SHARED THEMES IN THE ROMAN ELEGISTS

J. C. Yardley

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews

1976

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:
http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
http://hdl.handle.net/10023/15497

SHARED   THEMES   IN THE   ROMAN   ELEGISTS

J.C. Yardley

‭✶✶✶✶✶✶

Ph.d. Thesis

University of St. Andrews

1976

✶✶✶✶✶✶

ProQuest Number: 10171093

ProQuest 10171093

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th 8808

The work embodied in this thesis is my own and has not
been accepted in any previous application
for a higher degree.

The work in this thesis was completed under the supervision of
Professor G.W. Williams, sometime Professor of Humanity in the
University of St. Andrews and now Professor of Latin at Yale
University.   Professor Williams is currently in Australia and
not available to certify the thesis.   In his absence I have
seen the thesis and the candidate and can certify that the
conditions of the Resolution and Regulations of Ordinance G $\overline{V}$ C
(Higher Study and Research) have been fulfilled.

Signed:

R.M. Ogilvie, D.Litt.,F.B.A., F.S.A., F.S.A. Scot.

Professor of Humanity

SHARED THEMES IN THE ROMAN ELEGISTS

J.C. Yardley

ABSTRACT

The thesis is a detailed analysis of a selection of poems on similar themes by the Roman elegists in an attempt to estimate the originality of each poet in his treatment of each theme. The literary history of the themes prior to their occurrence in elegy is also considered.

The study opens with a discussion of two "generic" themes, the paraclausithyron and the propempticon ("generic" here being used in the sense of classification in terms of the poems' content). It is demonstrated that while the elegists were certainly aware of the Greek komastic tradition and the many topoi associated with it, they are also distinctively Roman and individualistic in their handling of the theme of the exclusus amator (in particular in their employment of religious language in the address to the door). The section on the propempticon concerns Prop.18 and Ovid Am.2.11, and again it is argued that while both poets were aware of the generic conventions deriving from Greek literature, (those of the "schetliastic propempticon") they have made a traditional form serve their own purposes, Propertius "dramatising" the situation (Cynthia at 1.8.26 is persuaded not to leave) and Ovid flippantly exaggerating and cleverly manipulating the topoi of the genre.

The second chapter focusses on three themes which seem to have strong connections with comedy. The first is the rixa or lovers' quarrel in

Abstract

which violence is inflicted by the one party of the love affair on the other. The girl's violence is enjoyed by her lover because it is interpreted as an indication of her passionate love for him, while the lover's violence is a source of regret to him. Comic precedents for both attitudes are produced. Next under discussion is the soldier-rival, based on the character of the *miles gloriosus* of comedy but adapted to suit each elegist's purposes. The third comic theme is the affair with the *ancilla*, found in both Propertius and Tibullus but given a very different treatment by each of them. This is perhaps inspired by the comic situation in which the husband is suspected by his carping wife of having an affair with her *ancilla*.

Three themes frequently occurring in Greek epigram are discussed in the third chapter. First under consideration is the figure of the *irrisor amoris*, the man who mocked love only to fall in love himself; variations on this theme by Tibullus (1.8.71ff. and 1.2.87ff.) and Propertius (1.9.1ff.) are examined in detail. There follows an analysis of Tibullus 1.2.25ff., Prop.3.16.11ff. and Ovid *Am*.1.6.13ff., adaptations of the epigrammatic motif of divine protection for the lover when he comes to his girl at night (but extended by Tibullus and Propertius to the claim that the lover enjoys divine protection at all times). The last epigrammatic theme discussed is that of the poet's attraction to several different types of girls/boys (Prop. 2.22A, 2.25.41ff; Tib.1.4.11ff; Ovid *Am*.2.4,2.10.).

Abstract

The fourth chapter is devoted to three illustrations of the elegist's
obsequium his willingness to attend the girl in sickness, to hunt
with her or go on a long journey with her.   These, it is demonstrated
by examples from Greek prose works on Friendship, are instances of the
duties to be expected of a friend in Hellenistic Friendship Literature.
These Freundschaftsdienste have been transformed by the elegists into
examples of the lover's devotion.

Chapter five is devoted to the themes of the girl's sickness (Prop.
2.28, (Tib.) 3.10, Ovid Am. 2.13), and her preoccupation with
cosmetics (Prop.1.2, 2.18c; Tib.1.8.9-16; Ovid Am.1.14, Ars.3.101ff.,
RA 343ff.).   The former (which may derive ultimately from Callimachus)
receives very different treatment from the three poets, though certain
topoi recur in the poems, demonstrating a degree of inter-borrowing
amongst the three.   (The view that these similarities are due to the
poems belonging to the genre soteria is countered in some detail).
The treatment of the latter theme by Propertius may reveal comic
influence, but its widespread occurrence in Greek literature of
various genres precludes certainty.

The conclusion attempts to draw together some of the threads of the
discussion (which suggests throughout that while the elegists know
and use Greek literature they are by no means servile imitators) by

Abstract

examining in detail Propertius 4.7 in which a number of different
literary traditions are combined and used effectively by the poet.

CONTENTS

Contents

<u>Select Bibliography</u>

(Note: This is not a complete bibliography but a list of works referred
to with some frequency. Abbreviations for these works appear in
brackets. For other works referred to bibliographical information is
given with the citation.)

A. <u>Editions of the Elegists</u>

Andre, J. :   <u>Tibulle : Elégies livre 1</u>,   Paris 1965.

                          (André).

Barsby, John :   <u>Ovid : Amores Book 1</u>, Oxford 1973.

                          (Barsby <u>Am 1</u>).

Brandt, Paul :   <u>P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres</u>,

                          Leipzig 1911.(Brandt <u>Am</u>).

                          <u>P. Ovidi Nasonis De Arte Amatoria Libri Tres</u>,

                          Leipzig 1902.(Brandt <u>Ars</u>).

Bréguet, Esther :   <u>Le Roman de Sulpicia : Elegies IV   2-12</u>

                          <u>du Corpus Tibullianum</u>, Geneva 1946.

                          (Bréguet <u>Sulpicia</u>).

Butler, H.E. and   <u>The Elegies of Propertius</u>, Oxford 1933.
Barber, E.A.
                          (Butler and Barber).

Camps, W.A. :   Propertius : Elegies Book 1, Cambridge 1961.

                                          Book 2,   1967.

                                          Book 3,   1966.

                                          Book 4,   1964.

                       (Camps 1,2,3,4)

Enk, P.J. :   Properti Elegiarum Liber 1, Leiden 1946.

                       (Enk 1).

                       Properti Elegiarum Liber Secundus,

                       Leiden 1962.(Enk 2).

Fedeli, P. :   Properzio Elegie, Libro IV, Bari 1965.

                       (Fedeli).

Munari, F.:   P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, ed. altera,

                       Florence 1955.(Munari).

Némethy, Geyza :   Albii Tibulli Carmina, Budapest 1905.

                       (Némethy).

Postgate, J.P. :   Select Elegies of Propertius, London 1881.

                       (Postgate).

Putnam, M.C.J. :   Tibullus : A Commentary, Norman,

                       Oklahoma 1973 . (Putnam, Tibullus).

Rothstein, M. :   Die Elegien des Sex Propertius, 2 vols.,

                       Berlin 1898.(Rothstein).

Schuster, M. :   <u>Propertius</u> ed. Schuster, cur. Franz Dornseiff,

                       ed. altera, Leipzig 1958.(Schuster).

Smith, Kirby Flower : <u>The Elegies of Albius Tibullus The Corpus

                       Tibullianum</u>, New Yok 1913. (Smith).

B. Other Works

Allen, Archibald :   "Sunt qui Propertium malint" in

Critical Essays on Roman Literature, ed.

J.P. Sullivan, London 1962, 107-148.(Allen).

Appel, G. :   De Romanorum precationibus, Religions-

geschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten

Bd. 7, Heft 2, Giessen 1909.(Appel).

Boucher, J.P. :   Etudes sur Properce : problèmes d'inspiration

et d'art, Paris 1965.(Boucher, Etudes).

Bürger, R. :   De Ovidi carminum amatoriorum inventione et

arte, Diss. Göttingen 1901.(Burger, De Ov. Carm.).

Cairns, Francis :   Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry,

Edinburgh 1972.(Cairns GC).

Copley, F.O. :   Exclusus Amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry,

American Philological Assn. Philological

Monographs 17(1956).(Copley, Excl. Am.).

Day, A.A. :   The Origins of Latin Love Elegy, Oxford 1938.

(Day, Origins).

Fordyce, C.J. :   Catullus, Oxford 1961.

(Fordyce).

Fraenkel, E. :   Horace, Oxford 1957.

(Fraenkel, Horace).

Gollnisch, T. :	Quaestiones Elegiacae, Diss. Vratislav. 1905.
	(Gollnisch, Quaest. Eleg.).
Gow, A.S.F. :	Theocritus, Cambridge 1950, 2vols.
	(Gow, Theocritus).
Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.E. :	The Greek Anthology : Hellenistic Epigrams, Cambridge 1965, 2vols. (Gow and Page HE).
	The Greek Anthology : The Garland of Philip, Cambridge 1968, 2vols. (Gow and Page GP).
Headlam, W. and Knox, A.D. :	Herodas, Cambridge 1922.
	(Headlam — Knox, Herodas).
Heinemann, Max. :	Epistulae Amatoriae quomodo cohaereant cum Elegiis Alexandrinis, Diss. Berlin 1919.
	(Heinemann, Ep. Am.).
Hubbard, Margaret :	Propertius, London 1974.
	(Hubbard, Propertius).
Jacoby, F. :	"Zur Entstehung der romischen Elegie" RM 60 (1905) 38–105.(Jacoby, "Zur Entstehung").
Kiessling, A. and Heinze, R. :	Horaz : Oden und Epoden, ed. 11, Zurich/Berlin 1964.(Kiessling — Heinze).
Kleinknecht, Hermann :	Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike, Stuttgart/Berlin 1937. (Kleinknecht).

Kölblinger, Gerald : Einige Topoi bei den lateinischen

Liebesdichtern, Diss. Vienna 1971.(Kölblinger).

Lattimore, R. : Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs, Urbana,

Ill. 1962.(Lattimore, Themes).

Lefèvre, Eckard : Propertius Ludibundus,Elemente des Humors

in seinen Elegien, Heidelberg, 1966.

(Lefèvre, Propertius Ludibundus).

Leo, F. : Plautinische Forschungen, 2nd. ed. Berlin 1912.

(Leo, Plaut.Forsch.).

Lilja, Saara : The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women,

Helsinki 1965.(Lilja).

Luck, Georg : The Latin Love Elegy, 2nd. ed. London 1969.

(Luck).

Mallet, F. : Quaestiones Propertianae, Diss. Göttingen 1882.

(Mallet, Quaest.Prop.).

Murgatroyd, P. : "Militia Amoris and the Roman Elegists"

Latomus 34 (1975) 59-79.(Murgatroyd, "Militia

Amoris").

Neumann, R. : Qua ratione Ovidius in Amoribus scribendis

Propertii elegiis usus sit, Diss. Göttingen

1919.(Neumann).

Nisbet, R.G.M. and   A Commentary on Horace Odes 1, Oxford 1970.
Hubbard, Margaret :
                     (Nisbet and Hubbard, Odes 1).

Norden, Eduard :   Agnostos Theos : Untersuchungen zur

                     Formengeschichte religioser Rede, Berlin 1913.

                     (Norden, Agnostos Theos).

Otto, A. :   Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen

                     Redensarten der Romer, Leipzig 1890.

                     (Otto, Sprichwörter).

Pfeiffer, R. :   Callimachus vol. 1 Fragmenta Oxford 1949.

                                 vol. 2 Hymni et Epigrammata .

                     Oxford 1953 (Pfeiffer).

Pichon, René :   Index Verborum Amatoriorum, Paris 1902.

                     (Pichon).

Quinn, K. :   Latin Explorations, London 1963.

                     (Quinn, LE).

                     Catullus, London 1970.

                     (Quinn, Catullus).

Reitzenstein, E. :   Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung

                     bei Properz, Philologus Suppl. 29.2 Leipzig

                     1936.(Reitzenstein, Wirklichkeitsbild).

Schulz-Vanheyden,   Properz und das griechische Epigramm,
Elmar :
                     Diss. Munster 1969.(Schulz-Vanheyden).

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. :	<u>Propertiana</u>, Cambridge 1956.
	(Shackleton Bailey, <u>Propertiana</u>).
Solmsen, F. :	"Propertius in his literary relations with Tibullus and Vergil" <u>Philologus</u> 105 (1961) 273-89.(Solmsen, "Propertius in his literary relations").
Spies, Alfons :	<u>Militat Omnis Amans.Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik</u>, Diss. Tubingen 1930.(Spies, <u>Militat Omnis Amans</u>).
Stroh, W. :	<u>Die romische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung</u>, Amsterdam 1971.(Stroh).
Tränkle, Hermann :	<u>Die Sprackhunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache</u>, Weisbaden 1960.(Tränkle, <u>Sprachkunst</u>).
Trenker, Sophie :	<u>The Greek Novella</u>, Cambridge 1958. (Trenker, <u>Novella</u>).
Viansino, Giovanni :	<u>Paolo Silenziario : Epigrammi</u>, Torino 1963. (Viansino, <u>Paolo Silenziario</u>). <u>Agathias Epigrammi</u>, Milano 1967. (Viansino, <u>Agathias</u>).
Williams, Gordon :	<u>Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry</u> Oxford 1968.(Williams, <u>TORP</u>).

Williams, Gordon :   The Third Book of Horace's Odes

Oxford 1969.(Williams, Odes 3).

Zingerle, Anton :   Ovidius und sein Verhältniss zu den

vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen

Dichtern, 3 vols. Innsbruck 1869 (vol.1),

1871 (vols. 2 and 3).(Zingerle).

INTRODUCTION

The Augustan love elegists, it is well known, have many themes and motifs in common[1], most of them deriving from earlier literature. The aim of this study is the detailed consideration of a number of such themes in an effort to estimate the originality of each of the elegists in his handling of the traditional material. I have chosen for consideration only major themes – that is themes which might either have whole poems devoted to them (at least by Propertius or Ovid) or which occur with considerable frequency in elegy – and, since much work has been done on the themes of elegy during the last century, I have chosen only those themes which in my view have received little attention or less than satisfactory treatment from scholars.

Most of the work done in this area during the last century and in the early years of this century was concerned with the origin and development of the Latin love elegy. This is, of course, connected with the question of the sources from which the elegists drew their themes and hence their originality, and so it is apposite that we consider this very briefly at the outset[2].

The prevailing view at the end of the nineteenth century was that there had existed in Alexandrian times a "subjective" elegy which was imitated by the Roman elegists. Not only did the elegists

Introduction

themselves, particularly Propertius, claim to admire and to be

following the great Alexandrian poets (Prop. 3.1.1.ff., 3.9.43-4, cf. also

Ovid... Am.2.4.19, Ars.3.329-30, Rem.Am.759-60 etc.)[3], but the

grammarian Diomedes expressly states Elegia est carmen compositum

hexametro versu pemtametroque alterius in vicem positis .... quod

genus carminis praecipue scripserunt apud Romanos Propertius et

Tibullus et Gallus imitati Graecos Callimachum et Euphoriona

(Gramm.Lat.1.484 Keil).   It seemed, therefore, a reasonable

supposition that the great Alexandrian poets had written poetry of

the kind later written in Latin by the Roman elegists.   So Leo,

noting in his Plautinische Forschungen (the first edition of which

appeared in 1895) that a number of comic themes and motives occurred

in the Roman elegists, decided that these could not have come

directly from Roman comedy (which was held in low regard by the

Augustan poets) and concluded that, while it was possible that they

came directly from the Greek comic poets[4], the most likely source

was the Alexandrian erotic elegy which had not survived the hazards

of textual transmission (Plaut. Forsch. 126-41).   Leo was not, pace

Day (Origins 1), the first scholar to advocate the existence of such

a body of literature, but he was probably the most influential.   He

had been preceded by such scholars as Otto and Mallet who had traced

to this lost literature the sources for the thematic resemblances

between the elegists and the late Greek epigrammatists, on the one

Introduction

hand, and the late Greek epistolographers, on the other[5].

The Alexandrian poets, according to this view, wrote not only narrative or "objective" elegy, but also a personal or "subjective" elegy, in which they described their own thoughts and emotions – a Greek elegy, in fact, just like the elegy of Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid. From these the Roman elegists drew their inspiration, and the relationship between them and their models was thus something analogous to the relationship between Plautus and Terence and their Greek models. Many scholars of the earlier twentieth century were persuaded to this view and, attributing to this lost genre all the thematic similarities between the elegists and any Greek author, many spent a great deal of time and effort reconstructing from such resemblances the lost elegies of the Alexandrian period[6].

In 1905 Jacoby published an article which was to become one of the most important milestones in the criticism of Roman elegy. In Rh.M.60(1905) ("Zur Enstehung der römischen Elegie") he denied that such a genre of poetry had ever existed in Greek literature. Against Leo's view that comic motives had come into Roman elegy via the Greek elegy he argued that an intermediary between Greek comedy and Roman elegy was an unnecessary hypothesis: the elegists took their "comic" themes directly from the Greek New Comedy. The Romans, he claimed, were the originators of the subjective elegy, which they developed

Introduction

from the Greek epigram – in his view Gallus was the protos heuretes
(see especially "Zur Entstehung" 67ff.) – but they included themes and
motives from earlier literature, including comedy.   Whether Gallus
was, indeed, the inventor of the Latin love elegy we shall probably
never know, unless the corpus of his work is at some point swelled
beyond the present single line, but the seventy years which have
elapsed since Jacoby's article have seen not a scrap of what could
with any certainty be assigned to the "subjective" Greek elegy emerge
from the sands of Egypt, and we can only presume that Jacoby was
correct in his belief that such an elegy never existed.

What, then, does Diomedes mean when he says that the Roman elegists
"imitated" Callimachus and Euphorion, and why do Propertius and Ovid
name the Alexandrian poets, and especially Callimachus, as their
models?   The answer must be that their debt to them was, generally
speaking, one of style and technique rather than of thematic content,
in particular the preference for the "slender" style ($\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta s$)
as opposed to the "fat" style ($\pi\alpha\chi\acute{u}\tau\eta s$)[7].   This is indeed
indicated, as Day (Origins 30) points out, by Prop.2.34.31-2, tu
satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan/et non inflati somnia Callimachi,
where Lynceus, who is being told to write love-poetry, is specifically
referred to the beginning of the Aetia, which is of course a
mythic-narrative poem.   The piece of evidence in support of the
Alexandrian "subjective" elegy which is most difficult to counter is

Introduction

perhaps Ovid <u>Trist</u>.2.367-8 <u>nec tibi, Battiade, nocuit quod saepe</u>
<u>legenti delicias versu fassus es ipse tuas</u>[8].   If the Alexandrian
poets wrote no elegy in which they celebrated their own love-affairs
it is certainly odd that Ovid should say that Callimachus told of his
own passions. .The argument can be met, however, and without resorting
to Jacoby's theory that Ovid had the epigrams in mind ("Zur Entstehung"
64-5).   Rostagni argues that the reference is indeed to Callimachus'
most famous and influential work, the <u>Aetia</u>, and that what we have in
Ovid is an example of the Ancients' tendency to see personal experience
in any story of passionate love[9], for the <u>Aetia</u> certainly contained
descriptions of passionate love, (for example, the story of Acontios
and Cydippe (fr.67-75)) (Augusto Rostagni "L'Elegia Erotica Latina"
<u>L'Influence Grecque sur la Poesie Latine de Catulle à Ovide</u> Fondation
Hardt <u>Entretiens</u> 2 (Geneva 1953) 65).   We must bear in mind, too, the
fact that this passage occurs in the letter to Augustus in which the
exiled Ovid is at pains to find as many predecessors in erotic writing
as he possibly can and it is not in his best interests to distinguish
between "subjective" and "objective" elegy[10].

Rostagni (<u>op.cit.</u> 72ff.) goes on to make the interesting point that
"personal" poetry was not favoured by Classical Greek, and perhaps also
Alexandrian Greek, poetic theory.   He correctly cites Plato <u>Phaedo</u>
60e-61b where Socrates, recounting how he was instructed by a dream to
write poetry, says that he was told that the poet should write "myths"

Introduction

and not "speeches": μετὰ δὲ τὸν θεόν, ἐννοήσας ὅτι τὸν ποιητὴν δέοι, εἴπερ μέλλοι ποιητὴς εἶναι, ποιεῖν μύθους ἀλλ' οὐ λόγους κ.τ.λ.(Phaedo 61b)[11]

Rostagni also refers to Aristotle Poet. 1460a where Aristotle recommends that the poet speak as little as possible in propria persona (αὐτὸν γὰρ δεῖ τὸν ποιητὴν ἐλάχιστα λέγειν), but the validity of this to Rostagni's argument is questionable since Aristotle is speaking specifically about epic poetry and Homer. However, one cannot dismiss lightly Rostagni's view that what was important for the Alexandrian poets in general was "il compito di recercare, raccogliere, ripetere, variare il vasto patrimonio delle tradizioni delle legende, dei miti" (op.cit.73), so that personal or "subjective" poetry was not really in accord with the zeitgeist of the period.

Whether or not this is so (one might indeed categorise epigram, which flourished in the Alexandrian period, as "personal poetry") what is important for the question of the Greek "subjective" elegy is the complete lack of papyrological finds. Elegy of the kind written by Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid was obviously a Roman invention (even if Quintilian only makes this claim for Satire[12]), whether its origins are to be traced to Gallus, as Jacoby would have it[13], or to the "personalita trabocca" of a Catullus who broke with Alexandrian tradition to write to Lesbia poems of various metres (i.e. not a book of mythic-narrative verse) describing

Introduction

his own feelings and experiences[14].

If the elegists did not, then, take their themes from a single literary
source, we must assume that they took them from several sources (epigram
and comedy, as most scholars agree, being the main, but not the only
ones, as we shall see in chapters 4 and 5). For it must be remembered
that the Roman poets, even love-poets, used the works of previous poets
and not just "personal experience" in the process of composition. This
obvious point would not need to be made if the comment of Fordyce on
Catullus 68.36 did not make it clear that there remain those for whom
"real poetry" is that which is inspired by personal experience.
Catullus tells his friend that he cannot compose a poem for him because
he does not have his library with him at Verona (68.33ff.) and Fordyce
comments: "the excuse is revealing evidence of the methods and ideals
of the doctus poeta: what is expected from him is Alexandrian poetry,
translated from, or modelled on, Greek, and for that he needs a library"[15].
But Ovid makes the same complaint from Tomi (Trist. 3.14.37-8 non hic
librorum per quos inviter alarque/copia) and his concern is his inability
to write good poetry, not good "Alexandrian poetry". We should remember,
too, what Damasippus is represented as saying to Horace during a period of
unproductivity:

> quorsum pertinvit stipare Platona Menandro,
>
> Eupolin, Archilochum, comites educere tantos?
>
> (Sat. 2.3.11-12)

Introduction

If the compositions of Catullus, Horace and Ovid relied heavily upon
the works of previous poets, we have no reason to believe that Propertius
and Tibullus - for all their apparent "sincerity" - did otherwise.   A
century later Quintilian was to put into words what the elegists had been
doing:

> Neque enim dubitari potest quin artis pars
>
> magna contineatur imitatione. Nam ut invenire
>
> primum fuit estque praecipuum, sic ea quae
>
> bene inventa sunt utile sequi. Atque omnis
>
> vitae ratio sic constat, ut quae probamus in
>
> aliis, facere ipsi velimus.

$$(\underline{Inst.}10.2.1-2)$$

One must, in the final analysis, agree with Day's conclusion that "the
sources contributing to Latin elegy are many and varied and its
writers are distinguished by the widely eclectic nature of their
knowledge of Greek literature and by their original employment of
stock material common to all writers" (Origins 138).   The importance
of Rhetoric, too, must not be underestimated.   The elegists all
received a rhetorical training, and the influence of this is sometimes
clear in their work (See Day Origins 59ff.);   indeed, many of the comic
themes in elegy may be the result of the rhetoricians' tendency to turn
to comedy for exempla and themes for exercies.   In what follows we shall
be examining a number of themes of different origins, and we shall

Introduction

consider how far each author has accepted the traditional form or use

of that theme and how far he has developed it and added to it himself.

The discussion of the source of each theme is necessary only to assess –

at least as far as this is possible with the loss of so much Greek

literature – the originality of the elegists in their treatment of it.

This will sometimes involve the postulation of lost sources for a theme

on the basis of the theme's occurrence in later Greek literature

(epigram and epistolography for the most part) and one consequently

runs the risk of incurring the odium which has fallen to the lot of

such Quellenforschung in recent years.   L.P. Wilkinson, for instance,

has declared: "Scholars with the gifts of a detective may deduce by

comparison with analogous works what a common source may have contained,

but the result is a phantom of little value for appreciation or

practical criticism"[16].   Practical criticism, however, requires the

study of an author's originality, and his originality can only be

assessed in the context of the tradition in which he is writing.

We are, however, concerned not only with the originality of the Roman

poets with regard to their Greek models, but also with their inter-

relationships.   It is quite clear, from verbal as well as thematic

similarities, that Ovid knew and used the work of his elegiac

predecessors.   It also seems very unlikely that Propertius and Tibullus

were ignorant of each other's work, even if they did enjoy the patronage

of different men (a factor which probably had little to do with the

Introduction

mutual friendship or intercourse of poets in the Augustan period[17]).

The three elegists must also have been very familiar with the works of

Catullus and the now lost Gallus.   Thus, in the consideration of each

theme, it will be necessary to examine the relationship of the poems

in question not only to the Greek tradition, but to the Roman one as

well.

TWO GENERIC THEMES

As Cairns (GC 6) has correctly noted, scholars are in the habit of using the term "genre" in two senses when discussing ancient literature. Most commonly it is used to distinguish different forms of literary composition such as epic, lyric poetry or elegy, but occasionally it denotes not a formal classification but a classification of literary works in terms of their content (e.g. Genethliaca or "birthday poems", and Arai or "cursing poems" etc.). Such genres will have their roots presumably in real-life situations and may appear and develop in several quite different formal genres. They are characterised by what Cairns calls "primary elements" (i.e. the situations are essentially the same in all manifestations of the particular genre) and also by a number of subsidiary topoi (i.e. themes which tend to recur in the examples of the genre). Take as an example a genre we are about to consider and the best-known genre in Roman poetry, the paraclausithyron. This has its roots, probably, in real-life occurrences — the desire of young men to gain admission to their girlfriends' houses after a symposium late at night. The basic situation — the lover's exclusion and the expression of his desire to be admitted — is the same in all instances of it, and there are a number of minor themes or topoi which constantly recur in these instances (e.g. the lover's drunkenness, his complaint about the weather etc.). Such paraclausithyra are found not only in elegy, but also in lyric, epigram and comedy.

In this section we shall deal with the paraclausithyron and also with a theme which clearly derives from another well-documented Greek genre, the propempticon.   This differs from the paraclausithyron in that it is what Cairns (GC 70-1) refers to as a "rhetorical genre", that is a genre which was regarded by the Hellenistic rhetoricians as suitable for exercises in the rhetorical schools.

1.   The Paraclausithryon And The Excluded Lover

The term paraclausithyron first occurs in Plutarch Amatorius 8 (753B). Protagenes, the defendant of pederasty and antagonist of heterosexual love, describes the typical behaviour of lovers as: κωμάζειν ἐπὶ θύρας, ᾄδειν τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον, ἀναδεῖν τὰ εἰκόνια, παγκρατιάζειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀντερστάς. The paraclausithyron, therefore, is the complaint of the lover[1], sung, as the word's etymology indicates, at the door of the loved one[2].   It occurs, as we can see from the surviving examples of such "door-songs" as the culmination of the komos, or revel, following a symposium, when the lover - with or without friends - comes, drunk and garlanded, to his beloved's doors to seek admission and finds himself excluded.   He sings his song in the almost inevitably vain hope of being admitted (or, sometimes, of getting the girl to come out) or as a lamentation on his exclusion.   Several Greek literary paraclausithyra are extant in the Palatine Anthology and elsewhere, all of them containing, as we shall see, a number of standard themes and motifs.   The genre persists in Latin literature, and particularly in elegy.   All three elegists produce a paraclausithyron: Propertius 1.16 contains one, as does

Tibullus 1.2, though only Ovid devotes an entire poem (<u>Am.</u> 1.6) to the song of the <u>exclusus amator</u>[3]. In the first section we shall consider these examples, as well as an interesting variation by Ovid in the <u>Metamorphoses</u> (13.835ff); in the next section we shall examine the many references made by the three poets to the <u>komos</u> and the <u>exclusus amator</u>.

A. <u>The Paraclausithyron</u>

<u>Origins and early history of the genre</u>. The <u>paraclausithyron</u> no doubt originated as a folk-song, rooted in Greek social conditions. After a symposium young men would, like Alcibiades in Plato's <u>Symposium</u> (212 C), roam the streets in a disorderly fashion, going to the houses of friends or perhaps trying to gain admission to the house of a girl or favourite boy (cf.,e.g., Plut. <u>Amatorius</u> 8, Lucian <u>Bis Acc.</u> 31, Theophrastus <u>Char.</u> 12; for other non-poetic references to the practice see Headlam-Knox, <u>Herodas</u> 82). That this practice, known as the <u>komos</u>, goes back to the classical period is revealed by several references to it in the lyric poets (e.g., Theognis 1065, Pratinas <u>PMG</u> 708.8, Anacreon <u>PMG</u> 373.3; more examples in Headlam-Knox, <u>loc.cit.</u>). Some of the conventional elements, or <u>topoi</u>, of the literary <u>paraclausithyron</u> can also be seen to have been drawn from "real life". For example, the lover's κοιμησις ἐπὶ θύραις is found at Plato <u>Symp.</u> 183A; the violence so often threatened to the door by the drunken <u>komast</u> is mentioned as having been inflicted on the door by the drunken Simon at Lysias <u>Contra Sim.</u> 6(97)[4]; the garland, worn by the <u>komast</u>

and often left on the threshold, is mentioned by Plutarch at De Cohib.
Ira 5 (Moralia 455B).   The actual practice of singing the song at the
door is referred to by both Plutarch (Amat. 8) and Lucian (Bis Acc. 31).

The earliest instance in literature of anything approximating to the
paraclausithyron is Alcaeus PLF 374 δέξαι με κωμάσδοντα,
δέξαι, λίσσομαι σε λίσσομαι, presumably a fragment from such a
poem addressed to a woman (see C.M. Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry from
Alcman to Simonides, (2nd ed. Oxford 1961) 163).   It perhaps occurs in
embryo at Euripides Cycl. 495-502 (see Copley, Excl.Am. 5ff), and
certainly occurs at Aristophanes Eccles. 947-8 and 960-75.   Here the
young man tells of his hope to find the girl alone, and informs us that
he is fired by both drink and desire, both statements being topoi of
the later literary paraclausithyron[5].   In 960ff he addresses the girl
directly, begging her to come and open the door:

Νεανίας   δεῦρο δὴ δεῦρο δή,   960
              καὶ σύ μοι καταδραμοῦ-
              σα τὴν θύραν ἄνοιξον
              τήνδ'· εἰ δὲ μή, καταπεσὼν κείσομαι.
              φίλον, ἀλλ ἐν τῷ σῷ
              βούλομαι κόλπῳ πλῃκτίζεσθαι
              μετὰ τῆς σῆς πυγῆς.   965
              Κύπρι τί μ'ἐκμαίνεις ἐπὶ ταύτῃ;
              μέθες, ἱκνοῦμαι σ' Ἔρως,
              καὶ ποίησον τήνδ' ἐς εὐνὴν
              τὴν ἐμὴν ἱκέσθαι.

Νεανις καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι μετρίως πρὸς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάγκην
ἐιρημέν᾽ ἐστίν. σὺ δέ μοι, φίλτατον, ὦ ἱκετεύω,   970
ἄνοιξον ἀσπάζου με·
διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω.

Νεανιᾱς ὦ χρυσοδαιδαλτον ἐμὸν μέλημα, Κύπριδος ἔρνος,
μέλιττα Μούσης, Χαρίτων θρέμμα, Τρυφῆς πρόσωπον,
ἄνοιξον ἀσπάζου με·
διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω.   975

Two points which Copley makes about these lines are worthy of notice.
First, they contain a refrain in 971-2 and 975-6 (ἄνοιξον ἀσπάζου με·
διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω), which perhaps recalls the folk song[6].
Secondly, the lover threatens to lie on the doorstep if he is not
admitted (962. ἐι δὲ μή, καταπεσὼν κείσομαι), and this is common
in later paraclausithyra.

We can be sure that the paraclausithyron was not neglected by later
writers of comedy since it occurs in Plautus Curculio 1-164 (on which
see Copley, Excl.Am. 9ff).   At Merc.409 occentent ostium is also a clear
reference to the serenade[7], as is occentabunt ostium at Persa 569.   The
extant fragments of Menander contain no real instance of it, but the
opening scene of the Misumenos appears to have contained an interesting
variation on it.   There Thrasonides complains that he has to stand
outside his own doors (Mis. A6 Sandbach)[8].   In mime we have the

Alexandrian Erotic Fragment in which a woman complains before her lover's
door after she had been rejected by him following a quarrel (Powell 177-8),
and komastic activity is referred to in the Egyptian Ostracon, the so-
called κωμαστής (Powell 181-2), and in Herodas' second Mime (especially
34ff.).

Theocritus more than once transfers this typically urban scene to a
country setting. Idyll 3 begins with a goatherd proclaiming that he is
off on a komos to Amaryllis and that Tityrus has been left in charge of
his flocks. At line 6 the scene changes and the rustic lover is now
before the entrance of Amaryllis' cave. The remainder of the poem (6-54)
is the goatherd's paraclausithyron addressed directly to Amaryllis, which
ends with his failure to gain admission[9]. This is the only Theocritean
example cited by Copley (Excl.Am.14), but Francis Cairns cogently argues
that Polyphemus' song to Galatea in Idyll 11 is also to be regarded as a
paraclausithyron, in which the girl is asked to come out rather than, as
is usually the case, admit the komast (GC, 145f.)[10]. Support for
Cairns's view comes from Ovid Met. 13.790ff., which is clearly modelled
on Theocritus' poem and which also contains other komastic elements as
well as a reminiscence of his own paraclausithyron in the Amores (see
below p.51). One might add Idyll 23.19-48, in which a desperate lover,
about to commit suicide, complains of the boy's cruelty at his door. This
is not, strictly speaking, a paraclausithyron, since the lover does not
request admission (nor lament his exclusion), though he does make the
request of him that he not pass by his corpse when he comes out but
rather honour it and bury it (35-48). The poem certainly relies on the

reader's knowledge of the <u>paraclausithyron</u> and contains at least two <u>topoi</u> of the song (tears of the lover at the door (17); kissing the threshold (18); perhaps, too, at 53-4, where the boy sees the corpse hanging from his door-post, the reader is meant to recall the <u>topos</u> of the garland, which is often hung on the door by the <u>komast</u> to remind his beloved of him).

But the genre in the Hellenistic period is represented mainly by epigram. References to the komastic situation and the lover's exclusion are numerous (cf., e.g.,5.167 (Asclep.), <u>AP</u> 5.191 (<u>Mel.</u>), 12.167 (<u>Mel.</u>). 12.252 (Straton)), but we also find a number of epigrams which purport to be the complaint of the excluded lover (cf.5.23(Callim), 5.145 and 164 (Asclep.),5.103(Rufinus),5.213(Poseidippus),5.118(Marc.Arg.),6.71 (Paulus Sil.),12.252(Straton)[11]. For our examination of the theme in Roman elegy it will be most convenient to isolate the motifs or <u>topoi</u> of the genre – those secondary elements which occur regularly in the examples of the genre[12]– to see how these have been used by the Roman poets.

<u>Topoi of the Greek Paraclausithyron</u>[13]. N.B. In each section examples of the <u>topos</u> are given first from epigrams which are <u>paraclausithyra</u> (denoted by the letter A), then from those epigrams which are not real <u>paraclausithyra</u> but which do deal with the komastic situation (B). Some parallels, where they exist, are adduced also from other genres.

    1. <u>The drunkenness of the excluded lover</u>

        A. <u>AP</u> 5.213.3(Poseidippus),6.71.2 (Paulus Sil.),
           12.252.2(Straton)

B. <u>AP</u> 5.167.1-2 (Asclep.), 5.281.1 (Paulus Sil.)

12.118.3 (Callim.)

Cf. also Eurip. <u>Cycl.</u> 495ff., Pratinas <u>PMG</u> 708.8f(Plg.),

Aristoph.   <u>Eccles.</u>938ff, Egyptian Ostracon 1,4,11,15

(Powell p.181-2), P.Teb.2(d).   (See Copley <u>Excl.Am.</u>13.)

2. <u>The lover wears a garland</u>   (usually left, subsequently,

on the door/doorstep)

A. <u>AP</u> 5.118 (Marc.Arg.), 5.145.1-2 (Asclep.), 6.71.1-5

(Paulus.Sil.).

B. <u>AP</u> 5.191.5-6 (Mel.), 5.281.1-2 (Paulus Sil.).

Cf. also Chariton 1.3.2, Theoc. 3.21, Frag. Grenfell, 25-6

(Powell p.178), Aristaenetus 2.19. etc.   A humorous

variation is Aelian <u>Var.Hist.</u> 13.1 where two centaurs

(ἐρασταὶ θρασεῖς καὶ κωμασταὶ βαρύτατοι) woo Atalanta

with garlands made from branches.

3. <u>The lover's vigil at the door</u>

A. <u>AP</u> 5.23.1-2 (Callim.), 5.164.4 (Asclep.), 6.71.5-6

(Paulus Sil.), 12.252.4 (Straton).

B. <u>AP</u> 5.189.2 (Asclep.), 12.72.1 (Mel.)

Cf.also Plato <u>Symp.</u> 183A (κοιμήσις ἐπὶ θύρας),

Philostratus <u>Ep</u> 29 (θυραυλίαι καὶ χαμαικοιτίαι), Aristaen.

2.20 (κοιμήσις ἐπὶ θύρας), Theoc. 3.53, Aristoph.

<u>Eccles.</u> 964

4. <u>The lover in inclement weather</u>

    A. <u>AP</u> 5.23.2 (Callim.)

    B. <u>AP</u> 5.189.1-2 (Asclep.), 5.167.1(id.), 5.64.1-3 (id.),

        12.167. 1 (Mel.), 12.115.3 (Anon.)

Cf. Philostratus <u>Ep.</u>29. Cf. also Valerius Aedituus fr.

1(Gell.19.9.2)3-4.   The poem may well be an adaptation

of a Greek epigram (See J.G.R. Wright, "A <u>Komos</u> in

Valerius Aedituus" <u>CQ</u> 25 (1975) 152-3).

5. <u>The lover sheds tears at the door</u>

    A. <u>AP</u> 5.145.2-6 (Asclep.).

    B. <u>AP</u> 12.72.6 (Mel.), <u>AP</u> 5.191.5-6 (Mel.).

6. <u>The lover kisses the door-post</u>

    A. -

    B. <u>AP</u> 12.118.5-6 (Callim.).

Cf. (Theoc.) 23.18 (with Gow's note).

7. <u>The lover carries a torch</u>

    A. <u>AP</u> 12.252.1 (Straton)

    B. <u>AP</u> 12.117.1 (Mel.)

Cf. Aristophanes <u>Eccles.</u> 692, <u>Plut.</u> 1041, Antiphanes fr.

199k (Meineke 3.114), Chariton 1.3.2, Theoc. 2.128, Aelian

<u>Var.Hist.</u> 13.1. Cf. also Valerius Aediduus fr. 1 (= Gell.

19.9.2) 1.

8. <u>The lover writes on the girl's door</u>

    A. -

B. <u>AP</u> 5.191.5-6 (Mel.).

Cf. (Theoc.) 23.45-8.   Cf. Plautus <u>Merc.</u> 409, which may

suggest its occurrence in Philemon.

9. <u>The lover threatens the door with violence</u>

A. <u>AP</u> 12.252.1. (Straton).

B. -

Cf. Theoc.2.128, Athenaeus 13.585a.

10. <u>The lover wonders if the girl is alone</u>

A. <u>AP</u> 5.213.1-2 (Poseidippus).

B. <u>AP</u> 5.191.5 (Mel.).

11. <u>The lover is hindered by a dog</u>

A. -

B. <u>AP</u> 5.30.4 (Antipater), 5.242.8 (Eratosth.Schol.).

12. <u>The lover warns the girl of approaching old age</u>

A. <u>AP</u> 5.23.5-6 (Callim.), 5.103.3-4 (Rufinus), 5.118.4

(Marc.Arg.).

B. -

Cf. (Theoc.) 23.28-32.

<u>The Roman Paraclausithyron/komos</u>

It is clear that the theme of the <u>exclusus amator</u> was attractive to the

Roman poets as well.   It may well be that not only the literary theme,

but the practice of the <u>komos</u> also was adopted by Roman Society.   This

is suggested by the occurrence of the <u>exclusus amator</u> in Lucretius'

scathing attack on sexual love and its manifestations in the fourth book:

> at lacrimans exclusus amator limina saepe
>
> floribus et sertis operit postisque superbos
>
> unguit amaracino et foribus miser oscula figit.
>
> <div align="right">(4.1177-79)</div>

Copley is probably correct in his assertion that "Lucretius would never

have made himself ridiculous by attacking with all the scorn of which

he was capable something that was only a foolish fancy of the poets and

had no counterpart in real life"[14].   Even stronger evidence for the

historicity of the practice comes from Apuleius' defence speech where

he describes the life-style of Herennius Rufinus and his family:

> ipse propudiosus, uxor lupa, filii similes:
>
> prorsus diebus ac noctibus ludibrio iuventutis
>
> ianua calcibus propulsata, fenestrae canticus
>
> circumstrepitae. . . . .
>
> <div align="right">(Apol. 75)</div>

Certainly the Greek literary paraclausithyron was taken over

enthusiastically by the Romans, and references to the komastic situation

occur often in Roman literature from Plautus to the elegists.   Copley

(Excl.Am.28ff). claims that the reason for this popularity was the pre-

existence of a Roman "door-song".   He argues that the opening scene of

Plautus' Curculio proves this;   for here, he claims, we have a

paraclausithyron which is distinctly Roman because the door is personified

and the theme of furtivus amor is present.   Neither of these elements,

Copley argues, is found in the Greek paraclausithyron, where the door is

not treated as a person and where, if the door does not open, it is because the girl herself does not wish to open it, not because she is prevented from doing so by a third person.   Now even if one concedes these points (and Copley does have to give ground a little on the personification argument, since a door is apostrophised by Strato at AP 12.252.1, perhaps suggesting that addresses to the door were not unknown in pre-elegiac epigram), to argue from this to a _pessuli_ song, is,as E.J. Kenney pointed out in his review of the book (CR 8(1958) 48-9),absurd.   However, Copley's two premises are basically sound, even if they do not produce his conclusion.   It is true that in the Roman examples of the _paraclausithyron_ the door is given greater prominence and is personified to a much greater extent than in the Greek _paraclausithyron_, and it is also true that _furtivus amor_ figures much more prominently in the Roman examples.   This is, as we shall see, particularly the case with elegy.

