so with ironical intent since Cornelius' work belongs to the annalistic tradition which Catullus refers to scornfully
15. (cont'n'd) elsewhere (see for example 36 and 95).

16. That Ovid is thinking of the Odes in particular is suggested by the language of *Tristia* 4.10.49-50: 'et tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures, / dum ferit Ausonia carmina culta lyra.' The adjective 'numerosus' would be an apt description of Horace's polymetric versatility as displayed in these poems, and the 'lyra' recalls his professed ambition to be numbered among the great lyric bards (cf. *Odes* 1.1.35-36).


18. See for example G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy*, pp. 24, 67-68, and D. O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus*, pp. 80-95. The use of such terms in the elegists is discussed under the final heading of my fourth chapter. In employing the words 'foedus' and 'fides' to describe the relations between lovers Ross maintains that the elegists are referring to the institution of marriage and are thereby lending monogamous overtones to their descriptions of free-love affairs; but in the case of Catullus the same author argues that the poet is not using these terms to denote any idea of marriage by which he might enhance the status of what is in fact an affair, but borrowing them, rather, from the sphere of political alliance between males to suggest that his relationship with Lesbia should command respect equal to that in which such practical and mutually advantageous understandings between men were traditionally held. However, I shall propose that both Catullus and the elegists are describing their affairs in monogamous terms and that even
18. (contn'd) so, a political significance does attach to them by virtue of the fact that marriage under the republic had been used as a political expedient and to such an end was the institution exploited within Augustus' own family for instance in an endeavour to solve the problem of the succession.

19. The usual objections to our identifying the Albius of the Odes with the elegist Tibullus are based on grounds of age, wealth, and the fact that the Glycera referred to in the Ode is not mentioned in the elegies of Tibullus. These objections are dealt with below under the heading Messalla and Tibullus. The fact that Horace speaks of Albius' wealth in the Epistle is not necessarily inconsistent with Tibullus' protestations of living in reduced circumstances, for I believe that Horace may be seeking to expose Tibullus' pose as the poor lover. Tibullus was an 'eques' and even taking into account the fact that his family fortunes may have been diminished during the confiscations, he may still have been comparatively well to do. In the words of K. F. Smith (The Elegies of Albius Tibullus p. 32): "The definition of wealth....is largely a relative, not to say a subjective matter." In addition, in my third chapter, under the heading Expressions of Disillusion in Tibullus, I shall argue that Tibullus contemplated premature retirement, and bearing in mind the fact that his descriptions of straitened means are by and large set in the future, it is possible that Horace misunderstood the motive underlying the protestations of penury; such retirement would probably have impressed upon Tibullus the need for retrenchment as the resources which he possessed would have to be managed more economically to support
19. (cont'd) him through the years ahead when he would be without the income from a more regular career. As for Horace's crediting him with a philosophical disposition we shall see in my third chapter under the heading Tibullus' Philosophical Basis for Retreat that there was indeed such a facet to his nature if the evidence of his elegies can be believed.

20. In reply to a possible objection that by 'voti sententia compos' we are to understand the genre of amatory elegy and the expression of a lover whose prayer has been answered by the winning of the object of his affections, it should be pointed out that the theme of successful love is the exception rather than the rule in elegy; cf. A. S. Wilkins, Horace, Epistles, p. 350 (on Ars Poetica 75-76).

21. Select Elegies of Propertius, pp. xxiv and 152.

22. See Butler and Barber, The Elegies of Propertius, p. 265.


24. Under the heading Messalla and Tibullus.


26. That is if we rule out Catullus' apology for not having fulfilled a promise to write some original poetry for Hortensius and to have presented him instead with a translation of a work by Callimachus (see Catullus 65.).


29. D. O. Ross, for instance, *(Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry)* who tells us that in the Monobiblos "there is no 'recusatio'" (p. 52) while stating later of elegy 1.7 "it is in fact a 'recusatio'" (p. 57) is likewise reluctant to put this label on the poem. We must, however, agree with him that it does not contain any of the obvious topoi stemming from Callimachean verse.

30. In my third chapter under the heading The Political Import of Tibullus 1.7 I shall have cause to discuss what I regard as the special significance of the conjoining of the themes of birthday and triumph in this elegy, the joint celebration of which in real life would have strong political implications, such a practice having been followed by oriental monarchs and more recently Pompey and Caesar.

31. One immediately thinks of Ennius who enjoyed the patronage of M. Fulvius Nobilior whose Aetolian campaign he celebrated in his 'Ambracia' and the fifteenth book of the Annals. See the article under *Patronage* (2) in the O.C.D. which gives a brief summary of the workings of this relationship during the republic.


33. For the possibility that lines 1 and 35-36 of Odes 1.1 are later additions see Page Horace, *Odes* p. 131. Butler and Barber, op.cit., compare Propertius 1.8b.43 with Vergil *Eclogues* 5.57 and Catullus 66.69 but the similarity is not so striking as it is in the case of the Horatian line.

35. Ruling out the MSS. reading in 2.13.1 which is commonly considered corrupt.


37. See my remarks under the heading Neoterica and Elegista concerning Gallus' relations with Vergil and Parthenius.

38. For the chronology see Butler and Barber, op.cit. pp. xxi - xxv and 62.

39. See Butler and Barber op.cit. p. 162.

40. This is especially evident from the dying words which Maecenas is said to have spoken to Augustus: 'Horatii, ut mei memor esto' (Suet. *Vita Horatii* 4) and the lines of Maecenas which refer to the poet: 'Lucentes, mea vita, nec amargados / beryllos mihi, Flacco, nec nitentes....' (Morel, frag. 2, p. 101); 'Ni te visceribus meis, Horatii, / plus iam diligo, tu tu(u)m sodalem / nimio videas strigosiorum' (id, frag 3, p. 102). Cf. also 'care Maecenas eques' (*Odes* 1.20.5).

41. In describing Messalla as maintaining the principle of always fighting for the 'just cause' Carcopino is translating Plutarch, *Brutus* 53.1., a source acknowledged in (his) note 9.

42. J. P. Postgate, *Selections from Tibullus* p. xviii; E. Smith, op.cit. (see my note 19) p. 31.

43. Cicero describes Crassus at the age of thirty-four as an 'adolescens' (*de Orat.* 2.2) and uses the word to describe both Brutus and Cassius in their fortieth year (*Phil.* 2.44), and himself in his forty fourth year (ibid. 46).
44. In a note on Odes 2.12.13 T. E. Page (op. cit.) explains that the name is a nom-de-plume formed from the Greek λυρείς υμνον meaning 'dulces cantus' - sweet songed - and the metrical equivalent of the Latin name Terentia (the idea of metrical substitution was proposed by the ancient scholiast and popularised in modern times by Richard Bentley in his *In Quintum Horatium Flaccum Notae et Emendationes*); by the same token Catullus calls Clodia by the name Lesbia, and Tibullus gives Plania the name Delia (cf. Apuleius *Apol.* 10: 'eadem igitur opera accusent C. Catullum, quod Lesbian pro Clodia nominarit, et Tucidam similiter, quod quae Metella erat Perillam scripsisset, et Propertium, qui Cynthiam dicat, Hostiam dissimulet, et Tibullum, quod ei sit Plania in animo, Delia in versu').

45. *Epp.* 1.4.7: 'di tibi divitiias dederunt artemque fruendi'. See note 19 above.


47. W. Wimmel, op. cit. (see my note 1) pp. 194 and 197.


50. Here I am quoting from Boucher's later work *Etudes sur Properce* p. 298, where he gives a resumé of the article in question.

51. See Butler and Barber, op. cit. pp. xxv-vi.

52. W. Wimmel, op. cit., p. 207.

53. Under the heading *The Horatian Reaction*. 

55. In the first footnote of the article, the author comments upon the failure of Butler and Barber, Enk, and Camps to notice the correspondences.


58. See for instance J.K. Newman, in *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry* p. 28. The phrase is the equivalent of the Greek (Homeric) formula ἀεὶ ἔσεσθαι κλέα ἀνήφρωτα.

59. I subsequently find that P. Brandt, in his edition of the Amores has noticed the linguistic similarity but the nature of the commentary does not lead the author to enter into Ovid's motive in echoing the work of Horace.

60. See for instance S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace* p. 14 and *lit.cit.*


63. 2.6 and 2.7, for example, deal with questions of morality, 2.8 and 2.9 the breakdown of the poet's relationship with his mistress, and 2.14 and 2.15 with the renewal of the relationship.
64. Under the heading A Novel Recusatio.

65. Butler and Barber, op. cit., at least admit both possibilities suggesting "(1) 'Bard of such sorrows am I.' Cp. Luc. vii 533 tantorum....me vate malorum. Or (2) 'I anticipate death' - haec vaticinor." (p. 220).

66. See the quotations from Ennius and Lucretius on page 15 of Newman's book The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry.

67. See my discussion of Propertius' elegy 4.6 in my second chapter under the heading Actian Apollo where I attempt to demonstrate that the poet treats Apollo and the Actian episode in a vein of mock solemnity and undercuts the seriousness of his own role as a poet treating national themes.

68. See Newman op. cit. (see above, note 66), pp. 29 and 33.

69. For the date of composition of Tibullus 2.5 see Smith, op. cit. p. 443 and for the date of publication of Books 2 and 3 of Propertius see Butler and Barber, op. cit., p. xxvi.

70. These elements are examined in detail in Chapter Three under the heading Irony and 'Levitas' in Tibullus 2.5, where I shall discuss some points raised by Putnam (op. cit.) who deserves credit for demonstrating that there are two sides to this elegy. As this later examination of elegy 2.5 is concerned with the approach of Tibullus to an episode and topics related to it which had assumed political importance for the emperor, I have decided to confine it to this later chapter; the reader may prefer to refer ahead to this section of my enquiry if unconvinced by the contention that Tibullus is writing in a playful mood in this poem.
71. Incidentally, in view of my earlier comments under the heading Propertius' Attitude to Horace where I pointed out that among contemporary Roman mortals divinity was in any case an imperial privilege - one which, however, Augustus later discouraged poets from attributing to him - it is possible that Propertius was aware that he might be regarded as insensitive in revelling in the thought of possessing a status concerning which the emperor, for political reasons, had reservations. Perhaps in taking such an inflated view of his poetical destiny he is reminding the emperor's eulogists that they had been guilty of gross flattery in drawing a divine parallel between their subject and the gods.

72. In this they seem to have turned to their own advantage a feature of verse which forms part of the 'vates' concept, with Venus, rather than Apollo, as the divinity from whom the power derives.

73. Cf. also Amores 2.1.15-18.

74. J. P. Postgate, Selections from Tibullus, p. 139, admits the possibility that they are one and the same person. More recent scholarship supports this view; E. N. O'Neil in C.P. 62 1967 pp. 163-68 points out that the reference to Macer's change of plans is indeed a literary reference whereas critics have interpreted Tibullus' elegy from a biographical point of view imagining that Macer had been disappointed in love and intended to enlist in the army, as Aemilius Macer did in Asia in 16 B.C., and hence have identified him with this other person of the same name. O'Neil argues that Tibullus is referring to Pompeius Macer the friend of Ovid who is addressed in Pont 2.10.10ff.
74. (cont'd) and to whose friendship Ovid alludes in *Amores* 2.18.39-40 which refers to his epic poetry, and that Tibullus is contrasting epic with elegiac, amatory, themes just as Propertius had done with regard to the Thebaid of Ponticus in elegy 1.7.

75. As we saw under the heading *Propertius' View of Vergil's Literary Career* such a contrast, with respect to the epic works of Lynceus (Varius) and Vergil, was a marked feature of Propertius 2.34.

76. See above, note 70.

77. See for instance *Amores* 2.1.1-2: 'Hoc quoque conposui Paelignis natus aquosis, / ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta mese.' cf. also *Amores* 3.1.17.

78. She may have in mind a poet like Pindar who was sometimes commissioned to write verse, as well as the more recent case of Varius who received a million sesterces from the emperor for his 'Thyestes' written to be performed as part of the Actium celebrations (Acron, ad Hor. *Epp.* 2.1.246); Horace informs us that Vergil and Varius received many gifts from Augustus: 'At neque dedecorant tua de se iudicia atque / munera quae multa dantis cum laude tulerunt / dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae...' (*Epp.* 2.1.245-47). Vergil's fortune at his death is said to have amounted to ten million sesterces.

79. See previous note.

80. On the interdependence of Horace's verse and the continuity of 'res Romanæ' see T. E. Page, *Horace: Odes* p. 393 (ad 3.30.8);
80. (Contd) "'dum', i.e. while Rome shall last; while her most venerable temple and her most venerable institutions remain".
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Introduction

In this chapter, I hope to demonstrate that Propertius did not experience a change of attitude which turned him into a supporter of Augustus, and the aims of his imperial plan. Paley, following Hertzberg, thought that the first half of the 'Einleitungselegie', in which Propertius announces that he can now write verse with 'Sacra diesque et cognomina prisca locorum' as his theme, belonged along with elegies 2, 4, 9 and 10 to a period prior to the composition of the Monobiblos. Accordingly, the second half, in which Horos recommends erotic rather than aetiological verse was thought to have been composed when Propertius had changed his mind, having since fallen in love with Cynthia. On this reckoning the second half is interpreted as an apology for not writing antiquarian poetry. This erroneous view of the last Book can be attributed to a failure to appreciate that there is essentially no incongruity between the aetiological and erotic aspects of the book. It will become more clear later, that Propertius did write aetiological verse at this late stage in his career, that they were not 'serious' juvenile efforts but mature works coloured by the outlook on life which he possessed in Bks. 1 - 3 revealing an antipathy which he had always harboured towards the aspirations of the Augustan regime. The passage which might be thought to suggest that early in his career Propertius had written 'serious' aetiological verse is the first couplet of the following:

'tum tibi paucia suo de carmine dictat Apollo
et vetat insano verba tonare Foro.
at tu finge elegos, fallax opus: haec tua castra!
scribat ut exemplo cetera turba tuo.'

(4.1.133-6)
where 'tonare' may be taken as equivalent to the Callimachean Βρωκανές, that is writing verse in the grand-style rather than composing erotic elegy, which while less inflated is no less demanding (fallax opus). When Vergil relates how Apollo censured him 'cum canerem reges et proelia' we no longer make the mistake of the ancient scholiast and take the poet's words literally and imagine that he actually began to write an epic only to give it up in favour of bucolic verse. Neither Vergil nor Propertius had commenced writing about 'res Romanas' and become 'offensus materia' only to write bucolic and erotic verse respectively. However, I hope to show that Propertius was 'offensus materia' in the 'Roman' elegies of Book 4 which cannot be said of Vergil in the Georgics and Aeneid.

Lefèvre (1) is I think correct in saying that we are unjustified in going so far as to claim Propertius became convinced that a renaissance of old Roman values was necessary, "Freilich darf man nicht so weit gehen und glauben, Properz habe sich aus echter Überzeugung von der Notwendigkeit der Erneuerung alter römischer Werte den altrömischen Stoffen zugewandt. Zu oft hatte er in den ersten drei Büchern diese Welt abgelehnt und sie zuweilen mit recht endeutigen Spott übergossen". In the previous three books he had rejected old Roman morality so often and scorned it so much that it argues against a sudden conversion. I would maintain that his attitudes to contemporary and antique Roman ways have not shifted to any marked degree in Bk. 4 when compared to his earlier professions. What has changed is the art form. The example of his master Callimachus in writing the Aitia was obviously in his mind when he contemplated the writing of Bk. 4, and I suspect that, as
in the case of Callimachus, his motive was above all an artistic one as Lefèvre believes: "Vielmehr sind für ihn wie für den Ovid der Metamorphoses und Fasten artistische Gründe die in dem Reiz der neuen aus dem Hellenismus übernommen Form liegen, entscheidend gewesen". (see above note 1). Ovid's motive for the composition of the Metamorphoses and Fasti can thus be paralleled with that of his predecessors. In addition I feel that Propertius saw the necessity of proving that his capabilities were not confined exclusively to a particular style, and this he had in common with Callimachus, for the scholiast on Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo (line 106) informs us that the Hecale was the Alexandrian's reply to those who alleged that he was incapable of writing a large scale work: ἔνακει ὑπὸ τοῦτον τοῦς σκόπους ἀυτοῦ μὴ διώκοντω ποιήσας μεγά ποίημα, δηεν ἑκακάσθη ποιήσας (2)
Propertius had equated national themes with large scale works and one of his reasons for the composition of Bk. 4 may have been to prove that his abilities were not entirely confined to erotic elegy. Vergil had claimed that by writing 'Ascraeum carmen' (Georgics 2. 176) he had made a successful literary innovation, and Horace felt likewise about his lyric 'Aeolium carmen'. (Odes 3.30.13.). Propertius, not to be outdone, announces that he is the first to write aetiological elegy in Latin on Roman themes (4.1.61-70), calling himself the Roman Callimachus just as Vergil had in effect called himself the Roman Hesiod, and Horace spoken of himself as the Roman Alcaeus. Horace's reference to a poet who claims to be a second Callimachus (Epp.2.2.99-101) is to be dated to the best of our knowledge to about 19 B.C. (3) Propertius' last book was composed in the years between 22 and 16 B.C., so it is reasonable to see in
Horace's reference to a Roman Callimachus a slighting comment on the title which Propertius had awarded himself. Horace was no doubt annoyed at Propertius' treatment of Roman themes. Whereas Horace in Bks. 1-3 of the Odes, and in the Carmen Saeculare had innovated in the process of singing the praises of Rome, Propertius' claim to innovation was based upon poetry which tended to be critical of the Roman heritage and which utilised an ironical 'levitas' which was opposed in principle to the 'gravitas' of Horace. By the end of the chapter I hope it will be easier to appreciate the grounds for Horace's annoyance. Salvatore D'Elia (4) is, I think, largely justified in maintaining that Propertius' Roman elegies were inspired by a wish to parody the Roman aspects of Horace's Odes and this would, I believe, account for the animosity of Horace towards the elegist.

What other motives might Propertius have had in producing such a book? Now that Cynthia, with whom he had associated his poetic talent, was dead Propertius may have been following his own literary inclinations in a spirit of experiment rather than responding to the wishes of a patron. Or again, Propertius is widely thought to have complied with the wishes of Maecenas or Augustus and written elegies dealing with aspects of Rome's heritage which the emperor was anxious to preserve and revitalise. Vergil in Bk. 8 of the Aeneid and Livy in Bk. 1 of his History both exhibit this interest in Rome's past and the motive in each case is similar, that is to inculcate a respect for ancient virtues and traditions. The aetiological elegies of Propertius treat themes which are found in these sections of the works of Vergil and Livy and hence it is tempting to believe that as all three authors enjoyed the patronage of Maecenas, that they were each in his own way conforming to his
prescriptions regarding the utility of literature. Propertius in Bks. 2 and 3 represents Maecenas as hoping that he will write about Rome and her emperor, and describes the alternatives as a work concerning Augustus in his capacity as statesman or commander in the civil wars (2, 1, 25 ff), in his eastern campaigns (2, 10, 9ff.) a history of Alba Longa (3. 3. 3), a gigantomachy, a subject which by now had achieved political significance (5), the foundation of Rome, or Augustus' struggle against the Parthians and the forces of Antony (3.9.47ff). Propertius had discounted these as being incompatible with his disposition and Callimachean conception of art. If Propertius, due to the fall of Maecenas from imperial favour, became directly subject to pressure from Augustus to write national poetry, and if the poet in Bk. 4 responded sincerely by composing elegies in praise of Roman history and contemporary society, why then does he fail to dedicate the work to Augustus? If, as I believe, Bk. 4 is far from being a sincere patriotic work, then the question does not arise. Suetonius tells us that Augustus was willing that he should be the subject of serious works only 'componi tamen aliquid de se nisi et serio et a praestantissimis offendebatur' (Suet. Aug. 89.3). Propertius' most recent work was too sceptical towards 'res Romanae' to permit a dedication to the 'princeps' of the Roman state. When I come to deal with the Vertumnus elegy 4.2, I put forward my own evidence in support of the view, which has little following at the moment, that Maecenas is the main guise of the god, and that the elegy serves the purpose of a dedicatory poem, as well as a lament for the passing of Maecenas from political prominence, the victim of neglect like Vertumnus.