Reasons can be suggested for these two differences, without assuming the existence of a Roman _pessuli_ song.   The personification of and greater concern with the door arises, as many, including Copley himself, have pointed out, from Roman door-magic and the prominence of the door in Roman religion[15].   This notion of the door as a religious object has great significance for the elegiac instances of the _paraclausithyron_, a significance which seems to have been given insufficient attention.   We shall return to this point in discussing the _paraclausithyron_ in elegy.

Furtivus _amor_, the other "Roman innovation" mentioned by Copley, can
also be satisfactorily explained.   First, however, we must reconsider
Copley's first example of furtivus _amor_, the opening scene of the   .
Curculio.   Copley argues that the blame for the lover's exclusion is
here transferred "from the girl to the door, the _leno_ and the duenna"
(Excl.Am.40).   This is true, but Copley does not ask _why_ the blame
has been so transferred.   In the play Phaedromus expresses to his slave
Palinurus his concern about his beloved Planesium (Curculio 45ff).   This
seems strange because, in fact, Phaedromus has no rival for Planesium's
affections, and there seems to be no reason why the pimp should forbid
Phaedromus' seeing her.   Elaine Fantham[16] has plausibly argued that in
Plautus' original Phaedromus had as a rival a wealthy purchaser of
Planesium who had not yet arrived to make final payment and collect his
goods (one may compare the similar situation in the Pseudolus).   If
this were so, then Phaedromus' anxiety about his girl would be explained.
This very reasonable explanation of the opening of the play has, however,
serious consequences for Copley's argument, for Phaedromus in the
original Greek would also have been excluded from the house by door,
leno and _duenna_, not by the girl, and furtivus amor would not be a Roman
addition but part of the original plot.

However, a casual perusal of the elegiac paraclausithyra and of Horace
Odes 3.10[17] will reveal that furtivus amor is given a prominence which
is missing from most of the Greek instances, (I omit from discussion
Catullus 67 which is not a paraclausithyron and Lucretius 4.1177-9,

which contains no reference, <u>pace</u> Copley, to <u>furtivus amor</u>[18]).   But
this is not because, as Copley would no doubt maintain, the notion of
<u>furtivus amor</u> is a conscious Roman addition to the <u>paraclausithyron</u>,
but because a husband and the triangular relationship involving him
with the poet and the girl are embodied in the tradition of Roman
elegy (dating probably from Catullus' Lesbia poems) and any genre of
poem introduced to elegy would naturally be made to conform to its
conventions.   In the background of Roman elegy - whether in real life
or not - lurks the <u>vir</u> who has a legal claim to the poet's girl[19]:
naturally the poet will include him also in the komastic situation.

Let us now turn to the elegiac examples to see how the elegists have
dealt with this highly stylised theme.

Prop. 1.16

In this poem, one of the most unusual in Propertius, the speaker
introduces himself in the first two lines as a door[20].   The whole
poem is, in fact, a monologue by the door in which it complains that
its status has been severely diminished;   in the old days it witnessed
triumphal processions (1-4) but now it has to tolerate the disgraceful
nocturnal behaviour of the lovers of the mistress of the house (5-12).
What particularly worries the door is one "suppliant" lover who,
during his vigil at the door, constantly complains about the door
(13-16).   In 17-44 we find the <u>paraclausithyron</u> of this lover, quoted
<u>in toto</u> by the door to illustrate his point.   The lover begins his song
by complaining of the door's cruelty and his own discomfort (17-26).

He wishes that his voice could pass through a crack in the door: cruel
though his mistress be, she could not help pitying him (27-32).   As it
is she lies in someone else's embrace and his prayers are in vain (33-4).
The door is to blame for this (35-6), the door whom the lover has never
maligned (37-40).   In fact the lover has produced poetry for it, kissed
it and treated it with a religious veneration (41-4).

The elements which Propertius has drawn from the Greek paraclausithyron
and komastic tradition are easy to see.   Though the lover does not
declare that he has been drinking, we must certainly reckon him to be
included in the potorum of line 5 (for drinking, see Topos 1 in the
Topoi of the Greek Paraclausithyron above).   Presumably, too, he
comes equipped with garland and torches as they do (7-8:   see Topoi 2
and 7 above).   The door tells us in 14 of the lover's longis excubiis
(see Topos 3), and the lover himself tells us that the weather is cold
(24:   see Topos 4).   That he weeps is indicated by the door's reference
to amantis fletibus in 47-8 (see Topos 5), and he claims, in line 42,
to have kissed the door (see Topos 6).   The door tells us in 10
that it has been "wounded" by the rixae of the women's lovers (see Topos
9), though presumably not by this one who claims in 37 that he has not
even verbally insulted it.   Finally, at 33, the lover believes the girl
lies in someone else's arms (see Topos 10).   Of the topoi listed above,
only 11 (the dog) and 12 (the warning of impending old age) are missing.

However, there is also much in the poem that has not been taken from the

Greek paraclausithyron.   It has often been pointed out that Propertius

is, in this poem, indebted to Catullus 67 which is a conversation between

a house-door and an interlocutor[21].   In both Catullus' and Propertius'

poems, the door defends itself against what it believes to be unjust

accusations by criticising the behaviour of the occupants of the house

to which it belongs.   But Propertius perhaps owes more to Catullus

than the idea of the talking door.   Consider the opening lines of the

poem:

> O dulci iocunda viro, iocunda parenti,
>
>> salve, teque bona Iuppiter auctet ope,
>
> ianua, quam Balbo dicunt servisse benigne
>
>> olim, cum sedes ipse senex tenuit,
>
> quamque ferunt rursus gnato servisse maligne,
>
>> postquam es porrecto facta marita sene:
>
> dic agedum nobis, quare mutata feraris
>
>> in dominum veterem deseruisse fidem.

L. Richardson ("Catullus 67: Interpretation and Form" AJP 88 (1967) 426)

has observed that bona ... ope in 2 is an archaic expression, but he has

not seen the real significance of it.   The first eight lines of the poem

are, in fact, Gebetsparodie: the speaker addresses the door as a deity,

making use of, or, rather, parodying, many conventions of the ancient

prayer.   The address begins with the highly-emotional O, so often found

in prayer (e.g., Horace Odes 1.30.1. O Venus regina Cnidi Paphique;

1.35.1. O diva gratum quae regis Antium.   In Gebetsparodie cf.3.21.1.

O nata mecum; 3.13.1. O fons Bandusiae[22].)   Then the door is addressed

by means of two honorific phrases in the vocative case: dulci iucunda

viro, iocunda parenti.   It is a well-known technique of the ancient

prayer to use a vocative with an attribute, or series of attributes, in

apposition to it: cf. Sappho 1.1. ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ'

Ἀφρόδιτα, παῖ Διὸς δολόπλοκε.   In Gebetsparodie cf.

Hor. Odes 3.21.1. O nata mecum . . . testa (see Norden, Agnostos Theos,

148.   Nisbet and Hubbard, Odes 1, 128).   Note, too, the repetition of

the word iucunda: such repetition (ἀναδίπλωσις) is also

common in prayer (see Norden, Agnostos Theos, 169 note 1).   Salve in

line 2 can be parallelled many times in prayer (see Appel 109-10; Fraenkel,

Horace, 169, esp.notes 3 and 4), while, as noted above, bona . . . ope is

an archaic expression (which, incidentally, Catullus clearly associated

with the language of religion, since he uses it elsewhere only at 34.21ff.

sis quocumque tibi placet/sancta nomine, Romulique,/antique ut solita's

bona/sospites ope gentem).   Auctet (2) is also archaic (cf. Lucretius 1.

56, Plaut. Amph. prol. 6 (Mercury speaking)).   In 3-4 and 5-6 we find

two relative clauses describing the door, and the "relative style" is

also a common feature of religious language (cf. Hor.Odes 1.10.1ff.

Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis,/qui feros cultus hominum recentum/voce

formasti catus. See Nisbet and Hubbard, Odes 1, 127).   The alliteration

of s in 4 and 5 and t in 2 can perhaps also be seen as Gebetsparodie,

since alliteration is often a feature of Roman prayers (see Appel 160ff.,

Kleinknecht 159ff.).   Even the apparently prosaic dic agedum nobis (7)

is, after the numerous instances of prayer-formulae, to be taken as
imparting a religious flavour: cf. Hor. Odes 1.32.3 age dic, 3.4.1
descende caelo et dic age: cf. also Homer Od.1.10.

Catullus' interlocutor, then, addresses the door with a request which
is made up of a number of prayer-formulae.   The interlocutor, as it were,
addresses the door as a god (as Horace, in Odes 3.21, addresses the wine-
jar as a god).   For this idea Catullus may be indebted to Plautus who,
in the opening scene of the Curculio, makes Phaedromus address the door
with Gebetsparodie: agite bibite, festivae fores;/potate, fite mihi
volentes propitiae (88-89) (On this scene see Kleinknecht 158ff.).
Whether the idea was widespread by Catullus' time we cannot tell:
certainly Lucretius makes the lover react to the door as he would a
deity, and we are not compelled, in view of the Plautine Gebetsparodie,
to the conclusion that Lucretius took the idea from Catullus (or vice
versa):

> at lacrimans exclusus amator limina saepe
>
> floribus et sertis operit postisque superbos
>
> unguit amaracino et floribus miser oscula figit.

Here the lover decorates and anoints the door-posts and threshold,
treating them, in fact, as a worshipper would an altar or a sacred
stone: cf. Apuleius Apol. 56. negant vidisse se . . . lapidem unctum
aut ramum coronatum, Flor. 1. lapis unguine delibutus; Minucius Felix
3.1. lapides . . . unctos et coronatos; Lucretius 5.1199; Tib. 1.1.11-12
etc. (For more examples see Butler and Owen on Apuleius Apol. 56.)   It

should also be remembered that doors did in fact receive a ritual oiling
from a bride when she entered her husband's house (see Isidore Etymolog.
9.7.,12; Donatus on Terence Hec. 135. According to Servius (ad Aen.
4.458) wolf's fat was used for this quod huius ferae et unguen et membra
multis rebus remedio sunt). Even kissing the doors has a parallel in the
religious fervour of those who implant kisses on temple thresholds: cf.
Tib. 1.2.84 dare sacratis oscula liminibus; Arnobius Adv. Nat. 1.49.
Perhaps it was Phaedromus' Gebetsparodie at Curculio 88-9 that prompted
Palinurus to say quin das savium at 94[23].

Returning to Propertius, we can see that his exclusus amator, like
Catullus' interlocutor, injects into his address to the door a number
of phrases and formulae that recall Roman prayers. Before the lover
begins his address, the door tells us that he is a Supplex, a word which
occurs in two other Roman paraclausithyra (Hor. Odes 3.10.16; Tib. 1.2.14.
cf. also Ovid Ars. 2.527-8)[24]. The lover begins his song at line 17, and
the door is immediately addressed and given a descriptive phrase in the
vocative case (Ianua vel domina penitus crudelior ipsa). In 35-42 we
have an excellent example of what Norden calls the "Du-Stil der
Prädikation" (Agnostos Theos, 143ff.): tu . . . tu (35) . . . te (37) in
anaphora, followed by at tibi in 41. Lines 24-5 are perhaps an ironic
variation of this widespread formula, with the first person used instead
of the second: me mediae noctes, me sidera plena iacentem,/frigidaque
Eoo me dolet aura gelu. (For a rather more obvious "parodische Ich-Stil-
Aretalogie", cf. Carm. Priap. 85 (quoted by Kleinknecht 194)). Most

revealing, however, is the lover's activity in 43-4: <u>ante tuos</u>

<u>quotiens verti me, perfida, postis/debitaque occultis vota tuli manibus</u>.

This, as many have noticed,[25] is the typical activity of a devotee in

prayer: cf. Plin. <u>NH</u> 28.25 <u>in adorando dextram ad osculum referimus</u>

<u>totumque corpus circumagimus</u>; Lucretius 5.1199; Val. Flacc. 8.244;.

Sueton. <u>Vitell.</u>2.5.

All these indications that the lover is addressing the door as a god

will throw some light on the problematical line 20 <u>nescia furtivas</u>

<u>reddere mota preces</u>. We can now see that Rothstein was correct in

interpreting <u>reddere preces</u> as "etwas vergelten" or "die Bitte

zurückgeben in Gestalt der Erfüllung". (This interpretation is

rejected by Butler and Barber, Enk, and Camps who want the expression

to mean simply "deliver my entreaties to my mistress".) There seems

to be in the poem an ironic reversal of the normal votive situation,

in which the devotee, after gaining his prayer, is expected to <u>reddere</u>

<u>vota</u> (cf.,e.g., Cicero <u>Leg.</u> 2.9.22; Vergil <u>Ecl.</u> 5.74-5; Ovid, <u>Am.</u> 1.7.36,

<u>RA</u> 813: cf. also Prop. 2.28.61). We can see from the end of the

lover's lament that his part of the bargain has been carried out (43-4

<u>quotiens . . . debitaque occultis vota tuli manibus</u>); however, he has

never received what he prayed and "paid" for (19-20). (For <u>preces</u> in

a komastic situation in Roman poetry, cf. Ovid <u>Am.</u> 1.6.3, 61; Prop.

4.9.33[26]; Hor. <u>Odes</u> 3.10.13.) <u>Mota</u>, in this line, has both its

literal and metaphorical meanings: it has never opened to and never

been persuaded by the lover. It is perhaps possible, too, that it

has a religious ring in its context;   for the religious significance

of _moveri_, cf. Statius _Theb._ 3.450 _sacra movere deum_ and the

scholiast's comment _moveri sacra dicuntur cum coeperint incohare._   In

Gebetsparodie cf. Hor. _Odes_ 3.21.6.   See further Norden, _Agnostos Theos_,

148 note 2.

Tibullus 1.2.7-14

Tibullus's _paraclausithyron_ is just one of a number of themes which the

poet has linked together in typical Tibullan manner.   The poem has no

fixed dramatic setting: it does not, as Copley maintains (_Excl. Am._, 92),

take place before the closed door, because in the first line he is asking

for more wine (surely he is not holding out his cup to the slave while

he enjoys an _al fresco_ drink on Delia's threshold).   It has been

suggested that the unity of the poem lies in the fact that all the themes

in it comprise "the quiet and painful reflection of the poet between

starting his solitary potations and falling into a drunken sleep"[27]   and

this seems to be the only reasonable explanation of the apparent change

of dramatic setting from 1ff., where the poet is addressing a slave in

a sympotic situation, and 7ff., where he addresses the door in a

komastic situation.

The poem opens with Tibullus asking for more wine: he wants to get

drunk because he has been shut out by his girl (1-6).   Then his

imagination wanders to the closed door, which he addresses for eight

lines (7-14), asking for admission.   Then Delia herself is addressed

and told to cheat the guards: she will have Venus' aid because Venus
helps those who help themselves (15-24).   This statement enables
Tibullus to cite an example from personal experience (see cap.2 note 40)
and launch into the theme of the lover's divine protection against the
dangers of the night. . Here we are interested only in 7-14, the
miniature paraclausithyron which Tibullus has woven into the poem.

This is very different from Propertius' poem.   First, as we have
observed above, the paraclausithyron is only one of many themes linked
together ·by· Tibullus.   Moreover, it employs far less of the topoi we
have seen occurring in the traditional Greek komastic situation.   The
garlands (topos 2 above) are mentioned in 14, and threats made to the
door (topos 9 above) are hinted at in 11-12.   In 7-8 we have what seems
to be an unusual variation on the topos of inclement weather (topos 4
above):   ianua difficilis domini, te verberet imber,/te Iovis imperio
fulmina missa petant.   The anaphora of te and its emphatic position
in both lines is significant.   Tibullus is, in fact, wishing upon the
door the misfortunes usually experienced by the lover, for it is
inevitably the lover himself who suffers the buffeting of the elements
(see topos 4 above).   In varying the topos in this way, Tibullus is
relying on the reader's generic expectation to see what he is doing.

These are the only topoi which Tibullus has taken from the Greek
tradition: however, the movement of the poem, the way in which it
develops, can be parallelled in Greek literature.   At 7-8 Tibullus

begins the paraclausithyron proper with a burst of indignation against
the door: he wants the rain to lash it, the thunderbolts of Zeus to
strike it.   In the lines which follow the poet's tone softens: by
11-12 he is asking the door to forgive any insults his own dementia
may have produced and praying that these may rebound on his own head.
This change of tone is found also in the Alexandrian Erotic Fragment
(Powell, Lyr. Alex. Adesp.1) where the excluded girl rails against her
lover in 18ff., calling him ὁ φρεναπάτης and ὁ πρὸ τοῦ μέγα
φρονῶν but changes to a plaintive tone in 27ff. (κύριε, μή μ'ἀφῇς
'απoκεκλισμενηV)   For a similar change of tone, cf. Hor. Odes 3.10
(plaintive in 1-8, threatening in 9-12, plaintive again in 13-18,
threatening again in 19-20) and Ovid Am. 1.6 (see below).   Ovid
certainly considered this alternation of wheedling and threats to be
typical of the paraclausithyron: cf. Rem. Am. 35-6 Et modo blanditias,
rigido modo iugia posti/dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans, ib. 507
nec dic blanditias nec fac convicia posti.

A number of elements which we have associated more with the Roman
paraclausithyron are also present.   First, as in Propertius' poem, the
door is addressed directly (7,9).   Secondly, the girl is married, since
the door belongs to a dominus (surely not, as Putnam on line 7 suggests,
her father!) and Tibullus requests that it open furtively (10).   Third,
even in this short sequence, we can see that the door is addressed in
the language of religion.   It is addressed directly and with an
attribute (difficilis domini (7)); but more striking than this is the

repetition, the ἀναδίπλωσις , of <u>ianua</u> in 9.   Then, at 11-12,

Tibullus prays that any insults he may have uttered to the door rebound

upon himself, and that the door remember instead his past behaviour:

this is perhaps reminiscent of the devotee reminding the deity of his

(the devotee's)past favours to him (often in a conditional clause, cf.

<u>Iliad</u> 1.39ff., 1.503ff., etc. For such <u>commercium</u> in Roman prayers, see

Appel 152f.).   In lines 13-14 Tibullus refers to his <u>voce</u> . . . <u>supplice</u>.

Ovid Am. 1.6

Unlike Prop. 1.16 and Tib. 1.2., this poem is a <u>paraclausithyron</u> in its

entirety, comprising throughout the words of the <u>exclusus amator</u>. There

are a number of similarities between the poem and the Greek komastic

epigrams, and also between it and the <u>paraclausithyra</u> of Propertius and

Tibullus, which Ovid doubtless knew (there are, however, no verbal

similarities between Ovid's poem and those of his two predecessors[28]).

The poem opens with Ovid asking the <u>ianitor</u> to admit him: he only

needs the door ajar a little because love has made him thin (1-6).

He once feared the night, but Cupid emboldened him and now he fears

only the <u>ianitor</u> (7-16).   He asks the <u>ianitor</u> to look at his tears --

and open the door to do so (17-18).   He then reminds him of a favour

he (Ovid) once did him and asks for repayment (19-24):   so may the

<u>ianitor</u> some day win freedom (25-6).   But the <u>ianitor</u> is unyielding

and Ovid wonders why in peacetime he bars the door against a friend

who comes, not with soldiers, but only with Cupid, "moderate"

inebriation and a garland (27-40). Is the doorkeeper sleeping, he

wonders (41-4). Does he perhaps have a girl with him (45-8)? Did

the door move? - No, it was just the wind (49-52). Then Ovid asks

the wind to blast the door (53-4). The night is silent and time is

passing (55-6); Ovid, frustrated, threatens to burn down the house --

night, wine and love urge him on to violent action (57-60). Threats

and prayers have been in vain - the ianitor is heartless and deserves

to be a prison-guard (61-4). Dawn is coming, and Ovid leaves his

garland to remind the girl of his wasted time (65-70), and then he

bids farewell to the ianitor and the doors (71-4).

The topoi of the Greek epigrammatic paraclausithyron or komastic

situation are easy to see. The lover is drunk: although he claims

that the circa mea tempora vinum is modicum (37) we can tell from the

tilted garland in 38 that this is an understatement (for drunkenness

see topos 1; for the garland topos2). The lover's vigil on the

doorstep (topos 3) is implicit in the poem and referred to by the lover

in 70 when he leaves the garland as temporis absumpti tam male testis.

Inclement weather (topos 4) is not specifically mentioned, but at 51

the door is moved by an animoso . . . vento, and the reference to

falling dew in 55 may be meant to call attention not only to the late

hour but also to the damp cold of morning. The lover's tears (topos 5)

appear in 18, the torch (topos 7) in 58. The lover threatens violence

(topos 9) at 57ff. He does not wonder whether the girl is alone

(topos 10) because this poem is concerned with the ianitor and the girl

is just a shadowy figure in the background who, in fact, plays a very

insignificant part in the poem.   What Ovid does do, however, is

wonder whether ianitor is alone: in 45-6 he suggests that he may have

his girl sleeping with him (an absurdity, of course, since the ianitor

is a slave and in chains, as Ovid mentions in 1 and 4).   This is a

novel use of the motif which would appeal (like Tibullus' reworking

of the inclement weather topos) to the reader's generic expectation.

We may also detect another Greek motif in 33ff:

> non ego militibus venio comitatus et armis:
>
> solus eram, si non saevus adesset Amor;
>
> hunc ego, si cupiam, nusquam dimittere possum.

Cf.Frag. Grenfell (Powell Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 1) 18ff.

> Συνοδηγὸν ἔχω τὸ πολὺ πῦρ
> Τοὺν τῇ ψυχῇ μōυ καιόμενον.

There is a clear thematic resemblance between the two passages, but

insufficient verbal similarity to suggest direct borrowing.   Perhaps

this, too, was a topos of Greek paraclausithyra, a variation on the

"protection of love" theme frequently found in epigram (see below p. 167ff.)

Missing from Ovid's poem are the kisses planted on the doors (topos 6),

the guard-dog (topos 11) and the warning of impending old age (topos 12).

Finally, the movement of the poem, like that of Tibullus', calls to mind

the Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, for this lover's tone also changes,

though here the plaintive prayers (18ff.) precede the threats and

insults (57ff.,63ff.).

But while Ovid utilises many of the topoi of the Greek paraclausithyron,
it is clear that his handling of the theme is strikingly original. We
have had some indication of this already. In particular, we notice that
the address is made not to the girl (who plays no prominent part in the
poem), nor, as in Propertius' and Tibullus' poems, to the door, but to
the ianitor. For this Ovid is criticised by Copley: "Now by putting
the ianitor, a commonplace and homely figure of Roman life, in the place
of the personified door, Ovid has cast aside all that the door represented.
And since the door was in a very real sense the life of the paraclausithyron
Ovid has cast that life aside with it" (Excl.Am. 126). This is a less
fair assessment than that of Barsby, who finds the poem a good example of
Ovid's reworking of a traditional theme (Am.1.81). The two innovations
which Barsby points to are the addressing of the song to the ianitor and
the use of the refrain[29] (unparallelled in the paraclausithyron since
Aristophanes, whose use of it is nothing like as prominent and artistic
as Ovid's).

Now while it is true that Ovid's address to the ianitor is itself a new
twist, this is not as important as the results which follow from it; for
the new twist is worthwhile because it opens up new areas for Ovid to
explore. As we have already seen, Ovid is able to play with the reader's
generic expectation at 45, where he wonders whether the ianitor has a
girl with him. There is much more than this. Since his addressee is a
person, and a person in an unfortunate and unenviable position, Ovid can
sympathise with his lot (1ff.). He can also, for humorous effect, claim

that he is more to be feared than footpads (15-6).   He can play tricks

on him, asking him to look at the poet's tears by opening the door a

little (17-8).   He can remind him of intercessions he has made with the

ianitor's mistress (19-20), wonder whether he is asleep (41-2) and

complain of his vigilance on other occasions (43-4).

We have noticed in other Roman paraclausithyra and instances of the

komastic situation the readiness of the poets to use religious language

to or of the door.   Ovid was not unaware of this, and was able to play

with his reader's expectations in his address to the ianitor.   At times

the language used to the ianitor is clear Gebetsparodie.   The poem

starts with a formal address to the doorkeeper, who has attached to him

the familiar participial phrase in the vocative case: Ianitor (indignum!)

dura religate catena (1).   Then follows the request: difficilem moto

cardine pande forem (2).   Neither Brandt nor Barsby comment on pandere

in this line.   In its past participle passus (e.g., passi comes, passis

capillis) it occurs frequently in Ovid, and in its meaning "to reveal" it

is also not uncommon[30].   But in its meaning "to open" it occurs only once

elsewhere[31], at Fasti 4.449 (the rape of Persephone) panditur interea Diti

via.   Here Bömer quotes as parallels Vergil Aen. 10.1 panditur interea

domus omnipotentis Olympi, Prop. 4.11.1. panditur ad nullas ianua nigra

preces, CE 1918.1. panditur introitus sacrata limina Cristo.   One may

add Hercules' "komastic" request at Prop. 4.9.33-4[32] Vos precor, o luci

sacro quae luditis antro,/pandite defessis hospita fana viris.   cf. also

Cat. 61.76 claustra pandite ianuae.   (The word is not found in Tibullus).

It is quite clear from these examples that _pandere_ has a much more
elevated ring than the usual _aperire_, and we may conclude that Ovid is
striving for an elevated effect.   Then, in the third line, Ovid claims
that his _prayer_ is for something small: _quod precor exiguum est._   Thus
the language of the first three lines, if not obvious _Gebetsparodie_, is
certainly very highflown, and when such language is used in an address
to a slave, the effect must be humorous.

At 15 we have a clear instance of _Gebetsparodie_:

> te nimium lentum timeo, tibi blandior uni:
>
> tu, me quo possis perdere, fulmen habes.

Again we find the familiar "du-Stil" with _te . . . tibi . . . tu_ in
anaphora.   When the religious tone is recognised, the significance of
line 16 becomes clear.   The joke lies not, as Barsby suggests, in a
play on the words for "thunderbolt" and "doorbolt",[33] but in the elevation
of the humble _ianitor_ to the position of the god of the _fulmen_ himself.
One may compare what Polyphemus says to Galatea in another _paraclausithyron_
(see below) at _Met_ 13.856-8 _tibi enim succumbimus uni,/quique Iovem et
caelum sperno et penetrabile fulmen,/Nerei, te vereor, tua fulmine saevior
ira est_ (Ovid here was presumably reusing the motif of his earlier
paraclausithyron).

At 27 Ovid says to the doorkeeper: _ferreus orantem nequiquam ianitor,
audis._   The verb _orare_ is used only once elsewhere in the _Amores_, at
1.8.77 where it again refers to the _exclusus amator._   In the _Ars_ it

occurs only at 2.565. <u>Nec Venus oranti . . . rustica Gradivo difficilisque</u>
<u>fuit</u>.   In Propertius it appears only once and then in its serious sense
(4.11.5 <u>te licet orantem fuscae deus audiat aulae</u>), and in both the
Tibullan examples it bears its literal meaning (1.2.63-4 <u>non ego totus</u>
<u>abesset amor, sed mutuus esset/orabam</u> (In the context of a magical ceremony)
and (Tib.) 3.1.15 <u>per vos (Pierides), auctores huius mihi carminis, oro</u>).
We may conclude, then, that Ovid intended the word to carry its religious
overtones, and since the object of the verb is a slave the effect is surely
humorous.   In fact, by making the <u>ianitor</u> the addressee of this poem,
Ovid was not "casting aside the life of the <u>paraclausithyron</u>" but
ingeniously opening up for himself an avenue for exploring new ways of
treating a well-worn theme.

Other innovations may be briefly mentioned.   First, the refrain <u>tempora</u>
<u>noctis eunt: excute poste seram</u> is a new addition: one can hardly
compare the refrain in the Aristophanic <u>paraclausithyron</u> (<u>Eccles</u>. 960ff.)
in which the words ἄνοιξον ἀσπάζου με · διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω
are repeated just once.   The refrain is used as a dramatic technique by
Ovid: after each one we are to imagine a pause while the lover waits
(in vain) for the doorkeeper to open the door.   Copley's comment on
Ovid's use of the refrain — which divides each of the pleas in the centre
of the poem into eight-line units — is that it "reveals signs of rigidity
and artificiality" (<u>Excl.Am</u>.128).   This is true, but one would hardly
expect anything but an "artificial" poem from Ovid.   The point is that
it is, like so many of the <u>Amores</u>, brilliantly artificial: the refrain,

which is neatly woven into the poem, is another instance of Ovid's

cleverness.   We may notice, too, the ingenious adaptation in 3-6 of

the standard erotic theme of the lover's poor physical condition[34];

the door need only be slightly ajar to admit his emaciated body.   In

29ff. Ovid also adapts to the situation the military metaphor so common

in elegy -- he comes not with an army but only with love, his undismissible

companion.   The result of all this is a brilliant tour-de-force, a poem

which is, indeed, artificial, but one in which new vitality has been

injected into a cliché.

Met. 13.789ff.

Before concluding, we should briefly look at another (non-elegiac)

paraclausithyron by Ovid, or, rather, at a variation of the paraclausithyron.

This is the speech of Polyphemus to Galatea in the Metamorphoses, another

attempt to give the old topic a new twist.   This time Ovid was helped

considerably by a Greek model, for the speech bears a strong resemblance

to Theocritus' eleventh Idyll, itself a variation on the paraclausithyron.

As Cairns (GC. 145ff.) has pointed out, the paraclausithyron is, in Idyll

II, transported by Theocritus to a new location, to the Homeric landscape

of Sicily (just as in Idyll 3 it was transferred to the contemporary

countryside).   Polyphemus comes to the seashore - Galatea's threshold -

and, since he cannot swim and therefore is unable to enter Galatea's

house, he asks Galatea to come out.   This situation Ovid's Polyphemus

shares.   There are also a number of shared motifs in both Ovid's and

Theocritus' poem, and also in Idyll 3, the other paraclausithyron in a

country setting.   These (quoted by Cairns GC. 146) are:

1.   The komast's remarks on his own appearance: Theoc. 3.8-9, 11.30-33, Ovid Met. 13.840-53.

2.   The gifts the komast is keeping for his mistress: Theoc.3. 10-11;   34, 11.40-41, Ovid Met. 13.810ff.

3.   The intense love of the komast and the girl's cruelty: Theoc. 3.15-17, 11.25ff.;   52-3;   10-11;   15-16, Ovid Met. 13.798ff., 867.

What is particularly interesting about Polyphemus' song in Ovid is the way in which the poet has adapted Theocritus.   Although there are these similarities between the two poets, Ovid adds some touches of his own, recalling his earlier paraclausithyron.   We have already seen how Galatea, like the ianitor, is more to be feared than Zeus.   Notice, too, 824-6:

> pauperis est numerare pecus;   de laudibus harum
>
> nil mihi credideris, praesens potes ipsa videre,
>
> ut vix circumeant distentum cruribus uber.

What Ovid is doing is transferring to Polyphemus' song the trick which he utilised in Am. 1.6.   There the ianitor is asked to observe Ovid's tears — and open the door to do it:

> aspice (uti videas, inmitia claustra relaxa)
>
> uda sit ut lacrimis ianua facta meis.

<div align="right">(Am.1.6.17-18)</div>

So, here, Galatea is told that she can see the flock for herself — but she has to be present to do so.

The most striking difference from the Theocritan model, however, is Ovid's use of Gebetsparodie: once more the komast makes his address using language which recalls the prayer.   First we notice the long string of descriptive phrases in the vocative case in 789-809 (how great an expansion of Theocritus 11.20-21 λευκοτέρα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν, ἀπαλωτέρα ἀρνός, μόσχω γαυροτέρα, φιαρωτέρα ἄμφακος ὠμᾶς). That Ovid is intentionally using Gebetsparodie is surely indicated by the description of Galatea as splendidior vitro (791), a clear imitation of Horace's hymnic address to the fountain of Bandusia in Odes 3.13.1 (O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro).   More striking, perhaps, is what Polyphemus says later:

> tantum miserere precesque
>
> supplicis exaudi! tibi enim succumbimus uni,
>
> quique Iovem et caelum sperno et penetrabile fulmen,
>
> Nerei, te versor, tua fulmine saevior ira est.
>
> (855-8)

The preces supplicis we have met already in our consideration of Roman paraclausithyra: there is nothing similar to it in Theocritus. In 856-8 we meet again the "du-Stil" with anaphora: tibi(856) . . . te (858) . . . tu (858) and, as noted above, the addressee is claimed by the komast to be a greater object of fear than Zeus's thunderbolt. So while this paraclausithyron is Greek in that it addresses the girl directly, and while many of its themes come from Theocritus, Ovid has once again shown his originality and added some distinctly Roman and

Ovidian touches.

What emerges clearly from this discussion of the Elegiac
paraclausithyron is the debt of the Roman poets to their Greek
antecedents and also their working within a peculiarly Roman tradition.
The individuality of each of the elegists can also be easily discerned.
The many details and topoi of the Greek song - the vigil, the garland,
the torches, etc. - are, indeed, in evidence in varying quantities in
these poems, but we have seen, too, the peculiarly Roman addition of
Gebetsparodie, the use of religious language and formulae. Catullus,
in 67, which is not a paraclausithyron, makes an interlocutor address
a door in terms which recall the prayer, and Catullus, too, we may
perhaps infer from the opening scene of the Curculio was not in this
respect an innovator: so, in Propertius' and Tibullus' paraclausithyra,
the door is addressed in formulaic religious language. Finally, Ovid
broke with his two predecessors by addressing, in Am. 1.6, not the door
but the doorkeeper, while in Met. 13.821 he returned to the Greek
tradition of addressing the girl directly. But in both he is conscious
of the Roman tradition and both ianitor and girl are addressed in
Gebetsparodie.

One must commend the elegists, and perhaps Propertius in particular
(if 1.16 was the first elegiac paraclausithyron), for choosing to
follow what one might call the "Comic-Catullan" tradition. For the
first (extant) Roman author of a non-dramatic komastic poem added

nothing that was Roman.   The poem is quoted by the rhetorician
Julianus as one of those Latin poems which could compare with Greek
verse (Gell. 19.9.12):

> Quid faculam praefers, Phileros, qua est nil opus nobis?
>
>   ibimus sic, lucet pectore flamma satis.
>
> istam nam potis est vis saeva extinguere venti
>
>   aut imber caelo candidus praecipitans.
>
> at contra hunc ignem Veneris, nisi si Venus ipsa,
>
>   nullast quae possit vis alia opprimere.

This is, for all its elegance, a poem "fashioned from Greek materials
and (having) little or no specifically Roman flavour" (Wright CQ n.s. 25
(1975) 153).   It plays with the traditional komastic topoi in the fashion
of Greek epigram.   The elegists were far more adventurous, and they were
successful.

B.   The Exclusus Amator Outside The Paraclausithyron

Outside the paraclausithyron the komastic situation occurs frequently
in the elegists: it is certainly the most persuasive theme in Augustan
poetry.   (In fact, it was probably because it had by Ovid become so
much of a cliché that the authors of the last book of the Tibullan
corpus dispensed with it completely.)   When it occurs in a poem, it
usually serves one of a number of purposes.   It can represent success
in, or the joys of, a lover-affair (the lover admitted);   or, conversely,
it can represent failure in, or the pains of, love (the lover excluded).
Sometimes it can simply represent the lover-affair itself, with no

emphasis laid upon success or failure in it.   Finally the exclusion

of the lover can represent difficulties in the affair caused not by

the girl's disdain, but by a third party who has rights over the girl

(presumably her husband).   The topoi which we considered in our

discussion of the paraclausithyron recur in these situations, some

more frequently than others.

Before we examine these topoi and look more closely at the instances

of the exclusus amator in elegy, we should notice a major difference

between the theme in elegy and the situation as it is usually represented

in Greek literature.   There the lover almost always asks the girl to

admit him, or complains about her refusal to do so.   In elegy the poet

often does the same, but just as often he asks the girl to come out to

him, or complains about her refusal to do so.   This, we must suppose,

is due to the girl's position: she cannot invite her lover in because

there is, in the background, a third person, presumably her husband,

who has exclusive rights to her person.   The barred doors and the

custodes, to which we find frequent references in the poems, are surely

a precaution taken by the husband against adulterers such as the elegist.[35]

In his interesting discussion of Theocritus Idyll II (in which Polyphemus,

as a komast, asks Galatea to come out from the sea – from her "house", as

it were), Francis Cairns has suggested that the komast's asking the girl

to come out "may ... be almost as normal as asking for admission" (GC.

145 and note 11).   The examples adduced to support this contention are

Plautus Curculio 1-164, Aristaenetus 2.4 and ("most important") Eupolis

fr. 139k. These examples should be examined in detail. The fragment

of Eupolis to which Cairns refers is the one in which the playwright

refers to Gnesippos ὃς νυκτερίν' εὗρε μοιχοῖς ἄσματ'

ἐκκαλεῖσθαι γύναικας ἔχοντας ἰαμβύκην τε κὰ τρίγωνον[36].

Gnesippos, then, composes poems for adulterers. The other two examples,

however, are different. In Curculio 1-164 the girl is a hetaera in the

charge of a leno: she is not free and consequently she has to cheat her

master and unbolt the door to meet her lover. So, too, Doris in

Aristaenetus 2.4 is a hetaera who has a δεσπότης (line 5 Hercher).

Thus girls come out to their lovers for one of two reasons: either they

are married (Eupolis), or they are hetaerae who are not free (Curculio

1-164; Aristaenetus 2.4). Now although a girl slipping out from her

husband's house to join a lover — the situation which we often meet in

elegy — is not unknown in Greek epigram (cf. Philodemus AP 5.120), it

does not occur in any of the Greek epigrams on komastic themes, and

elsewhere in Greek poetry it occurs only in Eupolis. For the most part,

the girls in the Greek komastic situation are free hetaerae who can

admit their lovers. It seems, therefore, that Cairns's contention

that the komast's request for the girl to exit may have been almost as

normal as a request for admission is not to be entertained. The difference

between the Greek and Roman examples may be explained by the fact that

while the girls in Greek literature are free hetaerae, those in elegy are

married women (or, at least, often represented as such).

Since it is very well-known by the time of the elegists, the komastic
situation is often referred to allusively by words such as limen,
ianua or fores: the poet does not feel the need to give the details
of the situation.   Also, as noted above, the theme is used almost
symbolically by the elegists to represent various facets of their
relationship with their mistresses.   First we shall examine the uses
of the theme which the three elegists have in common, and then we shall
consider individual variations of it.   Finally, we shall examine
briefly the topoi of the theme.

<center>Exclusus Amator: Uses of the theme</center>

(1) Admission/Exclusion: Success/failure in love

    A. Receptus Amans

        Occasionally, the lover's success in his love—affair is
represented or symbolised by his admission by the girl, or by her exit
to meet him.

Propertius:

    2.9.41-2.   The poet, who now has a rival for Cynthia's affections,
remembers his past success:

> sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina
>
>   et furtim misero ianua aperta mihi

    2.14. Propertius is receptus amans (28) while others, excluded,
beat on Cynthia's doors: pulsabant alii frustra dominamque vocabant (21).

    2.20.23-5. Propertius says that his nights spent with Cynthia were

not won by gifts:

> interea nobis non numquam ianua mollis,
>
> non numquam lecti copia facta tui.
>
> nec mihi muneribus nox ulla est empta beatis . . .

4.7.15-18. The dead Cynthia upbraids Propertius for forgetting how she came to him at night during her lifetime:

> iamne tibi exciderant vigilacis furta suburae
>
> et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis?
>
> per quam demisso quotiens tibi fune pependi,
>
> alterna veniens in tua colla manu.

Tibullus:

1.9.44. Marathus' girl came to him while Tibullus played the link-boy:

> latuit clausas post adoperta fores.

2.1.75-8 The power of Cupido:

> hoc (sc. Cupidine) duce custodes furtim transgressa iacentes
>
> ad iuvenem tenebris sola puella venit
>
> et pedibus praetemptat iter suspensa timore,
>
> explorat caecas cui manus ante vias.

Ovid:

Am. 2.12.2-4 (on the same theme as Prop. 2.12 — the celebration of a night spent with his girl)

> vicimus: in nostro est, ecce, Corinna sinu,
>
> quam vir, quam custos, quam ianua firma (tot hostes!)

servabant, ne qua posset ab arte capi.

Thus elegy, which by convention wins over the girl, is sometimes described as poetry which is able to open doors: cf. Prop. 1.10.16, 3.3.47-9; Ovid Am. 2.1.17-28; 3.1.45ff., 3.8.24 (where it is ineffectual), 3.12.12.

B. Exclusus amator

More often, however, the poet experiences rejection or difficulties with his girl, and this is frequently represented as the failure of the lover to be admitted, or of the girl to leave the house to meet him. In either case, the lover's problems result from the girl's refusal.

Propertius:

1.5.13. (to Gallus, who has designs on Cynthia)

a mea contemptus quotiens ad limina curres (i.e.from Cynthia's limina).cf. also 19-20 cogere ...discere et exclusum quid sit abire domum.

2.17.11-12. (on the hardships of loving Cynthia)

quem modo felicem invidia admirante ferebant,

nunc decimo admittor vix ego quoque die.

2.23.9. (the difficulties of an affair with a married woman)

cernere uti possis vultum custodis amari.

3.21.7. (in which the poet considers journeying to Athens to get away from his love-affair)

vix tamen aut semel admittit, cum saepe negarit.

Tibullus:

    2.6.11ff.

        magna loquor, sed magnifice mihi magna locuto

          excutiunt clausae fortia verba fores.

        iuravi quotiens rediturum ad limina numquam!

          cum bene iuravi, pes tamen ipse redit.

cf. 47-8 saepe ... haec (sc. lena) negat esse domi.

At 1.4.77-8 we have an interesting variation on this usage.   Tibullus

(as praeceptor amori) says

        gloria cuique sua est: me, qui spernentur, amantes

          consultent: cunctis ianua nostra patet.

The girl's doors are closed to these lovers, but Tibullus is always

available for help.

Ovid:

    Am. 3.8.7. (The eques is preferred to Ovid)

        cum bene laudavit, laudato ianua clausa est.

        ib. 63.

        me prohibet custos, in me timet illa maritum.

    Am. 3.11.9.

        ergo ego sustinui, foribus tam saepe repulsus,

          ingenuum dura ponere corpus humo?

    Ars. 3.456. (Ovid advises girls not to accept false lovers)

        ianua fallaci ne sit aperta viro.

    Ars. 3.581. (Girls should make lovers suffer so that they will

love more ardently)

    ante fores iaceat, "crudelis ianua" dicat.

Ars. 2.523ff. (The lover should endure his girl's repulse with
fortitude)

    clausa tibi fuerit promissa ianua nocte:
        Perfer et inmunda ponere corpus humo.

RA. 505ff. (The lover who wishes to be free should not let the
girl know that he is aggrieved at her disdain)

        dixerit ut venias: pacta tibi nocte venito;
            veneris, et fuerit ianua clausa: feres;
        nec dic blanditias, nec fac convicia posti,
            nec latus in duro limine pone tuum.
        postera lux aderit: careant tua verba querelis .....

RA. 677. (The lover should remember the hardships of the affair)
        nunc tibi rivalis, nunc durum limen amanti ...subeant ...

Thus the lover will often complain that the door will not open for
him, but will open for money: cf. Tib. 1.5.67-8, 2.4.21-2, 31ff., 39;
Prop. 3.13.9, cf. 4.5.47-8 (the lena's advice); Ovid Am. 1.8.77 (lena's
advice).   Or sometimes he will complain that while he has been excluded
his rival has not: Tib. 1.6.10ff., 1.5.71 (a rival stands waiting on the
threshold), cf. 1.9.58 (a curse on his rival: pateat cupidis semper
aperta domus); Prop. 2.16.6.   Such complaints are, of course, commonly
made by young men in New Comedy when their money has run out and/or a
richer rival admitted.   cf. Timocles Neaera fr. 23k.; Plaut. Asin. 127ff.,

<u>Truc</u>. 340ff., 633ff., 727ff.; Terence <u>Eunuch</u> 46ff.; cf. also in
comedy-related literature, Lucian <u>Dial. Mer</u>. 14.1.; Alciphron <u>Ep</u>. 2.6.

(2) <u>Exclusion = Love Affair</u>

In this case the <u>exclusus amator</u> simply represents the lover:
standing before the doors of a girl is the typical activity of a lover,
and exclusion is meant to signify nothing more than that the <u>exclusus</u>
is engaged in a love-affair.

<u>Propertius</u>:

1.4.22. (to Bassus)

heu nullo limine carus eris.

1.13.34 (to Gallus)

non alio limine dignus eras.

2.7.7.ff. (Propertius says he will not renounce Cynthia)

nam citius paterer caput hoc discedere collo

quam possem nuptae perdere more faces,

aut ego transirem tua limina clausa maritus ...

2.29.14. (the <u>pueri</u> upbraid the drunken Propertius out walking at
night)

at tu nescio quas quaeris, inepte, fores.

3.25.9-10 (Propertius renounces Cynthia)

limina iam nostris valeant lacrimantia verbis,

nec tamen irata ianua fracta manu.

<u>Tibullus</u>:

1.1.55-6. (Tibullus tells Messalla he is a lover, not a soldier)

me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae,

et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores.

1.2.93-4 (on the irrisor amoris, overtaken by love in old age)

stare nec ante fores puduit caraeve puellae

ancillam medio detinuisse foro.

2.1.73-4

hic (sc. Cupido) iuveni detraxit opus, hic dicere iussit

limen ad iratae verba pudenda senem.

Ovid:

Am. 1.9.7-8 (The lover and soldier have the same business)

pervigilant ambo; terra requiescit uterque:

ille fores dominae servat, at ille ducis.

cf. 15-16, 19-20, 27-8.

Similarly, Ars. 2.233ff.

militiae species amor est ...

saepe feres imbrem caelesti nube solutum,

frigidus et nuda saepe iacebis humo.

RA. 35-6. (Ovid assures Cupid that he is only trying to help

hopeless lovers, not destroy love.   Other lovers may carry on as before ...)

et modo blanditias rigido, modo iurgia, posti

dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans.

RA. 785. (God grant that you can abandon your love-affair)

di faciant, possis dominae transire relictae

limina.

(3) <u>Exclusion: the husband to blame</u>

In (1) we saw that the lover's admission or exclusion represented success
or failure in the love-affair: if things were going well, the girl
admitted him (or came out); if they were going badly she excluded him
(or failed to come out).   This is the situation we meet in Greek epigram,
as Copley (<u>Excl. Am.</u> 38ff.) correctly points out.   In elegy, however, the
door sometimes represents practical difficulties in the love-affair which
have nothing to do with the girl's affection for the lover.   She may
want to see him, but a third party – presumably a husband, since the girl
is obviously in his control – has put obstacles in his way.   The lover
therefore complains about these obstacles – the locked door and the
<u>custodes</u> – which stand between him and his girl.

<u>Propertius</u>:

    3.14.23-4   (Spartan society favourably contrasted with Roman)

        nec timor aut ulla est clausae tutela puellae,

          nec gravis austeri poena cavenda viri.

<u>Tibullus</u>:

    1.2.5-6

        nam posita est nostrae custodia saeva puellae,

          clauditur et dura ianua firma sera.

cf. 15ff., 31ff.

    1.8.55ff. (Tibullus reports Marathus' complaint that the physical
obstacles could have been overcome, but the girl was unwilling to take
the opportunity)

>   poterat custodia vinci:
>
>   ipse dedit cupidis fallere posse deus ....
>
>   et possum media quamvis obrepere nocte
>
>   et strepitu nullo clam reserare fores.

2.3.77-8

>   nunc si clausa mea est, si copia rara videndi,
>
>   heu miserum, laxam quid iuvat esse togam?

For this reason Tibullus on two occasions claims that in the golden age

houses had no doors: cf. 1.3.43, 2.3.73-4

Ovid:

   Am. 1.4.61-2   (after the symposium attended by Ovid, the girl and

the vir)

>   nocte vir includet;   lacrimis ego maestus obortis,
>
>   qua licet, ad saevas prosequar ad fores.

   Am. 2.19.21.   (Ovid tells the vir to look after his wife more

carefully -- for Ovid stolen fruit is sweeter)

>   et sine me ante tuos proiectum in limine postis
>
>   longa pruinosa frigora nocte pati.

cf. also 38.

Sometimes, however, the poets claim that barred doors and custodes are

of no use to the vir if the girl is determined to be unfaithful to him:

cf. Tib. 1.6.34, Prop. 2.6.39, 4.1.145-6, Ovid. Am.3.4.1ff.

These, then are the three main ways in which the elegists use the situation of the <u>exclusus amator</u>. There are, however, individual uses by the poets, or at least by Propertius and Tibullus, which cannot be thus categorised.

Propertius certainly makes more interesting use of the situation than the other two elegists. As we have seen, he does use it in the "conventional" ways, but he also makes it serve new and interesting purposes. First, he alone of the elegists uses it as an illustration of his devotion to his mistress. In his <u>propempticon</u>, 1.8., after he has expressed his desire that Cynthia have a good journey he says (21-2):

> nam me non ullae poterunt corrumpere, de te
>
> quin ego, vita, tuo limine vera querar.

His devotion to her is such that he will go to her threshold even when she is not in residence.

Again, in 1.18, he speculates on the reasons for his rejection by Cynthia, and at 23-4 says:

> an tua quod peperit nobis iniuria curas?
>
> quae solum tacitis cognita sunt foribus.

Propertius wonders whether Cynthia's coolness is the result of his complaints at her treatment of him, but then rejects this possibility on the grounds that only the door has been told of his troubles, not Cynthia herself.

In 2.25. Propertius claims that a strong love is not "worn away" by the threshold: the devoted lover will remain, uncomplaining, on the threshold:

> at nullo dominae teritur sub limine[37] amor, qui
>
> > restat et immerita sustinet aure minas.
>
> > > (2.25,17-18)

More interesting than this is Propertius' readiness to use of himself the _topoi_ normally associated with the _vir_. The clearest example of this is probably 2.6., Propertius' confession of jealousy. At 23-4 he says:

> felix Admeti coniunx et lectus Vlixis,
>
> > et quaecumque viri femina limen amat.

Clearly Propertius is thinking of the relationship between Cynthia and himself as a kind of marriage, and he wishes its terms were acepted by Cynthia in the way they were by Alcestis and Penelope (who never crossed the _limen_ of their husbands to meet a lover). So, at 37, Propertius says:

> quos igitur tibi custodes, quae limina ponam,
>
> > quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?
>
> nam nihil invitae tristis custodia prodest.
>
> > > (2.6,37-9)

Similarly, in 2.19., Propertius is happy that Cynthia is going into the country where no _rixa_ will take place before her windows (_nulla neque ante tuas orietur rixa fenestras/nec tibi clamatae somnus amarus erit_ (5));

again Propertius' concern is that of a husband. His concern, too, at
the seductive pleasures of Baiae and the possibility of Cynthia's
succumbing to them is expressed in terms which would suit a relationship
of marriage:

> quam vacet alterius blandos audire susurros
>
>> molliter in tacito litore compositam! -
>
> ut solet amoto labi custode puella
>
>> perfida communis nec meminisse deos.

<div align="right">(1.11.12-15)</div>

R.O.A.M. Lyne has, in a very persuasive paper, pointed out that in 1.3.,
where Propertius comes drunk to Cynthia, one is given the distinct
impression that the poet is presented "in terms that suggest for all the
world a guilty returning husband" ("Propertius and Cynthia, Elegy 1.3"
PCPS 196 (1970) 62). It should not therefore surprise us if
Propertius is elsewhere ready to apply to his relationship with Cynthia
terminology which suggests that he sees the foedus between them as that
of marriage.

Tibullus, in 1.3., twice makes clever allusion to this familiar erotic
situation. At 29ff., Tibullus prays to Isis, asking for her help
during his sickness: Delia will then be able to repay her vows:

> ut mea votivas persolvens Delia voces
>
>> ante sacras lino tecta fores sedeat.

Putnam (Tibullus 78) correctly notes that "Delia is momentarily in the
position of the exclusus amator". Later in the poem, describing the

unpleasant area of the underworld reserved for "love-criminals",
Tibullus mentions Cerberus: <u>tum niger in porta serpentum Cerberus ore/</u>
<u>stridet et aeratas excubat ante fores</u> (71-2).   He is, indeed, a figure
"more forbidding than the usual <u>custos</u>" (Putnam <u>Tibullus</u> 84), and so
has a special significance for the lover (who now cannot exit rather
than, as in life, enter).

1.6 also contains an interesting variation.   The poet complains in
1-14 that he taught Delia to cheat the <u>custodes</u>; she has learned to
do this, but now does it for his rival.   He therefore warns the husband
to guard her carefully, even against Tibullus himself (15-22).   He then
suggests that she be entrusted to the care of Tibullus himself (23-24);
in fact he will be prepared to accept the servile position of <u>custos</u>
(or perhaps <u>ianitor</u>) with all the harsh treatment it may bring:

> at mihi servandam credas: non saeva recuso
>
>   verbera, detrecto non ego vincla pedum.
>
> tum procul absitis, quisquis colit arte capillos,
>
>   et fluit effuso cui toga laxa sinu.

<div align="right">(1.6.37-40)</div>

The idea may have been inspired by Terence <u>Eunuch</u>.   575ff. where
Chaerea tells his friend Antipho how, disguised as a eunuch, he was
actually entrusted with the care of Pamphila inside Thais' house[38].

In Ovid we find no "new" use of the situation: what we do find — as
in <u>Am</u>. 1.6 — is the tongue-in-cheek use of it.   The clearest example

of this is <u>Am</u>. 1.9. in which the career of the lover and the soldier

are compared[39]:   both the lover and the soldier watch doors (8) and

withstand the cold of the night (15), both break down doors (20) and

make their way past bands of guards (27).   This humorous parallel so

appealed to Ovid that he used it again at <u>Ars</u>. 2.235-44.   Again, he

can argue, in typical Ovidian fashion, two different side of the same

issue in different poems: in <u>Am</u>. 2.19 he urges the husband to take

better care of his wife by locking the door and excluding the poet

(cf. 2.19.21, 38) while in <u>Am</u>. 3.4 he tells the husband that locking

up the girl will do no good, for the girl who wishes to be unfaithful

will find a way (3.4.1ff.).

The Topoi Of The Komastic Situation

Since the elegists use the situation mainly in talking about the

difficulties of the love-affair - their inability to get in or to

persuade the girl to come out (either because of the girl's obduracy

or the husband's vigilance) - the <u>topoi</u> of the komastic situation

are selected with discrimination.   Some do not appear at all.

Outside the <u>paraclausithyron</u> itself we find no reference in elegy

to the lover's tears at the doors[40], to his kisses on the doorstep

or his carrying a torch.   Other <u>topoi</u> occur only infrequently.

Writing on the doors we find only at Ovid <u>Am</u>. 3.1.53-4;   explicit

reference to the lover's drunkenness occurs only at Propertius 3.3.48

(though one might add Prop. 2.29.1., where Propertius is certainly

drunk and the <u>pueri</u> claim that he is making for <u>nescio quas</u> . . . <u>fores</u>

(14)); the garland only appears at Propertius 3.3.47 and Ovid <u>Ars.</u>
2.528 and 3.71-2.

Not surprisingly, in view of the uses of the situation discussed above,
the <u>topoi</u> occurring most frequently are those which emphasise the
hardship or difficulties experienced by the <u>komast</u>.   At the head of
the list is the long vigil on the doorstep; cf. Prop. 2.6.2, 2.17.15,
4.5.47-8; Tib. 1.1.56, 1.6.32, 2.4.22,cf. 1.3.71 (Cerberus); Ovid <u>Am.</u>
1.9.8, 19, 2.19.21, 3.11.9, 12, <u>Ars.</u> 2.238, 2.523-4, 3.581, <u>RA.</u> 506.
Naturally the lover's reference to the inclement weather is also a
frequently recurring <u>topos</u>: cf. Prop. 2.9.41ff., 2.17.15 (<u>sicca luna</u>[41]);
Tib. 1.2.29ff. (inverted-Tibullus is not harmed by the weather); Ovid
<u>Am.</u> 1.9.15-16; 2.19.21-2, <u>Ars.</u> 2.235ff.   We also meet quite frequently
references to the lover's violence: (Tib. 1.1.73-4; 1.10.54; Ovid <u>Am.</u>
2.19.39, <u>Ars.</u> 3.71-2, <u>RA.</u> 31) or; in Propertius, to his refusal to
inflict violence on door or girl; cf. 2.5.22, 3.25.9-10[42].   We also
find the complaint that while the lover is excluded the girl is not
alone (Prop. 2.14.21, 2.16.6; Ovid <u>Am.</u> 3.8.7, 3.11.11) and the dog,
missing from the Latin <u>paraclausithyron</u> proper, also makes a number of
appearances (cf. Tib. 1.6.32, 2.4.31ff.; Prop. 4.5.73-4; Ovid <u>Am.</u>
2.19.40).

In Propertius we find often, as we found in the Roman <u>paraclausithyron</u>,
a readiness to personify the door.   So at 1.18.24 he talks of things
which are known not to Cynthia, but only to her door (<u>tacitis cognita</u>

sunt foribus). We presume, too, that the recipient of his complaints
at 1.8.22 (quin ego, vita, tuo limine vera querar) will be Cynthia's
door. At 2.20.23 the door is said to have been mollis to Propertius;
at 3.25.9, when the poet bids farewell to Cynthia's threshold, he tells
us that it wept at his words in the past (limina iam nostris valeant
lacrimantia verbis).

Ovid, similarly, makes reference to the lover's beseeching of the doors
(Ars. 2.527), or singing to the doors (Am. 3.8.24, cf. also Am. 2.1.27).
Sometimes, too, in making such references to the paraclausithyron, he
refers to the technique which we observed in the elegiac paraclausithyron
and the Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, namely the alternation of threats
and supplication. cf. Ars. 3.581-2.

> Ante fores iaceat, "crudelis ianua" dicat
>
> multaque summisse, multa minanter agat!

RA. 35-6

> Et modo blanditias rigido, modo iurgia, posti
>
> dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans.

cf. also RA. 507.

The exclusus amator, even apart from the paraclausithyron, clearly
plays a varied and significant part in the elegiac poets; the komastic
situation was one which had a definite appeal to all three poets, and
to Propertius in particular. By Ovid it was clearly a cliché and even
he had difficulty in finding new uses for it. His paraclausithyron is

certainly a stroke of genius, but he was unable to develop the "small
motif" of the shut-out lover in any vitally new ways.   Thus, it does
not occur at all in the minor poets of the Tibullan Corpus, and only
very rarely in later literature (see Copley Excl.Am.140).   The
theme was exhausted; it was a literary cliché with little connection
with real life.   As Boucher has said, commenting on komastic scenes
in Propertius, "elles ne conviennent ni à une femme du monde — même
si elle a quelque goût pour la "dolce vita" — ni à un homme de lettres —
meme s'il est l'amant d'une femme très libre . . . Le thème ne peut
trouver sa realité que dans un milieu populaire . . . à Rome il est
avant tout un thème litteraire".   (Etudes 422)   That is not to say
that the situation — and, for that matter, all its topoi — never
occurred in real life.   We know from Apuleius (Ap.75) that it did,
but Apuleius refers to the occurrence to prove the disreputable nature
of the family of Herennius Rufinus.   Boucher is surely correct in
his suggestion that a strict biographical interpretation is out of
place when the theme concerns "un homme de lettres" and a "femme du
monde".   So, having little connection with real life and the
possibilities of fresh treatment being exhausted, the exclusus amator
virtually dies with Ovid.

2.   The Lover's Farewell

Propertius 1.8 and Ovid Am.2.11 are both poems in which the poet bids

farewell to his girl, who is about to undertake a sea-journey.   There are

some very close resemblances between the poems, some, as Neumann[43] has

demonstrated, the result of conscious imitation by Ovid, others perhaps

deriving from the fact that both poets were writing within the same

tradition.   Here we shall consider the history of that tradition to see

how far each poet was influenced by it or reacted to it;   we shall also

consider in some detail the relationship between Propertius' poem and

that of Ovid.

In Propertius 1.8 Cynthia has decided to leave Propertius to go to Illyria

with a rival.   In 1-16 the poet attempts to dissuade her by reminding her

of his love for her (1-4) and by emphasising the danger and discomfort of

such a journey (5-16);   but, realising that his persuasion is ineffectual,

he eventually gives in and wishes her a safe journey (17-20).   He adds

that he will remain faithful to her (21-2) and he will not stop asking

sailors who hurry past him[44] in which port she is to be found (23-6).   The

remainder of the poem is a shout of triumph in which Cynthia is no longer

addressed but referred to in the third person (thus occasioning many to

divide this part of the poem from 1-26):   Cynthia did not go after all,

preferring Propertius and his poetry to the rival and his wealth.

Ovid's poem opens with an attack upon the Argo, the first ship to put to

sea (1-6).   At 7 we see the reason for the attack: Corinna is about to

make a journey by sea and thus cause the poet concern for her safety (7-10).

At 11-32 Ovid gives a number of reasons for not going to sea but then, realising that his words are in vain, he wishes Corinna a safe journey and entrusts her to the care of the deities of the sea(33-6). He bids her remember him, and imagines their joyful reunion on her return (37-56).

The poems are clearly connected with, and indeed are instances of, the propempticon or bon voyage poem. We know a little about this genre, and our information comes mainly from two sources, from the numerous examples of such poems in ancient literature, and from the prescripts laid down for the writing of a propempticon by the rhetorician Menander in the third century A.D.[45] The subject has been considered by several modern scholars[46], most recently by Francis Cairns, who concentrates more than his predecessors on the relationship between Menander and the propempticon in Roman poetry.

Cairns (GC 6) broadly defines the propempticon as a genre whose primary elements (explicit or implicit) are "someone departing, another person bidding him farewell, and a relationship of affection between the two, plus an appropriate setting" (there are also, in the developed propempticon, Cairns notes, secondary elements or topoi). Accepting this definition for the moment, we can trace the origins of such poems back to Homer, to the words of farewell uttered by Calypso to Odysseus:

Διογενὲς Λαερτιάτη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
οὕτω δὴ οἶκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
αὐτίκα νῦν ἐθέλεις ἰέναι; σὺ δὲ χαῖρε καὶ ἔμπης.

(Od.5.203-5)

and those uttered by Helen to Telemachus at Od. 15.128-9

(σὺ δέ μοι χαίρων ἀφίκοιο / οἶκον
ἐυκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν)

A number of embryonic propemptica can be found in the lyric poets, too.
In Sappho's farewell addresses we find already two elements which were
to become topoi in later propemptica. At 94.7-8 Sappho, bidding
farewell to a girl, says χαίροισ' ἔρχεο
κἀμέθεν μέμναισ' [47], the memor sis topos which we
find later (e.g. Paulinus Nol. Carm. 17.9; Ovid Am. 2.11.37; Hor. Odes
3.27.14 etc. See Cairns GC 246 note 29), and at 5.1-2, her request
that Aphrodite and the Nereids guide her brother home safely foreshadows
the prayer to sea-deities so frequent in later propemptic poems (cf. Hor.
Odes 1.3.1; Prop. 1.8.18; Statius Silv. 3.2.8ff. See Cairns GC 250 note
23). The same topos can be found in Theognis' miniature propempticon
(691-2) and in Pindar Ol. 6. 103-5. The final two lines of Alcaeus
fr. 286a suggest that the fragment may have been part of a propempticon,
and Nisbet and Hubbard (Odes 1 41) cite as evidence for a propempticon
by Simonides Himerius Or. 31.2 Σιμωνίδης ... Ἱέρωνα πέμπων... ἥπτετο
μὲν λύρας, ἥπτετο δὲ δάκρυα μαῖαις τοῖς κρούμασιν.
Cairns (GC 55-6) suggests that the genre was well-enough established by
the lyric poets for one of them to invert its topoi: Archilochus fr.
79a D (Diehl-Beutler = Hipponax 115 (West)) is, he thinks, an inverted
propempticon (like Hor. Epode 10, which imitated this poem[48]), in which
the poet wishes his addressee a rough voyage and shipwreck. The genre

is found in drama, too. The schol. vet. comments on the propemptic

nature of Aristoph. Equit. 498[49] (ἀλλ' ἴθι χαίρων καὶ

πρᾶξειας κατὰ νοῦν τὸν ἐμόν, καὶ σε

φυλάττοι Ζεὺς ἀγοραῖος) and in Eurip. Helen 1451ff. the

chorus prays for a fair voyage for Helen.

The genre seems to have flourished in the Hellenistic period. Erinna

fr. 1 (Bergk), a prayer to the sea creature Pompilos to escort a friend

on a journey, clearly comes from a propempticon. So, too, does

Callimachus fr. 400 ἁ ναῦς ἁ τὸ μόνον φέγγος

ἐμὶν τὸ γλυκὺ τᾶς ζόας ἅρπαξας, ποτί

τε Ζανὸς ἱκνεῦμαι λιμενοσκόπω....

which has an obvious affinity with Hor. Odes 1.3, and Trypanis

believes Iambus 6 (fr. 196) was originally a propempticon. Theocritus

7.52-62, the song of Lycidas, is a miniature propempticon[50], and

Pfeiffer (on Callim. fr. 196) suggests that Apollonius Rhodius'

Canobos may have been propemptic (see especially fr. 2 (Powell) τέρψει

δὲ νηῶν ὁ γλυκύς σε χωρίτης / πλόος κομίζων δῶρα

πλουσίου Νείλου). Parthenius, we are informed by Stephanus[51], also

wrote such a poem, and to this the line Γλαύκω καὶ Νηρῆι

καὶ εἰναλίω (Ινωω Macrob.) Μελικέρτῃ (quoted by

Gellius 13.27.1-2 and Macrobius Sat. 5.17.18 as the model for Virgil

Georg. 1.437) may have belonged.

In Roman literature we find a number of fully-developed examples of the

genre.   Apart from the two poems in question, Horace <u>Odes</u> 1.3 is a poem of farewell to Virgil (though Virgil is not directly addressed), while Statius bids farewell to Macer in a much more ponderous fashion (<u>Silvae.</u> 3.2.).   Paulinus of Nola wrote no less than 340 lines in Sapphic metre to Nicetas, who was leaving the city, in which the standard propemptic <u>topoi</u> are adapted to a Christian context[52]. Horace <u>Epode</u> 10 (the inverted <u>propempticon</u>) wishes Maevius a bad journey and shipwreck.   Propertius 1.6 and Tibullus 1.3 are poems in which patrons are wished bon voyage, though other themes in the poems might make one hesitate to classify them as <u>propemptica</u> along with Statius <u>Silv.</u> 3.2, Prop. 1.8, Ovid <u>Am.</u> 2.11 etc.   (Cairns refers to them as "non-schetliastic <u>propemptica</u>"[53]).   Similarly, Horace <u>Odes</u> 3.27, Propertius 1.17 and Martial 10.104 contain <u>topoi</u> associated with the <u>propempticon</u>, though one would not go so far as to classify them, as Cairns does, as <u>propemptica</u>.

Thus the first extant Latin <u>propempticon</u> belongs to the Augustan age. We can, however, be sure that earlier ones did exist.   Charisius (Keil 1.124) quotes four lines from a <u>propempticon</u> by Cinna, and some have, not unreasonably, postulated a connection between this poem and the <u>propempticon</u> of Parthenius[54] (for Parthenius was, we are informed by the Suda, brought to Rome during the Mithridatic Wars by a Cinna, perhaps the father of the poet).   Even before this, Cichorius has suggested, Lucilius may have included a <u>propempticon</u> in his <u>Satires</u>[55]. It also seems likely that Gallus was the author of a propemptic elegy

which had a considerable influence on Propertius' poem (see below).

It was probably during the Hellenistic period that the prose propempticon, of the kind for which Menander laid down rules, became popular as a rhetorical exercise. We have no pre-elegiac rhetorical propemptica, but a number of later examples survive in the works of Himerius; cf. Or.10,12,15,31,36. These are ignored by Cairns, and their relevance to Latin propemptica is underrated by Nisbet and Hubbard. To the Hellenistic period also belongs the creation of the different categories of propempticon, dependent on the status of speaker and addressee, mentioned by Menander. Scholars have, for the most part, paid little attention to Menander's distinctions in their consideration of the poetic propempticon, but Cairns (GC 7ff.) has insisted that Menander's categories are of importance for the understanding of the Latin propempticon of the Augustan age. The three categories which Menander distinguishes are, as summed up by Cairns:

1. The propempticon of superior to inferior which has advice as its distinguishing characteristic.

2. The propempticon of equal to equal which has affection as its distinguishing characteristic.

3. The propempticon of inferior to superior which has encomium as its distinguishing characteristic.[56]

Cairns rightly points out (GC 9) that when Menander goes on to give an example of a propempticon, he chooses an example of the second type (equal to equal), and the example which he gives contains a schetliasmos,

a complaint made against the departing friend or against the harshness

of fate which separates friend from friend[57].   This does not, however,

necessarily mean (Cairns continues) that all poems of this category

contained a schetliasmos, or indeed that poems which belonged to the other

two categories necessarily omitted a schetliasmos.   Thus Cairns, in the

absence of any rhetorical example of or rules for categories 1 and 3, goes

on to classify as propemptica (of different categories) any poem in which

one party bids another farewell, and his list of propemptica (GC284-5) is

longer than any previous scholar's list.   The obvious question which arises

at this juncture is how justified one really is in applying so rigorously to

Augustan, or even post-Augustan, Latin poetry rules laid down by a Greek

rhetorician in the third century A.D.;   but Cairns's discussion also raises

the more complex question of when a poem actually becomes a generic poem.

Is, for example, Juvenal Sat.3 a propempticon (albeit "included by syntaktikon"

(GC284) because it ends with Juvenal bidding farewell to Umbricius, and are

Horace Odes 3.27 and Tibullus 1.3. propemptica because they begin with

farewells? Or should we simply categorise these as poems which employ

propemptic motifs?   Cairns seems to imply that any poem containing any

farewell wish is a propempticon but, in fact, these poems are so different in

shape and content that one hesitates to classify them as a genre.

For our purposes this question of generic classification need not be

answered, for both Prop. 1.8 and Ovid Am.2.11 belong to Menander's second

category of propempticon and they both contain a schetliasmos (in fact, they

they conform quite closely to Menander's precepts).   We are concerned here,

therefore, only with what Cairns refers to as the "schetliastic propempticon".

Menander (396.4ff. Spengel) says that the author of a propempticon will utter a schetliasmos [58] and make an effort to detain the friend; then, realising that his efforts are in vain, he will claim to be resigned to the traveller's determination to leave [59], sad though he be. What is important about this prescription for the structure of the work is that it is followed by both Propertius and Ovid.

Both poets begin with a schetliasmos. Propertius reminds Cynthia of their past love (1-4), points to the difficulties involved in her proposed journey (5-8) and expresses the wish that bad weather would hold her back (9-12) (though he does subjoin a wish that the winds remain favourable once she is under sail (13-16)). Ovid begins with a tirade against the first ship and navigation (1-6), probably a standard topos of the schetliasmos (cf.Hor. Odes 1.3.9ff., Statius Silv.3.2.61ff. [60]): he tells Corinna of the fear he will have for her safety (910) and of the difficulties of such a voyage (11-14) and then he proceeds to lecture girls in general on the hazards of sea-voyages (15-26). At 27 he returns to Corinna in particular, telling her how frightened she will be should some mishap befall her on the journey (27-32).

After the schetliasmoi both poems make a similar turn in direction. At 1.8.17-18 Propertius says:

>   sed quocumque modo de me, periura, mereris,

>   sit Galatea tuae non aliena viae.

Ovid's poem takes a similar turn at 33-4:

>   at si vana ferunt volucres mea dicta procellae,

>   aequa tamen puppi sit Galatea tuae.

Here we see that both poets request the aid of a sea deity for their

departing mistresses, and this is also prescribed by Menander (399.1ff.):

ἐὰν δὲ διὰ θαλάττης ἀνάγηται, ἐκεῖ σοι μνήμη θαλαττίων

ἔσται δαιμόνων, Αἰγυπτίου Πρωτέως, Ἀνθηδονίου Γλαύκου.

(For similar appeals to sea deities in propemptica, cf. Erinna fr.1

(Bergk), Callim. fr. 400, Statius Silv. 3.2.13ff.).

This change of direction advocated by Menander - with the poet affecting

resignation to the traveller's wishes - can be found in a propempticon

of Himerius: cf. Or.10.16 βαρὺ μέν, ὦ φίλη (sc. ψυχή)

καὶ παγχάλεπον χρόνῳ συνηθείας δοθείσης

στέρεσθαι· ἀνάγκη δέ, φασί, καὶ θεῶν βίᾳ

εἴκομεν τοῖς δεδογμένοις καὶ μὴ βουλόμενοι.

It can also be seen in the propempticon of Paulinus of Nola,

>   Carm.17.65ff.:

>   unde nos iustis precibus tuorum,

>   qui suum recte repetunt parentem,

>   cogimur victo, licet inrepleti,

>   cedere voto.

>   et quia spes iam rapitur tenendi,

urget affectus placitis favere.

An interesting example is Ovid Met. 11.421ff. which has been neglected by recent students of the propempticon, including Cairns[61]. Here Alcyone replies to her husband Ceyx, who has just told her of his intention to go to Delphi:

> "quae mea culpa tuam," dixit" carissime, mentem
>
> vertit? ubi est quae cura mei prior esse solebat?
>
> iam potes Alcyone securus abesse relicta?
>
> iam via longa placet? iam sum tibi carior absens?
>
> at, puto, per terras iter est, tantumque dolebo,
>
> non etiam metuam, curaeque timore carebunt.
>
> aequora me terrent et ponti tristis imago:
>
> et laceras nuper tabulas in litore vidi
>
> et saepe in tumulis sine corpore nomina legi.
>
> neve tuum fallax animum fiducia tangat,
>
> quod socer Hippotades tibi sit, qui carcere fortes
>
> contineat ventos, et, cum velit, aequora placet.
>
> cum semel emissi tenverunt aequora venti,
>
> nil illis vetitum est: incommendataque tellus
>
> omnis et omne fretum est, caeli quoque nubila vexant
>
> excutiuntque feris rutilos concursibus ignes.
>
> quo magis hos novi (nam novi et saepe paterna
>
> parva domo vidi), magis hos reor esse timendos.
>
> quod tua si flecti precibus sententia nullis,

care, potest, coniunx, nimiumque est certus eundi,

    me quoque tolle simul!

<div align="right">(<u>Met.</u>11.421—441)</div>

The passage is a very interesting example of the way Ovid can revivify

a stock theme or genre, here the "<u>schetliastic propempticon</u>". The

<u>schetliasmos</u> appears in 421—438, and bears some striking similarities to

Propertius' poem. Alcyone begins, as Propertius does, by reminding the

traveller (Ceyx) of their love — where, she asks, is his former love for her

(421—2)? In 423 she asks if he is able to go without her (<u>iam potes</u>

<u>Alcyone securus abesse relicta</u>), and this recalls Propertius 1.8.5—6

<u>tune audire potes vesani murmura ponti/fortis et in dura nave iacere potes?</u>

It is, indeed, possible that the beginning of Alcyone's speech is directly

indebted to Propertius rather than to the "propemptic tradition". At

427ff., however, Ovid is quite clearly using the conventions of the genre

to create dramatic irony. Ceyx is, in fact, going to go to Delphi by

sea, but Alcyone does not yet know this. Thus she says that at least

she will only grieve for his absence and not fear for his safety on the

sea— and then she goes on at great length about the danger of sea—faring,

a <u>topos</u> as we have seen, of the <u>schetliasmos</u>. The reader, aware of the

conventions of the genre, appreciates Ovid's handling of this particular

<u>topos</u>. Similarly, he will note at 439—441 the adaptation of another

traditional feature of the "<u>schetliastic propempticon</u>", the resignation

of the speaker to the traveller's wish. If nothing can change Ceyx's

mind and he is determined to go, says Alcyone, then — and at this point

the reader, like Ceyx, expects the blessing on his journey - Ceyx
should take her with him.

It is possible that both Ovid's propemptica are direct imitations of
Propertius 1.8, but his clever manipulation of the traditions of the
propempticon in Alcyone's speech suggests that he is in fact playing
upon the reader's generic expectation.   It seems more likely in view
of this and Menander's example of the "schetliastic propempticon", that
by the Hellenistic period this kind of poem, with a schetliasmos
followed by the speaker's resignation to the traveller's wishes, was
already current.   It seems likely, too, that Propertius was not the
poet who first introduced it to elegy.

This we can perhaps infer from the famous lines of Virgil's 10th
Eclogue which, we are told by Servius, were modelled on Gallus:

>   tu procul a patria - nec 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 secat aspera plantas.
>
>   (Ecl.10.47-50)

The theme of Gallus' poem, to judge from these lines, may have been
something like "Lycoris, you are cruelly leaving me and going far
from home.   Since, however, you insist on going, may you come to no
harm".   The structure of the poem, then, may have been similar to
Propertius', and the similarity of line 50 a tibi ne teneras glacies

secat aspera plantas to Prop. 1.8.7 tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire
pruinas (sc. potes) has often been pointed out.   The difference between
Gallus' and Propertius' circumstances are that Gallus would have been
bidding farewell to a girl who was going by land with his rival (to
Gaul)[62], while Cynthia's journey was to be by sea (to Illyria). Menander
(398.29ff.) states that when writing a propempticon for a friend
travelling by land, one should describe the route he is to take[63].   This
may explain the references to the Alpinas nives and frigora Rheni in
Gallus' poem.

Propertius' poem appears, therefore, to stand within a tradition of
propemptica.   It is indebted to this tradition for its structure, and
perhaps is indebted to Gallus in particular for the theme of a farewell
to a girl who is leaving with the poet's rival[64].   Propertius has,
however, added much that belongs neither to the tradition nor to Gallus.
The rival, who presumably played a large part in Gallus' poem, is
mentioned only briefly in 3 with the contemptuous words quicumque est
iste.   He is important not for the propempticon itself, but for the
second half of the poem (27-46) in which Propertius gloats over his defeat
of the rival's money by his power of song.   It is, indeed, in the addition
of this second half of the poem – the dramatic development of the
situation[65]– that Propertius' originality of treatment really lies.   For
what we have is not simply a propempticon containing a schetliasmos, but
a propempticon containing a schetliasmos which actually worked.   Cynthia
listened to Propertius' complaints in 1-16 and stayed behind, preferring

the poet and his poetry to the rival and his money.   It is probably no

coincidence, either, that the poem is framed by 1.7 and 1.9, the first

warning Ponticus that he will fall in love and will want to write love

poetry instead of epic, and the second urging him to write elegy after

he has fallen[66].

Lines 22ff., must also be considered an original touch.   The poet tells

Cynthia that in her absence he will remain faithful to her:

> nam me non ullae poterunt corrumpere, de te
>
> quin ego, vita, tuo limine vera querar;
>
> nec me deficiet nautes rogitare citatos
>
> "Dicite, quo portu clausa puella mea est?"
>
> (21-26)

The picture is surely not to be taken seriously.   If Boucher is correct

in stating that paraclausithyra in Propertius "ne conviennent ni à une

femme du monde...... ni à un homme de lettres" (Etudes 422), then how

much more implausible is the picture of "un homme de lettres" making his

complaints on Cynthia's doorstep when she is not even in residence! Nor

is one expected to take seriously the picture of Propertius asking the

sailors who hurry past him the present location of his girlfriend. This

is so implausible that it is surely intended to be humorous.   One is

reminded of Ovid's humorously over-drawn pictures when he is handling a

well-worn theme;   perhaps the propempticon was by this time such a stock

theme that Propertius felt it necessary to write with tongue in cheek.

Ovid's poem, as we have already seen, follows the Menandrian schema as closely as Propertius': again a _schetliasmos_ is followed by the speaker's reluctant compliance with the traveller's wishes. Ovid, while he no doubt has independent knowledge of the "rules" of the genre, knew and imitated Propertius' poem[67]. This is clear from the reference to Galatea at the same structural point of each poem, when the poet complies with the girl's wishes (Prop. 17-18; Ovid 33-4), and perhaps also from the mention of the Ceraunians as an example of a hazard on the voyage (Prop. 1.8.19; Ovid _Am._ 2.11.19. The "original" may have been Hor. _Odes_ 1.3.20, unless the Ceraunians had appeared in earlier _propemptica_). At 33-4 Ovid also uses the "words in the wind" _topos_[68] which also occurs at Prop. 1.8.12[69]. (Noticeable, too, are some reminiscences of other Propertian poems. The adjective _iniustus_ applied to the sea (12) is also found at Prop. 1.15.12; _pictosque lapillos_ at 13 seems to be a reminiscence of Prop. 1.2.13 _litora . . . picta lapillis_; _vestrum crimen erit talis iactura puellae_ (35) recalls Prop. 2.28.2 _tam formosa tuum mortua crimen erit_; _sua terra tenet_ (30) perhaps recalls Prop. 3.7.34 _cui sua terra parum est._)

More striking, however, are the differences between the poems; Ovid's poem is quite clearly no slavish imitation of Propertius'. It does, indeed, like Propertius', follow the Menandrian _schetliasmos_ - resignation schema, and it does contain the Propertian reminiscences noted above. There are, however, major differences.

First, however, let us examine two of the minor differences noted by
Neumann (96ff.)

(1) Prop. 1.8.4,
Neumann contends, has been expanded by Ovid at 9/10.   Propertius'
vento quolibet is replaced in Ovid by winds from all directions, from
North, East, West and South.   Now, in fact, as Görler (op. cit. (note
43) 340-1) has pointed out, a mention of the winds - a wish that
favourable ones arise and that unfavourable ones not occur - is
conventional in propemptica, and what we should compare with Ovid's
winds is not vento quolibet in 4 but the ventos of 13.

(2) Another
"expansion" by Ovid, according to Neumann, is the addition to
Propertius' Ceraunia (19) of Scylla, Charybdis and the Syrtes (17ff.).
Here Neumann is correct, and, in fact the difference is greater still.
Ovid is listing for puellae (15) the dangers of the sea: his purpose
is to deter Corinna from her proposed voyage.   When Propertius
similarly tries to deter Cynthia, he mentions only the vesani murmura
ponti (5), and then quickly moves (perhaps following Gallus) to the
hardships involved in the subsequent land journey.   So Ceraunia does
not occur, as it does in Ovid, in the schetliasmos; it occurs, after
the "resignation" of 17-18, in 19.   Moreover, Ovid's schetliasmos is
clearly tongue in cheek at 11ff.   Corinna is told to go to sea because
she'll not find cities or woods there, and she'll not find shells and
pebbles out in the middle of the sea either[70].

But the major differences between the two poems are at the beginning and
the end of them. Propertius plunges in medias res with an address to
Cynthia; it is, indeed, from this impassioned address that we gather
what is happening, that Cynthia is leaving with the poet's rival.
Ovid's poem begins much more obliquely: a four-line description of the
Argo and its journey (1-4) and a two-line curse upon it (5-6), recalling
the opening lines of Euripides' Medea, are followed by Ovid's explanation
of this tirade against sailing (Corinna is leaving (7-8)). What Ovid
seems to be doing is taking and expanding a topos of the schetliasmos,
the curse on sea-faring (a theme which has a life independent of the
propempticon and dates from Hesiod: see Nisbet and Hubbard Odes 1
43-4). This he brings up to the front of the poem, thus starting
with the general and moving to the particular. It may be that he
was influenced to some extent by Horace's propempticon, Odes 1.3, in
which Horace similarly expands this topos of the schetliasmos, though
he moves from the particular (the address to Virgil's ship (1-8)) to
the general (the tirade against navigation (9-40)).