In Bks. 2 and 3 Propertius had associated the name of Callimachus with a refusal to compose verse of a national character,
but he is not compromising his artistic beliefs in the first half of the Einleitungselegie to Bk. 4 where he contemplates such a task and calls himself the Roman Callimachus (4.1. 61-4). Like Callimachus he preferred to avoid the epic genre, and since national themes had been suggested to Propertius in terms of epic composition, his rejection of the genre involved a necessary rejection of the proposed subject matter. It is, then, tempting to believe that he had found in aetiological elegy a vehicle which overcame his artistic scruples, allowing him to voice sincere patriotic sentiments. I hope to show, however, that his earlier suspicions regarding the regime are voiced again in Bk. 4 with an irony sometimes derived from Callimachus, but as often as not from his own outlook, which contradicts such an assessment. Horos is naturally bewildered, fearing Propertius will contradict his former canons of art, imagining no doubt that he will embark upon a narrative work of epic dimensions, and for this reason he is careful to remind the poet of the admonition of Apollo against assuming such a tour de force. Nevertheless, though Propertius may not have thought (like Horos) that he was compromising his aesthetic canons in Bk. 4, is it not plausible that by practising Callimachean techniques to which he had appealed in his refusals to treat national themes in verse, he is not to some extent reasserting his attitude towards them?

In this respect, Rose's assessment of Bk. 3 could serve as a good description of Bk. 4. The erotic themes of the earlier book are "blended in most ingenious fashion with others as if he would show that his limitations are not so narrow as at first sight they would appear. In other words he was showing himself a true Callimachean, adapting the elegy as his model had done to all manner of themes". (6)

If we add to this that his Weltanschauung has little changed, we
shall be nearer the mark than if we see the last book as a volte-face. The problem posed by the latter view which sees it as a patriotic work, is considerably greater, for Propertius often treats a given theme with levity or irony to an extent which is clearly inconsistent with the earnestness of commitment. The approach of the poet towards the subject matter of the aetiological elegies 4, 6, 9 and 10, the latter three of which recall aspects of the emperor's career are either humorous (6 and 9), or critical (4 and 10). Elegy 8 which mocks the style of aetiological elegy both by its form and its humorous cross-reference to his other aetiological elegies, reveals that our suspicions about the poet's approach to his subject matter elsewhere is well-founded. I shall show that Cynthia and not Augustus is the dominant figure in the book contrary to the opinion of Ross that "it has seemed almost a betrayal to find that Cynthia has effectively disappeared from the fourth book and her place usurped by elegies not unlike 1.20", regardless of whether Cynthia is "largely a poetic fiction" or not (7), and that she is as formidable in 4.8 as the great warriors of 4.10, and that though dead she is presented as being as vivacious and exciting as ever, forcing a comparison which is detrimental to the frigid 'matrona' who speaks from the dead in the final elegy.

It would be useful for my argument if we could be sure, and share the confidence of Ross that "Book 4 is a return to the spirit and manner of Gallan elegy as well as being eminently Callimachean in its proposed subject matter; to the Roman reader acquainted with Callus' 'Amores', the work of the Roman Callimachus would have seemed perfectly natural" (8). The belief that Bk. 4 marked Propertius' conversion would be less tenable if this could
be proved and we should not rule out this possibility of a Gallan as well as a Callimachean precedent. Pillinger (9) has demonstrated clearly Propertius' debt to Callimachus, and we should be careful not to take Propertius at face-value failing to observe the humorous and ironic element in his work of which I have put forward several examples of my own. Lefèvre (10) has described Propertius as "zweifellos ein Dichter, der Humor und Ironie meisterhaft beherrscht .... bei ihm ist das facete dictum der Schilderung immer einer sinnvollen höheren Absicht untergeordnet und erreicht gerade im vierten Buch in Gedichten wie 4.5., 4.7 und 4.8 seinen Höhepunkt.... Die Skala der properzischen Ironie reicht vom Verspotten der Geliebten sowie der alten römischen Werte und der Götter bis zu der stellenweise stark ironischen Gestaltung der Erscheinung der toten Cynthia im 4.7. Die dringt sogar an einigen Stellen in die aitiologischen Gedichte wie 4.2 und 4.9". I hope to demonstrate that this aspect of Propertius' art is more prevalent in Bk. 4 than is usually given credit for, and especially in the aetiological poems where he is thought to be more sober. In choosing Roman aetiological material for his last book he was proving that he could rise to an occasion and because he did so without sacrificing his theory of art in the process, made his reply all the more effective. He was fortunate in having the example of Callimachus' Aitia before him because it gave him the ideal opportunity to practise his artistic criteria of style in writing what is virtually a parody of antiquarian and aetiological literature, the like of which was being employed by Vergil and Livy in particular to extol the institutions and traditions which the emperor was working to preserve as part of a programme to consolidate his achievements. It should be clear at the end of my examination that the erotic element considerably
outweighs what has wrongly been thought to be the patriotic element, and that as in the earlier three books, Propertius voices yet again his sympathy for Etruria as the victim of Roman aggression.

Finally, I must emphasise that I am of the opinion that Bk. 4 was not compiled posthumously by a literary executor who tried to arrange as best he could elegies which the author had never intended to stand side-by-side. Grimal and Hallett (11) have demonstrated convincingly that there exists an underlying design in the presentation of the book as it has come down to us. I have noticed in the elegies a number of cases where they clearly echo one another deliberately, allowing us to understand further the poet's approach to his subject matter, as well as assuring us that the poet intended them to be unified for presentation as a book.
Programme and Motive

In answer to those who consider Book 4 to be genuinely patriotic in tone, it should be pointed out that there is virtually no internal evidence to corroborate the view that Propertius intends to deliver a 'laudatio' of emperor and country. Even the lines:

'sed tamen exiguo quodcumque e pectore rivi fluxerit, hoc patriae serviet omne meae
(4.1. 59-60)

- which would inevitably be cited against the claim, have their qualification four lines later in:

'Umbria Romani patria Callimachi.'
(4.1.64)

Here I feel certain that by producing etiological verse on the lines of Callimachus he is doing his patria, that is, Umbria, where he was born, a service in that she will feel proud that her son has achieved success in his chosen field, which is the meaning of 'ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris' (4.1.63). In lines 121-2 Horos also calls this district the poet's patria, and being concerned with providing evidence of his supernatural insight, he can hardly be simply reiterating Propertius' words, but rather reading his mind and saying that it is to Umbria that he gives his heartfelt allegiance. Before actually looking at the elegies in turn I propose to look at Horos' speech in which I suspect Propertius voices the thoughts of those who think that the poet is about to forsake his earlier guiding principles. An important part of the astrologer's message to Propertius is a warning that many poets have attempted national poetry only to fail miserably and ruin their reputations. He suggests that Propertius should not follow suit and risk his own, but should be content to know that others emulate his achievement as an amatory elegist:
'at tu finge elegos, fallax opus: haec tua castra! --
scribat ut exemplo cetera turba tuo.'

(4.1. 135-6)

By using the word 'turba' Horos directs the poet's attention to his words in 3.1 the 'turba scriptorum' (line 12) over whom Propertius triumphs, and the 'invida turba' (line 21) who can only envy his superior poetic abilities. Now Horos issues another warning at the end of his speech:

'nunc tua vel mediis puppis luctetur in undis,
vel licet armatis hostis inermis eas,
vel tremefacta cavo tellus diducat hiatum:
ocipedis Cancri terga sinistre time!'

(4.1. 147-50)

This 'Wassersymbolik' is surely meant to remind Propertius of Apollo's advice given in 3.3:

'cur tua praescriptos evecta est pagina gyros?
non est ingenii cumba gravanda tui.
alter remus aquas alter tibi radat harenas,
tutus eris: medio maxima turba mari est.'

(3.3. 21-4)

This similarity between these passages is commented upon by critici varii but I detect additionally a play on words in the 'turba' of Apollo's admonition, which will link it in yet another way with Horos. Apollo is saying (on first reading) that Propertius would get himself into deep (medio mari, line 24) and dangerous (turba line 24) waters by setting full sail on to a sea of Ennian inspired composition. But as Propertius has used the word turba twice in 3.1 as mentioned above in describing his poetic contemporaries, there is the hint in Apollo's warning that many of them (turba) have drowned (medio mari) in undertaking the sort of verse which Apollo tries to persuade Propertius to renounce. Therefore, the admonition of Horos in 135-6 is expanded in 147-50 which reminds us directly of Apollo's picture of the deep and dangerous waters of which the
poet must beware, and indirectly of the turba of 3.1 who failing
to reach Propertius standards in their own verse, had attempted the
ambitious sort of verse which Propertius himself hopes to produce.
Likewise I would link up the first two couplets of Horos' speech as
being a reference to two couplets in 3.1:

'meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes:
ingnum post cineres auguror ipse diem.
ne mea contempto lapis indicet ossa sepulcro
provisum est Lycio vota probante deo.'

(3.1. 35-8)

to be compared with:

'Quo ruis imprudens, vage, dicere fata, Properti?
non sunt a dextro condita fila colo.
accersis lacrimas cantans, aversus Apollo:
poscis ab invita verba pigenda lyra.'

(4.1. 71-4)

In the former passage Propertius predicts the future popularity of
his erotic works, for Apollo the god of prophecy has granted his
approval to Propertius' enterprise as an amatory elegist. In the
latter passage by using the words dicere fata, meaning to prophesy
I do not understand this as referring, as Hallett (op.cit. p.28)
for instance construes the sense, to prophesying Roman greatness,
but prophesying artistic success in his new undertaking as
indicated in lines 59-70 immediately preceding, where he commands
Bacchus to award him an ivy wreath that he may win the acclaim of
his fellow Umbrians who will then compare their lofty citadels to
his soaring talent. Horos then, in his four opening lines reminds
Propertius that it is the sanction of Apollo which will determine
his poetic success. Whereas Apollo had given his approbation
(probante deo) in connection with the poet's erotic verse with the
result that Propertius' prophecy was valid (auguror), the reverse
is the case with regard to his new aetiological verse. Apollo is
against the enterprise (aversus Apollo) and the suggestion of Horos is that Propertius' prophecies (dicere fata) of his new poetic success have no sanction and are thus invalid. The outcome of such attempts would be tears (accersis lacrimas, line 3) and statements which might later cause him regret (verba pigenda) according to Horos, who states that Propertius is reluctant to change course (invita lyra). It is well known that Horos repeats and comments upon various statements made by Propertius in the first section. Within his own speech also, he significantly repeats one of his own words. In line 98 Propertius is informed that Horos' prophecy had foretold doom for the sons of Arria if she neglected his advice. The prophecy came true and Horos comments:

'vera, sed invito, contigit ista fides.'
(4.1.98)

This is surely a reflection on what he had said in line 74 quoted above 'poscis ab invita verba pigenda lyra.' meaning that Propertius, by defying the advice by Apollo, will be going against the grain of his natural poetic ability. I suspect that Horos intends us to make a deduction along the following lines. Propertius had once spoken of his verse as being his artistic offspring, and interestingly this metaphor is found in 3.1 the elegy to which I proposed Horos was directing Propertius' attention on the matter of his literary reputation:

'........................... et a me
nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis,
et mecum in curru parvi vectantur Amores,'
(3.1.9-11)

- literary composition is described as a process of parturition as his use of the verb nascor elsewhere indicates:

'maxima de nihilo nascitur historia.'
(2.1.16)
and:

'nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.'

(2.34.66)

the thought being derived, it would appear, from Callimachus:

\[ \mu\nu\sigma'\iota\nu'\epsilon\mu\nu\delta\iota\phi\alpha\tau\epsilon\mu\gamma\alpha\varphi\sigma\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\iota\omega\delta\iota\eta\nu \]

\[ \tau\iota\kappa\tau\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\lambda. \]

(Pfeiffer, Call. Aetia, Frag. 1, 19-20)

Also, in Horos' speech, line 121:

'Umbria te notis antiqua Penatibus edit'

Umbria is responsible for the birth of the poet, and so his relationship to Umbria is the same as that of Lupercus and Gallus to Arria and if he is not careful he will share their misfortune. Are we not then justified in interpreting Horos' words as an admonition to the effect that the literary produce which he hopes to bear, will meet with disaster if his warning goes unheeded by the poet. This would strengthen the argument of Nethercut (W.S. NF 2, 1968) that the exemplum of Arria is part of Horos' warning against the proposed poetic enterprise.

His article on elegiac technique in 4.1 clarifies another aspect of the elegy; at the end of the first section in which Propertius had contemplated writing of Rome's growth, he had likened himself to a horse-rider racing towards a finishing post 'has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus' (line 70). Lupercus, son of Arria, had met his death while horse riding 'quippe Lupercus, equi dum saucia protegit ora, heu eibi prolapso non bene cavit equo' (lines 93-4) and Gallus perished while guarding the standards 'Gallus at, in castris dum credits signs tuetur, concidit ante aquilae rostra cruenta suae: ' (lines 95-6). Nethercut's point is that 'were Propertius to 'go to battle' so to speak, he, too, might spend so
much time feeling uncomfortable about his new medium, the epic's subject matter and diction, that he would end foolishly, his life a waste". Moreover, Arris had encouraged her sons' undertaking because of her greed - 'matris avarae' (line 97). Camps' note is relevant here I think, explaining that she hoped that her sons would bring back money to their home. Nethercut emphasises that the theme of 'avaritia' is found in Horos' speech and throughout the poem beginning with 'fictilibus crevere dei haec aurea templae' (line 5). Horos claims that man's relationship with the gods is being perverted through the search for gain- 'nunc pretium fecere deos et fallitur suro/Iuppiter...' (lines 81-2). In lines 109-18 the sailing of the Greek fleet for Troy is shown as an ill-advised project sanctioned by Calchas. Nethercut maintains correctly that the Greeks like Paetus in 3.7 were attracted abroad in their desire for material reward. Also in 3.3, 21-4, 3.4 and 3.5 the journey overseas and the quest for gain were closely allied. The elegist by contrast prefers to remain at home content with what he has got. Again, I would cite Camps, on line 116 'et natat exuvias Graecia pressa suis' in support of Nethercut: "the wrecked ships are conceived as sinking more readily because heavily laden with the spoils of Troy". The Greeks' cupidity with regard to booty was ultimately responsible for hastening their destruction. Thus in lines 89-118 Propertius spoke first of horse-riding, then battle (castra) and voyaging by sea. Lefèvre (art.cit.) has seen that Horos refers to these in reverse order in lines 147-9:

'nunc tua vel mediis puppis lucet tur in undis,  
vel licet armatis hostis inermis eas,  
vel tremefacta cavo tellus diducat hiatum:

- that is, journeying by sea, battle, and horseriding, for the last line has in mind the horserider falling from his charge to the ground which gapes open, as it were, to receive him. Horos in these
lines is referring back to the greed which led to the death of 
Arria's sons and the disaster which befell the Greeks. Lefèvre's 
argument that Horos is referring more specifically to Propertius 
as well as Lupercus and Callus, is supported by his astute 
interpretation of the line which immediately follows the three lines 
which are quoted above, and which closes the elegy: 'octipedes Cancri 
terga sinistra time!' (line 150). This is parallel to the 'meta' 
in the last line of Propertius' speech (line 70). The constellation 
of Cancer is the turning point of the sun's course through the 
heavens as the 'meta' in Propertius' speech represents a turning 
point in the poet's career. Furthering Nethercut's hypothesis with 
regard to the criticism of the material motive behind the enterprises 
described in 4.1 Lefèvre had seen an allusion in the word Cancer to 
the gold and silver coins of 18 B.C. depicting a crab. In other 
words, Horos is warning Propertius against making a decision which 
he sees as influenced by the hope for material reward, that is 
'selling out' in the literal sense and not pursuing artistic dictates 
but compromising them for gain. Throughout Book 4 as I shall endeavour 
to clarify, Propertius bears in mind the advice of his astrologer 
and does not in fact confine himself to aetiological elegies as 
contemplated in the first section of the 'Einleitungselegie'. 
Furthermore, even in his aetiological verse he cannot be said in the 
light of the evidence which I shall adduce, to be the wholehearted 
poet laureate as some envisage him at the beginning of the book. 
The closing lines of the speech attributed to Propertius:

'Roma, fave, tibi surgit opus, date candida cives 
omnia, et inceptis dextera cantet avis!
sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum: 
has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus.'
(4.1.67-70)

have, I think, a resemblance to those found in 3,4:
In the former quotation Propertius requests favourable omens of the citizens as he is about to undertake the task of surveying the Roman historical heritage, and imagines himself as a horse rider racing to the finishing post. In the latter, Propertius had encouraged his fellow Romans as they set sail in ships and lead their horses into war against the Parthians. For Propertius the horse is a symbol of the heroic and epic, and he is implying in the former quotation that he will carry out in the medium of literature something which might serve Rome's interests (tibi surgit opus) just as he expects the warriors to contribute to Roman greatness. I would maintain that neither quotation is a statement of patriotic intent. Important for gauging the mood of the 'Einleitungselegie' is the drift of Propertius' thought after the lines quoted from 3.4 above, which undercut his sanction for the proposed campaign in the East. In the event of a triumph the poet would use the occasion merely for a day out with his 'puella' (line 15) caring not for the rewards which the soldiers have won. He felt no inclination to partake in the heroic adventure and will remain detached from it now that it has been successful. Applaud he might, but by naming Venus (line 19) he humorously intimates that he owes as much to her for his amour with the 'puella' as Caesar does for his triumph. Similarly, if this is an allusion which the poet expects us to notice, then Horos' speech which follows immediately after the closing lines of Propertius' speech may serve the same purpose, namely, to undercut the heroic by dwelling on the erotic, as Horos does to a considerable extent, reminding Propertius of his
true vocation as a poet of love. This feature of his verse did not terminate after he had completed his third book but is continued in its successor, as we shall see.

The first half of the 'Einleitungselegie' in which Propertius imagines himself giving a guided tour of important historical locations, reveals a contrast, the nature of which I shall examine, between ancient and modern. The impression which the 'hospes' and reader must inevitably obtain is that Rome has changed beyond recognition since its earliest days. The Palatine hill which had once been pasture for Evander's cattle, now accommodates the emperor Augustus himself, and the Actian Apollo in his new temple. The Curia occupies the site where formerly skin clad rustic citizens, one hundred altogether, had been summoned by a trumpet to the primitive equivalent of 'modern' senate meetings. Theatres with awnings and saffron scented stages were unheard of before foreign deities began to inundate the city. The Parilia has been replaced in popularity by the 'October Horse'. The simplicity formerly observed in the rites of Vesta and the Lares Compitales, is thought worthy of comment by Propertius. The licentious Lupercalia which are a more recent perversion of an already existing rural custom and the sophistication of modern weapons are aspects of modernity which are contrasted with the past. The 'hospes' then receives a 'crash course' in Roman history from the days when Lycmon aided Romulus in his fight against Tatius, to the advent of Julius Caesar. Hallett (op.cit. pp.15-21) correctly observes that Propertius is lamenting Rome's lost innocence, regarding unfavourably the monumentalisation undertaken in his own day on the site of primitive Rome by the emperor in his endeavour to restore temples and religious practices. In support of her argument I would include the following
which she has overlooked, the implications of which for Book 4 have generally gone unnoticed. I refer to lines 15-16:

\[
\text{'nec sinuosa cavo pendebant vela theatro,}
\text{pulpita sollemnis non oluere crocos.}
\]

(4.1. 15-16)

No awning billowed above the cavernous theatre; The stage, unlike today's exhaled no saffron; (trans. Mucker)

In conjunction with this I should like to draw attention to -

\[
\text{'quid genus aut virtus aut optima profuit illi}
\text{mater, et amplexum Caesaris esse focos ?}
\text{aut modo tam pleno fluitantia vela theatro,}
\]

(3.18. 11-13)

which records Marcellus' achievement in commencing the building of the theatre which was eventually completed by Augustus in 13 B.C. (see C.A.H. Vol. 10 p.574), the elegy being a homily on the vanity of human wishes. The verbal correspondence (12) and the similar positioning of 'vela theatro' in both passages make it highly probable that Propertius wants us to see the monumentalisation of Rome as ostentation, for 3.18 was also a condemnation of luxury (especially lines 19-20 and 27-8) and the effete practice in 4.1 of drenching the stage with saffron is surely a deliberately unfavourable comparison with the simplicity of earlier days. Camps suggests that the theatre of Marcellus may be in question in 4.1. The verbal similarities which I have drawn attention to make it almost certain that this is the case, and the sentiments of 3.18 by being alluded to in 4.1, in conjunction with the theatre and other monuments, make Hallett's argument more convincing. I do not propose to dwell on the import of Propertius' comparison of ancient and modern which I think has been covered carefully by Hallett and with which I am in agreement. Her interpretation of Propertius' feelings towards the characters from Roman history in the 'Einleitungselegie' could
perhaps be viewed more sympathetically if I examine first of all the aetiological elegies themselves and gauge Propertius' attitude from those first, then deal with the erotic elegies before finally assessing the significance of 4.1.