At the end of both poems, too, we note a major, indeed the major,
difference between them. Propertius' poem develops dramatically:
we know in 26ff. that Cynthia has abandoned her proposed journey.
Ovid did not follow Propertius in this: rather he imagines the return
of Corinna and their joyful reunion in 38-56[71]. With this is connected
another difference in the poem's content: unlike Cynthia (and Lycoris),

Corinna is not leaving with a rival. Neumann (98) believes that Ovid

may have omitted this interesting detail lest he appear too slavish an

imitator of his predecessor. Certainly, this omission by Ovid makes

the poems very different, for.Ovid's concern is only with his separation

from his girl, and not with her relationship with another man (or,

more specifically, with a rival's money). Thus Ovid,in 38ff., imagines

his joyful reunion with Corinna on the beach. Munari ad loc., following

Jacoby ("Zur Entstehung" 77), sees here an imitation of the end of

Tib. 1.3., where the poet, who is sick on Corcyra, imagines his joyful

reunion with Delia (89ff.). That this view is correct is, indeed,

suggested by the final couplet of each poem:

> hoc precor, hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem
>
>   Luciferum roseis candida portet equis.
>
>   (Tib.1.3.93-4)
>
> haec mihi quam primum caelo nitidissimus alto
>
>   Lucifer admisso tempora portet equo.
>
>   (Ovid.Am.2.11.55-6)

It must, however, be added that the section 38-56 is, generically, very

apposite to Ovid's poem, as the speaker's looking forward to the friend's

return seems to have been a common feature of the propempticon: cf.

Statius Silv. 3.2.127ff., Aristoph. Equit. 500ff. (Theoc. 7.63ff. is a

variation on this, with Lycidas promising to celebrate, in rustic

fashion, the arrival of Ageanax at his destination, if he does eventually

go)[72]. Menander does not prescribe such a description in his treatise

on the propempticon, but Cairns (GC 159-60) has pointed out that the
rhetor does prescribe, in his discussion of the apopemptic hymn, Τὴν
εὐχὴν ἐπὶ ἐπανόδῳ καὶ ἐπιθυμία δευτέρα.
Thus Ovid's description of his reunion with Corinna is very appropriate
to the genre, more so, indeed, than Tibullus imagining his reunion with
Delia at 1.3.89ff. (for 1.3 is a propempticon, if indeed it can be
classified as such, to Messalla, and Tibullus should, therefore, according
to the conventions of the genre, be imagining his joyful reunion with
Messalla, on his return).   So while Ovid was adapting Tibullus' lines,
he was adapting them with the rules of the genre firmly in mind (it is
noticeable, too, that Ovid introduces this section with the memor sis
topos frequently found in propemptica)[73].   Of course, Ovid's
description is humorously exaggerated.   Nereus is to tilt the sea to
the shore when Corinna is returning (39), and Corinna is not only to
pray for favouring winds but also to lend a hand with the sails (42).
The poet himself will be the first to catch sight of the ship, the
ship which carried his "gods" (nostros . . . deos (41-2))[74]; he will
take Corinna in his arms and kiss her (45)[75], he will offer a sacrifice,
and they will hold a party on the beach, with a couch and table made of
sand (47-9) and here Corinna will tell Ovid all her adventures (51-6).

Both Propertius and Ovid were writing a poem in a genre which had a long
history.   Its roots went back as far as Homer, and many poets had
written propemptica in both Greek and Latin.   In recent years Cinna
had written one, probably inspired by the resident Greek Parthenius;

so too had Horace, if, indeed, as seems likely, Odes 1.3 is early and
antedates Propertius 1.8[76].   Recently Gallus may have written a poem
in which he bade farewell to his girlfriend who was leaving him with
a rival.   What Propertius did to revivify the theme was to produce a
"dramatic" elegy, a poem in which time elapses between one part and
another, in which interval the schetliasmos - a traditional element
of the propempticon - will have been efficacious.   But even then the
first part of the poem (the propempticon proper 1-26) Propertius
could not treat in a wholly novel way.   The traditional schema of
the propempticon, the schetliasmos plus resignation to the departing
friend's wishes, could not be ignored, but since it was so obviously
a standard format could the reader really be convinced of the poet's
"sincerity" in that poem?   Thus Propertius, in 20ff., resorts to a
tongue-in-cheek treatment which to some extent deflates the apparent
fervour and earnestness of the first twenty lines, producing an
almost Ovidian tone.   For Ovid the task of producing a fresh poem
in this genre was even more difficult, since the propemptica of two
of his elegiac predecessors invited comparison with his own, but Ovid
as usual rose to the occasion.   His poem, while it is clearly
indebted to Propertius', successfully avoids slavish imitation of it,
and while he remains essentially within the conventions of the
propempticon his treatment of its topoi is clever and humorous
(culminating in the clever adaptation of Tibullus at the end of the
poem to conform to the generic pattern).   For Ovid proceeds and ends

as he began, with humour.   We know what to expect from the start, for

the grandiose opening (1-4), with alliteration of m(1), p(2) and v(4),

and the pompous adaptation of Euripides' famous lines in 5-6 warn us

to expect throughout scenes which will be humorously overdone.

THREE   COMIC   THEMES

That the elegists employ a number of themes which are drawn originally
from comedy nobody would deny: one need only think of the lena poems
of Propertius and Ovid (Prop. 4.5, Ovid Am. 1.8) and the various
erotodidactic themes common to both genres[1].   In the nineteenth and
early twentieth centuries the most common view was that such themes
entered elegy by way of the hypothetical Alexandrian subjective erotic
elegy which the elegists were presumed to have used as their models
(see Introduction).   Since the demise of the subjective erotic elegy
school, however, it has been generally assumed that comedy influenced
elegy directly, though the extent of this influence has been debated[2].
Many have also noted the possibility of indirect comic influence by
way of rhetoric;   the elegists all received a rhetorical training and
the rhetoricians, it is well known, constantly had recourse to comedy
for exempla and for themes for exercises[3].   Nor can we ignore the
likelihood of indirect influence through other intermediaries such as
mime and epigram, both of which adopted themes from comedy (in fact,
one of the themes discussed in this section, Lovers' Quarrels, while
it derives ultimately from comedy, is also found in the Anthology).

One question which arises at this point is whether, in cases of direct
comic influence, the elegists were influenced by Greek or Roman comedy.
Did the poets draw their themes and motives only from Greek New Comedy,
or did they know and use Terence, Plautus and Caecilius?   It has been

generally assumed that the former is the case and that the elegists

shunned comedy written in Latin[4].   This view has prevailed for a

number of reasons.   First, of course, there is the comparative

shortage of citations from the comic poets after the Republican period.

More important is the belief that the elegists' elder contemporary,

Horace, is the spokesman of all Augustan poets when he says in the

Ars Poetica:

Vos exemplaria Graeca

    nocturna versate manu, versate diurna.

    at vestri proavi Plautinos et numeros et

    laudavere sales, nimium patienter utrumque,

    ne dicam stulte, mirati, si modo ego et vos

    scimus inurbanum lepido seponere dicto

    legitimumque sonum digitis callemus et aure.

(AP 268-274)

Later, too, Quintilian had a low opinion of Roman comedy; in comoedia

maxime claudicamus (10.1.99) is his judgement (though this does not

prevent him from quoting Terence frequently)[5].   Next there is the

fact that no writer of Roman comedy is mentioned by Propertius or

Tibullus, or by Ovid in his erotic works, while Menander, at least,

receives frequent mentions, cf. Prop. 3.21.28[6], 4.5.43; Ovid Am.

1.15.18. One remembers especially Ars 3.329ff., where Ovid lists

the poets which should be known to a docta puella: they are Callimachus,

Philetas, Anacreon, Sappho, Menander, Propertius, Gallus, Tibullus

Varro Atacensis, Virgil and Ovid himself.   Ovid also tells us in the
Tristia that Menander was an author read at school:

> fabula iucundi nulla est sine amore Menandri,
>
> et solet hic pueris virginibusque legi.

(Trist 2.369-70)

a statement which is confirmed by Statius (Silv. 2.1.113).   Finally,
many of the motifs of elegy can be closely paralleled in the later
Greek epistolographers such as Aelian and Philostratus, and the common
source for such themes will be Greek New Comedy[7].

These are convincing arguments and there can be no doubt that the
elegists knew and used Greek New Comedy;   perhaps, however, the
arguments are not so convincing as to exclude completely the possibility
of direct influence of Roman comedy on some occasions.   In itself,
direct influence is not implausible despite the infrequency of citations
from Roman comedy and Horace's anti-Plautine stance.   Ovid (Trist.
2.359) speaks of Terence, at least, as a well-known author, and Horace
himself refers to the popularity of the Roman comedians whom Rome "learns
by heart":

> dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro,
>
> Plautus ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi,
>
> vincere Caecilius gravitate, Terentius arte,
>
> hos ediscit et hos arto stipata theatro
>
> spectat Roma potens.

(Ep.2.1.57-61)

Indeed, despite his insistence on exemplaria Graeca in the Ars Poetica, Horace clearly knew and utilised the Roman comic poets himself; cf. AP 237ff. (where, according to Pseudo-Acro, Horace describes a scene from Caecilius)[8], AP 54 (Plautus), Ep. 2.1.170ff. (Plautus), Sat. 1.2.20 (Terence).

It is very unlikely, then, that the elegists, or any other literary figures of the August age, did not know the old Roman comedies, but that does not necessarily mean that they went to these works for themes or ideas for their own work. This whole question is, of course, rendered extremely difficult by the loss of nearly all Greek comedy and by the consequent problem of the relationship between the Roman comic poets and their Greek originals. For when we examine a "comic" elegiac theme or motif, we almost inevitably have only a Roman comic parallel and we cannot tell whether the elegist is directly indebted to that Roman poet or to the poet's Greek model.

The problem is best illustrated by an example of a shared "comic" theme in elegy. In 3.6 Propertius questions his slave Lygdamus about Cynthia, and the poem has long been known to be inspired by a scene of comedy. The reader is asked to imagine that the poet and his mistress are estranged, that Lygdamus has recently come from Cynthia and has told Propertius what he saw in the house and what Cynthia said to him about Propertius. In the poem Lygdamus naturally does not speak: we gather what has happened — what the slave saw and what Cynthia said — from the

barrage of questions fired at Lygdamus by Propertius as he seeks

confirmation of what Lygdamus has already told him. This is patently

"un-comic" in structure, but the scene in the house which Lygdamus

has described to Propertius (and which Propertius now repeats) is very

close to Terence Heaut. 285-310[9], where Syrus tells his master Clinia

what he has seen in the house of Antiphila, whom Clinia loves but has

not seen for a long time. Syrus says that he found the girl faithful,

working at the loom and in no way dressed-up (285-91); this is how

Cynthia is described at 11-16. Clinia is anxious to get at the truth,

and he tells his slave not to curry favour by lying (302-3); Propertius

says the same thing to Lygdamus (3-6). Finally, both Antiphila and

Cynthia are described as crying and giving strong indications of their

love (Heaut. 304-7; Prop. 9-10, 17ff.)[10].

A compressed version of this same scene is Tib. 1.3.83-8, where the poet

asks Delia to remain true to him and imagines his return to her:

> at tu casta precor maneas, sanctique pudoris
>
>> adsideat custos sedula semper anus.
>
> haec tibi fabellas referat positaque lucerna
>
>> deducat plena stamina longa colu;
>
> at circa gravibus pensis adfixa puella
>
>> paulatim somno fessa remittat opus.
>
> tunc veniam subito . . .

Are Propertius and Tibullus indebted to Terence, or to the original of

Menander? A.G. Lee, in his review of André's edition of Tibullus Book 1

(CR 16 (1966) 189) opts for direct influence on Tibullus by Terence,
and this is quite possible.   But we must also remember that the
scholiast on Heaut. 289-94 remarks on the closeness of Terence's lines
to the Menandrian original (cf. Heaut. 293-5 praeterea una ancillula/
erat;   ea texebat una, pannis obsita/, neglecta, inmunda inluvie -
Menander fr. 130 (Koerte) καὶ θεράπαινίς ἦν μία. αὐτή συνέφαινε
ῥυπαρῶς διακειμένη).   In this case it is surely impossible to tell
whether the elegists' inspiration came from Menander or Terence.
(What one can tell, however, - and this is the important factor for
this study - is that, whatever the source, both poets have adapted a
comic scene in quite different ways.   Tibullus compresses it, omitting
any mention of tears after a lovers' quarrel (for the separation of
Tibullus from Delia in this poem is due to external factors, to the
poet's journey with Messalla), and makes it one small scene in a long
poem on a different subject.   Propertius makes a whole poem out of
it, allowing the scene to be revealed in a series of urgent questions
to his slave and also giving to Cynthia a speech reproaching him which
did not occur in the comic scene)[11].

In view of this difficulty, the direct influence of Roman Comedy on
elegy could only be satisfactorily demonstrated by the citation of
verbal parallels between the comic and elegiac passages.   A good
instance of verbal reminiscence of a Roman comic poet can be seen in
Horace Sat. 2.3.259ff., which is cited here along with the original
by way of illustration:

amator

exclusus qui distat, agit ubi secum, eat an non,

quo rediturus erat non arcessitus, et haeret

invisis foribus? "nec nunc, cum me vocet ultro,

accedam?   an potius mediter finire dolores?

exclusit; revocat; redeam?   non si obsecret".   ecce

servus non paulo sapientior: "o ere, quae res

nec modum habet neque consilium, ratione modoque

tractari non vult.   in amore haec mala, bellum,

pax rursum: haec si quis tempestatis prope ritu

mobilia et caeca fluitantia sorte laboret

reddere certa sibi, nihilo plus explicet ac si

insanire paret certa ratione modoque.

(Sat.2.3.259-271)

cf. Terence Eunuch. 46ff:

Phaedria: Quid igitur faciam?   non eam ne nunc quidem

quom accersor ultro?   an potius ita me comparem

non perpeti meretricum contumelias?

exclusit: revocet: redeam?   non si me obsecret . . .

Parmeno: ere, quae res in se neque consilium neque modum

habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes.

in amore haec omnia insunt vitia: iniuriae,

suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae,

bellum, pax rursum: incerta haec si tu postules

> ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas
>
> quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias.

<div align="right">(Eunuch.46-9;57-63)</div>

The verbal similarities between Horace and Terence are clear (in particular cf. Hor. 264~Terence 49; Hor. 65-6~Terence 57-8); had we an example this close in elegy the case would be proved. Unfortunately, we have not, but a few verbal peculiarities in Propertius would appear to derive from Roman comedy, and from Terence in particular.

(1) In 2.16 (discussed below) the adjective stolidum (8) is not an elegiac word but is does occur frequently in comedy (and appears here in Propertius in a "comic" context; see below p.135). Furthermore, the end of the poem bears a striking resemblance to the end of Terence's Eunuchus (and this ending seems to be Terentian and not Menandrian).

(2) The opening scene of the Eunuchus also seems to have exerted an influence on Propertius (as, we have seen, it did on Horace). Prop. 4.1.139-40 nam tibi victrices, quascumque labore parasti,/eludet palmas una puella tuas recalls, as Elaine Fantham has demonstrated[12], Eunuchus 54-5 actumst, ilicet,/peristi; eludet ubi te victum senserit. palmas (Prop. 4.1.140) reveals that the verb eludere has gladiatorial overtones, as it does in the Eunuchus passage, and both instances of the metaphor occur in an erotic context. This influence is therefore Roman and comic (whether Propertius had the Eunuchus passage[13] or another in mind) and the possibility of a Greek antecedent can be ruled out.

(3) At 3.3.50 <u>qui volet austeros arte ferire viros</u> Propertius uses
the verb <u>ferire</u> in a sense unparallelled in elegy.   It means here
to "sting" or "touch" for money, and appears to be taken from the
language of fencing[14].   We meet the word in this sense in comedy;
cf. Ter. <u>Phorm.</u> 47, Plaut. <u>Trin.</u>245.   Propertius uses it again at
4.5.44–5 <u>sed potius mundi Thais pretiosa Menandri,/cum ferit astutos</u>
<u>comica moecha Getas</u>, where it is quite clearly exploited for its
comic flavour (here, too, <u>astutos</u> is a comic word[15]).

(4) One may add a fourth, non–verbal argument.   The notion of the
lover in military service (<u>militia amoris</u>), one of the most pervasive
metaphors of elegy, seems to be of Roman, not Greek, origin, and to
appear first in comedy;   cf. Plaut. <u>Asin.</u> 655f and see Murgatroyd
"Militia Amoris" 67.

These are perhaps sufficient arguments to demonstrate direct influence
by Roman comedy, or at least Terence, on elegy.   The absence of
verbal similarities in Tibullus and Ovid may simply indicate a
disinclination on their part to utilise the diction of comedy;   it
seems reasonable to suppose that they, too, were familiar with the
Roman comic poets.   Ovid, as we have seen, mentions Terence in a way
which suggests that he was well known to his generation.   On the other
hand, one would not wish to argue that all, or even most, comic
influence came into elegy via Roman Comedy.   Menander was read at

school and was certainly known to all the elegists.   Barsby (_Am._ 1.12)
remarks that "where we can trace a theme back to comedy it is as likely
to be Menander as one of his Roman adaptors".   This is the neutral
position which we shall have to adopt, except in cases where verbal
similarities point to a Roman source, but what is important for our
discussion is not so much whether the source is Greek or Roman, but how
the elegists have developed and adapted to their own purposes comic
themes.

1.   The Lovers' Quarrel

The quarrel between the two lovers which develops into an ugly brawl

with physical violence inflicted by one party on the other is found in

all three poets.   Often it is designated by the word rixa (Prop.3.8.1;

Tib. 1.10.57; Ovid Ars.3.374; cf. also Hor. Odes1.13.11) which, as

W.L. Grant notes [16], is "almost a technical elegiac term"[17].   The

situation has a long literary history, going as far back as Aristophanes.

At Plut. 1013ff., the old woman wants to prove to Chaerestratus that

her young lover formerly entertained a deep affection for her and so

she says μυστηρίοις δὲ τοῖς μεγάλοις ὀχουμένην

ἐπὶ τῆς ἁμάξης ὅτι προσέβλεψέν με τις

ἐτυπτόμην διὰ τοῦθ' ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν. οὕτω

σφόδρα ζηλότυπος ὁ νεανίσκος ἦν.

The beating was prompted by the young man's jealousy and the old woman

assumes that only a man in love could be jealous.   This idea, that a

physical beating is an indication of passion, was quite clearly picked

up by the writers of New Comedy.   Though no examples survive in the

remains of New Comedy, we can postulate its occurrence from the

erotodidactic remarks of Ampelis to Chrysis in Lucian Dial.Mer.8.1

(299)[18]:

ΑΜΠ. ὅστις δέ, ὦ Χρυσί, μήτε ζηλοτυπεῖ μήτε
     ὀργίζεται μήτε ἐρράπισέ ποτε ἢ περιέκειρεν
     ἢ τὰ ἱμάτια περιέσχισεν, ἔτι ἐραστής
     ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν;

ΧΡ οὐκοῦν ταῦτα μόνα ἐρῶντος, ὦ Ἀμπελί, δείγματα;
ΑΜΠ. Ναί, ταῦτ' ἀνδρὸς θερμοῦ....

A similar piece of erotodidaxis, also drawn probably from a comic
source, is found in Chrysogone's letter to Terpander (Theophylactus
Ep.48):Μή μέμφου λοιδορουμένην τε καὶ ὑβρίζουσαν· οἱ γὰρ
ποθοῦντες γλυκείας καὶ τὰς ὕβρεις προσδέχονται καὶ πληγὰς
δὲ πολλάκις καὶ μώλωπιν ὡραΐζονται. εἰ δὲ δυσανασχετεῖς
ὑβριζόμενος, οὐδὲ ῥόδον τρυγήσεις τὴν ἄκανθαν εὐλαβούμενος.
One may add Alciphron Ep.4.4 where the lover's jealousy, and so his
love, reveals itself not in a physical attack upon the girl but a
lawsuit against her.   Polemon in Menander's Periceiromene was clearly
an impassioned lover whose jealous frenzy drove him to cut off his
mistress's hair, an action which he bitterly regrets (see 408ff.k. and
Philostratus Ep.16.1.ff.) and the heroine of the Rhapizomene was perhaps
also a girl who experienced violence at the hands of her lover (so
Webster Studies in Menander (Manchester 1950) 18; Koerte 130-1).

From comedy the scene passed into other genres.   In Theocritus Id.14
Aeschines tells how he lost his girl.   He was at a banquet with his
girlfriend Kynisca, and his rival Lycus was also present.   Kynisca
began to cry, Aischines hit her and since then Lycus has enjoyed her
favours (Theoc. 14.30ff.).   In epigram, Rufinus (AP 5.41) finds outside
a house a girl who has been beaten and stripped; he surmises that her
lover arrived and found her with someone else.. Agathias (AP.5.218)
upbraids one Polemo for surpassing in outrageous behavious his

Menandrian namesake; he had, in a fit of jealousy, not only cut off
his girl's hair but beaten her as well. For other epigrammatic rixae,
cf. AP.5.43 (Rufinus) and especially AP.5.248 in which Paulus Silentiarius
expresses remorse at the beating he has inflicted on his girl (a poem
which bears a strong resemblance to Ovid Am.1.7). These epigrams are
late, but it is possible that their authors are developing a theme which
they found in earlier epigrams.

This theme appealed to the elegists who all use it on more than one
occasion. To judge from the meagre evidence of the Greek examples cited
above, it was greatly developed and expanded by them. For our discussion
it will be convenient to subdivide the elegiac usages of the theme into
(a) the violence of the girl (when the lover is beaten) and
(b) the violence of the lover (when the girl is beaten). With few
exceptions, when the former is the case the lover, if he expresses any
reaction to the beating, is pleased, for the girl's violence is the
result of jealousy which is itself the result of lover. This is the
same idea as we saw at Aristoph. Plut. 1013ff., and expressed in
erotodidactic form by Lucian and Theophylactus. When, however, the
lover has beaten his girl, his subsequent feelings are horror, shame
and remorse. Perhaps even this "elegiac attitude" derives from earlier
literature, if Paulus Silentiarius, who expresses such feelings at
having beaten a girl (AP.5.248), is indebted to a pre-elegiac Greek
source and not to Ovid (see below). One is tempted to see Polemo in the
Periceiromene as the original regretful violent lover.

A. The Violent Girl

In 1.6 Tibullus asks Delia's mother to teach her daughter to be chaste
and says he wants strict rules of conduct imposed upon himself by Delia:

> et mihi sint durae leges, laudare nec ullam
>
>> possim ego quin oculos appetat illa meos;
>
> et si quid peccasse putet, ducarque capillis
>
>> immerito pronas proripiarque vias.
>
> non ego te pulsare velim, sed, venerit iste
>
>> si furor, optarim non habuisse manus.

<div align="right">(1.6.69-74)</div>

Should he break the rules, he wants Delia to punish him; if she breaks
them, he wouldn't want to harm her but he couldn't restrain himself.
Kölblinger (63-4) comments on this passage: "Der Dichter verlangt,
Delia solle keusch sein (67f.); dafür nimmt er die härtesten
Bedingungen auf sich". This misses the point. Tibullus wants to be
punished by Delia even if he is innocent (immerito 72). He wants Delia
to keep a jealous watch over him; beating him would be an indication of
her jealousy and, therefore, of her love. What Tibullus is saying
here, then, is that he wants his girl to feel the same jealous,
uncontrollable passion for him as he feels for her. Two of the details
of the beating are standard features of the rixa in elegy: Tibullus
wants his eyes scratched (70) and his hair pulled (71) (for some standard
features of the rixa, see Appendix I). These details may be of comic
origin; cf. Plautus Most.203, Aulul.53f., Rudens 759, Asin.908; Terence

Eunuch.648; cf. also Lucian _Dial.Mer._ 8.1ff., (quoted above).   To them,
however, Tibullus has added the novel picture of his being thrown
headlong into the street (72).

Propertius 3.8 begins with the poet's expression of joy at the _rixa_
which took place the previous evening:

> Dulcis ad hesternas fuerat mihi rixa lucernas,
>
> > vocis et insanae tot maledicta tuae,
>
> cum furibunda mero mensam propellis et in me
>
> > proicis insana cymbia plena manu.
>
> tu vero nostras audax invade capillos
>
> > et mea formosis unguibus ora nota,
>
> tu minitare oculos subiecta uxurere flamma,
>
> > fac mea rescisso pectora nuda sinu.

> (3.8.1-8)

Propertius, as often, makes the theme vivid and immediate by tying it
down to a particular time and place: the quarrel occurred the previous
evening (_hesternas ... lucernas_ (1)) and at a symposium (3-4).   The
poet tells us the _rixa_ was _dulcis_ (1);   in her fury Cynthia had not
only shouted abuse, but she had also kicked over the table and thrown
cups (full ones, too!) at Propertius (3-4).   In 5-8, in terms strongly
reminiscent of comedy[19], he invites Cynthia to attack him physically.
She is to tear his hair (5), scratch his cheeks (6) and tear his clothes
(8).   To these activities are added the burning, or threat of burning,
of Propertius' eyes (7)[20].   At 9 we are told why the _rixa_ was _dulcis_

for Propertius:

> nimirum veri dantur mihi signa caloris:
>
> nam sine amore gravi femina nulla dolet.

In the rest of the poem Propertius develops the paradox of the dulcis
rixa: he wants his rivals to see his wounds (21) and he informs
Cynthia that in te pax mihi nulla placet (34).

Propertius uses the theme in a different context from Tibullus, but
he does use it a similar way, for each poet expresses a wish to be the
object of his girl's violence.   It is of interest, too, that both
instances of the theme have erotodidactic connections, revealing
their comic provenance.   In Tibullus the theme occurs in a section
where Delia's mother had been requested by Tibullus to instruct Delia
in chastity (i.e. fidelity to the poet), a clear inversion of the
comic situation in which the mother-lena instructs her daughter in the
erotic arts[21].   In Propertius' poem an erotodidactic note is struck
by the explanatory section at 9ff., where the poet claims that no
woman can be provoked to anger unless she is in love.   Further, at
11-16, he emphasises his point by listing various types of women[22],
a technique frequently used by Ovid in the Ars. (cf.,e.g.,1.61ff.,
3.531ff.,3.773ff.; cf. Rem.Am.337ff.).   Even more significant is
17-18:

> his ego tormentis animi sum verus haruspex,
>
> has didici certo saepe in amore notas.

Cairns has noted that a claim to possess oracular infallibility in the
area of love is a topos of the erotodidactic situation (cf. Callim.

Iamb. 5.31-2; Prop.1.9.5-6 and see Cairns GC 73 and note 7).   Thus
traces of the original erotodidactic usage of the theme remain in both
poets, and while they have indeed personalised it and made it serve
their own purposes their use of it has been to some extent shaped by
the Greek comic tradition in which it occurred[23].

One is not surprised to find the theme in Ovid's great didactic work.
Ovid advises the lover to keep love alive by quarrels[24]:   the girl's
fears must be aroused and she must pale at the discovery of the lover's
infidelity (Ars.2.445ff.).   Ovid continues:

> O quater et quotiens numero comprehendere non est
>
>   felicem, de quo laesa puella dolet . . .
>
> ille ego sim, cuius laniet furiosa capillos;
>
>   ille ego sim, teneras cui petat ungue genas,
>
> quem videat lacrimans, quem torvis spectet ocellis,
>
>   quo sine non possit vivere, posse velit.
>
>   (2.447-8;   451-4)

Again the lover wishes to be beaten by the girl — to have his hair
torn and his cheeks scratched[25] — and he wants this, we must assume,
because it is an indication of the girl's love.   The theme is, of
course, differently used by Ovid, as a "personal" excursus in a
piece of erotodidaxis, but it has the same significance as in
Propertius and Tibullus.

Similarly, in his advice to women in the third book, Ovid says that to
make men believe that they are loved women should physically attack
them:

> spectet amabilius iuvenem et suspiret ab imo
>
>> femina, tam sero cur veniatque roget;
>
> accedant lacrimae, dolor et de paelice fictus,
>
>> et laniet digitis illius ora suis.
>
> iamdudum persuasus erit; miserabitur ultro,
>
>> et dicet "cura carpitur ista mei".

<div align="right">

(Ars.3.675-80)

</div>

In all these examples it is either stated, or implied, that violence
is the result of the girl's passion.   And in these cases it is always
the girl who is violent, although we noticed in the Greek examples
instances of a man's violence being interpreted as a sign of love.
In elegy the lover always regrets his own violence and usually makes
no reference to its being the result of passion.   This we shall
consider in a moment, but it is convenient to deal here with two
problems in Horace and Propertius involving the man's violence which
can perhaps be explained in the light of the Greek examples.

At Odes 1.13.9-12 Horace says:

> Uror, seu tibi candidos
>
> turparunt umeros inmodicae mero

>   rixae, sive puer furens

>   inpressit memorem dente labris notam.

On this Nisbet and Hubbard (<u>Odes 1</u> 174) comment: "Horace does not say
what emotion inflames him, but love, anger and jealousy are obviously
suggested by the context".   What excites these emotions in the poet
is described in the two disjunctive clauses.   The second of these
presents no difficulty; the marks left by the violent kisses are
evidence of Lydia's sexual contact with a passionate youth, and so
anger, jealousy and love (on the principle <u>cogas amantem irasci amari
si velis</u>[26]) are not surprising emotions for Horace to feel.   But the
bruised shoulders of the first conditional clause are evidence of
Lydia's involvement in a drunken brawl, and this seems at first glance
unlikely to inspire these same emotions in the poet.

Some have taken <u>rixa</u> to mean sexual intercourse, so that the first
disjunctive clause is exactly parallel to the second[27].   <u>Rixa</u> does
indeed bear this meaning at Cat.66.13 and Prop.2.15.4[28], but it is used
as a sexual metaphor nowhere else in Horace and the Propertian example
is, in fact, the only example of it in Augustan poetry.   A more
compelling objection is that <u>immodicae mero rixae</u> is an apt description
of the violent lovers'·quarrel (often occurring at a symposium and
involving the inebriation of the violent party), whereas it is difficult
to imagine how sexual intercourse can be rendered immoderate by wine.
<u>Rixae</u>, therefore, refers to quarrels between Lydia and Horace's rival
Telephus, and the poet is saying that he feels the same set of emotions

whether the violence of his rival manifests itself in quarrels with
Lydia or in love-making with her.   The man who inflicted injuries
upon Lydia during their quarrel did so because he was jealous to the
point of uncontrollable violence, and this, like the love-bites,
indicates not just a casual admirer, but a man whose love for Lydia
is deep and tempestuous.

At Prop. 4.5.39-40 the lena, advising Cynthia (if we are to assume
that the unnamed girl is Cynthia) on how to increase an admirer's
ardour, says:

> semper habe morsus circa tua colla recentis,
>
>   litibus alternis quos putet esse datos.

The text of 40 has been disputed.   Guyet could not understand litibus
and suggested lusibus or rictibus.   The manuscripts disagree over
alternis, some offering alterius.   Heinsius suggested that the first
two words of the line were dentibus alterius.

Butler and Barber, who accept Heinsius' dentibus alterius in 40,
correctly point out that litibus must mean quarrels and not amantium
luctamina (the interpretation nevertheless accepted by Fedeli and
Camps ad loc.).   Nowhere else in elegy (nor anywhere else, to my
knowledge) does lis have this erotic sense, whereas it does occur
elsewhere in elegy of the lovers' quarrel (cf. Ovid. Ars.2.151,153,
155; Rem.Am. 660).   We are faced now with the problem of
interpreting morsus in 39.   If litibus means quarrels and not

luctamina amantium, then these bites cannot be love-bites, although this
interpretation appears to be suggested by the fact that Ovid, in his
lena poem, which is probably indebted to Prop.4.5, clearly refers to
love-bites (Am.1.8.97-8 ille viri videat toto vestigia lecto/factaque
lascivis livida colla notis). We can, like Butler and Barber, remove
the problem by accepting Heinsius' dentibus alterius or Guyet's equally
attractive lusibus.

Perhaps, however, such surgery is unnecessary. On two other occasions
on which bites are inflicted by a person on another's neck in Propertius,
the bites are delivered in anger and are not love-bites. 3.8, we have
seen, is Propertius' celebration of Cynthia's attack on him, and here,
too, we find bites on the neck (in morso aequales videant mea vulnera
collo (21)). When the poet is caught in flagranti delicto with two
girls on the lawn, he is again attacked by Cynthia and bitten:

> Cynthia gaudet in exuviis victrixque recurrit
>
>   et mea perversa sauciat ora manu,
>
> imponitque notam collo morsuque cruentat[29]

$$(4.8.63-5)$$

This may also be the case at 4.5.39-40. What the lena wants Cynthia to
do is increase her admirer's ardour by giving him evidence of the
existence not simply of a rival lover (so Shackleton Bailey CQ 43 (1949)
28), but of a lover like Lydia's Telephus, a lover whose love is violent
enough for him to inflict injuries upon her. alternis, the lectio
difficilior which also has the authority of the Neapolitanus behind it,

is explained by Shackleton Bailey (loc.cit.) as "now one, now the other
taking the initiative".   The humour of the couplet, relying on the
reader's knowledge of the cliches of erotic poetry, matches well the
tone of the context, and we do not have to assume that Ovid's debt to
Propertius in his description of the lena extends as far as the
identical application of individual motifs.

We have now seen the elegiac instances of the theme of the girl's
violence as an indication of her love.   It must be added that Ovid
on two occasions uses the violent girl in a quite different way.
Acontius writes to Cydippe:

> ignoras tua iura;   voca!   cur arguor absens?
>
> > iamdudum dominae more venire iube.
>
> ipsa meos scindas licet imperiosa capillos,
>
> > oraque sint digitis livida nostra tuis,
>
> omnia perpetiar;   tantum fortasse timebo,
>
> > corpore laedatur ne manus ista meo.

> (Her.20.79-84)

Here the girl's violence, depicted by two of the most frequently
occurring topoi of the rixa (hair-pulling and face-scratching), will
be endured calmly by the lover.   The rixa is here an illustration of
the lover's obsequium.   This is a new application of the theme,
occurring in neither Propertius nor Tibullus (it is, indeed, conspicuously
absent from Priapus' list of examples of obsequium at Tib. 1.4.41ff.).
Ovid adds also a new and characteristically Ovidian touch to the theme:

Acontius' only fear is that Cydippe may hurt her hand when she scratches his face (84).

Ovid goes on to use the theme, briefly but with the same application, in the Ars. Lovers, he says, must resolve to endure many hardships at the hands of their girls: proponant animo multa ferenda suo (2.516). He then proceeds to give examples of these hardships, and insults and beatings are included:

> nec maledicta puta, nec verbera ferre puellae
>
> turpe, nec ad teneros oscula ferre pedes.
>
> (2.533-4)

Once more, enduring the violent girl's attack is part of the lover's obsequium, coupled here with another example of the lover's absolute servility to his mistress, his willingness to kiss her feet.

Finally, in Am.2.7, the first of the Cypassis poems, Ovid uses the theme in yet another new way. Here he wants to make light of the charge brought against him by Corinna that he is having an affair with Cypassis, and so he makes the counter-charge that Corinna is always unreasonably jealous and he is always suffering for it. Whatever he does is construed by Corinna as a sign of unfaithfulness, and if he praises a girl she attacks him: siquam laudavi, misero petis ungue capillos(7). This is an inversion of the usual elegiac attitude, the subtlety of which escaped Brandt, who simply remarks ad loc. "Ovid denkt also hier anders als Ars.2.451"[30].

B. The Violent Lover

We have already seen that in 1.6 Tibullus' attitude towards violence

inflicted by Delia is very different from his attitude towards violence

inflicted on Delia by himself.   In that case he could not help himself,

but he would wish not to have hands (1.6.73-4).   This is the standard

elegiac attitude, occurring again in the first book of Tibullus.   In

1.10, a tirade against the follies of war, Tibullus describes by way of

contrast a scene of rustic peace where the only wars are the bella

Veneris:

> Sed Veneris tunc bella calent, scissosque capillos
>
>   femina, perfractas conqueriturque fores;
>
> flet teneras subtusa genas: sed victor et ipse
>
>   flet sibi dementes tam valuisse manus.
>
> at lascivus Amor rixae mala verba ministrat,
>
>   inter et iratum lentus utrumque sedet.
>
> a lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam
>
>   verberat: e caelo deripit ille deos.
>
> sit satis a membris tenuem rescindere vestem,
>
>   sit satis ornatus dissoluisse comae,
>
> sit lacrimas movisse satis: quater ille beatus
>
>   quo tenera irato flere puella potest.

                                          (1.10.53-64)

Here we see a set of topoi similar to those in the examples of the

rixa already discussed.   However, Tibullus' manipulation of the

topoi is different.   Lines 53-7 give the details of the rixa from the
girl's point of view: she complains about her torn hair, broken doors
and bruised cheeks (which here replace the scratched cheeks in the
examples above, since scratching was considered a particularly feminine
form of attack[31]).   Contrasted with this violence is the picture of
lentus Amor, sitting between the two combatants (57-8).   Then follows
Tibullus' outcry against beating a girl, and a list of activities which
are permitted the irate lover: he can tear her clothes (61), ruin her
hair-style (62) (ornatus dissoluisse comae stands in contrast to
scissosque capillos in 53), and make her cry (63-4).   Kölblinger (57)
sees here "eine prickelnd erotische Atmosphäre".   Some support for
this view may come from Terence Eunuch.646 where Chaerea's rape of the
girl is described (vestem omnem miserae descidit, tum ipsam capillo
conscidit) and from Propertius' threat to Cynthia at 2.15.17ff. (quod
si pertendens animo vestita cubaris,/scissa veste meas experiere manus:/
quin etiam, si me ulterius provexerit ira,/ostendes matri bracchia laesa
tuae).   On the other hand, these descriptions occur in contexts which
clearly reveal that the violent acts are associated with rape[32], whereas
the Tibullan passage can be seen simply as a description of a lovers'
quarrel.

One noticeable addition to the usual aspects of the rixa in this passage
is the breaking of doors (54).   What the reader must assume is that the
girl has excluded the lover and he, believing that another is preferred
to him, has broken down the doors in a jealous rage.   (This topos,

imported from the komastic situation and occurring in comedy (cf. Ter.
Ad.102f, 120; cf.also Herodas 2.50) we meet again in the context of
the lovers' quarrel in both Propertius and Ovid.)   Jealousy is not
given specifically in this passage as the reason for the bella Veneris,
but this is what the reader is intended to assume (so André ad loc;
cf.2.4.37-8 where the motive for such behaviour is specifically given).

Propertius is specific in this regard.   In 2.5. he complains that
Cynthia's disreputable behaviour is a scandal throughout Rome, and at
19ff. he tells her how he intends to fight back:

> non solum taurus ferit uncis cornibus hostem,
>
>   verum etiam instanti laesa repugnat ovis.
>
> nec tibi periuro scindam de corpore vestis,
>
>   nec mea praeclusas fregerit ira fores,
>
> nec tibi conexos iratus carpere crinis,
>
>   nec duris ausim laedere pollicibus:
>
> rusticus haec aliquis tam turpia proelia quaerat,
>
>   cuius non hederae circuiere caput.
>
> scribam igitur, quod non umquam tua deleat aetas,
>
>   "Cynthia, forma potens; Cynthia, verba levis".

                                              (2.25.19-2 8)

This passage, as commentators have noted[33], closely resembles the
Tibullan passage quoted above (1.10.53ff.).   In particular, as
Solmsen ("Propertius in his literary relations" 274) has pointed out,
all four actions condemned by Propertius in this poem occur in Tibullus'

poem (clothes tearing - Prop.21, Tib.61; door-breaking - Prop.22, Tib. 54; hair-pulling - Prop.23, Tib.53; punching - Prop.24, Tib.55) and Tibullus has no other violent action not mentioned by Propertius. This behaviour, Propertius says, he will avoid, since it is the behaviour of a rusticus not a poet (25-6); instead he will punish Cynthia in his poetry (27ff.). Propertius clearly had Tibullus' poem in mind when he wrote (rusticus in 25 also seems to be a direct reference to Tibullus' passage; cf.1.10.51 rusticus e lucoque vehit, male sobrius ipse), and this section is perhaps a sly dig at Tibullus, though one would perhaps not go so far as to say, as Solmsen does, that Propertius is "venting his spleen on his rival's work"[34].

Propertius' use of the theme is different from Tibullus' in that he is taking a firm stand against any kind of violent action (not just extreme violence) against the girl. The reader is also meant to extract from the passage a hint of the nature of Propertius' relationship with Cynthia. Propertius begins with a firm rejection of violent behaviour: he will not tear her clothes or break down the closed doors (21-2). But the topoi of lines 23 and 24 - hair-pulling and punching - are dependant on ausim in 24: Propertius would not dare beat Cynthia. When he goes on to give as an explanation for his eschewing such action the belief that it is the behaviour of a rusticus, we suspect that, true as this may be, the real reason is that Propertius is frightened and would not dare do it[35] (and, in fact, we know from the Monobiblos, especially 1.3, the character of the woman involved).

Tibullus and Propertius do, however, have in common an abhorrence of

violence committed against the girl, even if Propertius is more fully

committed to this position than Tibullus.   This elegiac abhorrence of

violence on the lover's part is picked up by Horace, who invites Tyndaris

for a peaceful drink in the countryside, away from the riotous behaviour

of Cyrus:

> hic innocentis pocula Lesbii
>
> duces sub umbra, nec Semeleius
>
> > cum Marte confudent Thyoneus
> >
> > proelia, nec metues protervum
>
> suspecta Cyrum, ne male dispari
>
> incontinentis iniciat manus
>
> > et scindat haerentem coronam
> >
> > crinibus immeritamque vestem.

(Odes1.17.21-28)

This is not rape, but the violence of a jealous lover, as suspecta (25)

clearly reveals (see Nisbet and Hubbard ad loc.), and the rixa is

imagined as taking place at a wild symposium, the (presumably urban)

counterpart of Horace's peaceful rustic symposium.   At Horace's

symposium Tyndaris will not have her clothes torn and her garland

pulled off.   The scene, then, is the elegiac rixa, and Horace's

disapproval of the lover's violence is indicated by incontinentis (26)

and immeritam (28).