One is surprised that Boucher in Chapter 9 of his book Études sur Properce entitled 'L'art allusif' fails to speculate as to whether Propertius had any ulterior motive beyond the purely artistic in employing this feature of his verse. Boucher states basically that 'L'art allusif' consists of the poet's presenting an outline only, rather than recounting the whole of a story, which he expects his audience to know. It is thus a process of omission. He then states 'L'art allusif apparaît donc comme le propre de l'élegie qui évoque et résume contre l'épopée qui raconte et développe' (p. 328). He acknowledges Propertius' debt to Callimachus and shows the process at work in 4.6 indicating that the subject is one which would normally be treated as the main episode in an epic dealing with the conflict between Octavian and Antony at Actium and that the framework for the elegy is derived from Callimachus' 'Hymn to Apollo'. He notes the sacrifice (lines 1-10) and the prayer to the Muses (lines 11-12) by which the poet makes it clear that he will treat the action of the Temple of Apollo, followed by an introduction (2 lines) to the real subject (as Boucher sees it), that is, singing the praises of Augustus. The main omissions are that the poet fails to record the presence of Agrippa and Maecenas and the size and battle formations of the armies. The manoeuvres are artificially portrayed (lines 25-6) and two lines are devoted to the actual conflict (lines 55-6). Boucher is in accord with Heinze and Lucot to whom he refers (pp. 330-1) in believing that Propertius was trying above all to avoid a narrative account, Lucot having observed how with epigrammatic
parsimony Propertius records the issue of the hostilities rather than recount the hostilities themselves. Heinze however, has noticed that Propertius is capable of going into considerable detail in describing a battle scene, for instance in 4.10 the aetion of Jupiter Feretrius. The question which Boucher ought to have asked at this point is why the omission here in 4.6 in view of Heinze's observation? Actium was a crisis the outcome of which was decisive for the course of Roman history and first hand details of the battle must have been available to the poet, yet he fails to give a convincing report of the contest. Instead he reserves his talents in this direction for depicting conflicts which took place in the 8th, 5th and 3rd centuries B.C. those between Romulus and Acron, Cossus and Tolumnius, Marcellus and Virdomarus, for which he had to rely upon his imagination. Nearer the point is Hallett's observation: "By dwelling on Apollo's responsibility for Octavian's victory at Actium and saying little about Octavian's own efforts Propertius is minimising the emperor's accomplishments as politely as possible". She also notes that when Horace treats the same theme (Odes 1.37) there is no mention of Apollo (op. cit. p.115). Elegy 4.9 will perhaps more than any other make it more clear what the intentions of Propertius are in the aetiological poems. An examination of this elegy will throw more light on the aspects of 4.6 briefly touched upon above and to which I shall return later.
Ara Maxima

Anderson's comments on 4.9 (A.J.P. 85 1964) are, I feel, important for the question of the omissions as found in 4.6 and elsewhere: "Propertius suppresses certain elements of the story which might tend to enlarge its Roman and Augustan significance" (p. 3). We must now look carefully at the sort of omission which Propertius favours in his treatment of the aition of the Ara Maxima. Vergil in Aeneid Book 8 had dealt with the soteriological aspect of Hercules as a benefactor who performed 'labores' in the service of mankind. Galinsky (13) adequately substantiated that Vergil throughout his epic intended an equation between Hercules, Aeneas and Augustus as benefactors of mankind. The 'gravitas' with which Vergil and Horace had presented Hercules becomes what I think could aptly be termed 'levitas' in the case of Propertius' treatment of the character. Hercules' foundation of the Ara Maxima occupies 20 lines which serve as a prelude to his encounter with the priestesses of the Bona Dea which is narrated in 50 lines. Evander and his subjects, who according to the legend had been terrorised by Cacus, do not appear in Propertius' account whereas in Livy and Vergil Hercules' deed is the subject of the cult which Evander instituted. In one line the battle is over and Cacus is dead:

'Maenalio iacuit pulsus tria tempora ramo'

(4.9.15)

The Salian priests' hymn of thanks found in Vergil becomes the lowering of cattle in Propertius giving us an etymology of the meaning of the Forum 'Boarium'. Lines 16 and 17 '..... et Alcides sic sit:

'Ite boves, /Herculis ite boves'' are a clear echo of Vergil's Eclogues 7.44 and 10.77 and serve further to inform us that Propertius
is going to treat Hercules not as a heroic figure from epic but as a mere cowherd. As Pillinger notes (art.cit.p.157), the description of the embowered shrine is the Propertian counterpart to Vergil's description of Cacus' cave. Hercules is refused entry to the shrine and then he resorts to violence:

'et iacit ante fores verba minora deo'
(4.9.32)

where Propertius places emphasis on his humanity in the last three words as he does throughout the elegy, for Hercules who had usually been portrayed as an indefatigable hero is in Propertius' elegy fessus (line 4) defessus (line 34) fessus (line 66). The speech which follows from line 32 deprives Hercules of any pretensions to divinity and reduces him to the level of the 'exclusus amator' who delivers a paraklausithyron, 'ante fores'. In order to gain entry he begins like any 'miles gloriosus' to boast of his exploits (lines 37-50), but when he finds himself still excluded he apologises like the Theocritean Cyclops or Vergilian Corydon for his rough and ready nature, but to no avail. His strategy is next to persuade them that he is not so dissimilar from themselves, for he was once in service at the court of Omphale where he dressed as a woman down to the last detail, wearing even a brassière:

'mollis et hirsutum cepit mihi fascia pectus'
(4.9.49)

which, in spite of his rough hands, made him an 'apta puella' (line 50). By allowing Hercules to recall a time when he was dressed as a woman in connection with the rites of the Bona Dea, Propertius no doubt expects us to recall the violation of the rites of the goddess by Clodius in 62 B.C., for Clodius had dressed as a woman and thereby succeeded in gaining entry to the ceremonies reserved exclusively for women. Julius Caesar had divorced his wife as a result of the
scandal. As Augustus' wife Livia was responsible for the restoration of the temple of the Bona Dea (Ovid Fasti 5, 157–8) and an ancestor of hers had originally dedicated the temple, Propertius may well be mocking that aspect of Augustan policy which sought to bring about a religious revival as well as alluding to an amusing episode in the life of Augustus' father by adoption, which can hardly be calculated to inspire respect for religion and the family of the 'princeps' who was desirous of initiating a religious revival. So here is an instance of omission, if we agree that some allusion to the history of the cult is being made, working with an ulterior motive which serves to expand the humorous tone of the elegy and undercut the seriousness of the emperors' approach to religious matters. 'L'art allusif' had been defined as a literary device to obviate the necessity of delivering a narrative account involving the record of the minutiae of an episode, but as should now be more clear, it may be motivated not solely by artistic considerations but by the desire to comment upon the subject matter. The process is found to be at work again in the words of the 'sacerdos' to Hercules. She warns him to 'parce oculis' (line 53) and recalls what happened to Teiresias when he gazed upon the naked Athena, the suggestion being that the attendants of the 'sacerdos' are naked. The story is in no way recounted but the reader is expected to know the circumstances, and knowledge of them can only add to the humorous portrayal of the situation. Callimachus in the 'Hymn to Demeter' tells how Erysichthon desecrated the grove sacred to the goddess who sent on him a 'burning hunger' as a punishment:

αὐτίκα οἱ χαλεπτῶν τε καὶ ὕμιον ἐμβαλε λιμόν
αἴθωνα κρατείων, μεγάλα ὅ ἐστρεψεντο νοῦσῳ
(Callimachus Hymn 6, 66–7)
- for vandalising in particular the poplar tree. Propertius also describes a grove in 4.9, and the only tree which he mentions is a poplar tree - 'populus et longis ornabat frondibus aedem' (line 29) which would support the view that he had Callimachus in mind in describing Hercules' encounter with the attendants of the Bona Dea. Both Erysichthon and Hercules are guilty of violent desecration, and the excessive thirst which drove Hercules to violence has its counterpart in the excessive hunger which served to punish the outrage committed by Erysichthon. The burning hunger of Callimachus' hero is strikingly similar to the burning thirst ('aestus') from which Hercules suffers in this elegy. Pillinger and others (including Hallett) have missed this further link with Callimachus which shows Propertius following his master in deflating heroic characters and treating them with human realism. 'Aestus' the word used to describe Hercules' thirst can also mean sexual appetite and I suggest that maybe we are expected to recollect how in 1.20 the nymphs who abducted Hylas sent to fetch water (presumably to quench the Argonauts' thirst), caused Hercules to be sexually frustrated by their actions, and meant to recognise the erotic significance of the word 'aestus' when used in 4.9. Refused admittance by the 'sacerdos', Hercules resorts to violence and breaks down the door of the shrine, calling the site of the future city of Rome 'angulus mundi' (line 65) which "must have sounded unduly condescending to the Romans of the Augustan Age who saw even in the archaic city the incipient centre of all greatness" (Galinsky op. cit. p.155). Pillinger on this elegy (art.cit. p.182) says that it represents a "transformation of an epic theme into a vehicle suitable for expressing essentially humorous neoteric sentiments". The comic portrayal of a god owes a great deal to the Alexandrian tradition and elsewhere in elegy is notable in
Tibullus where he compares himself to Apollo who once worked as a farm hand in the service of Admetus and exploits the humour of the situation. Propertius' treatment of Hercules as an 'exclusus amator' is in the same tradition stemming from Callimachus and to a lesser extent Euripides' *Alcestis* and Aristophanes' *Frogs* where Hercules appears as a comic character. However, such an approach must detract from the solemnity of a Roman religious institution. By including elements which he has imported to modify the straightforward account found in Vergil and Livy, and excluding others, he has effectively diminished the stature of Hercules as a model of 'gravitas' with whom the emperor was content to be aligned. The defeat of Cacus by Hercules had become a symbol for Octavian's triumph over the forces of Antony and the emperor chose the anniversary of Hercules' achievement as the day to celebrate his Actian triumph. Grimal, aware of the equation of Hercules and Augustus in Vergil and Horace declares that it is impossible that Propertius was unaware of this symbolism: "Il n'est pas concevable que le symbolisme officiel de la légende qu'il contait ait échappé à un poète aussi conscient que Propère: eût-ce été malgré lui, il se trouvait ramené à des associations augustiennes". He realises that Propertius devotes little space to the aition of the Ara Maxima preferring to explain the aition of the temple of the Bona Dea. "Tout le poème est un aition de la chapelle de Bona Dea, autant et plus que du Grand Autel, qui n'en est que le prétexte" (art.cit. p.15), proposing that Propertius had in mind the fact that Livia, wife of the emperor, helped his moral regeneration programme by taking a personal interest in restoring the rites associated with the cult of the Bona Dea.

Pillinger on 4.9 has shown how Propertius uses epic diction in situations which are far removed from heroic situations normally
found in epic. I conclude this look at 4.9 with a quotation from his article: "The poem, then, far from serving to complement the traditional heroic interpretations of Hercules' mission at Rome, is a frankly neoteric production, not only in certain mannerisms of style but also in the deliberate cultivation of a "modern" view of Hercules that is evidently intended to rival his conventional aspect in epic versions..... if political considerations motivated this poem to any significant degree - and such a possibility ought not to be dismissed entirely - Propertius' interpretation of the Hercules myth is nevertheless far from being a truly serious panegyric on official cult policy." (art. cit. p.189).
Actian Apollo

We must now return to 4.6 which, because of its central position in Book 4, it is fair to suppose Propertius thought of as being of special importance. Unlike the other aetiological elegies, this alone deals with a contemporary topic - how Apollo received the divine epithet "Actian" and a new temple. Is 4.6 written in the same spirit as Vergil's Aeneid 8.675 ff. and Horace's Odes 1.37? Boucher (op. cit. p.153) is categorical on this question - "le sentiment général qui domine l'élegie est celui de l'action bénéfique d'Auguste - virtus et felicitas de la légitimité de ses armes, du caractère sauvent pour Rome de sa victoire sur Antoine et Cléopâtre". What reason can be adduced to throw suspicions on such a simplistic interpretation of a poem which has induced others to take a diametrically opposing view? Sullivan (Arethusa 2 1972, p.30) calls it the "strange, deliberately or unavoidably poor poem on Actium" and again (ibidem) "Propertius' most elaborate recusatio in which he proves that he is not suited to even the most artistically congenial way of supporting the programme of the regime". Gordon Williams has gone so far as to call it the "most ridiculous poem in the Latin language" (J.R.S. 52 1962, p.43). In Book 2 Propertius had taken a fairly dim view of Actium:

'qualem si cuncti cuperent decurrere vitae
et pressi multo membra iacere mero,
non ferrum crudele neque est celsi bellica navis,
nec nostra Actiacum vereret ossa mare,
nec totiens propriis circum oppugnata triumphis
lassa foret crinis solvere Roma suos'.

(2.15.41-6)

- where he had stressed the internecine nature of the war, and the fact that Octavian's triumph of 29 B.C. was really a triumph over Rome. Has Propertius really modified his outlook so radically in
4.6 and will he sing the praises of one who consolidated his power on the basis of the outcome of this battle? The elegy opens with the 'poet - priest' demanding the serious attention of his audience as he performs the rites which will win the favour of Calliope whom he hopes will prosper his undertaking. So important is the subject of the elegy that he requires that Jupiter also should pay heed to what he will relate,

'Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina: Caesar
dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse vaces.'

(4.6.13-14)

In 3.11 Propertius had sought to justify the power which women had over him by choosing Cleopatra as an example of a woman who had exerted her influence over the leading Romans of his day. Propertius makes her say that Rome had no cause to fear her, and indeed that while Octavian lived, Rome had no need to fear even Jupiter:

'vix timest salvo Caesare Roma Iovem'.

(3.11.66)

In both cases the hyperbole is evident. In 3.11 the poet said that he could hardly be blamed for being subject to the power of women's charms if Rome had virtually been at the mercy of a woman. Cleopatra recounts Roman history (lines 57 ff.) in order to show that Rome ought never to have regarded her as a threat. The effect of this can only be to diminish the stature of the 'princeps' as an effective leader:

'quid nunc Tarquinii fractas iuvat esse securis,
nomine quem simili vita superba notat,
si mulier patienda fuit ? cape, Roma, triumphum
et longum Augusto salva precare diem !'

(3.11. 47-50)

Likewise Propertius in 4.6 breathes a sigh of relief that Cleopatra made her escape at Actium sparing the Romans the sight of a woman as major exhibition in a triumph. In days gone by Rome had had
formidable enemies such as Jugurtha to contend with and eventually 'star' in her triumphs:

'di melius! quantus mulier foret una triumphus,
ductus erat per quas ante Iugurtha vias!'

(4.6. 65-6)

I feel fairly confident that 'mulier' is used contemptuously in 4.6 as in 3.11 just as Butler and Barber consider it is used in 3.24.1. (on which see their note). 4.6 then, evokes the sentiments voiced by Cleopatra in 3.11 and the former poem casts doubts, as the latter does, on the military efficacy of the Augustan war machine. Actium is not the only confrontation actually referred to in 4.6 for in lines 62 ff. Propertius declares that he has dealt sufficiently with martial themes and that it is now time for other poets to sing of Rome's remaining military campaigns. In each of the undertakings specified, Augustus took no active part as an 'imperator' leading his men into battle in the way that he had done at Actium. By naming the Sygambri we are reminded of the defeat inflicted on M. Lollius, and it was not until 9 B.C., considerably later than this elegy, that Tiberius finally subdued them. Butler and Barber on lines 77-84:

'ille paludosos memoret servire Sycambros,
Cepheam hic Meroen fusque regna canat,
hic referat sero confessum foedere Parthum:
"Reddat signa Remi, mox debite ipse suas;
sive aliquid pharetris Augustus parce Eois,
differat in pueros ista tropaea suos.
gaudae, Crasse, nigras si quid sapis inter harenas:
ire per Euphraten ad tua busta licet".'

(4.6. 77-84)

- make the following observations; on line 77 referring to the Sygambri "servire is a courtly exaggeration" and on the following line which refers to affairs in Egypt "The Ethiopians after reaching Egypt were defeated by the Roman praefectus of Egypt and forced to sue for peace in 22 B.C. Their territory was not however occupied
and Meroe was not actually reached" and on line 79, where the Parthian question is mentioned "The standards of Crassus had been restored by Parthia in 20 B.C. Propertius prophesies a still more complete victory for Rome". I would qualify the Butler and Barber comments on the Parthian question by adding that it is as though Propertius did not think a treaty with Parthia were sufficiently conclusive and expected the emperor to do something more positive by taking matters into his own hands rather than delegating the responsibility to his sons. (lines 81-2). In the final couplet of the passage quoted above, the only advantage, as I see it, to be gained by the 'paper' agreement with Parthia, is that Romans can now make the pilgrimage to the scene of Rome's humiliating defeat, and behold the tomb of Crassus. The poet is saying, in so many words, that the emperor should personally take the initiative and by force of arms avenge Crassus' defeat if he is any leader at all. These examples of foreign policy spoken of in lines 77-84 following Actium appear to be very shallow achievements indeed in which the emperor took no active part as commander himself. In fact even at Actium according to Propertius' account the emperor played an exceptionally subordinate role compared with Apollo who manages the actual business of the conflict. (lines 53-5). It should be remembered that Horace omitted Apollo altogether in his treatment of the subject thereby making Augustus appear as solely responsible for winning the contest. Horace had called Cleopatra 'fortis' (line 26) and one who behaved 'nec muliebriter' (line 22) whereas in Propertius she is specifically called 'mulier' (line 65). Horace's reason for enobling her is to make Augustus' victory over her more momentous and critical for the course of Roman history. In Horace she constituted a real threat and the
poet is genuinely grateful to the 'princeps' for removing this
solicitude from the minds of Rome's citizens. For Propertius, the
victory is an easy one, and surprise is expressed that she should
ever have been a match in the first place for the 'princeps'. In
line 57 Rome is said to have won by entrusting the outcome of the
battle to Apollo: 'vincit Roma fide Phoebi'. In line 60 Julius
Caesar is credited with having spoken the following from heaven:

'Sum deus; est nostri sanguinis ista fides'.

Julius reminds everyone that he also is now a deity for in 42 B.C.
Senate and People had enrolled him among the gods, though it was
not however until 29 B.C. that his temple was dedicated. Actian
Apollo received his temple in 28 B.C. I would adduce this as
support for my contention here that Caesar may be claiming priority
with regard to both divinity and possession of a temple which has
been recently dedicated. (14) There is a measure of ambiguity in
what he says. At first reading he is simply saying that he is the
father of Augustus and expressing pride in the fact that his son
was associated with the 'fides' which Rome placed in Apollo.
Another reading would understand him as asserting that he as well as
Apollo has divine status and as contesting the statement that Rome
won through her reliance on Apollo; it was rather, he suggests
due to Rome's faith in Augustus' Julian ancestry (nostri sanguinis
fides) and inherited 'virtus', that she was victorious. If this
latter interpretation is permitted then we have in effect a quarrel
in heaven. I would interpret the couplet immediately following
the protestation of Julius as applauding the validity of his claim.
In it, Triton and Nereids appear from the depths of the ocean, the
former blowing his horn, the latter clapping their hands:
Whereas I take these lines as a reaction to Julius' statement, it
it normally taken (see Butler and Barber p.358 and Hallett pp.112-3)
as a comment on Augustus' Actian victory. It is however capable
of undercutting the role played by the emperor's patron deity at
Actium, and humorously involving more deities in the divine quarrel.
Propertius had named Julius Caesar in 4.1 in the context of the
military prowess which had been bestowed on the Romans by possess-
ing, through the Julian gens, the goddess Venus as a protecting
deity:

'vexit et ipsa sui Caesaris arma Venus,
arma resurgentis portans victoria Troiae:  
felix terra tuos cepit, Iule, deos;'

(4.1.46-8)

So even at the beginning of the book Propertius had emphasised
the importance of Rome's affinity with Venus. In 4.6 he humorously
supports the claims of Julius Caesar and Venus against those of
Apollo by saying that the 'fides' which the citizens placed in the
line of Venus, meaning her descendant Augustus, had been equally
important for ensuring victory. Hallett (pp.112-3), I think, misses
this point, commenting: "In 59 Caesar appears as a star in the
heavens to congratulate his heir; in 61 Triton and sea goddesses
emerge from the deep for the same reason" and "the sudden
manifestation of Caesar's star in the heavens after the battle
seems a highly artificial way of praising Octavian for carrying
out his uncle's work; the applause of the marine deities is utterly
ridiculous both in introducing a tone of sheer playfulness and in
undercutting by juxtaposition and balance Julius Caesar's appearance".
I would agree with the interpretation of the playful mood of this
section, but it is even more humorous than is generally thought as I have attempted to elucidate.

Propertius has been taken to task over line 68:

'Actius hinc traxit Phoebus monumenta, quod eius una decem vicit missa sagitta ratis.'

(4.6.67-8)

Hallett comments for instance "The silly statement in 67-8 that Phoebus vanquished the ships with each arrow climaxes the series of preposterous remarks." (p.113). All the commentators on Propertius seemed to have missed the point here. While agreeing again that humour, is implied in the picture which is conjured up it is not such bad poetry (i.e. intentionally bad, see quotation from Sullivan's article sup.cit. and Hallett p.107) for underlying it is a reference to a lesser known monument erected to commemorate the Actian Victory. I quote from the Cambridge Ancient History (vol. 10. p.113) "Octavian set up many monuments of Actium. He ascribed his success to Apollo of Actium whose temple he enlarged; the local Actian festival was made quinquennial and equal in honour to the Olympian as the Alexandrian Ptolemeia had been, and to Apollo he dedicated his unique 'ten ship trophy' a ship from each of the classes of Antony's fleet, headed by his flagship." Propertius must have seen the monument comprising the ten ships and to explain the number, imagined that the ability of the archer-god, was such that one arrow sufficed to demolish the ships. Thus we can better appreciate the nature of the humour in the light of this information; Propertius is mocking an outward symbol of the emperor's Actian achievement.
Jupiter Feretrius

To continue with Propertius' treatment of the heroic I will next look at 4.10. In 32 B.C., Augustus began the restoration of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius in which were deposited the 'spolia opima', won and dedicated on only three occasions previously by Romulus, A. Cornelius Cossus, and M. Claudius Marcellus. This provides Propertius with subject matter for the penultimate elegy, the rite associated with the god. A statue of Romulus bearing the spoils won from Acron in the Forum of Augustus may also have suggested the topic. (see Ovid. Fasti 5.563-8, and C.A.H. Vol. 4 (plates) 176a/b, 204d). In executing the restoration the emperor doubtless sought to associate himself in yet another way with Romulus who had initiated the tradition. However, shortly after undertaking the work, he was placed in an embarrassing situation which must have provoked his jealousy in wishing to monopolise military reknown, for in 29 B.C., by killing Deldo, King of the Bastarnae, M. Licinius Crassus claimed the 'spolia opima' for himself and the right to deposit them in the temple. Augustus refused the request insisting that only generals who had acted under their own auspices were permitted to do so. Crassus alleged that Cossus had been only a 'tribunus militum', which was denied by the emperor who adduced fresh evidence to substantiate that he had been of consular rank. At a time when he was anxious to consolidate his position, the 'princeps' must have seen the request as a threat to his 'imperium' as he later saw the actions of Gallus in Egypt in 26 B.C. Taking this into consideration, if we are to interpret Bk. 4 as being inspired by a sincere patriotism, was Propertius' choice of subject matter for the penultimate elegy merely a reflection of
his inability to perceive the delicate nature of the emperor's predicament caused by an incident of which he could hardly wish to be reminded? Grimal believes that Augustus was seeking to honour his nephew Marcellus whom he had designated as successor to the principate by advertising the fact that he was of the same 'gens' as the conqueror of Virdomarus. This argument can be objected to simply on the grounds that Marcellus died in 23 B.C., and elegy 3.18 evoked the poet's response to his death. Of the elegies in Bk. 4, we can date all except 4.3 with a fair degree of certainty between the years 22 and 16 B.C.; Propertius then could not be flattering the emperor by praising the ancestry of his nephew. The elegy is bound to evoke the quandary in which the 'princeps' found himself due to M. Licinius Crassus' achievement, and to a lesser extent the ambitions and fate of Gallus. I note that Syme (pp.309-10) observes that Velleius Paterculus the 'loyal historian' omits any mention of either Gallus or Crassus "hence all the more reason to revive suppressed discordances in a fraudulently harmonious account of the restoration of the Republican government at Rome." If Syme is right, then Propertius is being overtly undiplomatic.

In lines 27-30 we read a curious lament for Veii which has led Hallett and others to suggest that the elegy would lose nothing if these lines were detached. The question is asked, why they are included, and the answer - which I would agree with - is that Propertius, as he has done on more than one occasion, is lamenting the fate of Etruria. In this respect, I would adduce in support of Hallett the further evidence of an argumentum ex silentio applied to Vergil based on MacKay's observations in Vergil's Italy
"Vergil's failure to mention Etruscan Veii on the left bank of the Allia is particularly curious because Rome's war with Veii, eighteen miles distant, was often compared with the Greek siege of Troy. Although Vergil does not introduce the site some scholars have thought that the war between Aeneas and Mezentius may reflect the historical conflict at Veii". No doubt Vergil felt guilty that Rome in 396 B.C. had destroyed the Etruscan city and preferred to pass over the event in silence. Etruria gave so much to Rome in the way of religious and civic customs that it was a harsh way to repay her for the bequest. Propertius in the previous books had associated Etruria with the civil wars and felt sympathy with the destruction which had befallen that region of Italy in his own lifetime. For example in the opening elegy of Bk. 2:

'nam quotiens Mutinam aut civilia busta Philippos
aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae,
eversonque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae,
et Ptolemeaei litora capta Phari,
aut canerem Aegyptum et Nilum, ...........
(2.1 27-31)

- where Etruria is a victim of recent civil upheavals. Earlier in 1.21 Gallus addresses a 'miles ab Etruscis saucius aggeribus'
(line 2) telling him as he is about to die that his bones will be found scattered in the Etrurian mountains in the hope presumably, that they will be identified and given burial:

'et quaecumque super dispersa invenerit ossa
montibus Etruscis, haec sciat esse mea.'
(1.21. 9-10)

In the following elegy he refers to the bones of his relative, which the earth of Etruria has left unburied, in the context of civil wars:
'si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra,
Italae duris funera temporibus,
cum Romana suos egit discordia civis,
(sic mihi praecipue, pulvis Etrusca, dolor,
tu proiecta mei perpessa es membra propinqu,
tu nullo miseri contegis ossa solo),

(1.22. 3-8)

Here we find the strong image of bones left unburied allied with
the troubles caused by war in Etruria as in 1.21. So in 4.10 it
comes as no surprise that bones are mentioned in a reference to
Etruria once more though commentators have neglected the fact:

'heu Vei veteres! et vos tum regna fuistis,
et vestro posita est aurea sella foro:
nunc intra muros pastoris bucina lenti
cantat, et in vestris ossibus arva metunt.'

(4.10. 27-30)

Propertius does what Vergil steered clear of, when he refers to
Rome's blood-guilt towards the annihilation of the city which rose
to protect Fidenae against Roman interference and domination. It
was Lars Tolumnius of Veii who led the joint revolt and was slain
by A. Cornelius Cossus who claimed the 'spolia opima'. I feel sure
that Propertius' lament is a condemnation of the Roman will to
dominate. In lines 25-6 Roman imperialism is motivated by the booty
to be won in war:

'necdum ultra Tiberim belli sonus, ultima praeda
Nomentum et captae iugera terna Corae.'

(4.10. 25-6)

In lines 17-22 Romulus is portrayed as favouring simplicity and
indeed his killing of Acron was not an act of aggression but of
self-defence with no hope of gain:

'hic spolia ex umeris ausus sperare Quirini
ipse dedit, sed non sanguine sicca suo.'

(4.10. 11-12)

Acron after all, had actually constituted a threat to the peace of
mind of the Romans:
'Acron Herculeus Caenina ductor ab arce,
Roma, tuis quondam finibus horror erat.'

(4.10. 9-10)

Propertius devotes 22 lines to the feat of Romulus, 16 to Cossus defeat of Tolumnius and only 6 lines to that of Marcellus over Virdomarus. I would adduce this as further support for the argument that Propertius is not seeking to ingratiate himself with the establishment by praising the line to which one of the emperor's connections belonged, for the poet passes hurriedly over the most recent winning of the 'spolia opima' by the ancestor of Marcellus. Romulus and Cossus are given speeches in lines 15 and 35 respectively but self expression is denied to Marcellus. The poet obviously meant us to compare Romulus' deed with that of Cossus. The former was in effect a necessity, the latter inspired by the will to dominate and make gain and the poet sympathises with the defeated Etruscan side. The pursuit of gain leading to self-destruction is I feel evident in 4.10, and in Bk. 3 two elegies had played with the motifs of 'ossa' and 'spolia', one of which, 3.12 concerning Postumus and Galla has its counterpart in 4.3, where Lycotas and Arethusa are thought to be the characters who appeared in Bk. 3, because of a close similarity of subject matter in both elegies. In 3.12 Postumus is about to desert Galla in order to make his reputation in Augustus' eastern campaigns. In line 3 Galla asks:

'tantine ulla fuit spoliati gloria Parthi,'

and in line 13 she voices her fear -

'neve aliquid de te flendum referatur in urna'

- that in his haste to win 'spolia' he may ultimately be killed and his bones returned home from the front. In 3.7, Paetus driven by the desire to amass wealth undertook a journey by sea but was ship-wrecked and drowned. Propertius makes the following
observation:

'sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa mariae,
nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est.  
infelix Aquilo, raptae timor Orithyiae,  
quae spolia ex illo tanta fuere tibi?'

(3.7. 11-14)

Is it stretching the imagination too far to suggest that Paetus, like Acron thought to win 'spolia' for himself but the reverse happened to both in that they became victims, that is, the 'spolia' of another agent? For the reasons which I have advanced, it is difficult to see how 4.10 can constitute a glorification of heroism.

**Tarpeia and Arethusa**

Two other elegies in Bk. 4, namely 3 and 4 which have military and erotic themes should be looked at now before going directly on to the remaining elegies which are predominantly erotic. The story of Tarpeia, as generally understood by the Romans of our poet's day, told how she had betrayed her father and city by facilitating the entry of the enemy, led by Titus Tatius, king of the Sabines, into Rome. The Roman historians Fabius Pictor and Livy maintain that she hoped to gain materially by arranging to admit them to the city if the Sabines in return would give her the golden amulets which they wore on their arms. Propertius is alone among Roman authors in stating that her deed was committed for love and not money, (see Butler and Barber p.p.343-4) and his treatment of the story as a Hellenistic poet might approach the subject allows him to exploit the psychology of a situation. That he is treating the story with Greek myth in mind is evident from the words which Tarpeia delivers when she declares that her plight is comparable to that of Scylla or Ariadne. (15) -
'quid mirum in patrios Scyllam saevisse capillos, 
candidaque in saevos inguina versa canis? 
prodita quid mirum fraterni cornua monstri, 
cum patuit lecto stamine torta via?'

(4.4. 39-42)

Propertius must have seen the Alexandrian approach to the stories of the princess who falls in love with the enemy commander and betrays her family and country as affording him the opportunity of updating a Roman legend and of commenting on a religious institution, for Propertius has also innovated by making Tarpeia a Vestal virgin as had Varro. This has the effect of making her love for Tatius even more startling. Propertius represents her as a peace-maker who hopes that by her marriage with the Sabine king the two factions may come to terms with one another and lay aside their arms:

'commissas acies ego possum solvere: nuptae 
vos medium palla foedus inite mea. 
adde Hymenaeae modos, tubicen fera murmura conde: 
credite, vestra meus molliet arma torus.'

(4.4. 59-62)

Butler and Barber on line 60 comment "She proposes to do what was actually done by the ravished Sabines who rushed between their Roman husbands and the Sabine fathers and caused them to come to terms". There is no suggestion that the Romans would be slaughtered if her plan were to be seen through; this may be due to naïveté on her part but she is not guilty of wishing that the Romans might perish as long as her plan succeeds. She reminds us that Tatius was not simply an aggressor but was seeking vengeance 'si minus, at raptae ne sint impune Sabinae, /me rape et alterna legae repemde uices!' (lines 57-8) and in effect she could be furthering the cause of justice. By giving Tarpeia the role of Vestal virgin surely Propertius intends us to ask questions.
The first is why does Vesta the goddess actually abet Tarpeia's plan by fanning the flames of her passion even brighter?

'dixit, et incerto permisit bracchia somno,
nescia se furiis accubuisse novis.
nam Vesta, Iliacae felix tutela favillae,
culpam alit et plures condit in ossa faces.'

(4.4. 67-70)

Vesta the goddess of the fire brought from Troy would also appear from Propertius' account to be the goddess of sexual passion. In the last couplet of this quotation fire and sexual passion are equated, in particular 'faces', and also possibly 'favilla'. (16) The Romans had been annoyed at the Sabines' unwillingness to surrender their daughters' in marriage and resorted to violence to gain their ends. Yet here we have a picture of a Roman girl made the victim of a strange rite which demands that she should remain a virgin. By describing Vesta as stirring her emotions even more deeply I suspect that the poet is criticising a practice which denies a sexual outlet for normal healthy girls, much as he criticises Roman military campaigns which lead to a separation between husband and wife, such as Lycotas and Arethusa depicted in the elegy immediately preceding, (with which I shall be concerned later) and Postumus and Galla, the subjects of 3.12. While not condoning treason he is certainly not in favour of a segregation of the sexes of which Tarpeia is a perfect example. The consequences can be disastrous. So when Propertius allows Vesta to inflame Tarpeia's passions even further, I believe we are to construe this as saying that the nature of Tarpeia's task, her exclusive service to the goddess, was in fact responsible for her frustration by denying the gratification of her instincts and it was this frustration which drove her to devise the unfortunate plan. Propertius had been
very much aware of the troubles caused by segregation in the preceding elegy when he made Arethusa say:

'Romanis utinam patuissent castra puellis!'  
(4.3. 45)

- followed three lines later by:

'omnis amor magnus, sed aperto in coniuge maior:  
 hac Venus, ut vivat, ventilat ipsa facem.'  
(4.3. 49-50)

- where Venus makes the torch of love's passion blaze even stronger for Arethusa as Vesta does for Tarpeia. Propertius had devoted a whole elegy, 3.14, to the subject of the segregation of the sexes where he expressed admiration for the Spartan system where there was no need for guarding a girl or fearing for her reputation:

'nec timor aut ulla est clausae tutela puellae'  
(3.14. 23)

The protection of the Vestal flame necessitated that the guardianship be entrusted to virgins who were to have no relationship with men. In 4.4 the *tutela favillae* is effectively, I think, a *tutela puellae* because this service in keeping the flame burning entailed segregation of the priestesses from men. The water needed for the rites of Vesta and her priestesses could not be taken from the main city water supply but from a special spring, and it is as a result of Tarpeia's having to seek water from such a source that she first became infatuated with Tatius -

'obstipuit regis facie et regalibus armis,  
interque oblitas exudit urna manus.'  
(4.4. 21-2)

Here as in the Hylas episode in Bk. 1 and the aition of the Ara Maxima in Bk. 4 we have the motif of the search for water associated with sexuality. I notice that *Nymphae* is used only four times in
Propertius, once in line 25 in the elegy under discussion, and also thrice in 1.20 the Hylas elegy. Its recurrence, outside that elegy in the Monobiblos in 4.4 alone, shows us that Propertius is almost certainly treating the story in the same vein as 1.20, as affording material for dealing with the troubles caused by love, taken from the world of myth and history. To keep the Vestal Virgins remote from the company of men on the one hand and on the other to require that they be put in situations where their instincts, long repressed, with naturally be aroused is 'playing with fire' and Propertius surely intends us to interpret it in this way. Also I suspect that by making Tarpeia a Vestal virgin he is contrasting and criticising Roman practices, for while the Romans at Romulus' instigation found it natural to take wives for themselves by capture from the Sabines, realising that their instincts would be gratified, they nevertheless set aside other women who were to have no dealings with men. In lines 45-7 I would surmise that this sympathetic approach of Propertius is evident once more:

'Pallados extinctos si quis mirabitur ignis,
ignoscat: lacrimis spargitur ara meia.
cras, ut rumor ait, tota potabitur urbe:'
(4.4. 45-7)

The picture of Tarpeia's tears quenching the flame of Vesta, even if it is only a rhetorical conceit must surely be, I feel, deliberately contrasted with that of the Romans quenching their thirsts with drink. While Tarpeia is enduring mental anguish in a fitful sleep the rest of the city is enjoying the festival of the Parilia (lines 73-8). There is 'lusus' in the city, the participants are described as an 'ebria turba' and even the guards are enjoying 'otia', all of which accentuate Tarpeia's miserable plight. Hallett (p.120) considers that Propertius is criticising
Romulus for being negligent at a time when the enemy were actually at the city walls, and is of the opinion that Tarpeia compares Romulus unfavourably with Tatius and that Propertius would subscribe to the comparison. I am inclined to agree. Tatius as she observes has sufficient sense to honour to punish Tarpeia for her deed - "Rome's foe alone could put a stop to behaviour unworthy of a Roman". I would add a fresh evidence that an unfavourable attitude towards Romulus is being expressed by Tarpeia, a direct reminder by the poet of his earlier comments on Romulus. In referring to the rape of the Sabine women in 2.6 he had considered this action, instigated by Romulus, as having been the cause of a subsequent decline in moral standards down to the poet's own day:

\[
\text{'nutritus duro, Romule, lacte lupae:}
\text{tu rapere intactus docuisti impune Sabinas:}
\text{per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor.'}
\]

\[\text{(2.6. 20-2)}\]

Now Tarpeia seems to have remembered well what Propertian commentators seem to have overlooked. I quote, again, her words:

\[
\text{'te toga picta decet, non quem sine matris honore}
\text{nutrit inhumanæ dura papilla lupæ.}
\text{hic, hospes, patria metuar regina sub aula?}
\text{dos tibi non humiliis prodita Roma venit.}
\text{si minus, at raptae ne sint impune Sabinæ,}
\text{me rape et alterna lege repende vices!'}
\]

\[\text{(4.4. 53-8)}\]

This similarity is strong enough to convince me that the poet intends us to remember his criticism of Romulus.

In line 53 Tarpeia says of Tatius 'te toga picta decet' and this is tantamount to saying that whereas Tatius has a nobility which has much in common with the Roman ideal, Romulus on the other hand lacks this quality, for she goes on in her speech to criticise his upbringing and bearing. In 2.6 Propertius saw immorality as
initially introduced into Rome by Romulus, (docuisti, line 21).

How can Tarpeia be criticised if the founder of the city is deemed lacking in good conduct? Overall the elegy is preoccupied with the erotic, and certain features link it with his earlier work, as I have shown. The dramatic changes to his account of this episode from Roman history are also calculated to afford material for a dramatic emotional conflict. Boucher on 4.4 (op.cit.p.148) says that the subject "n'a rien de particulièrement glorieux pour Rome". By choosing such a theme which is not essentially patriotic but which recalls one of Rome's darker moments, and to seek to a considerable extent to exculpate the protagonist, Propertius cannot be seen to be the simple convert to the regime which some would like to make him. If the reader expected a straight-forward account of the story on traditional lines then he could be somewhat surprised at Propertius' treatment of the theme.