Ovid devotes a whole poem to the theme.   In 1.7 he describes and deplores his beating of Corinna which presumably (though we are not specifically told this) arose from jealousy on his part.   The usual topoi are present.   Corinna's face is both bruised (4) and scratched (50), and her hair is torn (11,49).   Would it not have been enough, Ovid asks, to have shouted at her, threatened her and torn her clothes (45-8)?   Furthermore, the idea of representing the lover as contrite after he has beaten his girl was not introduced into elegy by Ovid; Tibullus' repentant rustic came first (1.10.53ff.).   But Ovid is the only elegist to speak in propria persona after the event, and in many respects he outdoes his predecessors.   Apart from the obvious difference of the expansion of the theme by the addition of exempla (7ff.,13ff., 29ff.,55ff.), and the extended description of the girl's fear (20ff., 51ff.), note the following:

1)   In the examples of the rixa already examined, the man's hands are· usually given some prominence (cf.Tib.1.10.56,1.6.74; Hor. Odes 1.17.26; Prop. 2.5.24 (pollicibus); Propertius, as Nisbet and Hubbard point out,[36] gives similar prominence to Cynthia's hands (1.6.16, 3.8.3f., 3.16.10)). Ovid gives them even greater prominence.   He begins the poem with a request to anyone who will help him (2): he wants his hands put in chains (1. Adde manus in vincla meas (meruere catenas)).   The hands are brought into the first line of the poem.   In 3-4 he explains why he wants this done:

> nam furor in dominam temeraria bracchia movit;
>
> flet mea vesana laesa puella manu.

Like Tibullus (1.6.74) he wishes that he did not have arms (or, rather, that they had fallen off (23)).   In 27 he addresses his hands in horror:

> quid mihi vobiscum, caedis scelerumque ministrae?
>
> debita sacrilegae vincla subite manus!

When at 61-2 he begs Corinna to forgive him, it is these terrible hands that she thrusts away:

> ter tamen ante pedes volui procumbere supplex;
>
> ter formidatas reppulit illa manus.

2) At 1,10.55 Tibullus refers to the violent rustic as victor. Propertius similarly makes the enraged Cynthia who has scattered her rivals victrix (4.8.67).   Ovid takes up this idea and expands it into a bitterly sarcastic description of a triumph, with Corinna as a wretched captive and himself as the triumphator:

> i nunc, magnificos victor molire triumphos,
>
>   cinge comam lauro votaque redde Iovi,
>
> quaeque tuos curros comitantum turba sequetur,
>
>   clamet 'io, forti victa puella viro est!'
>
> ante eat effuso tristis captiva capillo,
>
>   si sineret laesae, candida tota, genae.

> (Am.1.7.35-40)

3) An Ovidian addition is the notion of the divina puella which occurs

at various points of the poem.   If Ovid could beat his girl, then he
could beat the gods (saeva vel in sanctos verbera ferre (potui) deos (6)).
At 28 his hands are sacrilegae, a very strong word not used frequently by
the elegists[37].   In 31ff. he compares himself with Diomede, for he, like
Ovid, had struck a goddess (ille deam primus perculit; alter ego (32));
Diomede, however, had a good reason for doing so, since Aphrodite was his
enemy (33-4).   When he begs for Corinna's forgiveness, Ovid is a
suppliant grovelling before the cult statue:

> ter tamen ante pedes volui procumbere supples (61)

For procumbere cf.Tib.1.2.85;   Ovid Fast.2.438, Pont.2.2.124 and
especially line 18 of this poem (procubuit templo, casta Minerva, tuo).

4) Ovid's treatment of the theme is clearly humorous.   This is
unmistakably the case at the end of the poem which, like so many
Ovidian endings, deflates what has preceded it:

> at tu ne dubita (minuet vindicta dolorem)
>
> > protinus in voltus unguibus ire meos;
>
> nec nostris oculis nec nostris parce capillis:
>
> > quamlibet infirmas adiuvat ira manus.
>
> neve mei sceleris tam tristia signa supersint,
>
> > pone recompositas in statione comas.
>
> > > (63-68)

Exact your vengeance on me, the poet urges Corinna, or at least put
your hair back in order!   But we do not have to wait until the end
of the poem to see that Ovid's treatment is tongue-in-cheek.   When

he asks himself <u>ergo ego digestos potui laniare capillos</u>? (11) he feels

compelled not only to add the observation that even when dishevelled her

hair looked attractive (12), but also to give three couplets of

examples of women who were beautiful with their hair dishevelled (13-18).

Again when at 45 he adopts the Tibullan position that some milder action

against the girl would have been permissible, he brings in the notion of

decency, incongruous in the context:

> nonne satis fuerat . . .
>
> aut tunicam ⟨a⟩ summa diducere turpiter ora
>
> ad mediam (mediae zona tulisset opem)

$$(45-48)$$

We should now briefly consider the relationship of Ovid's poem to

Paulus Silentiarus' epigram on the same theme, for this is connected

with the question of Ovid's originality:

Ὦ παλάμη πάντολμε, σὺ τὸν πάγχρυσεον ἔτλης
    ἀπρὶξ δραξαμένη βόστρυχον ἀνερύσαι;
ἔτλης· οὐκ ἐμάλαξε τεὸν θράσος ἄλλινος αὐδή,
    σκύλμα κόμης, αὐχὴν μαλθακὰ κεκλιμένος.
νῦν θαμινοῖς πατάγοισι μάτην τὸ μέτωπον ἀράσσεις·
    οὐκέτι γὰρ μαζοῖς σὸν θέναρ ἐμπελάσει.
μή, λίτομαι, δέσποινα, τόσην μὴ λάμβανε ποινήν·
    μᾶλλον ἐγὼ τλαίην φάσγανον ἀσπασίως.

$$(\underline{AP}5.248)$$

Paulus' poem bears a clear resemblance to Ovid's, and the question which
arises from this is whether Paulus is directly indebted to Ovid or
whether both have drawn on a common source.   Until comparatively
recently, thematic resemblances to the elegists in Paulus were seen as
deriving from a common Alexandrian source (see, e.g., Mallet Quaest.Prop.
47ff., Gollnisch Quaest. Eleg.50-59, Peek in his article on Paulus
Silentiarius, RE 18(2) 2367), but in recent years some have argued that
Paulus knew and imitated the elegists (so Viansino, Paolo Silenziario
XIIff., Schulz-Vanheyden 156ff., who is supported by E.J. Kenney in his
review in CR 86 (1972) 111).   Whatever the answer to this vexed question,
one thing at least is clear, namely that Paulus, even if he did know the
elegists, also knew earlier Greek Literature, so that instances of
"borrowing" must be examined individually to decide whether direct
dependence on an elegist can be assumed.   This particular instance has
been discussed by Viansino (Paolo Silenziario 98) who puts forward two
arguments for Paulus' direct dependence on Ovid.   The first is that
Paulus, like Ovid, apostrophises his hands (Paulus 1-6;   Ovid 27-8);
this, Viansino believes, "vale a stabilire con certezza la dipenza di
Paolo da Ovidio".   The second argument concerns Paulus' use of the
word δέσποινα (7) to refer to his girl;   this seems to correspond
to the Latin domina[38].

These arguments appear, at first sight, convincing, but caution is
necessary.   First, the apostrophising of the hands in this context
is not so strange as to preclude independent usage by Paulus, who is

in fact writing in a genre in which other parts of the body are often addressed: cf. AP 5.226 (Paulus Silentiarius), 12.91 (Polystratus), 12.92 (Meleager) (eyes addressed); 12.147.4 (Meleager) (heart addressed); 12.216 (Strato), 12.232 (Scythinus) (penis addressed). Addresses to one's soul are also common; cf. AP 12.125, 132, 132 A (all Meleager). Indeed, one might suspect that this emphasis upon the offending hands (common, as we have seen, in the rixa) goes back to Menander: cf. Philostratus Ep. 61.1ff. (probably inspired by Menander's Periceiromene):

τίς σε, ὦ καλή, περιέκειρεν; ὡς ἀνόητος καὶ βάρβαρος ὁ μὴ ψαισάμενος τῶν Ἀφροδίτης δώρων· οὐδὲ γὰρ γῆ κομῶσα ἡδὺ οὕτω θέαμα ὡς γυνὴ κατάκομος. φεῦ ἀναιδοῦς παλάμης.[39]

Apart from φεῦ ἀναιδοῦς παλάμης, which recalls the address to the hands in Paulus and Ovid, ὡς ἀνόητος καὶ βάρβαρος is strikingly similar to Ovid's quis mihi non 'demens', quis non mihi 'barbare' dixit (19). The most reasonable supposition is that Ovid, Paulus and Philostratus are indebted to a common source.

As for the argument that δέσποινα recalls the Latin usage of domina, Viansino himself has to admit a similar usage in Achilles Tatius 2.6:

Χαῖρε, ἔφην, δέσποινα. ἡ δὲ μειδιάσασα γλυκὺ καὶ ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος ὅτι συνῆκε πῶς εἶπον τὸ " Χαῖρε, δέσποινα."

One may add the use of ἄνασσα at AP 5.26.2 (Anon.). It seems to me as likely, therefore, that both Paulus and Ovid are indebted to a common source.

Ovid goes on to use the theme on two occasions in the Ars. In the second book he combines it with the conventional theme of the lover's poverty. Ovid is a vates for poor men, because he was poor himself when he loved (165). His advice is that the poor man should love with caution and not get involved in fights with his girl. This can be expensive, a point which he emphasises by an example drawn from his own experience[40]:

> me memini iratum dominae turbasse capillos;
>
> haec mihi quam multos abstulit ira dies!
>
> nec puto, nec sensi tunicam laniasse, sed ipsa
>
> dixerat, et pretio est illa redempta meo.

(Ars.2.169-172)

This is, of course, a new use of the theme, but it was perhaps suggested to Ovid by a piece of erotodidaxis put in the mouth of Propertius' lena:

> si tibi forte comas vexaverit, utilis ira:
>
> post modo mercata pace premendus erit.

(Prop.4.5.31-2)

It is possible, however, that the idea had its origins in earlier erotodidaxis, perhaps in comedy.

Finally, in the third book of the Ars. Ovid advises women that the same techniques should not be used to capture the raw recruit and the veteran, hardened to love's service. In the case of a raw recruit, the girl should avoid having another lover at the same time (563-4). He continues:

> ille vetus miles sensim et sapienter amabit
>
>   multaque tironi non patienda feret;
>
> nec franget postes nec saevis ignibus uret
>
>   nec dominae teneras adpetet ungue genas
>
> nec scindet tunicasve suas tunicasve puellae,
>
>   nec raptus flendi causa capillus erit.
>
> ista decent pueros aetate et amore calentes.

<div align="right">(3.565-71)</div>

The veteran will not react violently to the girl's infidelity, so the
girl may with impunity take lovers other than him.   The clear
implication is that this will not do in the case of the inexperienced
lover;   his jealousy will incite him to the activities referred to in
567-70, the activities eschewed by the veteran.

These activities are the usual features of the rixa (see Appendix 1) —
face-scratching (568), clothes-tearing (569), hair-pulling (570).   But
now we meet also the door-breaking which we have seen in two other
instances of the theme;   Tibullus' rustic lover broke down his girl's
doors (1.10.54) and Propertius tells Cynthia that he will not resort to
such behaviour himself (2.5.22).   So the inexperienced lover, according
to Ovid, will behave like the rustic lover, and the topos is very apt in
the context.   Ovid goes even further.   The inexperienced lover is
likely to tear not just the girl's clothes — he might even tear his
own (569)!   Ovid once again has added a characteristic touch of humour
to an elegiac cliché.

At the risk of oversimplification, we may venture to say that two main
strains of development can be disentangled in the literary history of
the theme of lovers' quarrels.   First we have the erotodidactic
inference that those who inflict violence on their partners must
surely be in love.   This (a theme which dates at least from Aristophanes
and which occurred in erotodidaxis in New Comedy) we see developed in
elegy in the picture of the violent girl (Tib.1.6.69ff; Prop.3.8.1ff;
Ovid Ars.2.445ff.), though its original form (with the violent man)
can perhaps be seen in Horace Odes 1.13.9-12 and Propertius 4.5.39-40.
With Ovid the violence of the girl is also used in an example of the
lover's obsequium.   The other strain is the lover's uncontrollable
violence regretted after the event (Tib.1.10.53ff; Ovid Am.1.7.1ff.)
or regarded with disapproval by the poet (Prop.2.5.19ff; Tib.1.10.59f;
Horace Odes 1.17.21ff; for different reasons by Ovid Ars.2.169ff.,
3.565ff.).   This strain perhaps goes back to Menander's Periceiromene.

2.   The Soldier - Rival

The soldier-rival who has replaced the poet in the girl's affections

occurs in both Propertius (2.16) and Ovid (Am.3.8). The soldier-rival

of Tib.1.2.65ff. is really a different type, representing the foolish

man who spurns love in favour of money-grubbing[41]; he is not, like

Propertius' and Ovid's rivals, a threat to the poet.   There can be no

doubt that Ovid knew Propertius' poem, lines of which he echoes elsewhere

in the Amores (cf.1.2.52 - Prop.42; 2.9.18 - Prop.20).   It is,

therefore, worthwhile to examine the resemblances between these two

poems (especially since this instance of Propertian imitation by Ovid

has been overlooked by Neumann) before we consider the source of theme

and how the poets have developed it:

1) Both poets are at the moment excluded from their mistresses' houses:

Prop.5-6; Ovid 5-8, 23-4.

2) They explain that the reason for this exclusion is the girl's preference

of a rich soldier (a praetor in Propertius, an eques in Ovid):

>   Praetor ab Illyricis venit modo, Cynthia, terris,
>
>   maxima praeda tibi, maxima cura mihi.
>
>   (Prop.1-2)
>
>   Ecce recens dives parto per vulnera censu
>
>   praefertur nobis sanguine pastus eques
>
>   (Ovid 9-10)

3) Both express disgust at the thought of their girls embracing so foul

a lover, and they both refer to the beauty of the girls' arms in this

connection (candida tam foedo bracchia fusa viro (Prop.24); hunc potes amplecti formosis, vita, lacertis? (Ovid 11)).

4) At 27 Propertius refers to his rival as a barbarus[42], and this is the implication of Ovid 1-4. What Ovid says is that barbaria is at present considered to be the lack of money, so that the himself is barbarus and the rich eques is not; what he obviously means is that the reverse of this is actually the case.

5) In both poems the greed of present-day girls is deplored (Prop. 21ff., Ovid 29ff. and 61-2), and both poets contrast the past with the present (Prop.19-20, a humorous periphrasis[43]; Ovid 35-44, a description (at much greater length) of the Golden Age).

6) Both poets make a wish for the disappearance of the gifts which have corrupted the girl cf. Prop.43-6 haec videam rapidas in vanum ferre procellas:/quae tibi terra, velim, quae tibi fiat aqua; Ovid 65-6 O si neglecti quisquam deus ultor amantis/tam male quaesitas pulvere mutet opes[44].

7) Finally, we may add the fact that both poets make some reference to the present political situation as being representative of the money-grubbing attitude of their society. Ovid's reference to the curia at 55-6 curia pauperibus clausa est; dat census honores;/inde gravis iudex, inde severus eques may have been inspired by Propertius' wish at 19-20: atque utinam Romae nemo esset dives, et ipse/straminea posset dux habitare casa (a couplet which must have impressed Ovid, since 20 is echoed at Am.2.9.18 stramineis esset nunc quoque tecta casis).

Several of these parallels are indeed motifs which are the common
ground of elegy, and which are particularly frequent in poems which
concern a rival.   The exclusion of the lover is, as we have seen,
a particularly common theme, often involving a rival lover, who is
admitted instead (see above p.29).   For complaints about the greed
of contemporary girls, cf. Prop.3.13 passim; Tib.2.3.35ff., 1.9.
passim (homosexual); Ovid Am.1.10.11ff. etc. and for the accompanying
contrast with the past cf. Tib.2.3.35ff., Prop.2.25.35-6.   (In pre-
elegiac literature, cf. Glaucus AP 12.44, Callim. Iamb. 3.[45]).   For
insults heaped upon a rival, cf. Tib.1.9.73f. and especially 2.3.39f.
where the rival is a "barbarian slave".   However, the resemblances
between the two poems are cumulatively a strong argument for Ovidian
imitation of Propertius, and not all the points of contact between
them (note especially 2 and 3) are common elegiac themes.

The situation depicted by Propertius surely derives from comedy.
The praetor has recently arrived in town from overseas, from Illyria[46].
He is stupid (8) and he is uncouth (27), but he is also rich, and
this is why he has been able to supplant Propertius at Cynthia's table
and in her bed (nunc sine me plena fiunt convivia mensa,/nunc sine me
tota ianua nocte patet (5-6)).   The picture owes much to the familiar
"triangular" situation of comedy, involving the lover, the girl and
the miles gloriosus.   The miles, a stock character of comedy, is a
rich, stupid, uncouth braggart[47] who comes to town from overseas to
buy the lover's girl (as in Plautus' Epidicus and Curculio) or to

supplant him in the girl's affections by virtue of his wealth, if the
girl has independent status (as in Plautus' Truculentus and Terence's
Eunuchus). Cynthia is the greedy, unfaithful meretrix whom the pale-
faced lover (here Propertius) cannot win in competition with the
soldier's money. (Enk, in his Commentarius Criticus (117), noted
that the miles was a "divite quodam milite glorioso", but he makes
no mention of this in his later commentary[48].)

The comic provenance of the poem's situation is suggested also by the
language used by Propertius. The praetor is referred to as a sheep
which is to be sheared (8), a familiar comic metaphor which Ramsay
(The Mostellaria of Plautus (London 1869) 272) includes among his comic
"terms of roguery": cf. Bac. 242 itaque tondebo auro usque ad vivam
cutem; Merc. 526 (ovis)perbonast: tondetur nimium scite.; cf. also
Bac. 1095.1121ff. The praetor is also Cynthia's praeda (2), a word
which Plautus uses of a person to be exploited: cf. Men.441, Poen.
660, Rud.1262. This might, in fact, suggest that Propertius'
inspiration comes from Roman comedy rather than from the Greek originals;
and this view gains some support from line 8 where the praetor is called
a stolidum . . . pecus, for the adjective stolidus is found only once
elsewhere in elegy (Ovid Trist.5.10.38, where it is used of the Getae),
whereas it is a well-established word in comedy, occurring nine times
in Plautus and twice in Terence[49]. There is also a striking resemblance
between Prop.7-12, where the poet urges Cynthia to take advantage of the
situation and "fleece" the praetor - a very "un-elegiac" and certainly

un-Propertian piece of advice — and the final scene of the <u>Eunuchus</u>
where Phaedria is persuaded to allow the <u>miles</u> Thraso to retain an
interest in Thais because he is stupid and can be easily exploited
by the couple (<u>Eunuch.</u>1072-84). In fact, one is tempted to see the
poem's situation as deriving from this play of Terence (so Margaret
Hubbard <u>Propertius</u> 61), especially since this last scene, involving
as it does the imported character of Thraso, is distinctly Terentian
(though it is conceivable that Thraso is here replacing another
character who fulfilled the same function at the end of Menander's
<u>Eunuchus</u>). A further point of contact between Propertius and the
<u>Eunuchus</u> can be seen at Prop. 17-18 <u>semper in Oceanum mittit me</u>
<u>quaerere gemmas,/et iubet ex ipsa tollere dona Tyro</u>, an idea which
is perhaps drawn from Phaedria's exotic gifts to Thais (<u>Eunuch.</u>
165-70).

It must be added that Propertius was not the first to introduce a
solider-rival into elegy. He was preceded by Gallus, as we may
infer from Virgil's imitation of his lines at <u>Eclogue</u> 10.46ff. (see
above p.85f). Gallus' poem was probably a <u>propompticon</u>, in which
Lycoris was represented as going to Gaul with another soldier (hence
Servius' comment <u>hic autem Gallus amavit Cytheridem meretricem,</u>
<u>libertam Volumnii, quae eo spreto Antonium euntem ad Gallias est</u>
<u>secuta</u>). We have, therefore, the same "triangular" relationship
involving the unhappy, jilted lover, the unfaithful <u>meretrix</u> and the
soldier-rival. What Gallus might have done was to combine in a

single poem this "triangular" situation of comedy and the traditional
elements of the propempticon. However, this is highly speculative,
and while the possibility of indirect comic influence through Gallus
cannot be excluded, the comic language of 2.16 and the resemblance of
lines 7-12 to the final scene of the Eunuchus make Terence the more
likely source of Propertius' inspiration.

In transferring the comic situation to elegy Propertius has so
tranformed it as to make it almost unrecognisable. Only the outline
of it remains the same. For now the scene is set in Rome, and the
details of the situation are completely Romanised. The miles is not
the stupid, foreign mercenary of comedy, but a far more dangerous rival,
a Roman provincial governor. It is noticeable, too, that Propertius
makes the picture more convincing by adding the detail of the sea-route
from Epirus to Rome (saxo . . . Cerauno(3)). The tension is further
heightened by the fact that Cynthia is here a grasping meretrix[50],
without the honourable motives of a Thais for entertaining the rival.
Other Roman details are the casa Romuli in Propertius' professed desire
for the old morality at 19-20, the example of Antony and the gratuitous
compliment to Augustus at 37ff. and the poet's inability to gain any
pleasure from the activities of the Campus at 34[51].

Propertius has also added elements,for example the compliment to Caesar
and the repudiation of the stock erotic theme of the invalidity of the

aphrodisios horkos which provides the poem with its humorous conclusion[52].
It is clear, too, that we are to remember 1.8, the propempticon to
Cynthia who was to leave with the praetor on a previous visit. We are
specifically referred to this by 3-4:

> non potuit saxo vitam posuisse Cerauno?
>
> a, Neptune, tibi qualia dona darem!

Cairns (GC 206) sees in these lines "inverted prosphonetic topoi"(and
the poem as a whole as an "inverse prosphoneticon") but it seems to me
more likely that they are connected rather with the propempticon, and
with Prop.1.8 specifically. The Ceraunians were mentioned by the poet
at 1.8.19 when he was expressing the wish that Cynthia's journey be a
safe one. There he hoped that she would get safely by them; here he
wishes that the praetor hadn't. In 4 we have an inversion of the
propemptic prayer to the sea deity for the traveller's safe journey
under his protection[53]; what gifts he would have given in repayment of
his vows if the ship had sunk!

What is most striking, however, about Propertius' treatment of the theme
is his dramatisation of it. The tone of 1-6, to judge especially from
3-4, is one of anger. Then, as we have already seen, 7-12 has affinities
with the final scene of the Eunuchus: Propertius, like Phaedria,
becomes resigned to the situation and, in fact, he urges Cynthia to take
advantage of this opportunity and "fleece" the praetor. But this
patently un-Propertian composure does not last. At 12 he says:

> at tu nunc nostro, Venus, o succerre dolori,
>
> rumpat ut assiduis membra libidihibus!

at in 12 reveals a change in direction, and is quickly followed by the
impassioned O and the curse of 13. The composure is gone, and the
anger of the opening has returned.

The debt of Amores 3.8 to Propertius has already been demonstrated.
There are, however, many differences between the two poems. Ovid's
debt is only the broad outline of the poem – he, too, has been ousted
from his girl's affections by a rich soldier (Ovid makes his miles
more threatening by giving him equestrian status). First, Ovid omits
much that his predecessor included. Thus, for example, Propertius'
description of his mistress's greed in 11-12, 17-18 is omitted, as is
the warning of divine retribution for perjury in 47-56 and the flattery
of Augustus in 37ff.[54] Ovid enlarges on some of Propertius' points.
The reference to the morality of the past which is confined to a single
line in Propertius (20) becomes a full-blown description of the Golden
Age in Ovid (35-44), and while Propertius simply calls his military
rival a foedo . . . viro (24), Ovid spends twelve lines explaining to
his mistress why he finds the soldier disgusting (11-22). There is
also much in Ovid's poem that is not in Propertius'. The stock
elegiac motif of the lack of efficacy of love poetry in a love affair
is an Ovidian addition (1-8: 23-9)[55], as is the cynical twist of the
Danae story in 29-34 (perhaps indebted to Horace Odes 3.16 or to Greek
epigram)[56].

Perhaps the most striking difference between the two poems is that
Propertius, unlike Ovid, never lets the situation be forgotten, and
never allows the reader's attention to be drawn away from his
particular circumstances.   No generalisation is allowed more than
six lines without the reader being reminded of its application or
being brought back to the situation of the poem.   Thus 19-22 (the
greed of girls) is followed by 23-26, the application of the
generalisation to present circumstances.   The Antony and Cleopatra
example, with the compliment to Augustus (37-42), is allowed only
six lines before a new point is made in 43ff., where Cynthia is
addressed and the subject of the verb (<u>dedit</u>) is the <u>praetor</u>.   Lines
49-54 (the weather conditions indicating punishment of girls who have
perjured themselves) are followed by 55-6, where a moral is drawn from
this for Cynthia.   Ovid, on the other hand, once the situation has
been outlined and the rival maligned in 1-22, focuses his attention on
the general theme of avarice;   neither the girl nor the soldier is
mentioned again until 54.   In fact, about half of the poem is a moral
sermon on avarice, and this frames the "personal" material, the
triangular situation, for the poem begins and ends with money.

Ovid's poem reveals no comic influence in its language, and the "comic"
or personal situation is perhaps indebted to Propertius rather than to
comedy directly.   Propertius, as has been demonstrated, is almost
certainly indebted to comedy, and perhaps to Terence's <u>Eunuchus</u> in
particular.   But the influence is anything but obvious or all-pervasive,

and the poet has created something entirely different from what can only be called a "comic suggestion".

3.   The Affair With The Maid

Like the theme of the soldier-rival, the "triangular" relationship
involving lover, mistress and maid is missing from Tibullus but is
present in both Propertius and Ovid.   This time, however, the
differences between Propertius' and Ovid's uses of the theme are
so great as to suggest that Ovid was influenced little, if at all,
by Propertius' poem.   If he is, in fact, indebted to Propertius,
it will only be for the main outlines of theme, and that he may
have taken from comedy independently of Propertius.

Propertius 3.15 opens with an address to a woman whom we must
assume to be Cynthia.   The poet declares that while Lycinna did,
indeed, provide him with his first sexual experience, she and
Propertius have barely spoken to each other in almost three years;
in fact Propertius has had no relationship with a woman other than
Cynthia since the beginning of their affair (1-10).   Camps ad loc.
correctly notes that the force of iam in the first line of the wish
formula (sic ego non ullos iam norim in amore tumultus (1))continues
into the second line (nec veniat sine te nox vigilanda mihi (2)),
and that we are to understand that the protestation follows a quarrel
between the lovers which resulted in a sleepless night for Propertius.
The following lines (3-6) give the reason for the quarrel - the poet's
earlier affair with Lycinna which, we assume, has aroused Cynthia's
jealousy - and then Propertius assures Cynthia that her fears are
groundless (7-10).   The myth of Dirce takes up the rest of the poem

(apart from 43-6, a brief application of the myth to present circumstances) and, as Shackleton Bailey maintains, the bearing of the story of Dirce on the "personal" subject of the poem is clear and would be even without 43ff. which draws the moral from the story: the "real" triangle Cynthia-Propertius-Lycinna is paralleled by the mythical triangle Dirce-Lycus-Antiope (Propertiana 186). In 13ff. Propertius describes the torments inflicted upon Antiope by Dirce, and then goes out of his way to show that Antiope's position in the household of Dirce is that of a slave. She is referred to as famulam, and one of the punishments she endures at the hands of Dirce is described by the words pensis oneravit iniquis (15), which is very close to the description of the punishment inflicted on Cynthia's erstwhile slaves by her successor in Propertius' affections (4.7.41: at graviora rependit iniquis pensa quasillis/garrula de facie si qua locuta mea est). In fact, no extant version of the myth makes Antiope the servant of Dirce. Either, therefore, Propertius is following a version of the story unknown to us[57], or else he has himself altered the relationship between the characters of the myth, to suit the purposes of the poem. Whichever of these alternatives is the case, one thing at least is clear, that Antiope is the slave of Dirce in this poem. It follows, therefore, as many scholars have assumed[58], that Lycinna is the slave of Cynthia.

Both Camps and Butler and Barber point out that the poem resembles 1.20 in that in both cases after an introduction the poet relates a myth at

considerable length and ends with an application of the myth to the
present situation.   In both poems, too, it is left to the reader to
reconstruct the "actual" situation from the myth[59].   As in 1.20,
moreover, the myth takes precedence over the actual circumstances
and one assumes that the autobiographical setting of the poem is
necessitated by the genre in which the poet is writing[60] (here, in
fact, of the poem's 46 verses only 14 are given to the "personal"
situation, the remaining 32 recounting the myth).   Nevertheless,
biographical interpretation of the poem has been, and still is,
common, and Lycinna is part of the standard biographies of Propertius.
Butler and Barber claim in their introduction (xx) that "soon after
(Propertius') assumption of the toga virilis there took place his
first love-affair with Lycinna ... . It may have occurred some time
between 35 and 33 B.C."[61]. Enk, in his introduction to Book 1 (7),
makes the same observation: "vix sumpserat togam virilem cum cognovit
ancillam adulescentem, cui nomen erat Lycinna".   More recently, Georg
Luck (119) has said of the poet: "As a very young man he had an
affair with a slave-girl, Lycinna, whom he remembers affectionately
because of her unselfishness" and Lilja (13) declares that "as soon
as he had assumed the toga virilis, which is usually assumed at the
age of fifteen or sixteen, he had a love-affair of short duration with
Lycinna, and then fell in love with Cynthia ...". Boucher (Etudes
237) believes that "l'origine du poème (3.15) est à rechercher du côté
de la circonstance réelle dont le récit est la transposition, l'expression

symbolique et artistique"[62]. Williamowitz was worried by the amount of space devoted to the myth, but argued that the poem could still be interpreted biographically "because the link (sc. between the first ten lines and the myth) is not neatly joined"[63]. It hardly needs to be pointed out that an abrupt transition by no means guarantees the "sincerity" of a poem[64].

Other considerations cast doubt upon the historical existence of Corinna. Propertius states in the first line of Book 1 that Cynthia was *prima* (though this could be taken to mean not that she was his first amorous adventure but that "die wahre Leidenschaft der Liebe lernte er erst durch Cynthia kennen"[65]), and, furthermore, Lycinna appears in 3.15 for the first time and does not reappear. The most damning argument, however, is that the poem's "personal" theme is a literary borrowing.

Before we examine the literary history of the theme, however, let us look at Ovid's uses of it. His first use of it, in *Am.* 2.7, is very different from Propertius' and may owe something to Horace *Odes* 2.4. Ovid claims that Corinna is jealous of him and that his every action is twisted into a charge against him (1-16). The latest accusation of Corinna is that he is having a love-affair with Cypassis, the *ancilla* of Corinna (17-18). This the poet denies on the ground that no free man would be willing to enter into such a relationship with a slave (19-22) and also that it would be folly for him to choose someone

who would certainly betray him (23-6).

In the following poem (2.8) he addresses Cypassis, asking her how Corinna has discovered the affair (1-8). Then he answers the charge, which we are to assume Cypassis has brought against him, that he told Corinna that no sane man would seduce a slave, and he does this by adducing the examples of two mythological characters who fell in love with slaves, Achilles (with Briseis) and Agamemnon (with Cassandra) (9-14). He claims that his denial of the affair to his mistress was of benefit to Cypassis, whose blushes almost gave them away, and in return for this he requests her favours once more (15-22). At this point, in mid-poem as it were, Cypassis refuses,[66] and the poem ends on a note of blackmail: if Cypassis will not yield, Corinna will be told all.

It is clear that Ovid's attitude in these poems is very different from Propertius'. At the core of each of Ovid's poems lies the question whether or not it is morally correct for a free man to have sexual relations with a slave, with one poem arguing the "pros" and the other the "cons" of the "thesis"[67]. Propertius, who makes a sensitive plea to Cynthia not to maltreat Lycinna through jealousy, is not at all concerned with the question of the morality of his liason with an ancilla; this is, however, the theme of Horace Odes 2.4, addressed to Xanthias, who is in love with an ancilla (2.4.1). That Ovid is indebted to Horace is perhaps indicated by the fact that both poets

use the examples of Achilles and Agamemnon to support their argument
that love for a slave is not shameful (Odes 2.4.3-4; 7-8 Am.2.8.11-12)[68].
In Horace's poem, however, there is no suggestion that the ancilla is
a rival of Xanthias' mistress.

At Ars.1.375ff. Ovid considers the question of the advisability of
seducing the maid of the girl the lover desires to win.   This is
dangerous, he warns, and he would for that reason be opposed to it:

> quaeris an hanc ipsam prosit violare ministram?
>
> talibus admissis alea grandis inest.
>
> haec a concubita fit sedula, tardior illa;
>
> haec dominae munus te parat, illa sibi.
>
> casus in eventu est: licet hic indulgeat ausis,
>
> consilium tamen est abstinuisse meum.

> (1.375-80)

Nevertheless, he does consider the question further - in case the
prospective lover really takes a fancy to the maid (as, we remember,
Ovid had done to Cypassis).   In that case, the lover should gain the
mistress first, and then the maid (again as Ovid himself had done with
Cypassis).   Above all, he warns the lover, either do it well or don't
do it at all (aut non temptaris aut perfice (389)).   If the assault
is successful, then shared guilt will preserve their secret (as it
preserved his and Cypassis').   What Ovid advocates in this section of
the Ars. is, in fact, what he represents himself as having done in Am.
2.7 and 8 with Corinna's maid.

Finally, the theme occurs briefly in the third book.   Here, with an
argument from personal experience[69], he warns women to beware of
having a pretty serving-maid:

> nec nimium vobis formosa ancilla ministret:
>
> saepe vicem dominae praebuit illa mihi.

                                                  (3.665-6)

It is noticeable that, unlike the instance in the Amores, neither
of these passages from the Ars. is concerned with the question of the
morality or propriety of such a relationship: it is not, however,
surprising.

Now let us examine the source of the theme; to do this we must look
at the occurrence of casual relationships with slaves elsewhere in
ancient literature.   These are not uncommon and frequently, indeed
almost invariably, considerations of the propriety of such relationships
are present, or, at least, implied.   More emphasis is placed, it is
true, upon the relationships of freeborn women with male slaves.   The
Oxyrhyncus Mime and Herodas 5 deal with the adulterous relationships
of a free woman with a handsome male slave, and this became a theme of
Roman Satire (e.g. Juvenal 6.279ff; Petronius 45; cf. Martial 12.58)
and later Greek prose literature (e.g.Lucian Ep. Sat.29; Aristaenetus
2.15; Xen.Eph. 2.5.[70]).   It is found at least as early as Aristophanes
Thesm.491, and its occurrence in Aristophanes, Mime, Satire and Romance
may indicate that it was a theme of Novella[71].   (That is not to say,
of course, that such affairs are confined to literature or story-telling;

their occurrence in real life is well demonstrated by Claudius' law

of A.D.52 which diminished the status of a woman who entered into

concubinage with a slave.[72])

But the theme of a free man's relationship with a female slave is

also common.   Rufinus (AP 5.18) claims to prefer slaves to arrogant

(freeborn) women[73]:

$$\text{Μᾶλλον τῶν σοβαρῶν τὰς δουλίδας ἐκλεγόμεθα}$$
$$\text{οἱ μὴ τοῖς σπαταλοῖς κλέμμασι τερπόμενοι.}$$

This theme is inverted by Agathias (AP 5.302) who argues against

making a slave-girl one's mistress (15-16):

$$\text{ἢν δὲ μιγῇς ἰδίῃ θεραπαινίδι, τλῆθι καὶ αὐτὸς}$$
$$\text{δοῦλος ἐναλλάγδην δμωΐδι γινόμενος.}$$

The theme is by no means confined to epigram[74].   Theophrastus (4.14f)

claims that one of the characteristics of the Ἀγροικός is that

he has so little self-control that he will sink to seducing his serving-

girl, and Xenopithes in a letter of Aristaenetus (1.17) states that

before love overtook him he had experience of all types of women, slave-

girls included.   That this, too, was not simply a literary theme is

perhaps suggested by the word ancillariolus ("lover of maid-servants")

in Seneca (De Benef.1.9.4) and Martial (12.58.1) and also by

Quintilian's example of an "argument from similarity" (5.11.34): si turpis

dominae consuetudo cum servo, turpis domino cum ancilla: si mutis

animalibus finis voluptas, idem homini[75].

It is clear that the relationship of a free person with a slave has a
long literary history, one which presumably influenced the elegists
(and Horace).   Ovid and Horace, however, since they adopt a moral
pose, appear to stand closer to this tradition than Propertius, who
places no emphasis at all on the propriety of his relationship with
Lycinna.   Propertius has, in fact, ignored this tradition: Ovid
(in the _Amores_) and Horace have followed it.

However, the elegists stand together and apart from Horace in making
the _ancilla_ the rival of the mistress.   For this triangular situation
Ovid may be indebted to Propertius, although there are no verbal
similarities and no other similarities (i.e. of motifs or imagery)
between the two poets (so that it is possible that they are drawing
on a common source).   This situation, involving lover, mistress and
maid, derives from comedy, as Leo (_Plaut. Forsch._ 150) first suggested.
Leo pointed out the similarity of theme between the Ovidian Cypassis
poems and Plautus _Truculentus_ 93-4, where Diniarchus, who is in love
with the _meretrix_ Phronesium, sees Astaphium, the _ancilla_ of Phronesium,
approach and says: _sed haec quidem eius Astaphium est ancillula;/
cum ea quoque etiam mihi fuit commercium._   A closer parallel, also
cited by Leo, is Aristaenetus 2.7, which Leo believed was inspired by
New Comedy.   In this letter we have the story of a slave-girl who was
in love with her mistress's lover.   She was attractive, and so easily
seduced the lover, but they were caught in _flagranti delicto_ by the
mistress, who proceeded to tear out the girl's hair.   Albin Lesky

sees this as "Unterlage für einem Mimus"[76], but Leo may have been correct in assuming that comedy was the source since the situation here may be regarded as a conflation of two comic situations, the jealousy of the matrona of the slave-girl with whom she believes her husband to be in love (see below) and the matrona bursting into a house and discovering the husband in a compromising position with a girl, usually a meretrix (cf. Plautus Asin. 880ff., Merc.783). (Once again, however, it must be emphasised that "literary themes" also occur in real life: we should remember from Lysias' speech on Eratosthenes' murder the remarks Euphiletus alleges his wife made to him when urged to go and feed their child: ἵνα σύ γε ἔφη παρᾷς ἐνταῦθα τὴν παιδίσκην· καὶ πρότερον δὲ μεθύων εἷλκες αὐτήν (Lysias De Caed. Eratosth.12(92))

In fact, we do not have to rely on late epistolographers as evidence for this as a comic theme; satisfactory parallels can be found in Roman Comedy. In Plautus' Casina we find Cleostrata complaining of her husband's love for an ancilla (Casin.190ff.). At Caecilius Plocium 142ff. (Warmington 136ff.), the henpecked husband complains about his wife, and the reason he gives for his most recent troubles with her is that she suspects him of involvement with his ancilla (Ea me clam se cum mea ancilla ait consuetum (148)). The passage is quoted by Gellius (2.23.10) who informs us that the wife in Menander's Plocium entertained the same suspicion (2.23.8). It is true that in both Plautus and Caecilius (and Menander, his source) the "master" is

not a lover, but a husband, and it is not a mistress who is jealous of the <u>ancilla</u> but a wife. Nevertheless, the situation is still a triangular one, involving a man and a woman with a commitment to each other, and an <u>ancilla</u> who is suspected by the woman of being involved with the man. Apart from the formality of the relationship between the man and the woman, the situation parallels the elegiac situation exactly.

We cannot, of course, be certain that the elegists went to comedy for this theme. It was, as can be seen from the evidence here cited, one which occurred frequently in ancient literature, and while our few examples from comedy appear to be closer to Propertius 3.15 (and the <u>situation</u> of Ovid <u>Am.</u> 2.7 and 8 and <u>Ars.</u> 1.375ff.) in concentrating on the jealousy of the mistress/wife towards the "<u>ancilla</u>"rather than on the question of morality, we have no guarantee that the theme was not treated in a similar manner in other (epigrammatic?[77]) poetry. What is clear is that Propertius and Ovid are handling a theme taken from earlier literature, and that they have developed it in different ways. Propertius has created a very personal poem, so convincingly written that, despite the mythological "digression", it has long been subject to biographical interpretation; while Ovid, inspired by Propertius, or Horace, or Greek epigram, or a combination of all three, has produced two of the cleverest poems in the <u>Amores</u> and a witty section of the <u>Ars.</u>

THREE EPIGRAMMATIC THEMES

Little comment is needed on the elegists' acquaintance with Greek
epigram, the genre which is the ancestor, if we may use such an
Aristotelian concept[1], of the Latin love elegy. Long before the
birth of Latin elegy Hellenistic epigrams were known to and used
by the early authors of Roman erotic epigram (cf., for example,
Q. Lutatius Catulus 1 (Morel) — AP 12.73 (Callim); Porcius Licinus
6 (Morel) — AP 5.96 (Mel.); see further Day Origins 103ff.).
Epigrammatic themes occur frequently in all three elegists (see Day
Origins 113ff.) and Propertius' first poem opens with a reminiscence
of an epigram of Meleager (AP 12.101.1-2: see note 8).

Although a large number of epigrams survive in the Anthology a much
greater number have clearly been lost. This gives rise to the
problem (noted above p.127f.)of how we explain thematic resemblances
between late Greek epigrammatists, such as Paulus Silentiarius and
Agathias, and the Roman elegists. Are we to postulate a common
antecedent as earlier scholars such as Mallet and Gollnisch did (only
in Hellenistic epigram rather than, as they believed, "subjective"
elegy), or should we assume with more recent critics that these
Byzantine epigrammatists — or Paulus Silentiarius, at least — knew
and used the work of the Roman elegists? As noted above (p.127)
even if it can be demonstrated that Paulus knew the Roman elegists
(and the arguments of Viansino Paolo Silenziario XII-XV and Schulz-

Van heyden 156-169 are by no means conclusive) they also knew and
were intent on emulating earlier epigram (see Averil Cameron
Agathias (Oxford 1970) 26) and close thematic resemblances between
them and the elegists may be the result of close imitation of a
common epigrammatic antecedent. Each instance of such coincidence
must be examined individually. In general, unless linguistic
evidence can be produced to demonstrate the dependence of an
epigrammatist on an elegist, we are perhaps safer to assume a common
antecedent, but clearly it is wiser not to base arguments on such a
shaky foundation.