Likewise 4.3 is not an unqualified approval of the married state; it cannot by any means be said to represent the poet as having abandoned his earlier hostility to the idea of marriage as expressed say in 2.7. More likely is the possibility that he is reworking the subject of 3.12, where Galla is left behind in Rome by Postumus who is set on achieving success in the emperor's wars. Postumus came in for criticism because his love for material gain was greater than his love for Galla:

'si fas est, omnes pariter pereratis avari,
et quisquis fido praetulit arma toro!'

'moribus his alia coniuge dignus eras.'

(3.12. 5-6, ibid. 16)

- so in 4.3 Arethusa asks 'haecne marita fides?' (line 11) and
Stronger indications that 4.3 was written with 3.12 in mind are the fact that 'araxes' is mentioned only twice in the Propertian corpus, once in each of these elegies (3.12.8 and 4.3.35). Likewise 'lacerna' occurs only twice in the same elegies (3.12.7 and 4.3.18), if we accept 'lacernas' as the reading in 4.8.85 as Butler and Barber and not 'lacernas' as Luck would have it. Hallett's observation on lines 7-9 is 'ad rem' if we are to be sceptical as to whether this can be an elegy complimentary to the emperor.

Butler and Barber (p.338) comment on line 7: "Like Vergil and Horace, Propertius flatters Roman imperialism by anticipating exploits far beyond the point yet reached by Roman arms". It is this comment to which Hallett takes exception - "How on earth could allusions to episodes real or imagined, causing a sad young woman further grief fall into the category of flattery?" (Hallett, p.146). Arethusa is the victim of imperialism and not simply of war, and it is the expansionist policies mentioned in lines 7-9, in particular Bactra (line 7) Sericus (line 8) and Britannia (line 9) which are responsible. In support of the argument for an anti-militaristic approach to 4.3., I would link the elegy with 4.10 in three ways, the possibility of which has not to the best of my knowledge, been recognised by the critics of Bk. 4. In lines 63-4 of 4.3:

'ne, precor, ascensis tanti sit gloria Bactris,
raptave odorato carbasa lina duci,'  
(4.3. 63-4)

- we are reminded, in the pentameter, of the 'spolia opima' which
would be stripped from the conquered chieftain, and by implication of the dubious heroism described in the Jupiter Feretrius aition, 4.10. What can make it more convincing that 4.10 is alluded to is the appearance of the word *gloria* with the verb *ascendo* in that elegy, in a similar position to the same words in 4.3:

'\textit{magnum iter ascendo, sed dat mihi gloria vires:}'

a similarity which has gone unnoticed. In 4.10 Propertius describes the process of composition on a heroic theme in heroic terminology. Now in 4.3 Arethusa proposes to make an offering of the arms of her husband if he returns safely:

'\textit{armaque cum tulero portae votiua Capena, subscribam SALVO GRATA PVELLA VIRO.}'

(4.3. 71-2)

Butler and Barber on this couplet comment: "Though no god is mentioned, it is likely that the dedication was to Jupiter Redux; cp. Ov.H.xiii. 50 'et sua det Reduci vir meus arma Iovi'" (p. 343). Here again I would link 4.3 with 4.10 for, as in the latter elegy the hero would offer the arms taken from the enemy leader to Jupiter Feretrius, likewise Arethusa in the former, makes a dedication of arms to this other aspect of Jupiter, who had the power of bringing soldiers safely home. Jupiter Redux in 4.3 is contrasted with Jupiter Feretrius in 4.10. If my comparison of the two elegies is valid then I would assess the tone of each in the light of the other. The Jupiter Feretrius elegy did not treat the subject with the conviction of one who was a whole hearted supporter of the heroic life. It is the pursuit of 'gloria' which caused Arethusa's unhappiness as well as the troubles which befell Etruria. This is not the place to go into a detailed account of the poet's treatment of the character of Arethusa. I will but quote Hubbard: "There is probably no poem on which Propertius so brilliantly exploits the peculiar
characteristics of his own imagination to create another and convincing character" (Propertius p.147). Though there is a hint of humour occasionally, I see the poet sympathising with the condition of the heroine as a victim of Augustan foreign policy, (See Hallett pp.146-7), and the realism with which she has been created as an indication of the poet's attitude to the problem dealt with in the elegy.

Cornelia

I should like now to discuss the last elegy of the book, dealing with the deceased Cornelia and then to compare it with 4.7 and 8 which have Cynthia as their main subject. 4.11 comprises the speech of a dead 'matrona', the wife of L. Aemilius Paullus who was consul suffectus in 34 B.C., and daughter of Scribonia, who had been for a short while the wife of Octavian. Propertius is thought in this elegy to have been ultimately converted to Augustan ideals bound up with class, reward, social grouping and motherhood. Syme (p.467) found it a work which reveals a "gravity and depth of feeling" on the part of the poet; Butler (O.C.D. under Propertius) calls it "his noblest work". Sellar (Horace and the Elegiac Poets p.304) describes it as "if not the most inspired and spontaneous, certainly the noblest of his elegies". Hubbard, on the other hand (op.cit.p.146), noting the success of the poet in portraying the character of Arethusa, wonders whether Cornelia was so inextricably tangled around his (Propertius') heart-strings as she is round some of his commentators and detects an "interesting lack of harmony between what she says and what she conveys that in the art of his maturity one cannot take to be imposed by the form the poet has chosen". In other words Propertius was deliberately failing to make
of her a convincing character for the reason, as I see it, that her exceptional virtue has too much in common with that of a patient Griselda to effectively engage our sympathy. She is indeed an imposing Roman 'matrona'. The elegy is addressed to her husband and is, in effect, a 'laudatio funebris', an unusual reversal of the practice whereby a living relative would deliver a eulogy of the dead person. She thus arrogates the task of praising herself. She imagines her arrival in the underworld and pleads her case before the judges of Hades. Making a request that Dis Pater should treat her favourably 'det Pater hic umbrae mollia iura meae' (line 18), she declares that she is ready to be judged by Aeacus 'in mea sortita vindicet ossa pila' (line 20). The 'colour' of the subjunctive is important here. Camps (ad.loc.cit.) explains that it expresses not so much a wish as willingness, i.e. it is "jussive permissive; she means 'let him by all means.... I am not afraid.' She is ready to face the judges because she is confident in her virtue". So important is her case that Rhadamanthus and Minos are to act as assessors (line 21), with the Eumenides standing guard, and there is to be a public holiday free from punishments, in Tartarus, for the sinners Tantalus, Sisyphus, and Ixion; even Cerberus is to be spared his guard duty. At this point she confidently announces that she is conducting her own case 'ipsa loquor pro me' (line 27) and if she is found guilty she will usurp the judges' authority for she will stipulate the punishment to be inflicted upon herself— that which was imposed upon the Danaids. In the immediately following lines she neglects to say what she has done on earth but simply indulges in 'name dropping'. She has inherited 'fama' and 'decus' from her paternal ancestors Scipio Africanus the Elder and Younger, also known as Numantinus, and she speaks of the throng of famous people who are her ancestors on her mother's side of the family.
She adduces as witness to her virtues the long since dead Scipio Africanus and Aemilius Paullus conqueror of Macedon (lines 37-42). We learn that her morals, in practice, have not fallen short of the standards required by a censor, (this being almost certainly an allusion to the Censorship of her husband in 22 B.C.) and that she caused no one embarrassment. There could also be the meaning behind the words that she conducted her life in accordance with the moral legislation of Augustus. Her life was consistently good 'nec mea mutata est aetas' and completely faultless 'sine crimine tota est' (line 45). She was naturally good 'mi natura dedit leges a sanguine ductas' (line 47) as a result of good breeding, and no fear of a judge could have made her act more virtuously 'nec possis melior iudicis esse metu' (line 48). Even the strictest jury in the world would not intimidate her, so confident is she of her virtuous ways, and her friends need feel no worry that the decision of the court will bring shame on them. She speaks of herself in the same breath as those paragons of virtue Claudia Quinta and Aemilia. Scribonia, her mother had in no way been disgraced by her daughter's ways. Rome and Caesar were upset when she died, nor can she be accused of barrenness, her husband having merited the 'ius trium liberorum' on her account: 'et tamen emerui generosos vestis honores, / nec mea de sterili facta rapina domo' (lines 61-2). (See Butler and Barber p.384 on this couplet, positing that privileges of this kind must have been granted from 18 B.C., the year of the promulgation of the 'Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus' and not as generally thought from 9 B.C., under the 'Lex Papia Poppaea'). She bids her daughter follow her example and remain 'univira' (lines 67-8), which had from early times been considered a virtue, but in Augustan Rome had become
increasingly rare. In the lines 71-2 'haec est feminei merces extrema triumphi/ laudat ubi emeritum libera fama rogum,' she deems that her moral excellence has merited the 'laudes', which, if she were a man could only be won in connection with a triumph. Paullus is then reminded that the burden of looking after the family has fallen upon himself, and though he might wish to weep, he must refrain from doing so in front of the children and instead show the stiff upper-lip and appear emotionless (lines 79-80). Hallett on these lines notes that "although she takes great pride in her own honesty (27-8, si fallo ....), she has no qualms about ordering Paullus to deceive their children and hide his grief at her death from them (79-80, falle.)" As a widower she expects that Paullus will dream of her and talk to her as though she were able to answer back. If he decides to remarry then she hopes that her children will, by their exemplary behaviour, win over their stepmother. However, in lines 91-2:

'seu memor ille mea contentus manserit umbra
et tanti cineres duxerit esse meos'

- she implies by her use of the adjective 'contentus' and the genitive of value in 'tanti', that if he really loved her sufficiently, he will continue to do so even though she is dead. At line 99 she closes her speech-'causa perorata est', and requests her witnesses, who have been reduced to tears by her words, to rise-'flentes me surgite, testes' (line 99). Cornelia is sure that the earth is grateful that she has led such a good life (line 100). The penultimate line 'moribus et caelum patuit: sim digna merendo,' is translated "some for their virtue have been admitted even to heaven" by Camps, which brings out the force of the 'et' which he thinks is important here (p.167). We immediately think of those types of
deified mortals such as the Dioscuri, Bacchus, Hercules, Romulus, as well as, more recently, the emperor's adoptive father, whose virtues and achievements were honoured by mankind (cf. Hor. Odes 3.3.9-16 where Augustus is prophetically included among their number). When in the final line she makes her last request - 'honoratis ossa vehantur avis' - we could be excused for believing that she is aiming her sights higher than Elysium, especially in view of the recital of her infinite goodness. There is considerable disagreement over the reading of the final word of the elegy. The readings 'avis' (Heinsius) and 'equis' (NFLP1V2) would both refer to Elysium as would 'agris' proposed by my supervisor. Butler and Barber rule out the variant 'equis' because "a triumphal procession in Hades is out of the question!" (p.386). Nevertheless I find it interesting that in line 71 Cornelia applies the word 'triumphus' to herself in a couplet which "ends and sums up her virtues as wife." (Butler and Barber p.385). I suggest that the reading 'equis' can be defended on the grounds that Cornelia is being deliberately ambiguous and leaving her options open, hinting on the one hand at a triumphal apotheosis and, on the other, her conveyance to the underworld to assume a place in Elysium (for horses as a conveyance to Hades see below). In a discussion of the art of the Augustan age, Strong (C.A.H. vol.10 p.551) refers to a significant altar to the 'lares' restored by Augustus depicting on the back panel the apotheosis of Julius Caesar who "like Elijah, rises heavenward in a flaming chariot." Later the same author remarks that "Equestrian statues, always popular with the Romans, had long been granted as a special honour to distinguished men....Of even greater importance were the quadrigae of the gods or of the triumphing Emperors...drawn by a team of four horses, a type of monument to which many of the portraits which we
have been considering probably belonged." (p. 563). The 'honoratis equis' of Cornelia may, I believe, symbolise for her the prestige and progression to an exalted status which she hopes for in death. The use of the verb 'vehantur' with 'equis' in this final line would be by no means unusual, there being numerous parallels in Latin (see Lewis and Short s.v. 'equus' and 'veho' I), and 'honoratus' is commonly associated with 'equus' especially in inscriptions (see op. cit. s.v. 'equus' and lit. cit; also s.v. 'honoro') and we should remember that the whole elegy sounds like a sepulchral epitaph; indeed Butler and Barber go so far as to suggest that the text of this elegy appeared as the inscription on Cornelia's tomb. (p. 378). Nor should the fact that the words conjure up a picture of a man's world be counted against this interpretation when Cornelia, in referring to herself, uses the word 'triumphus' - the winning of which was the goal of mens' ambitions - in the recital of her virtues. As for the doubts expressed by Butler and Barber as to the likelihood of a triumph in Hades they are valid, but do not constitute grounds for rejecting the reading 'equis'. I note that Propertius refers to the horses of the god of the underworld which bore off Persephone to the abode of the dead in 3.22.4 (raptorisque...Ditis equos) hence we can appreciate that for Cornelia horses could symbolise the journey to the underworld as well as a grander apotheosis and public recognition of her virtue in general. Grimal (Latomus 12 1953 p. 45) is, I think, mistaken in regarding Cornelia's apotheosis as a fait accompli and a token of her superiority to Cynthia: "Cornelia est plus purement, plus absolument admirable que Cynthia et telle est sans doute la raison pour laquelle son apotheose couronne le livre tout entier." Hallett does not take him to task on this point with which I shall
deal below. On the other hand, Rothstein (Vol. 2 p. 364) in my opinion, takes too cautious a view: "Cornelia erhebt nicht den Anspruch vergöttert zu werden, wie ausgezeichnete Männer, Hercules, Romulus und Cäsar, zu den Göttern eingegangen sind; aber wen diese Männer sich durch ihre Verdienste die Bahn zum Himmel öffneten, so hofft sie wenigstens ein Anrecht auf Aufnahme in den Wohnungen der Selsigen erworben zu haben, und diese Wohnungen und den Zugang zu Ihnen denkt sie sich hier...." - where he proposes that Cornelia, by referring to mortals who have obtained divine status, is requesting that at least she should be allowed to be enrolled among the souls of Elysium. Rather the poet has made her claim deliberately ambiguous. It is difficult to decide exactly the status she wishes to gain, but the seemingly endless catalogue of her virtues constitute the qualifications we can imagine prerequisite for enrolment among the gods. The words of Cornelia, provoking as they do divergent interpretations, are at least ambiguous and probably intended to draw our attention to her hubristic disposition.

Hallett's own interpretation of this elegy is backed up by a comparison (p.169) of the poem with the sepulchral inscription of the 'matrona' Claudia (C.I.L.12.1211) dateable to 133-122 B.C., which in eight lines provides us with more information about Claudia as a person than one hundred and two lines tell us about Cornelia. Claudia was 'pulchrai', 'sermone lepido' and 'incessu commodo' and 'suum mareitum corde dilexit suom'. She was attractive, a charming talker, graceful in her gait and she loved her husband with all her heart. Cornelia never says that she loves her husband but presumes that she is loved by him. I would point out that Grimal (art. cit. p.44) makes a similar observation when he says of Cornelia that we can only guess that she loved him: "Elle ne parle presque pas de
son amour pour Paullus et le laisse seulement diviner'. In the words of Hallett, "Like Acanthis Cornelia fails to recognise the existence of love as a factor in human relationships" and "values her social and political connections to such an extent that she seeks to be judged on the basis of them, not on any personal qualities" (p.165)

Cornelia's declaration of social success reminds one of the elogia of the Scipios, the ancestors of Cornelia's father, which are, to quote Lattimore "rather stiff and read a little like official statements". (17) This is exactly the impression left by a reading of 4.11, whose subject is cold, materialistic, and overbearing.

Hallett maintains with good reason that Cornelia's assertion that Rome and the emperor mourned her death "sounds proposterous in view of the actual facts, that Augustus would not have considered her a member of his family, immediate or adopted" (p.174-75). She has drawn attention to the fact that in 39 B.C., over twenty years prior to the composition of the elegy under consideration, Octavian had divorced Scribonia the mother of Cornelia after a marriage which had lasted for only a year having become 'peraesus morum perversitatem eius' (Suet. Aug. 62). The union had been contracted as a political expedient, Scribonia's brother having been the father-in-law of Sextus Pompey. Scribonia had only just given birth to Julia before the divorce, and in 2 B.C., she went into voluntary exile with her daughter, their existence in Rome having become endangered (Dio 55. 10.12-16). Moreover in lines 59-60 Cornelia's claim that the emperor considered her a sister worthy of his own daughter Julia is likewise misleading, for Tacitus informs us (Annals 1.53) that Julia's adulterous
relationship with Sempronius Gracchus dates from the period 21-12 B.C., when she was still the wife of Agrippa. I would add that according to Suetonius she showed an adulterous interest toward Tiberius during this same marriage. (Tib. 7). Although Julia was not banished until 2 B.C., it is reasonable to suppose, with Hallett, that her immorality was public knowledge in 16 B.C., the year in which Propertius composed the elegy. These historical facts are further indications that Cornelia's boasts should not be entertained without considerable reservations. Space forbids me to discuss the self-assured worldliness of Cornelia. I refer the reader to Hallett (pp. 163-74) for an illuminating inquiry into those aspects of Cornelia's character which I have touched upon.

Cynthia Dead

I pass now to 4.7, whose subject is also a dead Roman lady. Compared with the frigid Cornelia, Cynthia though also dead in 4.7, appears to live in the dream of Propertius. In 4.8, she will be presented as alive and well, as spirited as she was in the earlier days. By virtue of these two elegies, the poet has secured for her a major place in Bk. 4, her name, I find, being mentioned more than any other, five times in all, as follows: Twice in elegy 7 (lines 3 and 85), and thrice in elegy 8 (lines 15, 51 and 63). The emperor is runner-up, though all instances of his name are confined to one elegy alone, being 4.6, in which he is referred to thrice by name (lines 29, 38 and 81) with the adjectival form appearing once (line 23). What can we discover about Propertius' attitude to Cynthia? In 4.11 Cornelia had supposed that Paullus would be faithful to her memory and dream about her at night, and if, as is almost certainly the case, the dead Cynthia and Cornelia are to be
compared, then Propertius in 4.7 is I feel being faithful to Cynthia's memory by giving her special prominence in his dream about her. That he allows her to level incriminations against himself surely denotes a respect for her feelings. If Propertius recanted in Bk. 4 to become the upholder of Augustan values and Cornelia represents his new ideal of womanhood, why does he allow Cynthia to accuse him of a lack of respect and fidelity and actually assign her to Elysium alongside Andromeda and Hypermnestra 'sine fraude maritae' (line 63)? I would emphasise that Cynthia has already been judged and has her place among the blessed of that abode (lines 59-68) whereas we cannot be certain what fate befell Cornelia. We can only assume that the verdict upon the latter was favourable. By allowing Cynthia to say that she has kept faith-'me servasse fidem' (line 53) and to allege that Propertius lacked this particular virtue-'celo ego perfidiae crimina multa tuae' (line 70) the poet makes her appear morally superior to himself. This I attribute to a change of heart towards Cynthia, whom the poet had accused of perfidy at the close of Bk. 3. A reconciliation between the two, or the realisation that she had not been to blame entirely, could be responsible for Propertius' modified attitude towards her. Of lines 5-6 'cum mihi somnus ab exsequiis penderet amoris, /et quererer lecti frigida regna mei', Camps says that they "might suggest that Propertius and Cynthia were still associated at the time of her death". (p.115). He expresses doubts which I will attempt to allay later, but in the hexameter of the couplet quoted, surely the meaning is quite clear - that he could not fall asleep because he had been shocked by the death and funeral of Cynthia. Admittedly in the pentameter two translations are possible, one meaning that his bed was now a cold domain, assuming this to be due
to Cynthia's death, the other that Cynthia who had once ruled his bed was now a cold corpse. In the light of the meaning of the hexameter, that he could not sleep because of the thought of her recent death, the former interpretation of the pentameter is more sensible, his complaint being that he is now left alone in a cold bed. In any case 'frigida' would not be a suitable word to describe Cynthia whose corpse shows all the signs of cremation and whose passions are still running high. Had Propertius and Cynthia come to terms before her death? The evidence for the break are the elegies 21.24 and 25 of Bk. 3. Musker (Poems of Propertius p.18) notes that in 10th. elegy of Bk. 3, Propertius wrote on the occasion of what must have been Cynthia's birthday, with feelings of tenderness and that he was not disillusioned at this stage. Propertius in the closing two elegies certainly expresses a decision to break off relations with her but "the taunts in the final poem about beauty fading as age approaches are a commonplace and, though sufficiently mordant are free from the sadistic touches by which poems in this strain are sometimes disfigured (see e.g. Horace Odes 1.25: the woman is to weep in an alleyway in the cold wind while burning lust rages around her ulcerated liver)" (ibid.). I would, in addition, cite the evidence of 4.5 in which the torments and curses which Propertius reserves for the 'lena' Acanthis show that his malediction could, if necessary, be much more biting. There is, then, no serious objection to a reconciliation between the two in the years intervening between 22 and 16 B.C. The motifs of 'fides' and 'perfidia' which were especially prominent in the Monobiblos, and evident in the subsequent two books, recur with ironic effect in the Cynthia poems of Bk. 4 according to Lefèvre. He claims that "die Basis der ersten drei Bücher sozusagen auf den Kopf gestellt wird" for "es ist eine
ironische Überraschung dass die immer Ungetreue nun ihrerseits Grund zur Anklage hat" (Propertius Ludibundus p.110). Formerly Propertius had had grounds for accusing Cynthia of 'perfidia' while he had kept his 'fides', but in the last book it is Cynthia who has grounds for accusing Propertius. In 2.8.25 ff. Propertius was so disillusioned with Cynthia, who had taken another lover, that he had considered murdering her so that they could at least be united in death. Concerning this Lefèvre writes "Die Enttäuschung über Cynthia lässt Properz an den Tod denken, doch möchte er sie bei der Vorstellung, dass sie selbst noch den Toten missachten werde, mit in den Tod ziehen. In 4.7 ist es Cynthia, die Properz aus Enttäuschung mit in den Tod reissen will" quoting 4.7. 93-4: 'nunc te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo: mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram' (ibid.). Here again then is another case of reversal. In 4.7 it is Cynthia who looks forward to the death of Propertius when she will be united with him, though he is at present being unfaithful to her memory. Lefèvre considers the technique to be playfully ironic, but if this is so I would ask why in 4.7 Propertius is willing at a stroke to allow himself to be thought the guilty party when in the closing two elegies of Bk. 3 he had called himself the recipient of 'vulners' dealt by Cynthia and stated that for the duration of the affair he had been constant: 'quinque tibi potui servire fideliter annos' (3.25.3), and that she will eventually regret spurning his 'fides', and that he is the victim of 'iniuria'. The details of the circumstances of her household in 4.7 have the ring of truth founded in historical events. A reconciliation subsequently marred by some action or words on Propertius' part is the best way of accounting for the shift of blame from Cynthia onto himself. The unprecedented circumstances
of 4.7, with their attendant realism suggestive of historical reality also favour this interpretation. How is this to affect our assessment of Bk. 4? First of all it allows us to see that the poet is viewing Cynthia in a light which is sufficiently favourable to allow us to believe that between the publication of Bks. 3 and 4, something had intervened to restore Cynthia to Propertius; otherwise the argument that irony is operating in 4.7, to the disadvantage of Cynthia, would have more weight. If no rapprochement had taken place and Propertius were being 'ludibundus' at Cynthia's expense then the exercise has backfired. If, as I believe, Propertius is being sincere in portraying Cynthia as the more virtuous party, this would help to make more plausible my opinion that Propertius is comparing Cynthia favourably with Cornelia.

I must now return, as promised, to Camp's objection to the idea of a reconciliation having taken place. In his opinion the obstacle to an acceptance of the hypothesis of a reconciliation is that the elegy "presents a portrait of Cynthia and an unromanticized portrait at that" (p.115). He does observe, however, that at line 49 the tone of her speech changes exactly in the middle of the elegy, in which she says she will not criticise him, even though he deserves censure: 'non tamen insector, quamvis mereare, Properti'. In the latter half her goodness is stressed. She has gained Elysium as opposed to Tartarus, she has kept faith. In the former half she had complained of his lack of feeling for her, his neglect of her funeral, and his having taken a new mistress. In the latter half she is content to pass over his transgressions, - 'celo ego perfidiæ crimina multa tuæ' (line 70) and she forgets her anger at his mismanagement of the household which she had felt in the former section, and tells him to care for her ageing nurse Parthenie:
It has been recognised that 4.7 and 8 are modelled to a certain extent on the Iliad Bk. 23 and the Odyssey Bks. 20-2 respectively, in which the ghost of Patroclus appears to Achilles, and Odysseus returns to his home and kills the suitors who have been exasperating the patience of Penelope. The pathos of Patroclus' appearance and especially his request that the cremated remains of Achilles be mingled with his own in the funerary urn is found in 4.7:

'nunc te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo: mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.'

(4.7.93-4)

The point I wish to make is that in the former half Propertius recalls the angry side of Cynthia's character, which had manifested itself throughout their love affair, while in the latter half he treats her with nostalgia, reminding himself of her good qualities. I would point out that invective delivered by the dead is a feature of some sepulchral inscriptions (for examples see Lattimore p p. 123-5) and should not be thought necessarily out of place in an elegy whose subject is the dead Cynthia whose violent temper Propertius had sampled in the earlier books, describing himself as 'expertae metuens iurgia saevitiae' in the Monobiblos 3.18.

In the light of what I have said it will be evident that I reject the hypothesis that Propertius saw in Cornelia a better type of woman who conformed to the mores of the establishment, and rejected the ideal of the 'puella' for that of the 'matrona'. He allows Cynthia to speak at the expense of his own reputation and portrays her as much warmer than Cornelia. Cornelia expressed a hope for immortality. In Cynthia's case immortality had virtually
been conferred upon her earlier than the last book, and 4.7. is
the poet's way of proving that what he said of her earlier is true.
In 2.28 he had imagined that she might die due to an illness brought
on, the poet suspected, by the blasphemous claim that she was as
fair as Venus, or that she had slighted Juno or Minerva. Propertius
then gives exempla of women who suffered in life but gained divine
status in death 'sed tibi vexatae per multa pericula vitae/ extre
teniet mollior hora die./ Io versa caput primos mugiverat annos:/
nunc dea, quae Nili flumina vacca bibit.' (lines 15-18). Other
women are then named who obtained divine status; Ino who became
the sea-goddess Leucothoe, and also Andromede and Callisto (lines
19-24). If Cynthia perishes she will be able to converse with
the Olympian goddess Semele about her illness and death - 'quod si
forte tibi properarint fata quietem,/ illa sepulturae fata beata
tuae,/narrabis Semelae, quo sit formosa periclo,/credet et illa,
suo docta puella malo;' (lines 25-8) - and be more outstanding than
the Homeric heroines in the life beyond 'et tibi Maeonias omnis
heroidas inter/primus erit nulla non tribuente locus' (lines 29-30).
Could it be that Propertius is demonstrating the veracity of his
claim in the Monobiblos that 'traicit et fati litora magnus amor.'
(1.19.12)? In that elegy he had protested that his love for her
would live on after his death, and that like Protesilaus his ghost
would return to his beloved, his only fear being that she might prove
unfaithful. The situation is reversed in 4.7. but might, neverthe-
less, be a reaffirmation of his beliefs about the survival of love
after death and this may be said of 4.7. and 4.8 in general, both
of which give considerable space to his relationship with Cynthia.
If what I have said is true then Propertius, in writing the last line
of 4.7 viz. 'inter complexus excidit umbra meos.' demonstrates that
he still has feelings for her, and that his elegiac Heals have not been abandoned by pressure from official quarters. If I may be permitted to draw an analogy from the world of music which might help towards an understanding of the poetic intention behind these two Cynthia poems, then by following his 'adagio assai' 4.7 with an 'allegro vivace' 4.8, Propertius was utilising a device which Beethoven uses in the 'Eroica' symphony where by leading from the Marcia Funebre into a Scherzo a triumphal note is struck.

Cynthia Alive

Hubbard has briefly drawn attention to the beginning of 4.8; with regard to the first fourteen lines she says "The reader has already met sacred places and explanatory rites in poems 2, 4 and 6 of this book and has been promised something similar in poem 1. Whatever he next expects after this elaborate and high sounding preface, it is not what he gets, an account of Cynthia's misconduct at this festival in the company of a depilated wastrel destined to a low gladiatorial career when the beard he is ashamed of finally vanquishes his shaven cheeks" (Propertius p.154). After stating this she does not question whether those elements which make the introduction misleading are to be found throughout the poem. My inquiry is concerned with such elements, and I have found that their occurrence elsewhere in the elegy can, with justification, allow us to view the poem as a parody of the aetiological works, as I shall now attempt to clarify. It is with the similarities between 4.8 and some features of the aetiological elegies with which I shall be preoccupied.

First of all, I must give a brief exegesis of the subject matter. Fourteen lines (3-14) are devoted to describing the
religious practice involving a snake rite at Lanuvium to ensure the fertility of the earth for farmers. The real subject, however, is far removed from religious seriousness, for it narrates Cynthia's dissolute behaviour at the festival with a low-bred lover, and Propertius' reaction to this which involved spending an abandoned evening at home in the company of two loose women. Cynthia's jealousy is provoked on her return and she routs the opposition, vents her fury upon Propertius forcing him to accept her 'terms' and concludes them in bed.

The location with which elegies 1a and 6 are associated is the Palatine hill and elegies 4 and 10 are connected with the Capitoline hill. Elegy 9 has as its setting the Aventine. The aetia dealing with Roman history are thus linked with famous hills of Rome. I consider the opening couplet of 4.8 to be part and parcel of the parody mentioned above:

'Disce, quid Esquilias hac nocte fugarit aquosas, cum vicina novis turba cucurrit agris.'

(4.8.1-2)

We are to be told a 'historia' which has only just occurred (discē ... hac noctē) on the Esquiline hill, but there is, I detect, a direct allusion in this same couplet to one of his earlier aetiological elegies, 4.4; we know that Cynthia's jealous fury became intolerable for the neighbours (vicīna turba) who quit their homes for the peace and quiet of the gardens of Maecenas (novis agris), and here we are surely meant to remember how Tarpeia's utterance concerning her love for Tatius had tried the patience of her neighbour the god Jupiter of the Capitol. 'Et sua Tarpeia residens ita flevit ab arce/ vulnera, vicīno non patienda Iovi:' (lines 29-30). Stronger support for my proposition that Propertius intended us to
think of 4.4 is to be found in lines 53-6 of 4.8:

'pocula mi digitos inter cecidere remissos,
palluerantque ipso labra soluta mero.
fulminat illa oculis et quantum femina saevit,
spectaculum capta nec minus urbe fuit.'

- where Cynthia returns enraged, the immediate effect on Propertius being that he drops his wine cup, turns pale, and compares the ensuing scene in his household to the capture of a city (line 56). In 4.4, Propertius describes the effect on Tarpeia when she first saw Tatius: 'obstipuit regis facie et regalibus armis, / interque oblitas excidit urna manus.' (lines 21-2); being so amazed at his appearance she let drop the water urn which she was carrying. The ultimate consequence of this was that the city of Rome was captured. Commentators have been too willing to accept the 'conquest' of Cynthia as the poet's adaptation of the story of Odysseus routing the suitors in his household, duly noting the Homeric parallels in 4.7 and 4.8, with the result that certain parallels within Book 4 itself have apparently been neglected. The central elegy of the book, 4.6, dealt with the Actian triumph of the emperor in which, as I sought to demonstrate earlier, Propertius strove to present Cleopatra as a woman who would never have constituted a threat to Rome if the city had had a leader of sufficiently high calibre. Her appearance in a Roman triumph would have been an embarrassment, a pathetic reflection on the ability of the 'triumphator'. Now in 4.8 Cynthia is pictured as riding in a triumphal chariot along the Via Appia to Lanuvium:

'Appia, dic quaeso, quantum te testa, triumphum egerit effusis per tua saxa rotis!'

(4.8 17-18)

Hubbard (op. cit. 155) has remarked upon the blasphemy implicit in Cynthia's conduct, directing our attention to the coins of Lanuvium
representing the goddess of the festival in a pose similar to that adopted by Cynthia but does not explain the nature of the similarity beyond the fact that both Cynthia and Juno Sospita appear to be 'tearing' along in chariots. Hallett only hints that there may be some divine parallel when she speaks of Cynthia's "super-human display of strength" (p. 185). If we look more closely we will see that the implications of this resemblance add up to more for the elegy as a whole. The reverse of the coin in question (see photograph 10b. overleaf) shows the goddess in a two-horse drawn chariot (biga); the most astonishing aspect of her is that she appears quite warlike. In her right hand a spear is held horizontally poised ready to be hurled. Her left hand holds a shield. These weapons are also held by the statue giving the goddess every appearance of being a warrior and indeed Latte speaks of a 'Kriegerische Kultstatue' (op. cit. p. 167, note 5). Cynthia's reckless chariot ride to Lanuvium reminds us of the chariot-borne Juno Sospita. Her return from Lanuvium to Propertius' house on the Esquiline Hill brings to mind the martial pose of the goddess for she virtually declares war on the household and successfully routs the opposition.

Apart from the victors who gained the 'spolia opima' in 4.10, Cynthia is the only character in the last book who actually draws blood successfully in a fight:

'Cynthia gaudet in exuviis victrixque recurrit et mea perversa sauciat ora manu, imponitque notam collo morsuque cruentat, praecipueque oculos, qui meruere, ferit.'

(4.8. 63-6)

I suggest that by the use of the verb 'ferit' we are again drawn to elegy 4.10 where the same verb is found again in connection with the 'spolia opima' -
Overleaf: statue and coins representing
Juno Sospita, photograph reproduced
from K. Latte: Römische Religionsgeschichte.
8. Juno Seispes von Lanuvium

9a. Juno Seispes  
9b. Mädchen, die Tempelschlan ge fütternd

10a. Juno Seispes  
10b. Juno Seispes auf Wagen
'nunc spolia in templo tria condita: causa Feretri,
ominem quod certe dux ferit ense ducem;'

(4.10. 45-6)

The verb 'ferio' appears only thrice in Bk. 4, once in each of the
elegies under discussion, and on another occasion in 4.5, where
Acanthis uses it in the vulgar sense of to dupe or trick. In the
line quoted above,-'Cynthia graudet in exuviiis victrixque recurrir'
the 'exuviae' are equivalent in meaning to 'spolia'. (for the
emphases, see below). Above, I agreed with Hubbard's contention
that Cynthia's career in her chariot down the Appian Way was meant
to evoke a picture of the goddess of the festival at Lanuvium.
Here I have a strong suspicion that an element of blasphemy is again
present. In Bk. 4 the adjective 'victrix' appears only twice outside
this elegy and both examples are to be found in 4.1 when Horos
describes how 'Veneris sub armis' Propertius should fight in Venus'
wars with a 'puella' who would deprive him of the palm of victory-
'victrices palmas' (lines 137-40) and in the former half he had
spoken of the 'victricia arma' of Venus-'vexit et ipsa sui Caesaris
arma Venus;/ arma resurgentis portans victricia Troiae:' (lines 46-7).
In 4.8 then, I consider that Cynthia is portrayed as a second Venus
Victrix. The poem is replete with imagery of the 'castra amoris'
which reaffirms his belief in the elegiac lover's way of life of the
earlier books. Hallett (p.130) enumerates these images drawing the
conclusion that lovers' conflicts, followed by the arrangement of
terms assuring a peaceful existence are once again shown to be
preferable to wars waged against Rome's enemies. There should be
"reconciliation and better mutual understanding" rather than "cold
blooded slaughter" as typified for instance by 4.10. By also using
epic diction set in the aetiological framework of the elegy, I
imagine that Propertius is intimating, that his elegiac way of life
is as important, if not more important than the themes treated in the aetiological elegies proper. The religiosity of the last six lines in which Cynthia performs a purification ceremony serve to remind us that his approach to 'sacra' elsewhere in Bk. 4 should not be taken too seriously. The possibility that some reference to a contemporary religious practice is intended has been overlooked. I discover that in 17 B.C., as part of the rituals involved in celebrating the Ludi Saeculares the emperor personally donated 'suffimenta,' that is incense for purificatory purposes, to the citizens. Coins depicting Augustus actually handing out the substance, have survived. (19) (see photograph overleaf). Propertius' use of the verb 'suffio' (line 84) would also readily bring to mind the donation which is described as 'suffimenta' on the coin. An allusion to this event in the closing lines of 4.8 is chronologically possible and would be in keeping with the mock religiosity of the whole poem. Critics have rightly compared the ritual cleansing in 4.8 to the scene in the Odyssey (Bk. 22) where the hero fumigates his household after killing the suitors but have ignored a contemporary historical parallel in favour of a mythical one. (20)
The theme of the aetiological elegies 3 and 4 had encompassed sexual frustration brought on by considerations of state. Tarpeia's love for Tatius was hopeless because Rome was at war with the Sabines, and Arethusa had been separated from Lycotas because he was fighting in Augustus' Parthian campaign. By leading a life free from social commitment on the other hand, the sexual passions can be satisfied as Propertius describes in the concluding couplet:

'atque ita mutato per singula pallia lecto respondi, et toto solvimus arma toro.'

(4.8. 87-8)

where 'solvimus arma' literally meaning to lay down weapons and
Overleaf: a 'siliqua' of 16 B.C., photographed reproduced from H. Mattingly: 
Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum
refrain from fighting is used as a metaphor for making love (cf. 'osculaque admota sumere et arma manu', 1.3.16) thereby evoking the world of the 'castra amoris' and restating the message of 'make love and not war' found in the earlier books. This transference of military imagery to describe the life devoted to peace serves, as elsewhere in the work of the elegist, to undercut heroic values, and by doing so in an elegy which is a parody of the aetiological elegies which contained a dubious heroism, Propertius makes his message more effective.

Vertumnus

Vertumnus, whom Propertius chooses to treat in 4.2, is a relatively obscure god in the Roman pantheon, but one who had originally been the principal god of Etruria—'deus Etruriae princeps' (Varro L.L. 5.46). His statue stood in the Vicus Tuscus having been brought to Rome by the Etruscan soldiers led by Lucumon whose aid had been sought by Romulus in his fight against Tatius King of the Sabines:

'et tu, Roma, meis tribuisti praemia Tuscis,
(unde hodie Vicus nomina Tuscus habet),
tempore quo sociis venit Lycomedius armis
atque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.'
(4.2. 49-52)

The couplet immediately following makes it clear that the statue's first appearance in Rome dates at least from this period when it actually witnessed the fighting between the Sabines and the Roman-Etruscan alliance:

'vidi ego labentis acies et tela caduca,
atque hostis turpi terga dedisse fugae.'
(4.2. 53-4)

Moreover, the fact that he describes himself as 'ante Numam grata
pauper in urbe deus' (line 60) shows again that his residence in Rome dates from the Kingship of Romulus and that subsequently he was cast in bronze during the reign of Numa by Mamurius Veturius (lines 61-3). His introduction to Rome thus marked a period of co-operation between Roman and Etruscan which was not, however, destined to last very long; in the second couplet of the elegy he alludes to the dark side of Rome's dealings with Etruria for he speaks of the occasion when the Romans led by M. Fulvius Flaccus annihilated Volsinii a leading Etrurian city in 264 B.C.; Vertumnus tells us that it was then that he 'inter proelia Volsinios desersuisse focos' (lines 3-4). The 'templum' of line 5 is in all probability that which Flaccus erected on the Aventine to house the god in fulfilment of an 'evocatio'. I will give my own interpretation of Vertumnus' mention of the temple later, but meanwhile, I wish to emphasise that the destruction of Volsinii like that of Veii is an historical landmark in the story of Rome's hostility towards Etruria. In 1.22 Propertius had imagined himself called upon to give an account of his origins: 'Qualis et unde genus, qui eint mihi, Tulle, Penates,/quaeris pro nostra semper amicitia' (lines 1-2), likewise Vertumnus replies to an inquisitive (but imaginary) person 'Qui mirare meas tot in uno corpore formas,/accipe Vertumni signa paterna dei' (lines 1-2). Both speakers proceed to give an account of their origins and both allude to the tribulations of Etruria. When the god informs us that he left Volsinii while the battle raged (lines 3-4, sup. cit.), we recall Propertius' mention of a more recent devastation of Etruria in the context of a 'recusatio' where he spoke of the 'eversosque focos antiquae gentis Etruscae' (2.1.29). Vertumnus is suffering neglect and as Hallett (p. 99) remarks, his very existence is threatened, which is the meaning behind lines 6,
and 55-6 (on which see below). In dealing with 4.10, I discussed Propertius' description of the site of Veii destroyed, abandoned and given over to flocks and the plough, which constituted, I believe, a lament for the destruction of Etruscan civilization. That passage reminds me strongly of a couplet in 2.6 'sed non immerito! velavit aranea fanum/ et mala desertos occupat herba deos.' (lines 35-6) - where, again man's disregard allows what ought to have been respected to become overgrown with wild vegetation, in this case the statues of the gods. Now it is interesting that this couplet quoted from 2.6, is preceded by 'non istis olim variabant tecta figuris:/ tum paries nullo crimine pictus erat' (lines 33-4). The elegy from which these lines are taken was concerned with the bad effect which wealth exerted upon morals and in lines 33-4 the craze for statues and pictures is seen as contributing to the neglect of the gods described in lines 35-6 being part of the process of moral degeneration. At this point I bring to mind the two thousand statues carried off to Rome after the sack of Volsinii by Flaccus, among them, in all probability, the statue of the god Vertumnus who had been the object of the general's 'evocatio', and who in 4.2 is portrayed as a victim of greed and now suffering the sort of neglect which befell Veii and the shrines of the gods in elegies 4.10 and 2.6.