1.   The Irrisor Amoris

The theme of the irrisor amoris, the man who mocked love and lovers

only to fall in love himself, occurs in both Propertius and Tibullus,

but in very different contexts.   It is a theme found in epigram, and

this seems the most likely source from which the elegists drew it.

Before we examine the use of the theme in epigram, let us turn briefly

to the elegiac instances of it.

Prop. 1.9.1ff.

> Dicebam tibi venturos, irrisor, amores,
>
>> nec tibi perpetuo libera verba fore:
>
> ecce iaces supplexque venis ad iura puellae,
>
>> et tibi nunc quaevis^2 imperat empta modo.
>
> non me Chaoniae vincant in amore columbae
>
>> dicere, quos iuvenes quaeque puella domet.
>
> me dolor et lacrimas merito fecere peritum.

Ponticus, earlier addressed by Propertius in 1.7, has fallen in love.

In 1.7 he was warned that his devotion to epic would be of no use

should he ever fall in love and feel Propertius' pains (1.7.15ff.);

when that happens, Propertius had told him, he will want to compose

love poetry (note the ominous futures in 17ff.) like Propertius, who

is the spokesman for young men in love (19-24)[3].   He was warned not

to spurn this type of poetry, because the later a love comes, the more

serious it is (25-6).   Evidently Ponticus did not listen, and, in the

time lapse which 1.8 is clearly meant to represent, Ponticus has
fallen, and, as Propertius had prophesied, this serus amor really
is serious, for the object of his love is a slave-girl. Propertius
knows about Ponticus' condition because he is an expert in love,
taught by experience. The poet goes on to tell Ponticus to compose
love-poetry and set aside his epics (9-14), assuring him that he has
no shortage of material (on the copia of 15See Appendix 2), and that
his need will be increasingly urgent in the future (15-32). Finally
Ponticus is told to confess his love, since this sometimes brings
relief (33-4)[4].

Tib.1.8.71-77

> hic Marathus quondam miseros ludebat amantes
> > nescius ultorem post caput esse deum;
> saepe etiam lacrimas fertur risisse dolentis
> > et cupidum ficta detinuisse mora:
> nunc omnes odit fastus, nunc displicet illi
> > quaecumque opposita est ianua dura sera.

The poem opens with Tibullus' detection of the symptoms of love in
Marathus (1-6). The poet urges Marathus not to conceal his love (7-8),
and then launches into the "adornment serves no purpose" theme (9-16).
Marathus has not been bewitched, Tibullus continues, but has simply
fallen in love (17-20). The rest of the poem is taken up with Tibullus'
effort to persuade the girl Pholoe to accept Marathus as a lover. At 69

he warns Pholoe that the gods hate _fastidia_, and then follow the lines

quoted above, in which Marathus is used as an example of the gods'

hatred of _fastidia_; Marathus once, like Pholoe now, also mocked

miseros . . . _amantes_, but now he is in love himself and he hates

fastus (a clear echo of _fastidia_ in 69) and locked doors. Finally

in 77-8 Tibullus applies the example and tells Pholoe to put an end

to her haughtiness, or similar punishment will be hers.

Tib.1.2.87-98

> at tu qui laetus rides mala nostra, caveto
>
>> mox tibi; non uni saeviet usque deus.
>
> vidi ego, qui iuvenum miseros lusisset amores,
>
>> post Veneris vinclis subdere colla senem
>
> et sibi blanditias tremula componere voce
>
>> et manibus canas fingere velle comas:
>
> stare nec ante fores puduit caraeve puellae
>
>> ancillam medio detinuisse foro.
>
> hunc puer, hunc iuvenis turba circumterit arta,
>
>> despuit in molles et sibi quisque sinus.

At 87 the poet turns suddenly from speculation on the reasons for his

unhappy condition (he has been rejected by Delia) to address an unnamed

mocker. The mocker is told to beware; not for ever will the god vent

his wrath on Tibullus alone. Then, to underline the veracity of this

statement, the old lover is adduced as an example drawn from personal

observation (vidi ego)[5].   The poem ends with a two-line address to Venus who is asked to spare the poet, since he is her faithful servant (97-8).

The theme certainly goes back to Greek literature.   Examples abound in the novel;   cf. Xen.Eph.1.1.5ff., 1.4.1ff.; Heliodorus 3.17, 4.10; Ach. Tat. 1.7.2-3; Nicet.Eugen. 6.333[6].   Its earliest occurrence in the genre is in the Parthenope and Metiochus fragment (Lavagnini 21-4), dated to the first century B.C., though it can be traced further back in prose literature to the story of Araspus and Panthea in Xen. Cyrop. 5.1.2-18 (see Trenkner Novella 26-7).   It has its ultimate origin, presumably, in the large number of mythological stories of characters who spurned Aphrodite and were often punished for this hybris with an unhappy or impossible love-affair (e.g. Milanion, Daphnis, Atalanta)[7].

The broad outline of the theme would certainly be well known to the elegists from these famous examples of irrisores amoris, and it may seem unnecessary to look for inspiration from a particular literary genre.   It is, however, a fact that the theme was taken up by the Greek epigrammatists, and this may have been the channel through which it came into elegy.   Certainly some of the epigrammatic instances of it bear a striking resemblance to the elegiac examples cited above.

The earliest instance of the theme in epigram is AP 12.23 (Meleager).

Ἠγρεύθην ὁ πρόσθεν ἐγώ ποτε τοῖς δυσέρωσι
κώμοις ἠιθέων πολλάκις ἐγγελάσας·
καί μ' ἐπὶ σοῖς ὁ πτανὸς Ἔρως προθύροισι, Μυΐσκε,
στῆσεν ἐπιγράψας, σκῦλ' ἀπὸ σωφροσύνης.

The poet, who once laughed at lovers, has now been caught himself and
is in love with Myiscus.   Gow and Page ad loc. (HE4524) refer to Anon.
5 and 9 (AP12.100 and 99) and Mel. 103. (AP12.101) as parallels for the
motif "first love", but the motif of this poem is not so much "first
love" as "mocker overtaken by love".   In fact, AP12.99 (= HE Anon.
3684-9) and AP12.101 (= HE Mel.4540-5) are close in that the poets
maintain that they arrogantly believed (although they did not mock others)
that love could not touch them[8].   This may also have been a theme of
komastic epigrams, although no instances of it survive in the Anthology;
cf. Aristaenetus 2.20 (where an excluded lover says to the girl things
which are   μυριόλεκτα καὶ συνήθη πρὸς τὰ
παιδικὰ τοῖς ἐρῶσιν (3-4)): ἔχε με κατὰ κράτος
ἑλοῦσα τὸν πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις ἀνάλωτον (5-6).

To return to Meleager AP12.23, the major difference between the theme
as it appears here and as it appears in the elegists is immediately
apparent.   Meleager is talking about his own experience whereas
Propertius and Tibullus are warning or advising somebody else
(Propertius his friend Ponticus and Tibullus an anonymous irrisor in
1.2, and Pholoe in 1.8).   But the "mocker-overtaken-by-love" theme is
common to Meleager and the elegists.

Much closer to the elegists is a late epigram by Paulus Silentiarius,
AP5.300:

Ὁ θρασὺς ὑψαύχην τε καὶ ὀφρύας εἰς ἓν ἀγείρων
    κάται παρθενικῆς παίγνιον ἀσθενέος.
ὁ πρὶν ὑπερβασίῃ δοκέων τὴν παῖδα χαλέπτειν,
    αὐτὸς ὑποδμηθεὶς ἐλπίδος ἐκτὸς ἔβη.
καὶ ῥ' ὁ μὲν ἱκεσίοισι πεσὼν θηλύνεται οἴκτοις·
    ἡ δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἄρσενα μῆνιν ἔχει.
παρθένε θυμολέαινα, καὶ εἰ χόλον ἔνδικον αἴθες
    σβέσσον ἀγηνορίην, ἐγγὺς ἴδες Νέμεσιν.

The points of contact between this poem and Tib.1.8 are quite striking.
Both poets talk about the erstwhile arrogance of the boy (Paulus 1,3;
Tib.71-4), and his present subjection to a girl (Paulus 2,4-6; Tib.72,
75-6). Paulus ends his poem with an address to the girl, who is
invited to abandon her disdain since she has looked at Nemesis "at close
range" (ἐγγύς). Viansino (Paolo Silenziario 90) comments that
"Ciò è nuovo nella tradizione erotica, poichè di solito ... le tristi
pene subite da chi disprezzava l'amore servono come generica parenesi
didattica, rivolta non all' amata, ma ad altre persone". But the
situation of Paulus' poem parallels that of Tibullus 1.8.69ff. In
both poems the poets warn the girls to abandon their pride and give in
to the lovers, the erstwhile mockers, since refusal to do so invites
Nemesis. It is possible that Paulus took the theme from Tibullus, but
since, as we have seen, the theme of the "mocker overtaken by love"

already existed in pre-elegiac Greek epigram, it seems more likely in
this case that the elegist and epigrammatist are indebted to a common,
epigrammatic source.

A point of contact between this poem and Propertius 1.9 may also be
noted.   Ponticus, the mocker, has fallen in love, and Propertius
emphasises the extent of his fall by making the object of his love a
slave-girl and claiming that Ponticus is now her slave (4).   In
Paulus' poem similar emphasis is laid upon the greatness of the fall
by underlining the weakness of the love-object and the extent of her
control over the boy, who is her toy (κεῖται παρθενικῆς
πλύγνιον ἀδρανέος (2)).   In Propertius' poem, too, epigrammatic
influence is further suggested by the occurrence of the motif "free man
being a slave to a slave" (4), which is a motif found in an epigram of
Agathias (AP5.302.15-16) and which thus perhaps goes back to earlier
epigram.   More important, as Schulz-Vanheyden (127-8) has pointed out,
the movement of Prop.1.9.1-4 is clearly epigrammatic, recalling the
"I told you so" introductions to many erotic epigrams in the Anthology.
Schulz-Vanheyden (127) quotes as an example AP12.132 (Meleager):

Οὔ σοι ταῦτ' ἐβόων, ψυχή, 'ναὶ Κύπριν ἁλώσει,
ὦ δύσερως, ἰξῷ πυκνὰ προσιπταμένη';
οὐκ ἐβόων; εἶλεν σε πάγη· τί μάτην ἐνὶ δεσμοῖς
σπαίρεις; αὐτὸς Ἔρως τὰ πτερά σου δέδεκεν....

Cf. AP5.107 (Philodemus), 5.21 (Rufinus) etc.   For more examples, see
Schulz-Vanheyden 127 note 52.

Paulus has another poem on a similar theme in the Anthology.   In AP
5.234 the poet himself (like Meleager AP12.23) refused to yield to love,
only to be punished for his stubbornness later:

Ὁ πρὶν ἀμαλθάκτοισιν ὑπὸ φρεσὶν ἡδὺν ἐν ἥβη
οἰστροφόρου Παφίης θεσμὸν ἀπειπάμενος·
γυιοβόροις βελέεσσιν ἀνέμβατος ὁ πρὶν Ἐρώτων
αὐχένα σοὶ κλίνω, Κύπρι, μεσαιπόλιος.
δέξο με καγχαλόωσα, σοφὴν ὅτι Παλλάδα νικᾶς
νῦν πλέον ἢ τὸ πάρος μήλῳ ἐφ' Ἑσπερίδων.

This poem bears some resemblance to Tib.1.2.87ff.   Tibullus there tells
the unnamed irrisor to beware lest the same fate befall him and he become
an old lover, like one the poet claims to have seen.   The details of the
picture of the old lover may, as Smith ad loc. (231) maintains, be
indebted to comedy, where the old lover is a stock figure of fun (cf. e.g.
Demaenetus and Demea in Plaut. Asin. and Merc. respectively[9]).   But the
old lover also came into epigram, and diatribe also concerned itself with
seemly behaviour in old age[10].   In later prose literature the old lover
is very common[11].   So, while comedy seems to be the most likely source,
the theme is too widely dispersed for us to postulate generic influence
with certainty.   Further, Paulus Silentiarius seems to be using the same
combination of themes as Tibullus;   he, too, uses the "old lover" theme
in conjunction with the irrisor theme.   Paulus refused to yield to love,
and he pays for it now by being punished with love when he is μεσαιπόλιος
(4).This is the situation we find in 1.2.8ff, where the irrisor is warned

that this may be his punishment.   It may well be, then, that both
poets are imitating earlier epigram.

Let us now look again at the elegiac instances of the theme to see how
pervasive this epigrammatic influence is.

First, Propertius.   We have seen that 1.9.1-4 betrays strong epigrammatic
influence both in theme and form.   Not only do we find the epigrammatic
irrisor theme, but the movement of the lines ("I told you it would happen
and it has") is also clearly epigrammatic.   But there is much more
besides which has nothing to do with epigram.   In the first place we
note the use of dramatic development from 1.7 to 1.9, with 1.8 used as a
time-gap (just as 1.11 and 12, the Baiae poems, represent the time-gap
between 1.10 and 1.13).   Secondly, Ponticus is not simply a lover, but
a poet as well, a representative of serious poetry.   The situation
depicted in 1.7 and 1.9 is very much involved with this;   1.7 is "about"
the contrast between epic and elegy, and a large portion of 1.9 carries
on this contrast (1.9.9-16).   It also seems not unlikely that 1.8 plays
a part in this, being an example of the efficacy of elegy as a method of
persuasion in a love-affair (1.8a being the elegiac attempt to deter
Cynthia from her proposed journey, and 1.8b demonstrating how successful
this attempt was[12]).   In short, while it cannot be denied that Propertius

is indebted to epigram in 1.9, it is also clear that his debt is not very large.

Tibullus' use of the theme is very different from Propertius'. The most obvious difference is that, in both of Tibullus' uses of it, the theme is used as a warning which is not yet fulfilled, whereas, in Propertius' poem, Ponticus, the _irrisor_, has already, like his epigrammatic antecedents, fallen in love. But there are more important differences. Let us now look again at the two instances of the theme, and see how Tibullus has used it.

First, in 1.8.71-7, the theme forms part of a very different situation. In Propertius, the situation depicted in the two poems is essentially "epigrammatic" in form; Ponticus was warned that he would fall in love and he did fall. But this is not the situation of Tib.1.8. Here, Tibullus describes Marathus' hopeless love for Pholoe, and attempts to bend Pholoe's will. The _irrisor_ theme occurs only as an example in an attempt to persuade Pholoe to accept Marathus as a lover; it is not essential to the structure of the poem. It is a practical example to Pholoe of Tibullus' statement that _oderunt fastidia divi_. Pholoe is behaving as Marathus had done, and is inviting the same retribution.

It is possible that Tibullus' use of the theme is indebted to Propertius 1.9[13]. Not only do both poets utilise the _irrisor_ theme, but both also claim to detect the symptoms of love in their friends because they are

experti amoris from their own experiences (Prop.1.9.5-8; Tib.1.8. 1-6[14]), and both urge their friends to confess their love to gain some relief (Prop.1.9.33-4; Tib.1.8.7-8 somewhat differently -- concealment makes it worse).   Notice, too, the striking verbal similarities between Tibullus 9-10 (quid tibi nunc molles prodest coluisse capillos/saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas) and Prop.9-10 (quid tibi nunc misero prodest grave dicere carmen/aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae).   The publication of Propertius' first book probably antedates Tibullus 1 by about a year, and it seems more likely, therefore, that Tibullus is the imitator.   Certainty in this matter, however, is impossible, since the poems of both poets were surely in circulation for some time before the publication of their books.

In 1.2 the irrisor theme has an even more tenuous connection with the poem's situation.   The poem begins with an address to a slave who is told to give the poet more wine so that he can forget his troubles. Then Tibullus launches into a number of well-worn elegiac themes, all connected to each other but not connected to the theme from which the poem starts.   The irrisor is one of these themes, and is not in any way necessary to the poem's setting.   At 87 the poet suddenly breaks off from his meditations on the reasons for his unhappy condition to address a previously unmentioned character who has apparently been mocking him (presumably during his drinking).   At tu introduces this mocker, who is warned that a similar fate may await him, and in old

age, too, which will make matters worse.   The _irrisor_ is left in 96,
and the poem ends with the poet's plea to Venus for mercy.

In short, the two poets have made very different uses of what was
probably by their time a well-known theme.   The epigrammatic
provenance of the theme seems clear, at least in Propertius' case,
but both poets have adapted it to suit their individual methods of
composition.   Propertius uses it as part of his dramatic situation;
Tibullus uses it in a chain of themes which he links together in his
characteristic manner.

2.   <u>The Lover Under Divine Protection At Night</u>

We turn now to a much narrower topic, to the lover enjoying divine

protection while he comes to his girl at night.   We find this in

Tibullus (1.2.25ff.) and Propertius (3.16.1-20) and we find something

similar in Ovid's <u>paraclausithyron</u> (1.6.9ff., a passage often compared

with the Tibullan and Propertian examples[15]).   We shall consider all

three passages, examining their relationship to each other and to the

Greek tradition which lies behind them.

Tibullus 1.2, which contains a miniature <u>paraclausithyron,</u> we have

considered already in chapter 1.   It begins with an address to a slave

who is told to pour out more neat wine for Tibullus who wishes to get

drunk because he has been excluded by his girl (1-6).   The scene now

changes (presumably in the poet's inebriated imagination) to the door,

to which the <u>paraclausithyron</u> is addressed (7-14).   In 15-24 Tibullus

urges Delia to come out, assuring her that she will have the help of

Venus, who always lends her aid to the exploits of lovers.   This

Tibullus knows from experience, having himself been the recipient of

such aid.   Indeed, he wanders in the city after nightfall and is never

set upon by footpads:

> en ego cum tenebris tota vagor anxius urbe[16]. . .
>
> nec sinit occurrat quisquam qui corpora ferro
>
> vulneret aut rapta praemia veste petat.
>
> quisquis amore tenetur, eat tutusque sacerque
>
> qualibet; insidias non timuisse decet.

(25-28)

We are not told why the poet wanders through the city at night, but the lines which follow (29-30) provide some obvious clues:

> non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis,
>
> non mihi, cum multa decidit imber aqua.

The hardships imposed by the weather on the lover are, as we have seen, a _topos_ of the komastic situation, and when he goes on to say that the inclement weather is no problem provided that Delia opens the door and signals for him to come (31-2), we know that Tibullus comes to no harm while he proceeds through the city to Delia's house. But the poet goes beyond this in 27-8, alleging not only that the lover is safe under these circumstances but that he is safe and sacrosanct (_tutusque sacerque_) wherever he goes.

Propertius 3.16 is almost entirely devoted to the theme of the lover's journey to his mistress at night (the final 10 lines are connected to the main theme by being a reflection on the poet's death and burial should an attempt on his life be successful[17]). Propertius has been given a message at midnight: Cynthia wants him to come to Tibur immediately (1-4). He debates whether he should risk going and meeting brigands on the road to Tivoli (5-6). Then he produces a reason for going which far outweighs this reason for not doing so: if he fails to do Cynthia's bidding, he will be in a much sorrier plight, as his past experience of her anger has taught him[18]. Then he provides a second reason for going: lovers are sacrosanct and nobody would harm them:

> nec tamen est quisquam, sacros qui laedat amantis:
>
> > Scironis media sic licet ire via.
>
> quisquis amator erit, Scythicis licet ambulet oris,
>
> > nemo adeo ut noceat[19] barbarus esse volet.
>
> luna ministrat iter, demonstrant astra salebras,
>
> > ipse Amor accensas percutit ante faces,
>
> saeva canum rabies morsus avertit hiantes:
>
> > huic generi quovis tempore tuta via est.
>
> > > (3.16.11-18)

Propertius then goes on to suggest, as a subsidiary reason for the lover's immunity to the dangers of the night, that his poor physical condition would arouse the footpad's compassion and stay his hand[20].

In *Am.*1.6 Ovid, like Tibullus, uses the theme in the context of the paraclausithyron. Ovid's paraclausithyron is, however, as we saw in chapter 1, of a very different kind, its tone being made clear by the opening lines in which the poet begs the ianitor to leave the door ajar only a little since love has produced such physical deterioration in him that he could slip through a small crack[21]. The mention of love leads Ovid to elaborate now on the power of Amor who, he says, can direct the lover past the custodes and prevent him from stumbling (7-8). Then, like Tibullus, Ovid appeals to personal experience[22] in support of this contention. He, too, was afraid of the dark but Cupid laughed and told him that he would be brave (9-12). Ovid continues:

nec mora, venit amor : non umbras nocte volantis,

    non timeo strictas in mea fata manus;

te nimium lentum timeo, tibi blandior uni:

    tu, me quo possis perdere, fulmen habes[23].

<div style="text-align:right">(Am.1.6.13-16)</div>

The passages are thematically similar.   All three poets talk about the lover's facing the dangers of the night, Ovid claiming that love removes the fear of them and Propertius and Tibullus that love gives the lover immunity to them.   In this the elegists are adapting and developing a Greek theme.   The lover's lack of fear in the face of danger or hardship can be paralleled in a number of later Greek prose authors.   According to Plutarch, the man in love fears nothing and can brave even the thunderbolts of Zeus: ὁ ἐρωτικὸς ὀλίγου δεῖν ἁπάντων περιφρονῶν .... φοβούμενος δὲ μηδὲν μηδὲ θαυμάζων μηδὲ θεραπεύων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν 'αἰχματὰν κεραυνὸν' οἷος ὢν ὑπομένειν. (Amatorius 762E).   In Longus, Daphnis is ready to face a long and dangerous journey through the snow to come to Chloe for, Longus tells us, ἔρωτι δ'ἄρα πάντα βάσιμα, καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ Σκυθικὴ χιών (3.5.)[24].

cf. also Musaeus 2.47-50, Aristaenetus 2.17.9ff.

Both the elegists and these authors have probably drawn the theme from epigram. In two poems in the Anthology we find love enabling lovers to brave the elements, to face, like Daphnis would have been able to, fire and snow and, like Plutarch's ἐρωτικός , even the thunderbolts of Zeus:

καὶ πυρὶ καὶ νιφετῷ με καί, εἰ βούλοιο κεραυνῷ
βάλλε, καὶ εἰς κρημνοὺς ἕλκε καὶ εἰς πελάγη·
τὸν γὰρ ἀπαυδήσαντα πόθοις καὶ Ἔρωτι δαμέντα
οὐδὲ Διὸς τρύχει πῦρ ἐπιβαλλόμενον.

(AP5.168(Anon.))

Asclepiades declares his determination to go to his girl's doors no matter what the weather conditions:

Νῖφε, χαλαζοβόλει, ποίει σκότος, αἶθε, κεραύνου,
πάντα τὰ πορφύροντ' ἐν χθονὶ σεῖε νέφη.
ἢν γάρ με κτείνῃς, τότε παύσομαι· ἢν δέ μ' ἀφῇς ζῆν
καὶ διαδὺς τούτων χείρονα, κωμάσομαι....

(AP5.64(Asclep.))

In these poems, as in the later Greek examples cited above, we find only the lover's defiance of weather conditions as he is urged by love to come to his mistress (for similar fearlessness by the lover, cf. Prop. 2.27.11-12). Closer to the elegiac motif is an anonymous epigram in the twelfth book:

Ἄκρητον μανίην ἔπιον· μεθύων μέγα μύθοις
ὥπλισμαι πολλὴν εἰς ὁδὸν ἀφροσύναν.
κωμάσομαι· τί δέ μοι βροντέων μέλει, ἢ τί κεραυνῶν;
ἢν βάλλῃ, τὸν ἔρωθ' ὅπλον ἄτρωτον ἔχων.

(AP.12.115(Anon.))

The poem is a development of the theme of the two epigrams quoted

above.   Again the lover will brave the elements (including

thunderbolts), but now love is a   ὅπλον   (shield) against

them (4).   Notice, too, that, like Asclepiades' poem (AP5.64),

this epigram is komastic (so perhaps is AP5.168 (Anon.), quoted

above, though the author is not explicit in this regard).

The protection of the lover on the way to his girl's doors is

implied also in an epigram by Posidippus, in which he claims to

have had Eros as his guide, when he came drunk and through footpads

to the house[25]:

Πυθιάς εἰ μὲν ἔχει τιν', ἀπέρχομαι· εἰ δὲ καθεύδει
ὧδε μόνη, μικρόν, πρὸς Διός, ἐσκαλέσαις.
εἰπὲ δὲ σύμβολον, μεθύων ὅτι καὶ διὰ κλωπῶν
ἤλθον, Ἔρωτι θρασεῖ χρώμενος ἡγεμόνι.

(AP5.213.(Posid.))

Again the theme occurs in a komastic context;   the poem is a

paraclausithyron in which the poet addresses the slave of his

girl Pythias.

There can be little doubt that the elegiac theme is indebted to

Greek epigram.   Now we must see how far the Greek epigrammatic

tradition influenced the elegists, and how much the elegists

influenced each other.   The most significant aspect of the

epigrammatic examples quoted above is, as we have noted, that they

are all komastic.   We should note, too, the references to inclement

weather, common in the komastic situation (5.64.1-2 (Asclep.);   5.

168.1-2,4(Anon.);   12.115.3 (Anon.)), to footpads (5.213.3) and also

to the protection of Eros for the travelling lover (5.213.4 (Posid.);

12.115.4 (Anon.)).

Tibullus' is chronologically the first of the elegies under discussion[26].

We have already noticed that he, like the epigrammatists, uses the theme

in a komastic context.   Furthermore, like Posidippus (AP5.213), he

refers to footpads (27-8), and like the three other epigrammatists he

refers to the adverse weather conditions which he is able to face,

thanks to love's aid.   The influence of Greek epigram on Tibullus,

then, is clear.   Two differences, however, should be noticed.   First,

Tibullus' poem is a long elegy, not an epigram, and, as usual, the motif

is only one of a number of interconnected themes. Secondly, the motif

is extended by Tibullus.   In epigram we find love as a shield   (AP

12.115,4(Anon.)) and love as a guide (AP5.213.4 (Posidippus)), and in

both instances the reference is to the protection of the lover as he

comes to the door of his girl;   indeed, we must assume that this

protection or guidance remains in operation only while the lover is on

love's errand, i.e. while he is coming to the girl's door (cf. in elegy,

Tib.2.1.75-6 <u>hoc (sc. Cupidine) duce custodes furtim transgressa iacentes/
ad iuvenem tenebris sola puella venit</u>). Tibullus follows the Greek
examples by referring to his own protection by love, in the past, in a
komastic situation (Delia will also, the poet implies, be given such help
since she is now in a komastic situation, as the recipient); but he goes
on to make the further point that a lover is safe and sacrosanct
everywhere (27-8), and this occurs in no extant Greek epigram.

It has often been noted, correctly, that Propertius' poem is indebted
to Tibullus 1.2[27].   Solmsen ("Propertius in his literary relations" 278)
points out the similarity of Tib.27-28 <u>quisquis amore tenetur eat tutusque
sacerque/qualibet</u> to Prop.12 <u>quisquis amator erit, Scythicis licet ambulet
oris</u> (As Tränkle (<u>Sprachkunst</u> 99) observes, Propertius has made specific
Tibullus' generalisation: Tibullus' lover is safe anywhere, Propertius'
in a particular far off and barbarous land).   Perhaps the most convincing
argument for Tibullan influence is that both poets refer to the lover's
sacrosanctity: cf. Tib.27 <u>tutusque sacerque</u>, Prop.11 <u>nec tamen est
quisquam sacros qui laedat amantes.</u>   <u>Sacer</u> of a person is not common,
and when it does occur, it usually means "accursed" or "wicked"[28].   Clearly
it does not have this meaning in either of these examples: here it must
mean "sacrosanct".   This is the only example of <u>sacer</u> used personally in
Propertius, while in Tibullus it occurs only once elsewhere (2.5.114,
where it refers to the sacrosanctity enjoyed by the poet).   That
Propertius was influenced by this poem of Tibullus seems, therefore, very
likely (though he must also have been acquainted with the Greek

epigrammatic tradition[29]).

However, Propertius puts the theme to very different use.   In the
Greek epigrams considered already and in Tibullus the theme is connected
with the komos or with the paraclausithyron.   In Propertius this
connection is very weak[30].   The poet claims that his mistress has
summoned him to Tibur, a long way to go on a komos (and with no chance
of his being excluded on his arrival since he comes on Cynthia's
instructions).   The poem gives his immediate reaction to the summons,
a reaction which is clearly humorous[31].   When he claims that his
mistress's anger is more to be feared than the danger of footpads, one
is reminded of the humorously overdrawn picture of the femina furibunda
in 4.8.51ff.[32]   Indeed, the lover's immunity is only the secondary
reason for making the dangerous journey, and Propertius goes on to add
another reason for going, namely that no one would be so wicked as to
spill a lover's thin blood, an illogical addition once the lover's
immunity has been established (as, indeed, are the final five couplets
of reflection on the poet's death and burial).   The real reason for his
going is his fear of Cynthia,which weighs more in his mind than the
dangers of the night.   Thus the motif has been removed from its
traditional setting and made to serve a different purpose[33].   However,
traces of the original komastic associations of the theme remain, for
the examples of the protection of Amor in 15ff. are distinctly komastic.
Amor carries the faces for the lover (for this topos of the paraclausithyron
see above p. 28)[34], and(more important since any night-journey would

involve the use of link-boys) he protects the lover from dogs, a traditional hazard for the komast (see above p.29 and p.71).

It is very likely that Ovid also knew Tibullus' poem; since both he and Tibullus belonged to Messalla's circle and Ovid more than once professes admiration for Tibullus[35] this is almost certain. However, Ovid's poem bears only a superficial resemblance to Tibullus', while the differences between them are striking. In Ovid, as in Tibullus, the motif is komastic: indeed Ovid's poem is a paraclausithyron. Unlike Tibullus, however, Ovid does not introduce the notion that the lover enjoys divine protection: he only states that he once feared the dark, but Cupid gave him courage and now he no longer fears shadows and footpads (9-14). This use of the motif is, in fact, closer to the Greek epigrams cited above (and to Prop.2.27.11-12) than it is to either Tibullus' or Propertius' poem. Indeed, the resemblance to Posidippus AP5.213 is particularly striking. Both poems are paraclausithyra in which we find references to footpads (Ovid 14, Posidippus 3) and to love's powers as a guide (Ovid 7-8, Posidippus 4), and both poems are addressed to slaves who are asked to admit the poet. Ovid may well have had Posidippus' poem in mind when he wrote Am.1.6.

That is not to say, however, that Posidippus was the only influence on Ovid. Line 14 non timeo strictas in mea fata manus undoubtedly reveals Propertian influence, for we find a similar pentameter ending at Prop. 3.9.56 Antonique gravis in sua fata manus. More significant is the

fact that a similar line ending occurs in 3.16 where Propertius, like

Ovid, is talking about his fear of footpads on the road to his mistress:

cf. 3.16.6 <u>ut timeam audaces in mea membra manus</u>.   The lines are too

close for the resemblance to be coincidental, and since the context of

both passages is similar we may confidently assume that we have here a

conscious reminiscence of Propertius, which Ovid may have expected his

readers (or listeners) to recognise[36].

Kiessling noted the similarity between the elegiac theme and Hor. <u>Odes</u>

1.22.9-16, where Horace claims, in an example drawn from "personal

experience", that a wolf fled from him while he sang of his Lalage

in the countryside[37].   Recently Nisbet and Hubbard have claimed that

Horace "is applying to himself, not without amusement, the elegists'

commonplace that the lover is a sacred person under divine protection"

(<u>Odes</u> 1 262-3), quoting, to support their contention, Prop.3.16.11ff.,

Tib.1.2.27ff., Ovid <u>Am.</u>1.6.13ff., <u>AP</u>5.213.3ff. (Posidippus) and Longus

3.5.   These examples are not, however, valid in every case.   Longus

3.5 (quoted above) contains no suggestion that a lover enjoys divine

protection,while Posidippus <u>AP</u>5.213, as we have seen, refers only to

Eros's guidance of the lover to the girl's doors and there is no

suggestion that the lover is at all times "a sacred person under divine

protection".   Nor, indeed, is there such a suggestion in Ovid <u>Am.</u>1.6[38].

In fact, what Nisbet and Hubbard refer to as "the elegists' commonplace"

is no such thing, for two examples (the one imitating the other) do not

make a commonplace[39].   We should note, too, that 3.16 had probably not

been published when Odes 1-3 appeared, but it is quite possible that

Horace had read or heard it before publication.   (This is the view of

Richard Haywood ("Integer Vitae and Propertius" CJ37 (1941-2) 28-32)who

sees Odes 1.22 as a "persiflage . . . aimed at the expression of the

idea in the sixteenth poem of Propertius' third book".   Indeed, there

may be a connection between Propertius' poem and Horace's in that both

refer not just to divine protection, but to divine protection against

savage animals, dogs in Propertius' case, and a wolf in Horace's).

It does, indeed, seem likely that Horace is parodying a theme of elegy

- perhaps of Tibullus, in particular, if he did not know Propertius'

poem - but to refer to the theme as an "elegists' commonplace" is a

mistake.

In short, while this theme has its roots in Greek epigram, it is

developed and variously treated by the elegists (and Horace).   Tibullus

adds the idea of the sacrosancity of the lover, an idea which he derived

from the Greek theme of Love's guidance/protection of the lover on his

komos to the girl's doors.   Propertius takes this idea from Tibullus,

but takes the motif from its traditional position in the paraclausithyron

and gives it a fresh, lively context.   The elegist who stays closest

to the spirit of the Greek epigrams is the latest one.   Ovid makes no

mention of the lover's enjoyment of heaven's protection, and appears

to be deeply indebted to Greek epigram, perhaps to Posidippus in

particular, and yet this poem, with its light-hearted twist of

traditional themes,is characteristically Ovidian.

3.   The Attractions Of Different Girls

The poet's assertion that he is attracted by the different charms of

several types of women is found in all three poets.   Propertius tells

his friend Demophoon of this "weakness" of his in 2.22A, and inverts

the theme three poems later (2.25.41ff.).   Ovid makes a similar

confession in Am.2.4, and Priapus tells Tibullus in 1.4 that all boys

are attractive in their various ways.   The theme of Ovid Am.2.10, a

claim by the poet to be in love with two specific girls at the same

time, is, though related, not quite the same[40] and is therefore treated

separately here.

Amores 2.4 clearly reveals the influence of Propertius 2.22A, although

the development of the poems is very different[41].   Propertius' poem is

in the form of a monologue to Demophoon.   Demophoon knows, the poet

states, that on the day before Propertius was attracted to many girls

in the theatres;   he was attracted to girls on the stage, and to girls

in the audience (1-12).   He then pretends that Demophoon interjects[42]

and asks him the reason for this behaviour;   there is no answer to this,

he says - this vitium is in his nature and will not change (13-20).

Then he counters an objection, which he assumes Demophoon will make,

that many women are bad for his health;   no girl, he claims, has yet

had reason to find fault with his performance (21-4).   Like Jupiter

in his affair with Alcmena, Achilles with Briseis or Hector with

Andromache, he too is fresh the day after (25-34).   Then the poet

returns to his main theme, adding an argument from utility for his

plurality of affairs: a ship is safer when two cables hold it (35-42).

Ovid begins with a confession that he has no control over his feelings:
he is constantly falling in love (1-10).   He loves a girl if she is shy
or if she is forward or if she is stern and virtuous (11-16);   he loves
her if she is cultured or uncultured (17-18);   whether she praises or
criticises his poetry (19-22).   He loves a girl who walks gracefully,
or a girl who is awkward;   one who sings well   or plays well or dances
well (25-32).   She can be tall or short (33-36), well - or poorly-dressed
(37-8).   Her skin can be pale, golden or black;   her hair can be dark or
fair;   she can be young or old (39-46).   In fact, he loves all types of
women (47-8).

Although developed differently, the themes of both poems are essentially
the same.   Propertius and Ovid both claim that they are constantly
falling in love[43], and both claim that this is a _vitium_ (Prop.17, Ovid 2)
(though Propertius later abandons this position to argue for the benefits
of a plurality of love-affairs (35ff.)).   Propertius' poem clearly
influenced Ovid.   It seems likely, too, that Ovid borrowed from
Propertius the idea of attraction to a beautiful singer or dancer: Ovid
29 _illa placet gestu numerosaque bracchia ducit_ looks like a reminiscence
of Propertius 5-6 _sive aliquis molli diducit candida gestu/bracchia._
However, as Neumann (66ff.) points out, Ovid's debt to Propertius is not
confined to 2.22A;   he also was influenced by 2.25.

In this poem Propertius complains that he is out of favour with Cynthia,
but that he will remain steadfast in his love for her.   At 38ff. he turns
to those people who would advocate dividing one's affections between
several women and claims that one woman is enough trouble for any man.
Lines 41-6 clearly influenced Ovid:

> vidistis pleno teneram candore puellam,
>
>   vidistis fuscam, ducit uterque color;
>
> vidistis quandam Argiva prodire figura,
>
>   vidistis nostras, utraque forma rapit;
>
> illaque plebeio vel sit sandycis amictu:
>
>   haec atque illa mali vulneris una via est.

With lines 41-2 cf. Ovid 39-40:

> candida me capiet, capiet me flava puella;
>
>   est etiam in fusco grata colore venus.

For the attractions of plain and ornate dress (Prop.45-6) cf. Ovid 37-8
non est culta: subit quid cultae accedere possit;/ ornata est: dotes
exhibet ipsa suas.   Perhaps, too, Ovid's veteres heroidas aequas (33)
was inspired by Propertius 43 vidistis quandam Argiva prodire figura,
since the adjective Argivus (=Greek) is an epic usage, very rare in
elegy, with a distinctly "heroic" ring[44].

Ovid may also owe something to Tibullus.   At 11ff. he claims that he is
attracted by a shy girl, and also by a forward girl.   Priapus (Tib.1.4.
13-14) feels the same about boys:

> hic, quia fortis adest audacia, cepit;   at illi
>
> virgineus teneras stat pudor ante genas[45].

Compare also Ovid 9-10:

> Non est certa meos quae forma invitet amores;
>
> centum sunt causae cur ego semper amem.

with Tib.1.4.9-10:

> O fuge te tenerae puerorum credere turbae:
>
> nam causam iusti semper amoris habent.

Inter-borrowing between Propertius and Tibullus is also possible, but
not certain by any means.   Tibullus lists the attractive features of
different boys (1.4.11-14) as Propertius lists the attractive features
of different girls in 2.22A.5-10 and, more important (because Propertius,
like Tibullus, claims to be attracted to certain features and their
opposites) in 2.25.41-6.   However, the attractive features listed by the
one poet are different from those listed by the other[46], and it might be
argued that both poets are simply writing within the same tradition.

If this is, in fact, the case, the tradition is an epigrammatic one,
which is very strong in the Anthology from Rhianos in the third century
B.C. to Strato in the second A.D.   To see the extent of epigrammatic
influence in the elegists we shall now examine the theme first in
pre-elegiac epigram (that is in the epigrammatists who were composing
before the Augustan Age, and then in post-elegiac epigram (since the
motifs of later epigram, where they coincide with those of elegy, can

perhaps be traced back to earlier epigram, now lost).

A. Pre-elegiac Epigram

In pre-Augustan Greek epigram we find several instances of the poet's confession that he is attracted to more than one girl or boy (we shall return to this in our discussion of Am.2.4, where the poet claims to have fallen in love with two girls simultaneously). For example Meleager (AP9.16) claims to be in love with three girls at the same time, as does the author of AP12.89 (Anon.). Elsewhere, Meleager claims to be attracted to several boys (AP12.256): cf. also AP12.95 (Meleager), 12.87 (Anon.). In these examples, however, the poet states only that he is attracted to several girls or boys: he does not, like the elegiac poets, give the reasons for each of his attractions. We do, however, find this theme in Rhianus AP12.93.

οἱ παῖδες λαβύρινθος ἀνέξοδος· ᾗ γὰρ ἂν ὄμμα
ῥίψῃς, ὡς ἰξῷ τοῦτο προσαμπέχεται.
τῇ μὲν γὰρ Θεόδωρος ἄγει ποτὶ πίονα σαρκὸς
ἀκμὴν καὶ γυίων ἄνθος ἀκηράσιον·
τῇ δὲ Φιλοκλῆος χρύσεον ῥέθος, ὃς τὸ καθ' ὕψος
οὐ μέγας, οὐρανίῃ δ' ἀμφιτέθηλε χάρις.
ἢν δ' ἐπὶ Λεπτίνεω στρέψῃς δέμας, οὐκέτι γυῖα
κινήσεις, ἀλύτῳ δ' ὡς ἀδάμαντι μενεῖς
ἴχνια κολληθείς· τοῖον σέλας ὄμμασιν αἴθει
κοῦρος καὶ νεάτους ἐκ κορυφῆς ὄνυχας.
χαίρετε καλοὶ παῖδες, ἐς ἀκμαίην δὲ μόλοιτε
ἥβην, καὶ λευκὴν ἀμφιέσαισθε κόμην.

Very similar, as the compiler of the Anthology must have seen, is the
epigram which stands next to this, AP12.94 (Meleager):

τερπνὸς μὲν Διόδωρος, ἐν ὄμμασι δ'Ἡράκλειτος,
  ἡδυεπὴς δὲ Δίων, ὀσφύϊ δ'Οὐλιάδης.
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν ψαύοις ἁπαλόχροος, ᾧ δὲ, Φιλόκλεις,
  ἔμβλεπε, τῷ δὲ λάλει, τὸν δὲ .... τὸ λειπόμενον.
ὡς γνῷς οἷος ἐμὸς νόος ἄφθονος· ἢν δὲ Μυΐσκῳ
  λίχνος ἐπιβλέψῃς, μηκέτ' ἴδοις τὸ καλόν.

In these epigrams we come closer to the theme as we find it in elegy:
the poets are attracted by the many different features or attributes
of various boys[47].