Livy, as Latte has indicated (op.cit. p.191), speaks of the shrine of Vertumnus as the scene of an annual pan-Etruscan congress: "Der annalist den Livius in der ersten Dekade folgt, nennt wiederholt eine Bundesversammlung der Etruskerner ad fanum Voltumnae, was schwerlich mehr ist als eine andere Form des gleichen Namens." If we bear in mind Varro's testimony that Vertumnus was
the leading Etruscan god then his virtual redundancy as a god in Rome is indeed remarkable. (see Latte, ibid. "In der volkstumlichen Religion hat der Gott in Rom keine Rolle gespielt") As I mentioned above, the god is anxious about his future. His wish is that he may continue to witness the life of the forum: 'Romanum satis est posse videre Forum' (line 6), 'sed facias, divum Sator, ut Romana per sevum/ transeat ante meos turba togata pedes' (lines 55-6). Hallett follows the argument of Grimal in explaining the god's anxiety as due to the threat of the removal of his statue because of the building programme which involved the rebuilding and extension of the Basilica Julia which had been destroyed by fire at the beginning of the reign of Augustus, who now decided to rebuild it on a grander scale. Whereas the restored Basilica was dedicated in 12 B.C., Grimal (Latomus 12 1953, p.30) rightly points out that the whole project probably spanned the previous twenty years; the extension of the building could only have been southward into the Vicus Tuscus with the result that the statue's view of the Forum was obscured - "dissimule derriere la basilique projetee le malheureux risquait de ne plus rien voir du tout". It may even have been necessary to actually remove the statue. I would disagree however with Grimal when he says that Propertius thought it necessary to include an Etruscan aition which would avoid evoking the hostilities between Rome and Etruria: "Les autres legendes ou intervenaient le peuple etrusque ou ses rois n'etaient que recits de violence, de conquete et de tyrannie. Et Properce ne pouvaient pour cette raison les evoquer" art. cit. p.31). My comments on Veii in 4.10 make it clear that the poet intended us to sympathise with the fall of Etruscan greatness and when Volsinii is named in the elegy under discussion we think as a Roman of Propertius' day must have done of the
destruction of the Etruscan heritage, which permitted the immediate demotion of its chief deity.

In the couplet - 'haec me turba iuvat, nec templo laetor eburno: Romanum satis est posse videre Forum' (lines 5-6), Vertumnus speaks of a temple. This must be the edifice built by M. Fulvius Flaccus in fulfilment of the 'evocatio' of which I spoke earlier. The statue of the god in the Vicus Tuscus however is quite distinct from the god's temple on the Aventine. The statue actually witnesses at first-hand everyday Roman life in the Forum and hopes that he may continue to do so (lines 55-6). This should lead us to query the meaning of 'nec templo laetor eburno' which is ambiguous to say the least. Butler and Barber on these lines comment: "It may be inferred from this that the temple on the Aventine was not remarkable for its magnificence". Paley comments: "The statue of Vertumnus, apparently not inclosed in a shrine (nec templo laetor eburno) was placed in the Vicus Tuscus...". The former interpretation takes 'nec' with 'eburno' and not as a negative with the verb 'laetor'. Paley takes 'nec' with 'laetor' translating them as "I do not possess" but while I also take these two words together I would translate them as "I do not enjoy" preferring the alternative sense of the verb. Butler and Barber portray the god as happy with a shabby temple whereas I imagine Vertumnus to be saying "I have a fine temple ornamented with ivory (the one on the Aventine) which I do not occupy nor would it give pleasure to do so". Camps dismisses the possibility of a specific reference to the Aventine temple in favour of the view that a grand temple in general is to be understood. However, if Vertumnus were to be installed in the Aventine temple he would have two reasons for complaint, for he would be deprived of his view of the life of the Forum, and he would be sharing it with a portrait of
his conqueror (see Latte, op. cit. p.191, Fest. 228L) in triumphal
garb, a constant reminder of his fate in Rome. So much for
Vertumnus' expressions of insecurity. I come now to the point
where I will argue that Vertumnus has much in common with Maecenas,
fallen from favour since 23 B.C., putting forward new evidence which,
added to that of Lucot (Pallas 1 1953, pp.66-80), makes the argument
more sound. Maecenas is to be considered the main guise of Vertumnus
as he has something in common with the various aspects of the god.

The most recent articles on Propertius 4.2. by Dee and
Marquis (21) discuss the elegy without expressing acquaintance with
the view of Lucot that Vertumnus personifies Maecenas in lines 21-46,
nor did an earlier article by Suits (22); in none of these articles
does the name of Maecenas appear. The similarities which I have
noticed between the passages from the first two books of Vergil's
Georgics and the Vertumnus elegy lines 1-22 are put forward to
corroborate Lucot's argument, for they show quite clearly that
Propertius intended us to remember both Vergilian passages, the
former dedicating the book to Maecenas, the latter again referring
to him by name in a horticultural context. It is in such a context
that we discover the god in 4.2. when he derives his name from the
procession of the seasons ('vertentis anni', line 11), and enumerates
the fruits named by Vergil in the passage quoted from the second book
of the Georgics. Vergil describes how one plant can, in effect,
become another sort of plant by means of grafting. The experience
of Vertumnus is strangely similar for in lines 21-46 he will
proceed to tell us that he also is capable of transformation. The
nature of my evidence is a startling correspondence of words between
the Vertumnus elegy and passages from Vergil's Georgics Books 1 and
2 where he addresses Maecenas. Lucot appears to have been the first
to see that in 4.2, Propertius was presenting us with a picture of Maecenas. However, he dealt only with the transformations of Vertumnus in lines 21-46. My evidence embraces the lines 1-22 and by a comparison with the passages from the Georgics (see lay-out overleaf) shows that Propertius had Maecenas in mind, the effect being that Maecenas after all is prominent in Bk. 4, to such an extent that he may be seen as the dedicatee of the book, in this, the first elegy after the announcement of the programme of the work as a whole. Further evidence will be brought to bear to defend the equation of Vertumnus with Maecenas.
'Quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram
vertere, Maecenas, ulmisque adiungere vitis
conveniat, quae cura boum, qui cultus habendo
sit pecori, apibus quanta experientia parcis,
hinc canere incipiam.'

(Vergil, Georgics 1.1-5)

'et saepe alterius ramos inpune videmus
vertere in alterius, mutatamque insita mala
ferre pirum et prunis lapidosa rubescere corna.
quare agite o proprios generatem discite cultus
agricolae, fructusque feros mollite colendo
neu segnes iacent terrae. iuvat Ismara Baccho
conserere atque olea magnum vestire Tabernum.
tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem,
o decus, o fame merito para maxima nostrae,
Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti!

(Vergil, Georgics 2.32-41)

'tamen haec quoque, si quis
insert aut scrobibus mandet mutata subactis,
exuerint silvestrem animum, cultuque frequenti
in quascumque voles artis haud tarda sequitur.'

(Vergil, ibid.49-52)

'iam quae seminibus iactis se sustulit arbos
tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram,
pomace degenerant sucos obita priores
et turpis avibus praedam fert uva racemos.'

(Vergil, ibid.57-60)

'Qui mirare mess tot in uno corpore formas,
accipe Vertumni signa paterna dei.
Tuscus ego (et) Tuscis orior, nec paenitet inter
proelia Volsinios deseruisse focos.'

(Propertius, 4.2.1-4)

'seu, quia vertentis fructum praecipimus anni,
Vertumni rursus credidit esse sacrum.
prima mihi variat liventibus uva racemis,
et coma lactenti spicce fruge tumet;
hic dulces cerasos, hic autmamia pruna
cernis et aestivo mora rubere die;
insitor hic solvit pomosa vota corona,
cum pirus invito stipite mala tuit.
mendax fama, noces: alius mihi nominis index:
de se narranti tu modo crede deo.
opportuna mea est cunctis natura figuris:
in quacumque voles verte, decorus ero.'

(Propertius, ibid.11-22)
I do not intend to dwell for the moment on the numerous similarities which are presented in such a way as to make them evident at first sight. Their relevance will become apparent when added to the findings of Lucot.

Dee has noticed that 'liventibus uva racemis' echoes both Horace (Odes 2.5. 10-12) and Vergil's 'uva racemos' (Georgics 2.60. quoted above). He also observes when examining Propertius' use of 'insitor' (line 17) that he "seems to be playing upon another Vergilian passage, Georgics 2.33-4 'mutatamque insita mala/ferre pirum et prunis lapidosa rubescere corna' ". These are the only correspondences which he has designated between the passages quoted above, and the latter instance is cited only to shed light on the Propertian use of "a word of extreme rarity". (For Dee's approach to these echoes which I have included in my parallel passages, see art.cit. pp. 46-47). Before drawing conclusions we must first investigate the evidence of Lucot for lines 21-46 of 4.2;

'indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella:
meque virum sumpta quis neget esse toga?'
(23-4)
'suppetat hic, piscis calamo praedabor, et ibo
mundus demissis institor in tunicis'
(37-8)

In the former couplet (lines 23-4) Vertumnus claims that he can easily assume the appearance of a girl dressed in Coan silk at one moment and that of a man wearing a toga at another. We know that there was uncertainty regarding the sex of the chief divinity of the Etruscans. Livy speaks of Voltumna, and it is thought that either the divinity was masculinised when brought to Rome or that Vertumnus was the male counterpart of Voltumna. Propertius apparently was aware of the bisexual nature of the god which gives the couplet part of its significance but we must ask with Lucot "pourquoi des étoffes de Cos?" Our evidence for the character of Maecenas proves that he was notoriously effeminate and the descriptions of his literary style are almost certainly influenced by the salient features of his life-style, for instance Tacitus (Dialogus 26.1) in discussing Maecenas' literary style speaks of it as effemintely dressed-"fucatis et meretriciis vestibus", and Seneca seeking to prove that 'le style c'est l'homme lui-même' speaking of Maecenas says 'qui lacernas coloris improbi sumunt, qui perlucentem togam,.....'
( Epp. 114. 21.) and criticising one of his poems which expressed a desire to hang on to life at any cost, spoke of its effeminacy-'Quid sibi vult ista carminis effeminati turpitude?' (Epp. 101.13); just as Vertumnus could be either 'vir' or 'puella' so Maecenas' life style would remind us a 'vir' at one moment, and a 'femina' at another- 'vir, ubi res vigiliam exigeret,..... otio ac molitiis paene ultra feminam fluens' (Vell. Pat.2.88.2). Juvenal also alludes to the feminine aspect of Maecenas in 'vestem/purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam' (12.39.) In the latter couplet (lines 37-8) Vertumnus claims that he can wear his tunic high as a fisherman or
wear one which reaches to his feet. Maecenas' eccentricity revealed
itself in his dress, in particular the wearing of a loose flowing
tunic which reached to his heels: 'hoc tibi occurret hunc esse qui
solutis tunicis in urbe semper incesserit? nam etiam cum absentis
Caesaris partibus fungeretur, signum a discincto petebatur' (Seneca
Epp. 114.6); 'Non oratio eius aequa soluta est quam ipse discinctus?'
(Epp. 114.4); 'Habuit ingenium grande et virile, nisi illud secundis
discinisset', (Epp. 92.35). The author of the 'Elegy in defence of
Maecenas' also refers to this habit of Maecenas:

'Quod discinctus eras (namque id prope carpitur unum),
diluitur nimia simplicitate tua.
Sic illi vixerex quibus fuit aurea Virgo,
quae bene praecinctos postmodum pulsa fugit.
Livide, quid tandem tunicae nocuere solutae
aut tibi ventosi quid nocuere sinus?
Num minus urbis erst custos et Caesaris hospes?'
(Eleg. in Maec. 1.21-7)

He also seeks to excuse Maecenas by pointing out that Bacchus and
Hercules had worn flowing tunics: 'Et tibi securo tunicae fluxere
solutae' (sc. Baccheline 57), (ibid. line 59) 'Lydia te tunicas
iussit lasciva fluentes/inter lanificas ducere' (sc. impiger Alcide
line 69) (ibid. line 77). So far, the picture which Propertius has
drawn of Vertumnus has more in common with what we know of Maecenas
and the same can be said of the couplet we shall consider next:

'sobrius ad lites: at cum est imposta corona,
clamabis capiti vine subisse meo'
(4.2.29-30)

Vertumnus can be sober or drunk at will. Now the evidence suggests
that Maecenas was very partial to wine. Seneca criticises, as we
have seen, his dress, and he also censures his drunkenness:

'Feliciorum ergo tu Maecenatem putas....? Mero se licet sopiat....'
(Da Prov. 3.10), 'ebrius sermo' (Epp. 19.9), 'ebrii hominis'
(Epp. 114.4) 'ebrietas' (Epp. 114.22). The author of the first
elegy in defence of Maecenas excuses his subject's love of wine and as Lucot has acutely observed, has adapted a line of Propertius in so doing 'Bacche, coloratos postquam devicimus Indos, /potasti galea duce iuvante merum' (Eleg. in Maec. 1. 57-8) the pentameter strongly echoing 'potabis galea fessus Araxis aquam (Prop. 3.12.8). Pliny even speaks of 'vina Maecenatiana' (N.H. 14.67). Horace, knowing how discriminating a wine drinker was his friend, excuses the quality of his own wine - 'vile potabis modicis Sabinum/cantharis....' (Odes 1.20. 1-2); 'Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno/tu bibes uavam' (ibid. 9-10). Likewise he asks Mæcenas to taost his friend with a hundred cupfuls of wine - 'sume Mæcenas, cyathos amici/sospitis centum....' (Odes 3.8.13ff); Epistles 1.19 addressed to Mæcenas tells how wine had inspired the poets Homer and Ennius, and interestingly enough the first word of the next epistle is 'Vertumnum', a point which Lucot overlooks. So much for the testimony of Horace.

Vertumnus imagines himself wearing a chaplet in his drunken state - 'imposta corona' - suggesting that he has been to a sympotic gathering. Now the scholiast on Vergil informs us that Mæcenas had written a 'Symposium' which was concerned with a eulogy of the merits of wine: 'Hoc etiam in Symposio ubi Vergilius et Horatius interfuerunt, cum ex persona Messalae de vi vini loqueretur, ait "idem umor ministrat faciles oculos, pulchriora reddit omnia, et dulcis iuventae reducit omnia" ' (Schol. Dan. adVerg. Aen. 8.310). If we accept that Mæcenas was in Propertius' mind when he composed 4.2 then it is not difficult to see a reference to the Etruscan's praise of wine in the picture of a tipsy, revelling Etruscan god. The 'corona' (line 29) which Vertumnus describes himself as wearing may also be a reminder of Mæcenas' love of flowers which Lucot duly notes on 'rosam' (line 40), overlooking the possibility of this
earlier instance. Vertumnus goes on to tell us that given a 'mitre' (an effeminate piece of clothing for a man to wear, which recalls yet again Maecenas' 'mollitia') he will play the part of Bacchus (the god of the vine, carrying on the portrait of Maecenas as a tippler) as well as that of Apollo the god of song:

'cinge caput mitra, speciem furabor Iacchi; 
furabor Phoebi, si modo plectra dabis.'
(lines 31-2)

We possess several fragments of Maecenas' poetic compositions - epigrams, a hexameter line supposed to have belonged to an epic poem, and a line from a galliambic poem. The 'Prometheus' and 'Octavia' were probably tragedies. Here again the 'Elegy in defence of Maecenas' supplies the information that is lacking due to the loss of Maecenas' literary works; 'Pallade cum docta Phoebus donaverat artes,/ tu decus et laudes huius et huius eras' (Elegia in Maec. l. 17-18); 'Pieridas Phoebumque colens in mollibus hortis'. (ibid. 35). Apollo had bestowed artistic gifts upon him and Maecenas 'cultivated' Apollo and the Muses in his garden (on which see below), which is another way of saying that he was accustomed to writing poetry in his garden. He can easily, like Vertumnus, be identified with aspects of both of these gods.

In the couplet:

'est etiam aurigae species Vertumnus et eius 
traicit alterno qui leve pondus equo.'
(lines 35-6)

Vertumnus claims that he can assume the appearance of a charioteer and one who jumps from one horse to another. Lucot demonstrates convincingly that Maecenas must have had a passion for horses to which Propertius is alluding. Boucher in his book Études sur Properce (which post-dates Lucot's article by more than a decade) would
support this view for he argues not only that Maecenas was generally interested in horses but also that with them he must have won an Olympic victory (p.35, quoting Verg. Georg. 3.49, Hor. Ode 1.1.3, Prop. 3.9.17). We possess some evidence from Propertius' earlier works, for instance 'si te forte meo ducet via promima busto, / esseda caelatis siste Britanna iugis' (2.1.75-6) which credits him with possessing a British chariot, and 'mollia tu coeptae fautor cape lora iuventae, / dexteraque immissis da mihi signa rotis' (3.9.57-8) where, asking for guidance on literary matters he appeals to Maecenas to steer him as though he were a young steed, and in the line 'has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus.' (4.1.70) where Propertius likens the effort involved in his undertaking to that spent by a horse racing to the finishing post. Vergil also testifies to his patron's interest in horses and hunting;

'interea Dryadum silvas saltusque sequamur intactos, tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa. te sine nil altum mens incohate: en age segnis rumpe moras; vocat ingenti clamore Cithaeron Taygetique canes domitrixque Epidaurus equorum, et vox adsensu nemorum ingeminata remugit.'

(Georgics 3.40-45)

Likewise Horace in dedicating the first three books of Odes to Maecenas writes:

'Maecenas atavis edite regibus o et praesidium et dulce decus meum, sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum collegisse iuvat metaque fervidis evitata rotis palmaque nobilis terrarum dominos evexit ad deos;'

(Horace Odes 1.1.1-6)

- drawing a picture of the chariot race and the glory which accrues to the victor.

Before dealing with the remaining couplets in the section comprising lines 21-46, it will be helpful to supply a little more
information about Maecenas' writings and interests in support of what Lucot has to say on the couplets which we have yet to examine. Maecenas wrote a 'Natural History' which Pliny often mentions, dealing mainly with fishes and gems. Pliny also tells us that Maecenas was interested in cookery and that Sabinius Tiro dedicated a book on gardening to him (N.H. 19.57) which is again indicative of his interest in cuisine.

As for the couplet:

'cassibus impositis venor: sed harundine sumpta
fautor plumoso sum deus aucupio.'

(lines 33-4)

- Lucot sees the first half of the hexameter as a reference to Maecenas' interest in hunting as revealed by the passage from the Georgics quoted above. The picture in the rest of the couplet of Vertumnus shooting birds can be seen as drawing attention to the fact that his Etruscan counterpart wrote a book on birds. Charisius' statement 'volucrum, Maecenas in dialogo II' (Keil. Gramm. Lat. vol. 1 p.146) is our evidence for crediting him with the authorship of such a book. In line 40:

'sirpiculis medio pulvere ferre rosam'

- it is plausible that Propertius, like Horace, had noticed his patron's fondness for flowers, in particular, roses:

'Tyrrhena regum progenies, tibi
non ante verso lene merum cado
cum flore, Maecenas, rosarum et
pressa tuis balanus capillis...