B. Post-elegiac Epigram

In later epigram only Strato develops the theme.   In one of his
epigrams (AP12.198) he simply states (like Meleager AP9.16 and 12.95
and the authors of AP12.87 (Anon.) and 12.89 (Anon.)) that he is a lover
of all boys, without giving reasons for his attraction to various kinds
of boys.   In three other poems, however, he is closer to the epigrams
considered in the previous section (AP12.93 (Rhianus) and 12.94
(Meleager)) and to Roman elegy.   In AP12.4 he claims to love boys of
all ages between twelve and sixteen.   In AP12.244 he loves boys who are
white-skinned, honey-complexioned or who have auburn hair.   Closest to
elegy is probably AP12.5:

τοὺς λευκοὺς ἀγαπῶ, φιλέω δ'ἅμα τοὺς μελιχρώδεις
καὶ ξανθούς, στέργω δ'ἔμπαλι τοὺς μέλανας.
οὐδὲ κόρας ξανθὰς παραπέμπομαι ἀλλὰ περισσῶς
τοὺς μελανοφθάλμους αἰγλοφανεῖς τε φιλῶ.

We can see that Strato is here using opposites to emphasise his
attraction to different types of boys: he loves fair-skinned and
olive-skinned boys; he loves fair-haired and dark-haired boys; he
loves brown eyes, and sparkling black eyes. This use of opposites
is something not found in earlier epigram; Rhianus (12.93) and
Meleager (12.94) certainly list the physical attributes which attract
them to different boys, but these attributes are not arranged as
opposites. We do, however, find this in elegy, in the poems under
consideration; cf. Prop. 2.25.41ff., Tib. 1.4.13-14., Ovid Am.2.4.11-46.
Notice, too, the reference to skin-colour in line 1 of Strato's poem,
paralleled in Ovid Am.2.4.39-40. Geffken ("Strato" REZweite Reihe
IV 277) rightly calls Strato a "Buchpederast" and claims that even
where parallels are lacking one may assume that the themes of his
poems are a "Variierung älterer Vorwurfe". This use of opposites
may be a variation by Strato of the "multiplicity-of-loves" theme of
earlier epigram, but since we also find this technique in elegy it
is surely plausible to trace it back to pre-elegiac epigram.

There remains the consideration of what the individual elegist has
done to vary or adapt this traditional theme of epigram.

i. Tibullus 1.4.11-14

It can now be seen that Tibullus is following the Greek epigrammatic
tradition when he makes Priapus claim that boys can attract by different,
even opposite, qualities. Even so, the motif as it appears in this poem
is essentially different from what we have observed in epigram. Apart
from the obvious difference that it occupies only a small place in
Tibullus' poem as the introductory section, as it were, of Priapus'
Ars Amandi[48], the qualities listed by Priapus as attractive are
different from those listed by any of the epigrammatic poets. In
epigram reference is made only to physical features which the poet
thinks attractive (skin-colour, hair, eyes, etc.). Tibullus, however,
begins not with physical features but with physical activities (horse-
riding and swimming (11-12))[49], with only a hint of an attractive
physical appearance in the word niveo (12). Furthermore, the picture
here is a Roman one, or Romanised one: the boys, like Horace's Sybaris
(Odes1.8), are presumably riding in the Campus Martius and swimming in
the Tiber[50]. Then the poet refers to qualities of character, to the
modest and forward types (13-14), and this, too, is not found in the
epigrams we have considered (though it is found elsewhere in epigram[51]).

ii. Propertius 2.22A and 2.25.39-46

In 2.22A Propertius also makes considerable changes in the theme and his
use of it is very different from epigram. First, like Tibullus, he too
puts it in a Roman context, and ties it to a particular occasion. He
claims that his attraction to several different girls was witnessed by his

friend the previous day, that the compita give him success and the theatres are his undoing (3-4. nulla meis frustra lustrantur compita plantis/o nimis exitio nata theatra meo). Boyancé ("Properce aux fêtes du quartier" REA52 (1950) 64-70) is correct in seeing here a reference to the Ludi Compitales (a suggestion which Camps (2.151-2) supports with arguments from style). Thus the different girls to whom Propertius claims to be attracted are all set within a limited context; he was attracted on a particular occasion (a Roman festival) and in a particular place (the theatres)[52]. Notice, too, that like Tibullus he departs from the epigrammatic motif in not simply listing physical characteristics which attract him. Instead, as the context requires, he gives a small picture of each girl to whom he is attracted, at the theatrical performances -- the dancer with the supple white arms (5-6), the skilful singer (6), the girl in the audience with uncovered breast (7-8), the girl with a pearl on her forehead (9-10).

Most important, however, is the quality of dramatic development which the poem is given[53]. In 1-12 Propertius claims that he is attracted to different types of girls. Then at 13 he puts a question in the mouth of his friend Demophoon[54]: he informs his readers that Demophoon wants to know why the poet is mollis in omnes. The rest of the poem is an answer to this, or rather a set of different answers. First he claims that there is no answer; this tendency of his is a vitium which is in his nature (14-18). Then in 19-20 a note of self-justification creeps in. He begins to suspect that Demophoon's question springs from jealousy

(invide 20), and so he proclaims in a tone of self-righteousness that
he will never be blind to beauty (the implication being that nobody
should be blind to beauty). The answer, of course, is not strictly
logical, but logic should not always be expected from a love-poet.
He then assumes that a further objection on Demophoon's part will be
the effect of this rakish life on the poet's health, and he counters
this objection by an appeal to the examples of Jupiter, Achilles and
Hector (21-34). Their love-affairs did not prevent them from doing
their duty. Finally, he claims that more than one love at a time
is profitable (35-40). Propertius has, in fact, moved from a position
of admitted guilt at the beginning of the poem to one of self-
justification at the end, and he does this by means of Demophoon, to
whose questions he assigns a motive of jealousy and against whom he
consequently reacts emotionally. Thus while the poem begins as a
development of an epigrammatic theme, and even ends "epigrammatically"
with an aphoristic couplet reminiscent of the concluding lines of many
Greek epigrams[55], Propertius has produced a highly original poem which
bears little resemblance to any poem in the Anthology[56].

Prop.2.25.39-46 is much closer to epigram, although the poet here
introduces the theme only for refutation. The poem reflects on the
poet's devotion to Cynthia, despite her rejection of him, and in the
final section Propertius attacks those who would advocate a number of
simultaneous love-affairs; one woman, claims the poet, is enough
trouble for anyone. The application of the theme thus seems very

different from epigram, and is very different;   the similarity lies

in the emphasis laid by Propertius on purely physical characteristics

(skin-colour (41-2);   figure (43-4)) and also in the fact that the

subject of the passage (vos(39)) is attracted by opposing qualities

(light and dark skin (41-2);   Greek and Roman figure (43-4);   poor and

rich dress (45-6)).   But what the poet has done is introduce the

theme simply for rejection, and he makes a point which is diametrically

opposed to the epigrammatic motif: una sit et cuivis femina multa mala

(48).

iii Ovid Am.2.4.

We have already considered Ovid's debt to Propertius and his possible

debt to Tibullus.   Once Propertian and Tibullan influence is granted,

it is difficult to estimate the direct effect of Greek epigram in the

details of 2.4.   There appear to be more points of detail in common

with Propertius than with extant epigram.   Only at 41ff., where the

poet claims to be attracted by girls with dark hair and fair hair, do

we find a motif which Ovid shares only with an epigrammatist (AP12.5.2

(Strato)) and not with either of his elegiac predecessors.

However, while in the details of the poem there appears to be more

contact with Propertius than with epigram, in the development of the

theme Ovid is much closer to epigram than he is to Propertius.   The

theme (unlike Prop.2.25.38ff. and Tib.1.4.10ff.) occupies the whole

poem, and we do not find the intricate psychological development that

we find in Prop. 2.22A. Ovid's poem begins with the statement that
he is attracted to all types and that he cannot control himself, then
runs through a list of the types which do attract him and concludes as
it started with the statement that he loves all types of women. It is
true that the types mentioned are more numerous and of a different kind
from those of epigram: we find Tibullus' modest/forward type (11-14),
Propertius' singer/dancer (25-30), fair/dark girls (39-40) and well/poorly-
dressed girls (37-8), but we also find cultured/uncultured girls (17-18),
the girls who like Ovid's poetry and the girls who find fault with it
(19-22), short girls and tall girls (33-6), fair-haired and dark-haired
girls (41-44), young girls and older women (45-6). But the fact remains
that after the introduction (1-10) Ovid's treatment is after the manner
of Greek epigram, involving only an addition to the epigrammatic list of
types of attractive features. Ovid's poem is very different from
Propertius'.

We turn now to the rather different, though related, theme of Ovid
Am.2.10, in which the poet claims to be in love with two girls at the
same time. Ovid begins by addressing Graecinus[57], who had told him
that it was impossible to love two women at once; this the poet now
denies because that is the position in which he finds himself (1-4).
Both girls are equally matched in beauty, dress and accomplishments,
and he wavers in love between the two like a boat in conflicting winds
(5-10). He asks why Venus tortures him like this (11-14), but then he
changes his tune and claims that his present situation is better than a

life without love and if one woman cannot satisfy him, then let there
be two!   (15-22).   He has strength enough for this (23-8) and he is
ready to die in love's service (29-38).

This is different from the elegiac examples considered above.   There
the claim was made by the poets (by Priapus in Tibullus) that they
found attractive several different types of women or boys: they were
attracted by different, even opposing, characteristics.   Here, however,
Ovid claims to be in love simultaneously with two specific girls.   This
is not the same, and the theme has a rather different literary history.
Nevertheless, it is clear that in this poem, too, Ovid is indebted to
Propertius 2.22A.

Ovid's poem falls into two parts.   In 1-14 he complains that he is in
love with two different girls at the same time;   then (15-38) he
justifies his position by claiming that it is preferable to a loveless
life and that he is strong enough to fulfil his obligations to both
girls.   The resemblance to Prop.2.22A is clear.   Both poets, in
addressing friends, change their attitudes towards the circumstances
in which they find themselves in mid-poem, and both claim that they are
physically capable of discharging their duties to the girls.   In
particular, note the resemblance of:

> sed tibi si exilis videor tenuatus in artus,
>
>   falleris: haud umquam est culta labore Venus.
>
> percontere licet: saepe est experta puella

officium tota nocte valere meum.

<div align="right">(Prop.2.22A.21-4)</div>

to

sufficiam: graciles, non sunt sine viribus artus;

pondere, non nervis, corpora nostra carent.

et lateri dabit in vires alimenta voluptas:

decepta est opera nulla puella mea;

saepe ego lascive consumpsi tempora noctis . . .

<div align="right">(Am.2.10.22-6)</div>

As Bürger (De Ov. Carm.16) and Neumann (84) point out, Propertius'
examples from mythology in 25ff. are omitted by Ovid who prefers to use
the example of personal experience: saepe ego lascive consumpsi tempora
noctis/utilis et forti corpore mane fui (27-8).

There seem to be two other Propertian reminiscences in the poem. At
11f. Ovid claims that Venus is doubling his pains by giving him two loves:
this is probably inspired by Prop.2.25.41ff. where the poet claims that
one woman is trouble enough for any man. Further, Ovid 17-18 hostibus
eveniat viduo dormire cubili/et medio laxe ponere membra toro is clearly
a reminiscence of Prop.2.8.20 hostibus eveniat lenta puella meis[58].

The theme of a man's love for two (or more) specific girls or boys is
also found in epigram. We have already seen instances of this. Meleager
(AP9.16) claims to be simultaneously in love with three:

Τρισσαὶ μὲν Χάριτες, τρεῖς δὲ γλυκυπάρθενοι Ὧραι
τρεῖς δ'ἐμὲ θηλυμανεῖς οἰστοβαλοῦσι πόθοι.
ἦ γάρ τοι τρία τόξα κατείρυσεν, ὡς ἄρα μέλλων
οὐχὶ μίαν τρώσειν, τρεῖς δ'ἐν ἐμοὶ καρδίας;

Another poet also suffers the pains of three arrows in one heart, in a
poem which is either an imitation of Meleager or imitated by him (AP
12.89 (Anon.)). The author of AP12.87 (Anon.) claims that he is
'burned' by Damon, Ismenus and other boys as well. In AP12.95 Meleager
varies the theme somewhat with a wish that his friend Phanocles enjoy the
various delights of eight different boys (cf. also AP12.256 (Meleager)).
Closer to Ovid is AP12.88 (Anon.) whose author claims that two passions
are consuming him; he is in love with both Asander and Telephus, and he
suggests that he be cut in two and his limbs divided between the two boys.
Similarly Polystratus (AP12.91) is in love with Antiochus and Stasicrates,
and he appears to tell his eyes, which caused the trouble, to be completely
consumed by the fires of love[59].

A variation is an epigram in which Philodemus claims to be in love with a
hetaera and a virgin at the same time (AP12.173). Philodemus cannot say
which of the two is the more desirable (1-4), but he concludes that the
virgin is because he desires "everything that is kept under guard" (5-6).
Similarly Strato (AP12.246) claims to love and be loved by a pair of
brothers and he cannot choose between them. The one makes himself
available, the other plays "hard to get"; the one pleases by his presence,
the other by his absence.

An epigram of particular interest for Ovid's poem is <u>AP</u>5.232 (Paulus

Silentiarius) in which the speaker, a girl, claims that her love

fluctuates between Hippomenes, Leander and Xanthus[60]. The last two

lines of the poem are particularly relevant to Ovid:

$$\text{εἰ δέ τις ἡμῖν}$$
$$\text{μέμφεται, ἐν πενίη μιμνέτω οἰογάμω.}$$

cf. Ovid 17-18

> hostibus eveniat viduo dormire cubili
>
> et medio laxe ponere membra toro.

The explanation for this similarity is probably a common antecedent.

In this case another piece of evidence makes a common antecedent a more

likely hypothesis than Paulus' dependance on Ovid. Aristaenetus <u>Ep.</u>

2.11 appears to have been inspired by the double-love theme of epigram[61].

Apollogenes (the "writer" of the letter) claims to be in love with his

wife and a courtesan (a theme similar to Philodemus' love for a

prostitute and a virgin in <u>AP</u>12.173). This letter has aspects in

common with both Ovid and Paulus. At line 7 Apollogenes says:

$$\text{θατέρα συνὼν οὐκ ἀμνημονῶ τῆς ἑτέρας, τὴν}$$
$$\text{εἰκόνα ταύτης ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναπλάττων.}$$

cf. Paulus 1-3.

$$\text{Ἱππομένην φιλέουσα νόον προσέρεισα Λεάνδρω·}$$
$$\text{ἐν δὲ Λεανδρείοις χείλεσι πηγνυμένη}$$
$$\text{εἰκόνα τὴν Ξάνθοιο φέρω φρεσί·}$$

Aristaenetus continues (9-13):

$$\text{ἔοικα γοῦν κυβερνήτη ὑπὸ δυοῖν}$$
$$\text{πνευμάτων ἀπειλημμένω, τοῦ μὲν ἔνθεν}$$

τοῦ δὲ ἔνδεν ἑστηκότος καὶ περὶ
τῆς νεὼς μαχομένων, ἐπὶ τ' ἀναντία
μὲν τὴν θάλασσαν ὠθούντων, ἐπ'
ἀμφότερα δὲ τὴν μίαν ναῦν ἐλαυνόντων.

This comparison is employed by Ovid, 9-10:

> erro, velut ventis discordibus acta phaselos
>
> dividuumque tenent alter et alter amor.

Paulus is presumably not imitating Aristaenetus, and we may assume, too, that Aristaenetus is not imitating Ovid. On the other hand, there are strong resemblances to be found among the three works (particularly between Paulus and Aristaenetus), too close for them to be coincidental. The most reasonable explanation for these similarities would seem to be a common source or tradition, probably in epigram. It may, indeed, be significant that the notion of love descending like a storm at sea (cf. Aristaenetus 9-13, Ovid 9-10) is found in epigram in the context of this double-love theme; cf. AP12.88.1(Anon.).

Ovid, then, appears to some extent to be indebted to epigram directly for some of the details of this poem, and certainly the main theme (love for two different girls) belongs to epigram. His greatest debt, however, is to Propertius 2.22A. Both Propertius' and Ovid's poems are developed, as we have seen, in a similar way, and in view of Ovid's debt to his predecessor elsewhere it is clearly unnecessary to postulate a common antecedent. What Ovid has done is to develop an epigrammatic theme (love for two specific people) along the lines of Propertius 2.22A,

itself an adaptation of a connected but different epigrammatic theme
(the poet's attraction to various types of women).   One cannot but
conclude that Ovid's originality is not seen to its fullest advantage
in this poem.

THREE THEMES OF FRIENDSHIP LITERATURE

In this chapter we shall be considering three ways in which the lover
demonstrates his obsequium: he is a diligent visitor to the girl's
sickbed, he (or, just as often, she) is ready to attend the girl (or
boy) on a hunting expedition, and he is willing to go with her on a
long journey.   These themes are not "generic" in either sense of
the word.   They do not constitute genres, like the paraclausithyron
or propempticon, and they do not originate from, or pertain exclusively
to, a formal genre such as comedy or epigram.   The three themes appear
in various forms in very diverse literary contexts, but they do have
one thing in common apart from their occurrence as instances of obsequium
in the elegists, namely that all three appear to have been illustrations
of the devotion of a friend in Hellenistic treatises on friendship.   This
we can infer with some confidence from their occurrence as instances of
Freundschaftsdienst in later authors who write about friendship and its
duties (e.g. Lucian, Plutarch, Seneca).

The origin of the themes will not, of course, be Freundeschaftslehre
but life itself.   People were sick in the ancient world, they did hunt
and they did travel, and all three involved serious risk.   All three
situations were dangerous and made demands upon friendship.   But the
fact is that the services of friends on these occasions became conventional
literary examples of Freundschaftsdienst and they reappear in erotic
literature as examples of the lover's devotion.   Where the elegists

actually took their themes from we cannot tell: it does seem unlikely
that they ransacked Hellenistic philosophical treatises for instances
of obsequium. It may be that such examples came into elegy via
Alexandrian erotic literature, whether epigram or "narrative" elegy.
The scholar-poets of the Alexandrian period will have been aware of
the conventional instances of Freundschaftsdienst used by the
philosophers and could well have adapted them to an erotic context.
Some support for this theory comes from the occasional re-appearance
of such themes in later Greek literature in erotic contexts (e.g.
sick-visiting in Philostratus Ep.7; hunting together in Nonnus Dion.
16.21ff. and Achilles Tatius 2.345ff.). It is also possible that
such examples of "friendly devotion" subsequently or concurrently
enjoyed a life outside the sphere of philosophy or literature and
that the elegists (or Alexandrian poets before them) were influenced
by a "popular tradition". Whatever the channel of influence it is
clear that the elegists have used as examples of obsequium to their
mistresses the same situations used by Hellenistic Freundschaftslehre
as examples of service to a friend.

1.　　　　　　　　<u>The Lover's Sick-Visiting</u>

The lover making a visit to his girl's sickbed is a situation found in
all three elegists.　Tibullus and Propertius claim to have visited
Delia and Cynthia respectively during their illnesses (Tib.1.5.9-16;
Prop.2.9.25-8), and Ovid advises the student lover to capitalise on the
girl's sickness by visiting her and demonstrating his devotion to her
(<u>Ars</u>.2.315-336).　All three poets are, in these passages, using the
girl's illness to illustrate the <u>obsequium</u> of the lover.

Tibullus 1.5 opens with the statement that the poet arrogantly believed
that he could bear separation from Delia, but that his efforts to do so
were in vain (1-6).　He begs Delia to spare him (7-8), and as a
demonstration of his past devotion to her he refers to his attendance on
her during an illness;

> ille ego, cum tristi morbo defessa iaceres
> 　te dicor votis eripuisse meis:
> ipseque te circum lustravi sulpure puro,
> 　carmine cum magico praecinuisset anus;
> ipse procuravi ne possent saeva nocere
> 　somnia, ter sancta deveneranda mola;
> ipse ego velatus filo tunicisque solutis
> 　vota novem Triviae nocte silente dedi.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(9-16)

Tibullus made vows for Delia's recovery (9-10); he took charge of the
sulphur in a purification ceremony with an old witch (11-12); he averted

nightmares by sacrifices (13-14) and made vows to Trivia in the silence of night (15-16). But now, Tibullus continues, in spite of such exemplary devotion on his part, he has been supplanted in Delia's affection by a rival (17), and we learn later in the poem that this rival is a _dives amator_(47).

The first twenty-four lines of Propertius 2.9 contrast the faithfulness of two heroines (Penelope and Briseis) in difficult (Penelope) or impossible (Briseis) situations with the fickleness of Cynthia, who could not remain faithful to the poet for one day and night. Then a series of angry rhetorical questions are fired at Cynthia:

> haec mihi vota tuam propter suscepta salutem
>
>> cum capite hoc Stygiae iam poterentur aquae,
>
> et lectum flentes circum staremus amici?
>
>> hic ubi tum, pro di, perfida, quisve fuit?
>
>>> (25-28)

The poet then turns from the particular case of Cynthia's infidelity to general consideration of the fickleness of women (29-37).

At _Ars._2.315ff. Ovid tells the lover that the girl's indisposition provides him with an excellent opportunity for demonstrating his love and devotion for her (_tunc amor et pietas tua sit manifesta puellae_(321)). He continues:

> nec tibi morosi ueniant fastidia morbi,
>
>> perque tuas fiant, quae sinet ipsa, manus,

et videat flentem, nec taedeat oscula ferre,

    et sicco lacrimas conbibat ore tuas.

multa vove, sed cuncta palam, quotiensque libebit,

    quae referas illi, somnia laeta vide.

et veniat quae lustret anus lectumque locumque,

    praeferat et tremula sulphur et ova manu.

omnibus his inerunt gratae vestigia curae;

    in tabulas multis haec via fecit iter.

nec tamen officiis odium quaeratur ab aegra;

    sit suus in blanda sedulitate modus:

neve cibo prohibe nec amari pocula suci

    porrige; rivalis misceat illa tuus.

The theme is similar to that of Propertius and Tibullus: (3.323-36) sickness again demonstrates the lover's devotion.   Ovid is almost certainly, as Zingerle (1.58) observed, indebted to Tibullus in whose passage we also find a reference to an anus and to sulphur (Tib.1.5.11-12).

Turning now from elegy, we find that sick-visiting is often regarded a a Freundschaftsdienst, as a service one friend may be expected to perform for another.   Seneca, for instance, arguing against the proposition that the wise man is self-sufficient and so in no need of a friend, claims that the self-sufficiency of the sapiens lies in his ability, not his desire, to be without a friend (Ep.1.9.1-5).   Indeed the wise man will want friendship, but (contrary to the contention of Epicurus) his motives will not be selfish: non ad hoc (sc. habere amicum vult), quod dicebat Epicurus in hac ipsa

epistula, ut habeat qui sibi aegro adsideat, succurrat in vincula coniecto vel inopi, sed ut habeat aliquem, cui ipse aegro adsideat, quem ipse circumventum hostili custodia liberet (ib.8 = Usener fr. 175).   What Epicurus must have said is that friendship starts from motives of self-interest,[1] as a kind of medical and legal insurance (and, in fact, sickness and legal difficulties were surely the occasions on which friends were needed most by the ancients).   The context is not erotic, but the passage bears a distinct resemblance to the elegiac motifs in that the devotion of (in this case) a friend is demonstrated by his sick-bed visiting.

A similar use of the theme occurs in Horace.   The first satire of Book 1, ostensibly a diatribe against μεμψιμοιρία, develops into a tirade against avarice, and at 80ff. Horace addresses the avaricious man:

> at si condoluit temptatum frigore corpus
>
> aut alius casus lecto te adfixit, habes qui
>
> adsideat, fomenta paret, medicum roget, ut te
>
> suscitet ac reddat gnatis carisque propinquis?

Once again sick-visiting is a Freundschaftsdienst.   The striking resemblances between this poem and pseudo-Hippocrates Ep.17 (Hercher) suggest a common source for at least parts of the poem and the epistle in Hellenistic philosophy[2], and the occurrence of the sick-visiting motif in a satire indebted to Hellenistic philosophical sources (as well as its occurrence in Epicurus) appears to suggest that that motif was to be found in Hellenistic philosophy.

Confirmation of this comes from Plutarch.   At De Am. Mult. 95 D Plutarch
claims that people are more likely to forgive a friend's failure in some
respect if the failure results from negligence rather than attendance on
another friend, and he uses the example of sickness: ὁ δὲ λέγων "οὐ
παρέστην σοι δίκην ἔχοντι, παριστάμην γὰρ ἑτέρῳ
φίλῳ" καὶ "πυρέτοντα σ'οὐκ εἶδον, τῷ δεῖνῳ γὰρ
φίλους ἑστιῶντι συνησχολούμην, αἰτίαν τῆς ἀμελείας τὴν
ἑτέρων ἐπιμέλειαν ποιούμενος οὐ λύει τὴν μέμψιν...

It can be no coincidence that once again sick-visiting and legal aid are
found together as the duties of a friend.   Sickness occurs again in two
other works connected with friendship.   Plutarch De Am. et Ad. 63 D
refers to Arcesilaus' visit to the sick-bed of his friend Apelles, and
Lucian Tox.18, at the conclusion of Mnesippus' story of the friendship
between Agathocles and Dinias, states that Agathocles ἔτρεφε τὸν
Δεινίαν καὶ νοσήσαντά τε ἐπὶ μήκιστον ἐθεράπευσε.
The conclusion that sick-visiting was a common theme of Hellenistic
Freundschaftslehre seems unavoidable[3].

However, while it is true that sick-visiting as a Freundschaftsdienst
was a motif of Greek Friendship Literature, it seems, as we have suggested
above, unlikely that this was the source of the elegiac theme.   And,
indeed, the motif is not confined to philosophy: it must have originated
in life itself.   This we can assume from Thucydides, who, in his
description of the plague, makes it clear that visiting a sick friend
was commonly regarded as a friend's duty:

καὶ τὸν πλεῖστον φθόρον τοῦτο ἐνεποίει· εἴτε γὰρ
μὴ θέλοιεν δεδιότες ἀλλήλοις προσιέναι, ἀπώλλυντο
ἔρημοι, καὶ οἰκίαι πολλαὶ ἐκενώθησαν ἀπορίᾳ
τοῦ θεραπεύσαντος· εἴτε προσίοιεν, διεφθείροντο, καὶ
μάλιστα οἱ ἀρετῆς τι μεταποιούμενοι· αἰσχύνῃ
γὰρ ἠφείδουν σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐσιόντες παρὰ τοὺς
φίλους, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰς ὀλοφύρσεις τῶν ἀπογιγνομένων
τελευτῶντες καὶ οἱ οἰκεῖοι ἐξέκαμνον
ὑπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ κακοῦ νικώμενοι.   (Thuc.2.51.4-5)

We first meet the motif in an erotic, or quasi-erotic, context in

Xenophon, in a piece of erotodidaxis given by Socrates to the hetaera

Theodote:

δεῖ [σε] τὸν μὲν ἐπιμελόμενον ἀσμένως ὑποδέχεσθαι,
τὸν δ' ἐντρυφῶντα ἀποκλείειν καὶ ἀρρωστήσαντος
γε φίλον φροντιστικῶς ἐπισκέψασθαι (Xen.Mem.3.11.10)

It may well be that the theme found its way into Hellenistic poetry, and

that this is the channel through which it came into Roman elegy.   This

is perhaps suggested by its occurrence in an epistle of Philostratus,

which is particularly significant for Tibullus 1.5.Philostratus Ep.7

is a ψόγος πλούτου in which a poor man tries to convince

a puer delicatus that a poor man makes a better lover than a rich man.

One of the arguments in support of this is a poor man's willingness to

tend the boy in sickness: τις δύναται παραμεῖναι νοσοῦντι; τις συναγρυπνῆσαι;
(41-2). No answer is required; clearly the poor man will and the rich
man will not. The context is very different from that of the elegiac
examples, and the relationship involved is a homosexual one, but the
similarity of the theme to the elegiac theme is clear: here, too, a
man's devotion to the object of his affections is demonstrated by his
attendance during sickness, and this attendance is contrasted with a
rival's (in this case a rich rival's) lack of concern. It is surely
significant that Tibullus', like Philostratus', rival is a dives amator
and that Tibullus also tries to convince Delia of the superiority of
the impecunious lover:

> pauper erit praesto tibi semper; pauper adibit
>
> primus et in tenero fixus erit latere . . .
>
> (1.5.61-62)

It is unlikely that Philostratus is imitating Tibullus; dependence on
a common source is a much more plausible explanation for this similarity.
Heinemann (Ep.Am.45-6) thought that this common source was a rhetorical
work περὶ πενίας , but since such a work is unlikely to have
been erotic in content we may rather postulate a source in Alexandrian
erotic poetry[4].

We should also notice in passing Lucian Amores 46, quoted as a parallel
by both Gollnisch (Quaest.Eleg.47) and Heinemann (Ep.Am.113). There
Callicratidas, extolling the virtues of pederasty, says of the ideal boy
he has been describing:

εἰ δὲ καὶ, οἷος ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως νόμος, νόσος ἐπιψαύσειεν, αὐτῷ κάμνοντι συννοσήσω καὶ διὰ χειμερίου θαλάσσης ἀναγομένῳ συμπλεύσομαι.

Here the idea is somewhat different: the lover will not visit his beloved but share his illness. However, it is noticeable that the motif occurs here in conjunction with another Freundschaftsdienst, the lover's readiness to go on a journey with his beloved (discussed below), and so Lcuian may be deliberately exaggerating a well-known motif which he expects his readers to recognise.(Callicratidas will not only visit the boy but even share his symptoms!)

What emerges from this discussion is that visiting a sick friend was regarded as a duty by the Greeks of the classical and Hellenistic periods. It became, as one would expect, a theme of philosophical literature on the subject of friendship, and it probably also became a theme of Hellenistic erotic literature (mainly, one suspects from the evidence of Lucian and Philostratus, pederastic). The elegists adopted the theme and used it with reference to their own mistresses. Both Propertius and Tibullus use it in this way, as a method of demonstrating to their girls the superiority of their obsequium to that of their rivals. Both poets declare that despite this devotion, they have been supplanted by these rivals, and this application of the motif to the "actual" circumstances of a love affair (i.e. "I did visit you" rather than "I would be prepared to visit you") is, as far

as we can tell, an innovation of the elegists. What we may notice, however, is that Propertius, unlike Tibullus, makes it quite clear that his activity was a _Freundschaftsdienst_. At 27 he says: _et lectum flentes circum staremus amici_, with _amici_ occupying an emphatic position at the end of the line (Cynthia, on the other hand, has broken her "contract" with Propertius and is _perfida_ (28)). Ovid's treatment of the theme is very different: the humour and cynicism of his advice to the lover to take advantage of the situation is quite clear and characteristically Ovidian[5]. Here, too, however, we get a hint of the theme's origin in the obligation of friendship, for, as we have seen, Ovid's advice to the lover is that he should let the girl recognise his _pietas_ (321); _pietas_ is, of course, a word with strong religious overtones, not used elsewhere in elegy of the sexual relationship between a man and a woman[6].

2.   Hunting Together

The theme of attending one's favourite on a hunt occurs in both Tibullus
and Ovid and also, in an indirect way, in Propertius.   Its first
occurrence in Elegy is in Tib. 1.4, Priapus' Ars Amandi, where the god
advises obsequium for the lover;   amongst other things, the lover should
carry the boy's nets should he wish to hunt (1.4.49-50).   Ovid similarly
urges obsequium in the Ars., quoting the example of Milanion who carried
Atalanta's nets, but then adding that the lover's obsequium need not go
this far (Ars.2.185-92).   The indirect use of the theme in Propertius
is, in fact, also a use of the example of Milanion as an illustration
of obsequium (1.1.9-18).   Attendance on the favourite during a hunt
illustrates the lover's devotion at Ovid Her. 5.7ff., where Oenone
emphasises her past services to Paris, and at Met. 10.162ff., where
Apollo forgets his music and archery to carry nets, handle the dogs and
attend Hyacinthus on the hunt.   In The Garland of Sulpicia, Sulpicia
herself, in a variation on the theme, beseeches the boar not to harm
Cerinthus, and then claims that she would perform all the servile duties
of the hunt provided that she could be with Cerinthus (Tib.3.9.(4.3)11ff.).

Let us now examine in more detail each of these instances of the theme
before we proceed with an inquiry into the sources of it.

Tibullus 1.4.49-50

        nec, velit insidiis altas si claudere valles,

          dum placeas, umeri retia ferre negent.

At 40 the god has told the poet that <u>obsequio plurima vincit amor</u>, and in 41-52 he gives examples of <u>obsequium</u>. The lover should be willing to accompany the boy on a journey by land (41-4) or by sea (45-6); he should be prepared to endure hard labour for him (47-8); he should attend him on the hunt, carrying the nets (49-50), and, should the boy wish to fence, he should fight with him and let him win (51-2). Then the boy will yield to the lover (53. <u>tunc tibi mitis erit</u>). Thus the hunting motif appears as one of a number of examples of <u>obsequium</u>; the lover is instructed to carry the boy's hunting nets in order to find favour with him. He must play the part of the συνεργός or ἀρκυωρός the attendant to the hunter[7]:

<u>(Tib.3.9(4.3)11-18</u>

> sed tamen, ut tecum liceat, Cerinthe, vagari,
>
> > ipsa ego per montes retia torta feram,
>
> ipsa ego velocis quaeram vestigia cervi
>
> > et demam celeri ferrea vincla cani.
>
> tunc mihi, tunc placeant silvae, si, lux mea, tecum
>
> > arguar ante ipsos concubuisse plagas:
>
> tunc veniat licet ad casses, inlaesus abibit,
>
> > ne Veneris cupidae gaudia turbet, aper.

The poem begins with Sulpicia's begging the boar not to harm Cerinthus (1-4). After this she curses the woods which have lured her lover away from her (5-6) and muses briefly on the folly of hunting (7-10).

Then follow these lines in which she undercuts all that has been said
so far; now, provided that she could be with Cerinthus, she would be
prepared to carry nets (12), to do the tracking (13) and to unleash
the dogs (14).   These are all servile duties,[8] and one may note that
Sulpicia (a girl of good breeding in the poetry, if not in life[9])
emphasises this by the words ipsa ego in 12, repeated in 13.

The theme is clearly extended in this poem.   In 1.4. we simply find
the idea of net-carrying; here Sulpicia will also track the quarry
and unleash the dogs – and she is a woman.   Also, the reason for her
being willing to do this for her lover is different; it is not to
please him that she will carry his nets etc. but to be with him.   In
fact, she goes on to say that they will make love at the nets and the
boar can go away unharmed lest he interrupt their lovemaking (15-16)!
Sulpicia's imagination is running riot; she will do anything to be
with her lover, even the most servile and unwomanly tasks.   It is
difficult to resist the conclusion that this section of the poem is
inspired directly by Euripides Hippol.208ff. and 215ff., where the
frenzied Phaedra imagines a similar situation, or by Ovid Her.4.38ff.
(Phaedra to Hippolytus) which is itself modelled on Euripides (see
Bréguet Sulpicia 296ff., who, in fact, argues for Ovidian authorship
of Sulpicia's Garland (see especially 276ff.)). What the poet has
taken from what one may call the elegiac tradition are the details of
the servile duties involved – carrying the nets, unleashing the dogs,
tracking the quarry (all of which can be parallelled elsewhere in an

erotic context).   In Euripides we find none of these.   The only
details mentioned by Phaedra are shouting to the dogs (219) and throwing
a spear (220).   She thus imagines herself as a companion on the hunt
rather than an attendant.

Ovid Heroides 5.17-20

> quis tibi monstrabat saltus venatibus aptos
>
>   et tegeret catulos qua fera rupe suos?
>
> retia saepe comes maculis distincta tetendi;
>
>   saepe citos egi per iuga longa canes.

Oenone is writing to Paris, her erstwhile lover who has rejected her
in favour of Helen, and she reminds him of their past love and her
devotion to him.   As an illustration of this devotion she uses the
hunting-together motif.

What is remarkable about this instance of the motif is just how
helpful Oenone was.   First, she found the hiding place of the animals
for Paris.   Then she did not simply carry the nets for him (or, what
we find elsewhere, watch them[10]);   it was she who actually set them up
(19).   Finally, she does not simply unleash the dogs, but drives them
over the hills herself.   Kölbinger is right in suggesting that Ovid
has adapted the motif to suit the character of Paris[11].   He is not a
great hunter but an effeminate womaniser, and so Oenone does most of
the work in this manly pursuit.

Ars.2.189-90, 193-4

<div style="margin-left: 2em">

Saepe tulit iusso fallacia retia collo,

saepe fera torvos cuspide fixit apros . . .

non te Maenalias armatum scandere silvas

nec iubeo collo retia ferre tuo.

</div>

In this section, beginning at 177, the poet is discussing the

efficacy of obsequium in a love affair.   In 179-84 he gives

examples from nature, and then switches in 185ff. to a mythological

example, to Milanion's winning of the virginal Atalanta by his

obsequium.   One example of his obsequium is given in 189-90;   he

submitted to carrying nets for the hunt when she told him to (iusso

. . . collo), and he hunted with her himself (190).   But Ovid

does not recommend that the lover's obsequium go that far;   he

should simply yield to his girl's wishes and agree with whatever she

says (197-200).

Ovid is adapting the motif to suit the nature of his work, a handbook

of love for today's young lover.   Hunting is not a pursuit of girls

today, and so lovers have no need to play Milanion.   So, like

Propertius 1.1.9ff., which he is doubtless imitating here[12], Ovid

introduces the example of Milanion for rejection, though the rejection

is made for different reasons from Propertius.   In Ovid's case such

obsequium is unnecessary for today's lover;   in Propertius' case the

girl is so unyielding that it would not produce the success it did for

Milanion.

Met.10.170-4

> Nec Citharae nec sunt in honore sagittae:
>
> immemor ipse sui non retia ferre recusat,
>
> non tenuisse canes, non per iuga montis iniqui
>
> ire comes, longaque alit adsuetudine flammas.

Here the motif is combined with the standard erotic motif of the lover's inability to concentrate on his usual occupation (cf.,e.g., Sappho fr. 102,Plaut.Most.151ff., Verg. Aen.4.84ff., Hor.Odes1.8, 3.12, Prop. 2.16.33ff., etc.[13]).   Apollo, in love with Hyacinthus, forgets his music and archery and attends the boy on a hunt.   His obsequium to Hyacinthus is revealed by his willingness to undertake even the most servile duties.   A god though he is, he does not refuse to carry the nets, look after the dogs and attend the boy, and this discrepancy between the god's status and the servility of his duties on the hunt is emphasised by the words immemor ipse sui (171).

Propertius 1.1.9-12, 15-17

> Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores
>
> saevitiam durae contudit Iasidos.
>
> nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,
>
> ibat et hirsutas ille videre feras . . .
>
> ergo velocem potuit domuisse puellam:
>
> tantum in amore preces et benefacta valent.
>
> in me tardus amor non ullas cogitat artis.

This, the only instance of the motif in Propertius, we have already considered briefly. As Shackleton Bailey points out, the reference in hirsutas videre feras (12) is "fairly certainly to his hunting in Atalanta's company" (Propertiana 4). Propertius is saying that Milanion was able to bend the will of Atalanta by his obsequium, whereas preces and benefacta are of no avail in his case. Propertius does not suggest that he is ready to perform this service himself – and not surprisingly since Cynthia is no huntress and would be uninterested in such a display of devotion. We have already seen that Ovid, too, introduces the example of Milanion only to reject it, but for different reasons (Ars.2.189ff.). In the other Ovidian examples (Her.5.17ff. and Met.10.170ff.) and in the Tibullan examples, the services are performed for a male.

That the theme was current before the heyday of Roman Elegy is shown by its occurrence in Vergil's Eclogues. In Eclogue 3 Damoetas and Menalcas engage in an amoeboeic singing match, and at 64ff. the two singers introduce their loves, Damoetas his girl Galatea and Menalcas his boyfriend Amyntas. At 74-5 Menlcas complains:

> quid prodest quod me ipse animo non spernis, Amynta,
>
> si dum tu sectaris apros, ego retia servo?

Menalcas' complaint is that Amyntas' affection is of little use if he (Menlcas) is left to watch the nets while the boy does the hunting. This looks like a variation, or rather rejection, of a well-known theme;

one may demonstrate one's affection in the traditional way, Menalcas seems to be saying, but this serves little purpose if, in fact, it produces physical separation from one's favourite.   This use of the theme suggests that hunting-together as an illustration of _obsequium_ was already well known.   Whether or not it occurred in Gallus we cannot say, but it seems reasonable to postulate its existence in Hellenistic Greek poetry.

Some support for this comes perhaps from Nonnus, who may be indebted to earlier Greek poetry.   In book 16, Dionysus, infatuated with Nicaea, soliloquises:

ἵξομαι, ᾗχι πέλει δροσερὸς δρόμος, ᾗχι φαρέτρη
ᾗχι βέλος καὶ τόξον ἐπήρατον, ᾗχι καὶ αὖται
παρθενικῆς ἀγάμοιο μύρου πνείουσι χαμεῦναι
φαύσω καὶ σταλίκων καὶ δίκτυα χερσὶ πετάσσω
ἀγρώσσω καὶ ἔγωγε καὶ ἠθάδα νεβρὸν ὀλέσσω.

(Dionysiaca 16.21-25)

Later, he says:

δέξό με θηρεύοντα συνέμπορον· ἢν δ' ἐθελήσῃς
αὐτὸς ἐγὼ σταλίκων γλυκερὸν βάρος, αὐτὸς ἀείρω
ἐνδρομίδας καὶ τόξα καὶ ἱμερόεντας ὀιστούς,
αὐτὸς ἐγώ·

(Dionysiaca 16.82-85)

Dionysus offers to carry the stakes (24, 83)[14], to stretch the nets (24) and to be Nicaea's companion on the hunt (25, 82), dressed for the part

(83-4).   As in Ovid Met.10.170ff., a god is offering his services to a mortal for the menial duties of the hunt, and this is emphasised by the words αὐτὸς ἐγώ in 83, repeated in 85.[15]   The stake-carrying element is not found in the elegiac examples. Perhaps this comes from Nonnus' Hellenistic source, but variation by Nonnus of an Ovidian theme — for it seems likely that he knew Ovid — cannot be ruled out[16].