(Horace. Odes 3.29.1-4)

Lucot has seen that in the couplet

'caeruleus cucumis tumidoque cucurbita ventre
me notat et iunco brassica vincta levi;

(lines 43-4)

- 'me notat' affords a clue that we are being presented with a portrait of a person, whom Propertius describes as suffering from
middle-age spread, and by his employing the imagery of the vegetable
garden - the cucumber, swollen gourd and cabbage - we are reminded
once more of Maecenas' interest in horticulture. There is also a
touch of humour in envisaging such a person performing the
acrobatics depicted in -

'traicit alterno qui leve pondus equo' (line 36)

Apart from attributing Maecenas' corpulence to 'middle-age
spread', and here he is simply assuming that the man was a victim
of a fairly common ailment, Lucot forwards no other evidence that
this may have been a distinguishing feature of Maecenas in particular.
However, I quote the remarks of Taylor on the physical characteristics
of the Etruscans which would suggest that the contemporary reader was
likely to regard this attribute as the mark of one belonging to the
same stock as Maecenas: "The obesity of the Etruscans was proverbial,
and is noted by Virgil and Catullus" (Etruscan Researches p.61).
The comment by Fordyce on Catullus 39.11 (pinguis Umber aut obesus
Etruscus) deals with the literary references which Taylor does not
specify: "'obesus Etruscus' accords with Virgil's 'pinguis
Tyrrhenus' (Georg. ii 193) and with representations of Etruscans in
art." (Catullus p.186). Fordyce supports the reading 'pinguis' as
applied to the Umbrian by referring to Persius (3.74) and Athenaeus
(12.526) who also use this adjective to describe Umbrians. There
is, then, the interesting possibility that Propertius who expresses
pride in his Umbrian origins (cf. 1.22.9; 4.1.63, 64, 121), and who
as we saw in my first chapter (under heading Propertius' Error)
sought to identify himself with the ancestral region of Maecenas
while laying stress on the geographical proximity of Umbria and
Etruria in a bid for patronage, may once more be subtly associating
himself with Maecenas on the basis of a proverbial similarity between
Etruscan and Umbrian.

Finally, there could be a direct allusion to Maecenas' achievements in military matters in:

'arma tuli quondam, et, memini, laudabar in illis'  
(line 27)

Here once more the 'Elegy in defence of Maecenas' supplies our information:

'Quid faceret? defunctus erat comes integer, idem miles et Augusti fortis et usque pius; illum piscosi viderunt saxa Pelori ignibus hostilis reddere ligna ratis; pulvere in Emathio fortem videre Philippi; quam nunc ille tener, tam gravis hostis erat. cum freta Niliaceae texerunt lata carinae, fortis erat circa, fortis et ante ducem, militis Eoi fugientis terga secutus, territus ad Nili dum fugit ille caput.'  
(Eleg. in Maec. 1. 39-48)

- where the author credits Maecenas with having seen action in Sicily at Philippi and at Actium. He certainly aided Octavian in his fight against Sextus Pompeius in 36 B.C.

In lines 41-2 Vertumnus boasts that he can play the part of a 'Lar' of the garden:

'nam quid ego adiciam, de quo mihi maxima fama est, hortorum in manibus dona probata meis?'

The couplet could, I think, easily have been spoken by the owner of the 'horti Maecenatis', the Capability Brown of ancient Rome, one of whose claims to fame rested on the fact that he had redeveloped a paupers' cemetery on the Esquiline as a park where he spent much of his leisure time surrounded by shady oaks, fountains and fruit trees, vying with the birds in song:

'maluit umbrosam quercum lymphasque cadentes paucaque pomosi iugera certa soli: Pieridas Phoebumque colens in mollibus hortis sederat argutas garrulus inter avis'  
(Eleg. in Maec. 1. 33-6)
If we agree with the commentator in the Loeb edition of the "Elegiae in Maecenatem" that "the poems give the impression that the author stood close to the facts introduced" (Minor Latin Poets p.116) then the garrulity of Maecenas corresponds to that of Vertumnus who is portrayed as a veritable market-place gossip. Finally, before I move on to support a textual variant which is relevant to the investigation, I suggest that both Maecenas and Vertumnus have a common ancestry. After speaking of 'meis Tuacis' (line 49), Vertumnus names Lucumon in particular as responsible for his introduction to Rome (lines 51-2). Maecenas could trace his descent from the Lucumones of Arretium (23) and consequently his connection with Vertumnus dates as far back as the kingship of Romulus.

I am unconvinced by Housman's textual emendation in the second line of the elegy viz. 'regna' for 'signa' (0), preserving 'paterna' (NF4 V2 Vo). Butler and Barber follow Housman explaining: "'signa paterna' is a very difficult phrase, whether it be taken as 'my paternal' or as 'my native signs' sc. the signs whereby my origin may be known, i.e. my 'aitia'. regna makes all clear with very little change" (p.334). Textual consensus, however, supports the reading of 'signa' which I would keep here. At the same time I would keep 'petenda' given by MSS. instead of 'paterna' for reasons which will become apparent. Arguing against Housman's emendation is the textual evidence from Ovid Ars Amatoria 1.114 'rex populo praedae signa petenda dedit!' ('petenda' MSS. 'petita' Bentley, Madvig). That Ovid has Propertius in mind is likely for in lines 103-4 we find:

'Tunc neque marmoreo pendebant vela theatro
nec fuerant liquido pulpita rubra croco
which is clearly a multiple verbal reference to Propertius 4.1. 15-16:

>nec sinuosa cavo pendeant vela theatro
> pulpita sollemnes non olere crocos.'

If the correlation between Vertumnus and Maecenas is valid, then it is fair to ask how the phrase 'signa petere' could be applicable to both characters. Camps (who, incidentally, retains 'signa') correctly interprets the substantiate as meaning "distinguishing particulars of any kind" (note on 4.2.2.). 'signum' can mean more specifically, a watchword, and used with the verb 'petere' the sense becomes 'to request the watch-word' which would permit freedom of movement. The successors of Augustus were to assume personally this function of giving the watch-word, but as Seneca informs us, it was Maecenas who when acting as Augustus' deputy, had the responsibility of divulging it: 'signum ab eo petebatur' (Seneca Epp. 114). The relationship between the person who asks for the 'signum' and the person who makes it known is one of subject and master and the phrase 'signa petere' possesses the additional meaning of 'to be held in subjection' (see Sen. Ben 4.2.2). Before saying how all this is relevant to Vertumnus, there remains another use of the word which is pertinent to the career of Maecenas. Dio Cassius (51.3) records that the emperor entrusted Maecenas with his seal so that he could manage the administration of the state while affairs detained the emperor abroad, by delivering letters ostensibly from the emperor himself, and also alter his letters as the political situation demanded. Pliny speaks of the private seal, 'signum', of Maecenas which terrified tax-payers (N.H. 37.4) which is again a revealing example of the power with which he was entrusted. It is surely not overestimating Propertius' ability to be subtle in employing word-play for the sake of effect if we see in the word 'signum' the
meanings of statue, distinguishing particulars, watch-word and seal.
In the light of what has been said above with regard to the fall
from significance of Vertumnus, the phrase 'signa petere' might
refer to the inferior position in which the god finds himself, a
subject rather than a 'deus princeps'. It may also cleverly refer
to the power which Maecenas once held when he was in favour with the
emperor, with the alternative meaning of to be held in subjection
sadly hinting at the demise of his patron. The experience of both
god and patron are skilfully alluded to by this use of the word
'signa'. Vertumnus is saying "Listen, and I will tell you how you
may unlock the secrets of my name!" and also "Hear how my new
identities are symptoms of my fortune's decline!" The former meaning
serves to introduce an aetiological work, the latter to compare the
similar fortunes of the god and the aristocrat.

We have seen how the many guises of Vertumnus bear a close
affinity with the character of Maecenas as revealed by his
contemporaries and those who were later to draw attention to the
salient features of his personality, his interests and literary
endeavours. His interest in the sphere of horticulture and the land
was in all probability the reason why Vergil dedicated the Georgics
to him, and if we believe Vergil himself, the work was virtually
commissioned by his patron as the poet suggests when speaking of
the 'haud mollia iussa' of Maecenas in connection with its production.
Vertumnus' association with the world of gardening and agriculture
as found particularly in lines 11-20, recalls vividly the address
to Maecenas in Bk. 2 of the Georgics, the language of which, (as
presented above) was almost certainly in Propertius' mind at this
stage. The introductory couplet of the Vertumnus' elegy is, I
believe, clearly an echo of the first two lines of Bk. 1 of the Georgics and the assertion by the god of his Etruscan descent ('Tuscus ego' - line 3) can be matched by Vergil's reference to his patron by name in line 2, whom we know could be regarded more than any other as a living symbol of the continuity of Etruscan civilisation by virtue of his direct descent from its nobility. To the contemporary reader of Propertius, the figure of Vertumnus as described in the elegy must have immediately brought to mind Maecenas, and there remains yet one more plausible, but to the best of my knowledge universally neglected reason as to why this should be so. Would not the figure of Vertumnus, so skilled in acting various 'partes' in an amusing way, remind the Augustan reader of the most famous comic actor of the day? It is surely no coincidence that the freedman and favourite of Maecenas, the 'pantomimus' Bathyllus was recognised as such (24), and so we are given another clue regarding the subject of this 'enigma variation'.

By recalling Vergil's dedication in the Georgics, Propertius in effect also dedicates his last book to Maecenas in the first of his aetiological elegies and expresses sympathy for him as a victim of Augustan politics which had relegated him to relative obscurity compared with his former prominence. The eclipse of Maecenas' ascendancy fed the scepticism of Propertius of which Bk. 4 is a continuing expression.

By way of postscript it may be added that in a later article by Lucot (R.E.L. 35 1957 pp.195-204) the investigation of Propertius' relationship with Maecenas was pursued further and this involved further comment on the Vertumnus elegy. Here he detects a parting volley discharged at Horace who had frustrated the hopes
that Propertius had harboured of maintaining a close friendship
with his patron.\(25\) The argument hinges upon lines 51-4:

\[
\text{... sociis venit Lycomedius armis}
\text{atque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.}
\text{vidi ego labentea acies et tela caduca,}
\text{atque hostes turpi terga dedisse fugae.'}
\]

With these Lucot compares lines 9-10 of Odes 2.7 of Horace:

\[
\text{'tecum Philippos et celerem fugam}
\text{tensi relicta non bene parmula.'}
\]

Horace refers, of course, to the episode in the war fought at Philippi
in which he had taken up arms on the republican side only to be
turned in flight. He had become reconciled to the winning side,
and as Lucot points out, had, through the offices of Maecenas, against
whose faction he had been initially opposed, become the recipient
of a homestead in a region which marked him out as a 'Sabinus'.
By confronting us with a picture of the Sabines of Tatius throwing
away their weapons before the forces of the Etruscan Lucumon,
Propertius reminds the reader how the 'Sabine' Horace, once the
follower of Brutus, had been opposed to the most famous contemporary
Etruscan before becoming won over to the man and eventually to his
political point of view. This is more understandable if we remember
that Maecenas, as I have already mentioned, traced his ancestry
back to the Lucumones. If the elegy is a study of Maecenas in
disguise, then an allusion to the political past of his friend, less
dubious than that of his rival for poetic fame, may well be a
feature of the elegy.\(26\)

\textbf{Acanthis and Related Matters}

We are left with 4.5 with which I shall deal briefly, for
it is obvious that the 'lena' Acanthis and the 'amica' of Propertius
belong to the poet's world of amorous affairs fictional or true and
that the elegy contains no material which could be misinterpreted so as to give rise to the opinion that the poet is speaking with the voice of the establishment, which is more often than not the case with the aetiological elegies. Here again, Propertius is bearing in mind the advice of Horos as in 4.3., 4.4., 4.7., 4.8., 4.11., and to an extent in 4.9., when in 4.5 he confines himself to an erotic theme. Much of the imagery and language is similar to that found in the amatory elegies of Bks. 1-3 as the commentaries are careful to point out, and we cannot rule out the possibility that the 'amica' whom the procuress tried to corrupt, is Cynthia herself. Lines 55-6 are identical to lines 1-2 in the second elegy of the Monobiblos, but are not necessarily a marginal note which has been interpolated. They can easily be seen as an example given by Acanthis of the sort of verse with which a would-be lover might try to win the 'amica' in question and as a unique example of the poet allowing one of his characters to quote his 'ipsissima verba' with ironical and dramatic effect. Having already given so much space to Cynthia in Bk. 4 (viz. 7 and 8), it is natural that we should identify the 'amica' in this elegy with her. (cf. Hallett p.159)

The elegy, which heaps curses on the bawd, coming as it does immediately before 4.6 dealing with the battle of Actium, Apollo and Augustus, could only have been regarded with embarrassment by the emperor if he had ever been under the misapprehension that 4.6 was a serious exercise in praising his achievements. If we take 4.6 as the pivot around which the other elegies are arranged and balanced according to their respective themes (i.e. 4.5 to be compared with 4.7. - 4.4 with 4.8 etc.,) as Grimal (art.cit.p.56), then a comparison between Acanthis and the dead Cynthia is inevitable. Grimal's remarks relating to such a contrast are also relevant in
retrospect to what I said above when I maintained that Cynthia in 4.7 was presented as a more attractive and sincere person than Cornelia in 4.11. The greed and damnation of Acanthis has its counterpart in the salvation and the purity of love of Cynthia. "La lena, par ses conseiles impies, est responsable des erreurs passagères de Cynthie dont elle est 'l'âme noire'. La damnation de la lena garantit et prépare le salut de Cynthie. Le contraste est trop évident pour ne pas avoir été voulu, de deux amours 'profanes' dont l'un est conforme à la loi divine, celui qui garde la 'Fides', et dont l'autre est coupable parce qu'il n'a pour objet que le profit." (p.56) Earlier I disagreed with Grimal's argument that Cornelia had obtained apotheosis as a reward for her life on the earth and criticised the view that her qualities were superior to those of Cynthia, drawing attention to the fact that judgment had been suspended upon Cornelia whereas Cynthia had already gained a place among heroines in Elysium and won our sympathy by her willingness to forgive, and her loyalty to Propertius, though he was guilty of infidelity. When Grimal, comparing 4.4 and 4.8 describes Cynthia in the latter elegy as "démontrant par ses actes sa 'fides' ", whereas Tarpeia is guilty of 'perfidia', (art.cit. p.51) one is inclined to question his enthusiastic admiration for Cornelia especially when he had admitted that her 'fides' was based upon a negative approach to behaviour "pour justifier son espérance, Cornelia, elle, invoque seulement sa fidélité à observer les lois" (p.44). I would qualify this by adding that the virtue of 'fides' came naturally to Cynthia but to Cornelia only through a self-critical faculty.
Conclusion

Throughout this investigation, I have sought to show that verse which was prima facie patriotic, is to a large degree quite the reverse, this being the case in the aetiological elegies 4.2., 4.4., 4.6., 4.9., and 4.10. The erotic element outweighs the ostensibly patriotic content. Horos' speech in 4.1 is an exhortation to the poet to content himself with erotic themes (lines 135-46). Elegy 4.3 has much in common with the situation found in 3.12 where Postumus had left Galla to take part in the military campaigns of Augustus. Elegy 4.4 which narrates the legend of Tarpeia is in effect a study in the psychology of female sexuality and elegy 4.5 dealing with the 'lena' Acanthis, describes how she complicated the course of the poet's love. In elegy 4.7 the poet's dream allows Cynthia to reflect upon her affair with Propertius and 4.8 represents her as alive, well, and essentially unchanged, as though the relationship had been resumed. 4.9 presents us with a picture of Hercules as an 'exclusus amator' and the closing elegy 4.11 is erotic, although the relationship between male and female as depicted by Cornelia is the sort that is quite unlike the elegiac love which Propertius pursued in the earlier books. The comparison which we are forced to make between the dead Cynthia, the embodiment of elegiac love in 4.7, and the dead Cornelia, reveals how the former is a more vivacious sensitive and warm-hearted individual. Only the first half of 4.1 and the elegies 4.2., and 4.6., and 4.10 are devoid of erotic content. Six of the elegies deal exclusively with erotic topics and only four with the type of verse envisaged in the former half of 4.1, and the hero of one of these is found in a situation familiar to an elegiac lover and speaks the sort of language that a
lover would employ. Cynthia is the dominant character in the book (even if we rule out 4.5 where her presence is open to debate).

Propertius cannot be said to have abandoned erotic poetry nor can he be seen as a poet laureate in his last book. The aetiological elegies do not represent commitment but experiment. He was proving to himself and others that his preoccupation with erotic elegy was not attributable to a lack of ability in other directions, and this he achieved without selling out to the establishment.
Note References for Chapter Two


3. On the question of chronology see the introductory note on Epp. 2.2 in the edition of A.S. Wilkins p.290 who follows Mommsen in dating the epistle to 19 B.C.


10. E. Lefèvre: op.cit. p.430 - although I personally do not believe that the irony in 4.7 and 4.8 works to the disadvantage of Cynthia as will become evident when I investigate these elegies and suggest that it resides and is directed elsewhere.


15. Hallett (op.cit. p.119) wrongly imagines lines 41-42 to be a reference to Pasiphae. Propertius must have in mind Ariadne and her desertion by Theseus, a theme which had been treated by Catullus (64.116-206) from a psychological point of view.

16. Propertius uses the word 'favilla' on four occasions. In 1.19.19 it has an erotic meaning: 'quae tu viva mea possis sentire favilla!' as it also has in 1.9.18: 'neodem etiam palles, vero nec tangeris igni: haec est venturi prima favilla malii.'


19. An 'aureus' of 16 B.C. for which see H. Mattingly: Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, Vol. 1 plate 3.8 (described p.16), and C.A.H. Vol. 10, ch.15 p.478, and book of plates Vol. 4, plate 200k. The description in Mattingly is as follows: Obverse: Head of Augustus, laureate, r. IMP. CAESAR TR. POT. IIX (r.down, l.up). Reverse: Augustus, bare-headed, togate, seated l. on low stool on low platform; before him stand two togate figures r., to the former of whom he is handing 'suffimenta' taken from a box at his feet. LVD. S on front and side of platform. L. ME SCI NIVS l. up, r. down. AVG. SVF. P in ex.

20. See for instance the article by H. MacL. Currie on Propertius 4.8 in Latomus 32 1973, pp. 616-22, which deals with the Odyssean parallel in considerable detail.


25. For the antipathy of Horace towards elegy and Propertius see my discussion of the subject in chapter one under the headings The Horatian Reaction and Propertius' Attitude to Horace.

26. It should be pointed out that in his earlier article (p.78) Lucot stated that the humorous description of Vertumnus, while being intended to conjure up a picture of Maecenas, would not have damaged his reputation for his eccentricities were well known. However, in the later article (pp.203-4) his opinion seems to have shifted Vertumnus-like for he puts forward the view that no only is he attacking Horace in the way I have explained, but that he is also attacking Maecenas in the elegy as a whole which thus takes the form of a satire. An injurious motive is less likely partly because of the reason Lucot puts forward in the earlier article, and also because Augustus himself had parodied, joked at and tolerated the bizarrie of Maecenas' writings and behaviour (cf. 'cacoelos et antiquarios, ut diverso genere vitiosos, pari fastidio sprevit exagitabatque nonnumquam; in primis Maecenatem suum, cuius "myrobrechis", ut ait, "cincinnos" usque quaque persequitur et imitando per iccum irridet.' - Suet. Aug. 86; 'ludos Augustalis tunc primum coeptos turbavit discordia ex certamine histrionum. Indulserat ei ludicro Augustus, dum Mæceni obtinuerat effuso in amorem Bathylli.' - Tac. A.1.54). Political and not behavioural reasons dictated his eclipse as a leading statesman: "Augustus could
not forgive a breach of confidence." (Syme, p. 342). In any case it is difficult to see how in such a late work any malicious design on Propertius' part would be effective, not only because jokes made at the expense of the character of Maecenas were nothing new, but also because since 23 B.C. he had become increasingly withdrawn from public life and his misfortunes would hardly be exacerbated by a humorous character sketch. For these reasons I am not inclined towards the later view of Lucot.