At any rate there can be little doubt that the theme occurred in Hellenistic philosophical works on friendship.   At the end of the ninth book of the Nicomachean Ethics Aristotle in his discussion of friendship claims that men always wish to share their favourite pursuits with their friends: καὶ ὅτι ποτ' ἐστιν ἑκάστοις τὸ εἶναι ἢ οὖ χάριν αἱροῦνται τὸ ζῆν, ἐν τούτῳ μετὰ τῶν φίλων βούλονται διάγειν· διόπερ οἱ μὲν συμπίνουσιν, οἱ δὲ συγκυβεύουσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ συγγυμνάζονται καὶ συγκυνηγοῦσιν ἢ συμφιλοσοφοῦσιν, ἕκαστοι ἐν τούτῳ συνημερεύοντες ὅτι περ μάλιστα ἀγαπῶσι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ· συζῆν γὰρ βουλόμενοι μετὰ τῶν φίλων, ταῦτα ποιοῦσι καὶ τούτων κοινωνοῦσιν ὡς οἷον τε..... (NE 1172a)

According to Aristotle, then, the typical pursuits which friends share are, depending on their temperaments, drinking, dice, gymnastics, hunting and philosophy.

We find hunting-together again in two of Plutarch's works on friendship,

used by him, presumably, because it is a standard example of a
"friendship-activity"[17]. At De Am. Mult. 96f. he argues that a man
cannot have many friends because nobody is so adaptable as to be able
to accomodate himself to the activities of many different people. He
continues (97A): αἱ δὲ φιλίαι τὰ ἤθη ζητοῦσι συνεξομοιοῦν
καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα
καὶ τὰς διαθέσεις. Πρωτέως τινὸς οὐκ εὐτυχοῦς
οὐδὲ πάνυ χρηστοῦ τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γοητείας
ἑαυτὸν εἰς ἕτερον εἶδος ἐξ ἑτέρου μεταλλάττοντος
ἐν τ' αὐτῷ πολλάκις, φιλολόγοις συναναγιγνώσκοντος
καὶ παλαισταῖς συγκονιομένου καὶ φιλοθήροις
συγκυνηγετοῦντος καὶ φιλοπόταις συμμεθυσκομένου
καὶ πολιτικοῖς συναρχαιρεσιάζοντος....

Similar occupations appear in a rather different context at De Ad. et
Am. 52 BC, where Plutarch is making the point that the flatterer will
engage in whatever occupation his quarry enjoys: ὁ δὲ κόλαξ αὐτὸς
ἑτέρους ἐπάγεται καὶ παλεύει, μιμούμενος οὐχ
ὁμοίως ἅπαντας, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν συνορχούμενος
καὶ συνάδων, τῷ δὲ συμπαλαίων καὶ συγκονιόμενος·
θηρατικοῦ δὲ καὶ κυνηγετικοῦ λαβόμενος μονονοὺ
τὰ τῆς Φαίδρας ἀναβοῶν ἕπεται

προς θεῶν ἔραμαι κυσὶ θωῦξαι
βαλιαῖς ἐλάφοις ἐγχριμπτόμενος.

καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸ θηρίον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν
ἐκδαγγνεύει καὶ περιβάλλεται τὸν κυνηγόν. ἂν δὲ
θηρεύῃ φιλόλογον καὶ φιλομαθῆ νέον, αὖθις ἐν βιβλίοις

ἐστί....εἴτε ῥάθυμός τις ἐμπέπαικεν αὖθις καὶ φιλοπότης
καὶ πλούσιος....ψυκτῆρες δὲ καὶ φιάλαι καὶ γέλωτες
ἐν περιπάτοις καὶ σκώμματα πρὸς τοὺς φιλοσοφοῦντας.

The occupations mentioned by Plutarch are, therefore: reading,
wrestling, hunting, drinking and politics in De Am. Mult. and dancing
and singing, wrestling, hunting, reading and drinking in De Am et Ad.
Now taking the two works of Plutarch together with Aristotle's
Nichomachean Ethics, we find that all three have the following
occupations in common: drinking, gymnastics (= wrestling in Plutarch)
and hunting.   If we may add a broad category under the heading
"intellectual pursuits,"then we have a fourth common element, since
Aristotle's philosophy will be parallelled by reading in the Plutarch
passages.   But the most persistent motif is hunting-together which was
clearly a motif of Friendship Literature.   Further evidence, if more
is needed, is provided by Lucian's work on friendship, Toxaris, where
we find the friends Belitta and Basthes, Toxaris' second example of
ideal friendship, on a hunt together (Tox.43)[18].

Hunting together is also found in the context of friendship in Roman
literature.   In Ep.1.18 Horace, who is advising Lollius on how to be
friends with the great, says:

> nec tua laudabis studia aut aliena reprendes,
>
> nec, cum venari volet ille, poemata panges.

<div align="right">(Ep.1.18.39-40)</div>

Kiessling-Heinze's note on line 40 that "Lollius mag ja als junger Mann damals seine Verse nur ebenso gemacht haben" misses the point. What Horace is doing is combining two contrasting motifs of Friendship Literature, two activities which, as we have seen, friends engage in together - hunting, on the one hand, and intellectual pursuits on the other. We have noted that to Aristotle "intellectual pursuits" means philosophy, and to Plutarch reading. To Horace, naturally, it would mean poetic composition. If the great man is interested in one thing, says the poet, then do not wilfully do the opposite.

The elegists, presumably, did not take the motif directly from Greek philosophical writings on friendship. There was probably a medium through which such friendship motifs came into Elegy, and that again was probably Hellenistic poetry. This would explain the appearance of the theme in later Greek poetry (Nonnus), and also in Achilles Tatius 2.34 (where the pederast Menelaus says that he has been hunting with his boyfriend Clitophon), for it is well known that many of the themes and motifs of the Greek novel derive from Hellenistic poetry. It would explain also its appearance in Vergil's Eclogues. But however it came from Friendship Literature it is clear that the theme is considerably different in the hands of the elegists. Since we have already considered individual treatment of the theme by the elegists, we shall conclude now with a few general observations on the theme in elegy.

It is quite clear that the whole tenor of the motif is changed; in elegy — and probably in Hellenistic poetry — hunting together is not a Freundschaftsdienst but an example of the lover's obsequium to his/ her beloved.   There is less emphasis on companionship, and much more on service.   The poets concentrate upon the devotion of the lover in being willing to hunt with the beloved, and in particular on being ready to perform the menial services connected with the hunt.   He is willing to be the attendant on the hunt.   So we find in the erotic examples references to carrying the nets (Tib.1.4.50, (Tib.)3.9(4.3)12, Ovid Ars.2.189, 194, Met.10.171) or watching the nets (Vergil Ecl.3.75), or setting the nets (Ovid Her.5.19, Nonnus Dion.16.24);   to looking after or unleashing the dogs ((Tib.)3.9(4.3)14, Ovid Her.5.20, Met. 10.172), all duties of the attendant.   In Propertius 1.1.11-12 and Ovid Ars.2.189ff. we have the added point of the lover having the heart actually to take part in the hunt, and we remember that the συνεργός   was sometimes expected to take part in the capture and killing of larger animals[19].

And yet, despite the different slant of the motif in the hands of the elegists, a slight trace of its heritage remains.   In a number of the examples considered above the notion of companionship on the hunt, which is what is stressed in Friendship Literature, is present;   cf. Ovid Her. 5.18 retia saepe comes maculis distincta tetendi, Met.10.172-3

non per iuga montis iniqui/ire comes,   Nonnus, Dion.16.82 δέξό με
Θηρεύοντι συνέμπορον(cf. also Tib.1.4.41 neu comes ire neges,
where Tibullus is using another motif of Friendship Literature,
travelling together[20]).

3.   <u>Travelling Together</u>

Another theme which seems to be connected with "Friendship Literature"
is the lover's assertion of his willing ness to make a journey with
his beloved.   We have already noted Tibullus' use of this theme in
Priapus' <u>Ars Amandi</u> where it occurs together with the hunting together
motif as an illustration of the pederast's <u>obsequium</u> towards his
boyfriend (Tib.1.4.40ff.).   Propertius illustrates his <u>fides</u> and
<u>constantia</u> by the claim that he would be prepared to take a long sea
journey with Cynthia (2.26.27-30).   Ovid makes accompanying the girl
on a journey the lover's <u>officium</u>, equivalent to the <u>longa via</u> of the
soldier in <u>Am.</u>1.9.9-10, while in <u>Her.</u>14.159ff. and <u>Am.</u>2.16.15ff. he
varies the theme by making the girl, rather than the lover, the
companion on the journey.   In all of these instances the willingness
to accompany the object of one's love on a journey is, like the
willingness to hunt with the beloved, an illustration of the lover's
devotion.   Let us now look in greater detail at each of these
instances of the motif in elegy, and then consider examples of it in
the context of friendship in Roman, and then Greek, literature.

i. Tib.1.4.40-46

                    obsequio plurima vincet amor.
            neu comes ire neges, quamvis via longa paretur
                et Canis arenti torreat arva siti,
            quamvis praetexens picta ferrugine caelum
                venturam amiciat imbrifer arcus aquam.

> vel si caeruleas puppi volet ire per undas,
>
> ipse levem remo per freta pelle ratem.

To demonstrate your <u>obsequium</u> to your boy, Priapus tells the poet, do
not refuse to accompany him on a long walk, no matter how threatening
the weather, and row the boat yourself if he wants to take a boat ride[21].
Thus Tibullus is instructed by Priapus to comply with the boy's wishes
and take part in whatever he finds pleasurable, and this is very
different from the instances of the motif in Propertius, Ovid and the
friendship contexts where, as we shall see, emphasis is laid upon the
hardships or dangers of the journey.   Here the only "danger" is the
inclement weather for the walk (hot weather in 42, rain in 43-4), the
only hardship the rowing of the boat (46).   One may compare 1.9.13-16
where the boy's duties to the old lover, Tibullus' rival, will result,
Marathus is warned, in the loss of his beauty through the ravages of
wind and sun on a <u>longa via</u>).

ii. Prop.2.26.27-30

> multum in amore fides, multum constantia prodest:
>
> qui dare multa potest, multa et amare potest.
>
> seu mare per longum mea cogitet ire puella,
>
> hanc sequar et fidos una aget aura duos.

The view of Houseman and Rothstein that a couplet has dropped out
between 28 and 29 in which Propertius expresses his willingness to
accompany Cynthia on a land journey has much to commend it.   The
transition between 28 and 29 is certainly very abrupt even if <u>seu</u> is

equivalent to _et si_[22], while the motif in both Tibullus and Ovid
involves travel both by land and by sea[23].   But whether or not we
accept this view it is clear that the travelling together motif is
an illustration of the poet's claim that _multum in amore fides, multum
constantia prodest._   He emphasises his devotion to Cynthia by telling
her what he is prepared to undertake for her sake, what dangers, in
particular, he is prepared to face on a journey with her.   He makes
this clear in what follows, especially in 35-6: _omnia perpetiar:
saevus licet urgeat Eurus/velaque in incertum frigidus Auster agat_ etc.

Two things should be noted about this use of the motif.   First, like
Tibullus (but unlike many of the examples we shall consider), Propertius
does not mention specific locations that he will be prepared to visit
with Cynthia.   Secondly, unlike Tibullus, the journey which the poet
envisages is a serious one with real hardships and real dangers, not
a pleasure trip.

iii. Ovid Am.2.16

Ovid is at Sulmo without Corinna.   It is a beautiful place, he says
(1-10), but Corinna is not there, though his love for her is (11-14).
This leads to a curse against the _protoi heuretai_ of roads, who
should have instructed girls to attend their lovers on their journeys:

> aut iuvenum comites iussissent ire puellas,
>
> si fuit in longas terra secanda vias.
>
> tum mihi, si premerem ventosas horridus Alpes,

> dummodo cum domina, molle fuisset iter;
>
> cum domina Libycas ausim perrumpere Syrtes
>
> et dare non aequis vela ferenda notis;
>
> non quae virgineo portenta sub inguine latrant
>
> nec timeam vestros, curva Malea, sinus
>
> nec quae submersis ratibus saturata Charybdis
>
> fundit et effusas ore receptat aquas.
>
> quod si Neptuni ventosa potentia vincat
>
> et subventuros auferat unda deos,
>
> tu nostris niveos umeris impone lacertos:
>
> corpore nos facili dulce feremus onus.

(2.16.17-30)

Ovid would be prepared to face the Alps (19-20), the Syrtes, equally
infamous as a danger for sailors (21-2), Scylla (23) and Charybdis
(25), Malea (24), and shipwreck itself (27ff.).   Thus we find again
the lover prepared to travel by land (the Alps) and by sea (the Syrtes
etc. in 21ff.).   But it is noticeable that Ovid has varied the theme
by making the girl, and not himself, the comes.   He does not, like
Propertius (and Tibullus, in Priapus' list of instructions), say that
he would be prepared to travel with his beloved to far-away places,
but that he could face the dangers of these places if the beloved were
with him[24].   Another striking difference in his use of the theme is
the listing of the place names which he would have the courage to visit.

iv. Her.13.159-64

> Per reditus corpusque tuum, mea numina,iuro,
>
> > perque pares animi coniugiique faces,
>
> me tibi venturam comitem, quocumque vocaris,
>
> > sive – quod heu! timeo – sive superstes eris.

Laodamia, at home in Thessally, is writing to Protesilaus who, though Laodamia is unaware of it, has already sacrificed his own life in the landing at Troy. She will go to him and be his comes, wherever he calls her. Once again the motif differs from the Tibullan and Propertian examples cited above in the sex of the comes, but this time it is the woman who speaks, offering an essentially male service and so further emphasising her devotion[25]. The situation, is, in fact, analagous to Sulpicia's offer to act as the attendant on Cerinthus in the hunt in (Tib.)3.9(4.3)11ff.

v. Am.1.9.9-14

> militis officium longa est via: mitte puellam,
>
> > strenuus exempto fine sequetur amans;
>
> ibit in adversos montes duplicataque nimbo
>
> > flumina, congestas exteret ille nives,
>
> nec freta pressurus tumidos causabitur Euros
>
> > aptaque verrendis sidera quaeret aquis.

In this poem Ovid, with characteristic ingenuity, exploits the well-worn theme of the militia amoris[26], and in comparing the life of the soldier

with that of the lover he claims that long journeys are the <u>officia</u>
of both.   The <u>via longa</u> which is the soldier's <u>officium</u> is the
campaign, parallelled by the lover's journey to the ends of the earth:
<u>mitte puellam, strenuus exempto fine sequetur amans</u> (9-10).   <u>Sequi</u>
in this case probably neans not "to follow" but "to attend"; Propertius,
in fact, uses the same word in his use of the travelling together motif,
and there it clearly means to attend (<u>hanc sequar et fides una aget aura</u>
<u>duos</u> (2.26.30)).   Thus we find a situation parallel to our Tibullan and
Propertian examples;   the lover will be <u>comes</u> to the beloved.   Place
names are not listed in this instance, but the lover will face a
difficult journey by land (<u>adversos montes duplicataque nimbo flumina</u>,
<u>congestas</u> . . . <u>nives</u> (11-12)) and a dangerous sea voyage (<u>tumidos</u> . . .
<u>Euros, aptaque verrendis sidera quaret aquis</u> (13-14)).

Finally, we may briefly note the occurrence of the theme in "silver"
Latin poetry, at Seneca <u>Phaedra</u> 700ff. where Phaedra, declaring her love
to Hippolytus, says:

>   te vel per ignes, per mare insanum sequar
>
>   rupesque et amnes, unda quos torrens rapit,
>
>   quacumque gressus tuleris hac amens agar.

As in Ovid <u>Her.</u>13.159ff. a woman is declaring her willingness to
accompany a man;   and again we notice the mention of the two elements,
land (701) and sea (700).   Place names are not listed, but the
difficulties and dangers of both elements are stressed (<u>mare insanum</u>/
<u>rupesque et amnes, unda quos torrens rapit</u>).

Now let us turn to the uses of the theme in the context of friendship.
First we shall consider its appearances in Roman poetry, and then we shall
briefly examine its occurrence -- albeit in embryo -- in Hellenistic
Friendship Literature (in fact, in Lucian and Plutarch, though we may
with confidence postulate its occurrence in earlier Freundschaftslehre).

i. Catullus 11.1-14

> Furi et Aureli, comites Catulli --
>
> sive in extremos penetrabit Indos,
>
> litus ut longe resonante Eoa
>
> > tunditur unda,
>
> sive in Hyrcanos Arabasve molles,
>
> seu Sagas sagittiferosve Parthos,
>
> sive quae septemgeminus colorat
>
> > aequora Nilus,
>
> sive trans altas gradietur Alpes,
>
> Caesaris visens monimenta magni,
>
> Gallicum Rhenum horribile aequor ulti --
>
> > mosque Britannos --
>
> omnia haec, quaecumque feret voluntas
>
> caelitum, temptare simul parati . . .

It is not necessary here to go into the question of whether this address
to Furius and Aurelius is sincere or ironic[27]; on the surface, at least,
Catullus is complimenting them on the depth of their friendship for him --
they will be faithful companions no matter where he goes.   Place names

occur in profusion; we find the Indians (2-4), the Hyrcani, living on

the South shore of the Caspian sea, and the Arabs (5), the Sagae and

the Parthians (6), the Nile (7-8), the Alps (9-10), the Rhine (11)

and the Britons (12) - all of them symbolising great distance or danger.

To make this even clearer, Catullus occasionally uses adjectives which

express distance (extremos . . . Indos (2); ultimosque Britannos (10-11)),

danger (sagittiferosve Parthos (6); horribile aequor (11)) or difficulty

of terrain (altas . . . Alpes (9); longe resonante Eoa/tunditur unda (3-4)).

ii. Horace Epode 1.11-14

> feremus et te vel per Alpium iuga
>
> inhospitalem et Caucasum
>
> vel Occidentis usque ad ultimum sinum
>
> forti sequemur pectore.

In this, the first of three instances of the motif in Horace, the poet

is addressing Maecenas, who is leaving to fight Antony[28]. Horace

opens the poem by asking himself whether he should choose leisure at

home or hardships abroad with Maecenas (1-10), and in these lines he

decides on the latter.   He mentions a few places representative of

difficulty and danger - theAlps, the Caucasus, the far West[29]- and

emphasises these aspects by his choice of adjectives (inhospitalem . . .

Caucasum (12); Occidentis . . . ultimum sinum (13);   forti sequemur

pectore (14)).   But, as Cairns (GC141-2) has pointed out, the motif

is used here in a novel way.   Instead of saying "I would accompany you

anywhere" Horace puts the motif in a factual form and declares that he
will accompany Maecenas anywhere. However, the most original and
striking variation of the theme occurs in the following lines (15ff.)
and is overlooked by Cairns. Although it is not always explicit in
the examples cited thus far, there is implicit in the theme the idea
that the comes attends the friend to help him and protect him. So
Horace now imagines that Maecenas asks him how he, a poet and so by
definition imbellis, can be of help (15-16 roges, tuum labore quid
iuvem meo/imbellis ac firmus parum?). Horace answers that as
Maecenas' comes he will have less anxiety concerning him, even though
he could not be of help in time of trouble (17-22).

iii. Odes 2.6.1-6

> Septimi, Gades aditure mecum et
>
> Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferre nostra et
>
> barbaras Syrtes, ubi Maura semper
>
>> aestuat unda,
>
> Tibur Argeo positam colono
>
> sit meae sedes utinam senectae . . .

Horace's introduction is very probably inspired by the opening lines of
Catullus' eleventh poem. His place names are fewer – we find only Gades,
the Cantabri and the Syrtes – but again the names symbolize distance and
danger and thus demonstrate the true friendship of Septimius. Gades,
at the southern tip of Spain, was proverbial as a remote place[30]. By

the Cantabri Horace expresses the danger of war (cf. bellicus Cantaber
in Odes 2.11.1, and Cantaber non ante domabilis in Odes 4.14.41),
making this even clearer by the phrase indoctum iuga ferre nostra (2).
By the Syrtes, the famous sandbanks off the coast of North Africa, he
expresses the danger of shipwreck[31], which he makes even clearer by the
adjective barbaras (3) and the clause ubi Maura semper/aestuat unda.
Thus the quality of Septimius' friendship is revealed by his willingness
to be Horace's comes despite distance and the danger of land (through
war) or sea (through shipwreck). One should note also how Horace makes
this willingness on Septimius' part more immediate by the use of the
future participle aditure and by substituting the conjunctive et in 1-2
for Catullus' disjunctive sive and seu in 11.2-9. It is not until the
second stanza that we realize that these journeys are only examples of
what Septimius would be prepared to do, not what he is going to do,
for Horace.

iv. Odes 3.4.29ff.

>   utcumque mecum vos eritis, libens
>   insanientem navita Bosporum
>   temptabo et urentis harenas
>   litoris Assyrii viator,
>   visam Britannos hospitibus feros
>   et laetum equino sanguine Concanum
>   visam pharetratos Gelonos
>   et Scythicum inviolatus amnem.

Two traditional elements of the motif are immediately apparent from
these stanzas;   first, Horace is using the place list we have already
noticed in several passages and, secondly, he makes the contrast between
travel by land and travel by sea (navita (30); viator (32)).   Again,
too, the difficulty or danger of the places mentioned is emphasised by
an appropriate epithet; as Wickham (on 35) points out, each of the
places is given an epithet which describes the ferocious nature of its
inhabitants, with the single exception of Scythicum . . . amnem (36),
where the word inviolatus produces the same effect by implying that
others would not enjoy similar protection from danger if they approached
the river.   But there are two interesting innovations.   In the first
place, all the localities mentioned are at the time of writing areas of
conflict on the borders of the empire[32];   this lends greater immediacy
and relevance to the list of dangers that Horace would face.   Secondly,
we notice here what we noticed in Ovid Am.2.16.15ff., that the situation
is inverted, with the poet claiming that he could himself face specified
dangers if he had the friend - in this case the friends, the Camenae -
at his side.   The theme is not "I will be willing to accompany you to
these dangerous places" but "if you come with me, I will be able to face
these dangerous places".

Propertius 1.6.1ff.

> Non ego nunc Hadriae vereor mare noscere tecum,
>
> > Tulle, neque Aegaeo ducere vela salo,
>
> cum quo Rhipaeos possim conscendere montes

> ulteriusque domos vadere Memnonias;
>
> sed me complexae remorantur verba puellae,
>
> mutatoque graves saepe colore preces.

The protestation of Propertius' friendship for Tullus occupies
lines 3-4.   The poet claims that his refusal to accompany Tullus to
Asia derives not from fear (1-2), but from Cynthia's complaints (5-6).
For, he says, he would be able to climb with Tullus the Rhipaean
Mountains, the mythical mountain range in the far North[33], and go
beyond the home of Memnon, that is Ethiopia.   Cairns (GC4) describes
Propertius' use of the motif as "novel and extended".   The poet does
not simply name some far-off and dangerous places which he would visit
with Tullus;   he says that he would go _further_ than these (_ulteriusque_
(4)).   What Cairns does not comment on is the use of _possim_ in line 3,
which he paraphrases as "I would accompany you".   Now in most of the
examples so far considered the proof of friendship is the willingness
of the person to accompany his friend into places of hardship or danger
(so, e.g., Catullus 11.1ff., Horace _Odes_2.6.1ff.).   But Propertius
does not tell Tullus that he would be willing to accompany him to the
Rhipean Mountains or beyond Ethiopia;   he says that he _could_ visit these
places, and this suits well the opening words (_non ego nunc vereor_) and
his relationship with Tullus.   Tullus is a man of action, politically
important and the patron of the _poeta mollis_ Propertius.   In declaring
his friendship for such a person, Propertius has to be tactful, as
Horace does in declaring his friendship for Maecenas in Epode 1.   Horace,

we have seen, circumvents the problem by saying "I would accompany you
anywhere, and, though it would be of no benefit to you, I would be less
anxious about your safety in doing so". Propertius says "I could
accompany you anywhere", and the suppressed reason is perhaps "since
you would protect me". Thus the motif has been inverted, and is similar
to Horace Odes3.4.29ff. (discussed above), in which Horace claims that
he could face the trouble spots of the Empire if the Camenae were with
him. (Alternatively, the suppressed reason may be "such is my devotion
to you", so that the situation parallels that of Ovid Am.2.16.19ff. where
the poet says that he could face the dangers of a voyage if his mistress
were with him (compare possim in 3 with ausim at Ovid Am.2.16.21)[34]).

Let us now look briefly at two examples of the theme in post-elegiac
Roman poetry, in Statius' Silvae. Silvae 5.1. is an epicedion on
Priscilla, the wife of T. Flavius Abascantus[35]. At127ff. the poet
addresses Abascantus directly:

>   tecum gelidas comes illa per arctos
>   Sarmaticasque hiemes Histrumque et pallida Rheni
>   frigora, tecum omnis animo durata per aestus,
>   et, si castra darent, vellet gestare pharetras.

Again we find a list of far-off and difficult places which the "friend"
would be prepared to visit, but now these are divided not into land and
sea journeys, which we have seen so often, but into hot and cold places
(arctos (127); Sarmaticasque hiemes Histrumque (128); pallida Rheni
frigora (128-9); omnis . . . aestus (129)). One notices, too, in

this passage the first "objectivised" use of the motif; Statius is

talking not about his own relationship with a friend, but about a

relationship between two other people.   Furthermore, the comes is a

woman, and the person with whom she would be prepared to travel is her

husband.   Thus Statius has adapted the motif to the context of marriage,

another innovation.   He further imagines a reason for Abascantus to be

away in these far-off places; he would naturally be on military service.

So Statius adds the further point that, if it were permitted, his wife

would even join him in battle.   Statius' use of the motif is, therefore,

very striking and original, but his good taste must be questioned, since

in 129 he clearly imagines the deceased Priscilla as an Amazon. (vellet

gestare pharetras)[36].

A second Statian use of the motif is to be found in Silvae 3.5, and

once again it is used in the context of marriage, but this time Statius'

own.   The poet wishes to return from Rome to his native Naples, and he

pleads with his wife to agree to his plan.   He starts the poem by

declaring her fidelity to him (1-17), and then says:

> Quas autem comitem te rapto per undas?
>
> quamquam, et si gelidas irem mansurus ad Arctos,
>
> vel super Hesperiae vada caligantia Thules,
>
> aut septemgemini caput impenetrabile Nili,
>
> hortarere vias.

(18-22)

Again we find the names of the far-off places in a list — the far north
(Arctos (19)), beyond Thule in the West (20), the source of the Nile in
the South (21).   All of these are new elements in the motif;   only
Arctos can be parallelled elsewhere, and that only in Statius' later
use of the motif (Silvae5.1.127).   Also, in emphasising his wife's
devotion, Statius goes beyond the usual "you would accompany me" and says
"you would be encouraging our departure" ("du wurdest nicht nur mit mir
gehen" paraphrases Vollmer on 21 (430) "sondern sogar mich noch antreiben").
This is a novel and interesting use of the motif, and at the same time far
more elegant and tasteful than his later variation in 5.1.

Now let us turn to the uses of the travelling together theme in Greek
philosophical works on friendship, and first to Plutarch.   At De Am.Mult.
95c Plutarch poses the question of what a man would do if, having many
friends, he were asked by all of these friends at the same time to
perform a service for them.   Then he gives examples of the services
friends may ask a person to perform: ἂν δ'ἑνὶ καιρῷ διαφόροις
πράγμασι καὶ πάθεσι προστυγχάνοντες ὁμοῦ παρακαλῶσιν
ὁ μὲν πλέων συναποδημεῖν ὁ δὲ κρινόμενος συνδικεῖν ὁ δὲ
κρίνων συνδικάζειν ὁ δὲ πιπράσκων ἢ ἀγοράζων συνδιοικεῖν,
ὁ δὲ γαμῶν συνθύειν ὁ δὲ θάπτων συμπενθεῖν....
According to Plutarch, then, the services a person may expect from his
friend are to accompany him on a journey abroad, to help him defend a
case[37], to sit as a judge with him, to help him in business ventures,
to help him celebrate a wedding and, finally, to help with a funeral.

At <u>De Frat. Am.</u>491D, Plutarch argues that while caring for brothers themselves is commendable, one should also show kindness towards one's brothers in-laws, servants, physicians and faithful friends. His description of this last category is φίλοις πιστοῖς καὶ προθύμως συνδιενεγκοῦσιν ἀποδημίαν ἢ στρατείαν. So, once again, the ἀποδημία, the journey abroad, with a friend is a <u>Freundschaftsdienst</u>.

Turning now to Lucian's <u>Toxaris</u>, we find the motif occurring as a service performed by one of the ideal friends described by Toxaris. In 18 Toxaris discusses the great friendship of Agathocles for Deinias. Deinias is sent into exile on the island of Gyaros for the murder of Charicleia, with whom he had had an affair, and her husband Demonax. Only Agathocles, of all his friends, did not abandon Demonax. καὶ συναπῆρεν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ συνεισῆλθεν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον μόνος τῶν φίλων καὶ πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐνεδέησεν. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤδη ἔφευγεν ὁ Δεινίας, οὐδὲ τότε ἀπελείφθη τοῦ ἑταίρου, καταδικάσας δὲ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ διέτριβεν ἐν Γυάρῳ καὶ συνέφευγεν αὐτῷ....νοσήσαντά τε ἐπὶ μήκιστον ἐθεράπευσε. Here we see together a cluster of friendship services -- travelling together, legal aid and sick visiting[38].

That Plutarch and Lucian are using a motif of Roman poetry is extremely unlikely, as was stated above in the discussion of the hunting together motif. It seems almost certain that they are using a standard example

of a friendship service, which occurred in earlier treatises on
friendship, and that the Roman poets -- and perhaps Greek poets before
them -- adapted this motif to suit their needs.

In adapting it, the Roman poets extended and altered it considerably.
In Plutarch and Lucian we find only the suggestion that a service a
man may expect from a friend is that he accompany him on a journey.
In Roman poetry we find much more than this.   Individual variations
have already been considered, and it remains only to comment briefly
on some general features of its appearance in Roman poetry and to
reconsider, in the light of this, the elegiac examples.   First, we
notice that, since the motif is used by the poets to express depth of
friendship, stress is placed upon the hardships or dangers of the journeys
the friend is willing to make.   Often this is done by listing far-off
and dangerous places that the friend is prepared to undertake and
sometimes the journeys the friend is prepared to undertake are divided
into land -- and sea-journeys.   This listing of place names goes back·
at least to Catullus 11, and, if the introduction to this poem is ironic,
perhaps further (to Hellenistic poetry?).   The implication is that the
friend would provide companionship - hence the word comes is frequently
found in the contexts[39]- and protection.   We notice, too, inversion of
the theme in Horace Odes3.4.29ff. and Prop.1.6.3-4, where the poets claim
that they would be able to face dangerous journeys if they are
accompanied by their friends.

Turning back now to the erotic instances of the motif, we find it in
its simplest form in Prop.2.26.27-30, where the poet simply states
that he would accompany Cynthia on a dangerous sea-voyage (and perhaps,
if a couplet has been lost, a land-journey), and this illustrates his
fides and constantia.   This "simple" form is also what we find in Ovid
Am.1.9.9ff., where the journey with the girl, by land and sea,is the
lover's officium;   so, too, at Her.13.159-64, where, however, the
speaker is a woman.   Tibullus makes travelling with the boy an example
of the pederast's obsequium, and, while he retains the idea of travel
by land and sea, he makes the journeys leisure activities (Tib.1.4.41-6).
Despite individual variations, these instances of the motif all have one
thing in common;   like the friends of Catullus 11, Horace Odes2.6, etc.,
the poets here illustrate depth of love by willingness to accompany the
beloved.   In Ovid Am.2.16.17-30 we find an inversion of the theme, with
Ovid claiming that he could face dangerous, far-away places if Corinna
acted as his companion.   This parallels the instances of the inverted
theme in the "friendship" contexts of Prop.1.6.1ff. and Horace Odes
3.4.29ff.

ILLNESS AND COSMETICS

In this chapter we shall consider two very different themes, both
of which occur in all three elegists, the girl's illness (and the
lover's concern for her safety) and the lover's objections to his
girl's use of cosmetics.   Neither of these themes are generic in
the narrower sense, though Cairns argues, unconvincingly in my view,
that the elegiac sickness poems belong to the genre soteria.   Nor
can these themes be said to pertain exclusively to Comedy or Epigram.

1.   The Sickness Of The Girl

In the preceding chapter we examined the references made by the poets

to their past Freundschaftsdienste, one of which was their visits to

their mistresses when they were sick.   We also have in all three

elegists (or, more correctly, in Propertius, Ovid and Pseudo-Tibullus)

complete poems in which the girls are represented as being ill and the

poets offer prayers for their return to health.   A number of motives

recur in the three poems, demonstrating a degree of inter-borrowing

amongst the poets, but despite striking similarities in the poems

the three poets treat the same theme in very different ways.

The first poem, chronologically, is the twenty-eighth poem in

Propertius' second book; it is also the most complex.   Commentators

have argued whether it is a single poem, or two, three or four poems,

because Book 2 is fraught with textual problems and the situation

depicted by the poem appears to change at various points[1].   Now,

however, it is generally agreed (despite Barber's division of it into

three parts) that it is a single poem employing the internal dramatic

development so loved by Propertius.   The degree of dramatic development

is, it is true, much greater than elsewhere in Propertius, involving as

it does three time changes, but Margaret Hubbard, following Godolphin[2],

has correctly noted that Propertius' readers, acquainted with the many

dramatic developments of the Mime, would "not be overperplexed if an

elegiac poet presented them with different phases of a single situation"[3].

In 1-34 the scene is set: Propertius prays to Jupiter for the recovery of

Cynthia who is ill during the sickly season (1-4)[4]. But perhaps, the
poet muses, the weather is not to blame, and the real reason is a
religious one (5-14). Cynthia's present discomfort, however, will
have a fortunate outcome, as the fate of a number of apparently
unfortunate, but subsequently happy, mythological heroines demonstrates
(15-24), and even if she does die she will have an enviable position in
the underworld, so she should grin and bear it (25-32). At 35 we must
suppose some time has elapsed, for in 35-46 Cynthia's condition has
apparently worsened and the distraught poet avows that he will either
live or die with her[5]. If she is saved he will, he vows, offer a poem
of thanks to Jupiter, and Cynthia will give thanks personally in his
temple. At 47 we are to assume another time-lapse, for Propertius is
now addressing Persephone. In 47-58 Cynthia is no better, but still
alive. Finally, in 59-64, she is healed, and Propertius to repay her
vows to Diana and Isis[6].

The poem is not as serious as many scholars have assumed. The switch
from the weather to Cynthia's broken oaths as the reason for the illness
(3-8) is surely not to be taken seriously (aphrodisia horkoi are,
traditionally, not binding[7]), nor is the pompous address to formosae
in 13-14, and perhaps in 27f a hint is given of a more plausible (though
not seriously stated) reason for the illness, namely Juno's anger over
Jupiter's love for Cynthia. The latter has been suggested by Margaret
Hubbard (Propertius 54), who wishes to see the transition to this new
"diagnosis" made in the exempla of 17ff. The difficulty with this is

that while Io (17-18), Callisto (23-4) and Semele (27) (who, according
to Hubbard, though "not formally in the list of exempla of course
belongs to it") are examples of women with whom Zeus had affairs, Ino
(19-20) and Andromeda (21-2) are not.   Rather than doctor the text,
it seems better to assume, with Camps (2.188), that "the point being
made in all this passage is that the heroines received, after much
suffering, rich recompense".   The suggestions of Zeus's love for
Cynthia as a cause of the illness then begins at 27-8 (narrabis Semelae,
quo sis formosa periclo/, credet et illa, suo docta puella malo[8]),
though it may be argued that the notion is to be thought of as arising
from the last of the preceding exempla, Callisto (23-4).

At 45-6 the picture of Cynthia sitting before Jupiter's feet is, as
Margaret Hubbard (Propertius 56) suggests, meant to recall Homer's
description of Thetis' imprecations to Zeus (Iliad 1.500ff.), and this
is at variance with the notion of a serious poem.   The humour of the
last two lines, moreover, is unmistakeable: Cynthia is to repay her
vows to Isis (now a goddess, once a cow) and this, the poet complains,
will keep Cynthia from him again.   "The result of these successful
appeals to various deities" Margaret Hubbard comments (Propertius 57)
"is to exclude the poet ten nights more from his mistress's bed[9]".

The author of (Tib.) 3.10 (4.4) varies the theme by "objectivising" the
situation.   Instead of praying for his own girl's recovery, he represents
himself as a spectator, a third person, observing the relationship of

(

Cerinthus and Sulpicia, who is now sick[10]. The technique is a clear

borrowing from Tib.1.8.49ff. where Tibullus is the spectator in the

Marathus-Pholoe affair (in particular note the parallelism between

Tibullus' request to Pholoe neu Marathum torque: puero quae gloria

victo est? (Tib.1.8.49) and Pseudo-Tibullus' request to Apollo neu

iuvenum torque, metuit qui fata puellae (Tib.3.10(4.4)11.11). The

poem opens with an address to Phoebus, and in the first ten lines

conforms closely to the conventions of the prayer. Phoebus is

addressed directly, with a suitable honorific phrase intonsa Phoebe

superbe coma (on this prayer-formula see above p.36) and the poet

requests he present himself with the formulaic 'huc ades (for adesse⁻

in prayers cf.Cat.62.5, Tib.1.7.49, (Tib.)3.6.1, Ovid Am.2.13.21 etc.

(More examples in Appel 116). In particular, huc ades et seems

formulaic: cf. Tib.1.7.49, 2.1.35, Ovid Am.1.6.54 etc. (see Bréguet

263-4 for more examples)). This request is repeated in the second

line; for $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\pi\lambda\omega\sigma\iota s$ in prayers see above p.36 . The request

for the god's presence is urgently repeated in 9, sancte veni; on

venire in such contexts see Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace Odes1.2.30

(29) and for sancte cf. Tib.2.1.81, (Tib.)3.11(4.5)12, 3.12(4.6)7,

Catullus 34.22 etc. (see also Appel 95ff.). In 3-4 Apollo is, as

often, given a reason for helping the devotee, though it is a rather

unusual one: laying healing hands on such a beautiful girl will not

be unpleasant. A less obvious feature of the prayer follows at 7-8

(et quodcumque mali est et quidquid triste timemus,/in pelagus rapidis

evehat amnis aquis): for the wish that trouble be directed elsewhere,

see Nisbet and Hubbard on <u>Odes</u>2.28.27 (333-4) and note especially <u>Orph H.</u>
36.16 (quoted by Nisbet and Hubbard)πεμπτοις δ'εἰς ὀρέων κεφαλὰς
νούσους τε καὶ ἄλγη.[12]

At 11 Cerinthus is introduced. Apollo is asked not to "torture" him,
and Tibullus informs the god that the young man is making innumerable
vows on his girl's behalf, though in his desperation these sometimes
turn to <u>aspera verba</u> against the gods[13]. Since the interpretation
of the rest of the poem depends upon the transposition of a couplet,
I quote the remainder of the poem, in full, as it stands in the mss:

15   pone metum, Cerinthe: deus non laedit amantes.

           tu modo semper ama: salva puella tibi est.

        at nunc tota tua est, te solum candida secum

           cogitat et frustra credula turba sedet.

        Phoebe, fave: laus magna tibi tribuetur in uno

20   corpore servato restituisse duos.

        nil opus est fletu: lacrimis erit aptius uti,

           si quando fuerit tristior illa tibi.

        iam celeber, iam laetus eris, cum debita reddet.

           certatim sanctis laetus uterque focis.

25   tunc te felicem dicet pia turba deorum,

           optabunt artes et sibi quisque tuas.

Most editors have followed the <u>deteriores</u> in placing 21-2 after 17[14],
but recently Francis Cairns has deemed such a transposition unnecessary.

Cairns (GC155) argues that at line 15 there occurs, as in Propertius
2.28, a time-lapse, for in the following line we see the reason for
the poet's assurance to Cerinthus that the god does not harm lovers -
Sulpicia is now well again (salva puella tibi est).   In 19-20 Phoebus
is addressed again and asked to favour the lovers, and in 21ff. the
poet turns yet again to Cerinthus, telling him to save his tears for
some future occasion when he will be rejected by Sulpicia.   "His
immediate prospects" Cairns (GC156) comments "are joyful (23-26):
the pair will pay their soteria to the gods and Cerinthus will be
envied for his fortune in love by the crowds at the temple".   This
interpretation of the poem is crucial for Cairns's argument about
the nature of the sickness theme in elegy (discussed below) and
should be scrutinised carefully.

Cairns's interpretation, and his argument for retaining 21-2 in their
original position, depends upon his interpretation of salva puella tibi
est (16).   This, he maintains, reveals that Sulpicia, ill at the start
of the poem, is now healed.   But the words are more likely to be an
assurance to Cerinthus by the poet that his girl is safe from death,
or that she will be healed (with present used, as often, of an action
about to be started[15]).   That the poet is not saying that Sulpicia
is already healed seems clear from 19-20:   great praise will accrue
to Apollo (tribuetur) if the two lovers are saved by the rescue of
Sulpicia.   In 15-16 the poet has, like a good friend, been assuring
Cerinthus of his girl's recovery ·even though he is not convinced

himself that she will recover.

That being so, the transition from 16 to 17 is extremely awkward. After saying "Just keep on loving her — she's going to be alright" the poet would hardly add "but now she's all yours". If, however, the transposition of 21-2 to follow 15-16 is made, we get excellent sense. After assuring Cerinthus that his girl will recover (15-16), the poet goes on to say: "Don't cry: save your tears for the time when she rejects you (21-2)[16], but at the moment she is completely yours and it is your rivals who are rejected (17-18)[17] (so, the clear implication is, you need not cry now). Then (19) Apollo is addressed again (with the formulaic _fave_[18]), and remains the addressee till the end of the poem. Thus the last four lines (23-6) are addressed to the deity and not, as Cairns suggests, to Cerinthus whom the gods will consider _felix_[19]. Apollo is told by the poet that he will be famous and happy (_iam celeber, iam laetus eris_(23)) when the lovers try to outdo each other (_certatim_(24)) in repaying their vows; he will be the envy of heaven, where all the other gods will wish to possess his healing powers (_artes_ (26)).

Thus the poem does not, as Cairns maintains, develop dramatically. It is a prayer made by Pseudo-Tibullus on Cerinthus' behalf to Apollo at a particular point during Sulpicia's illness. Lines 1-14 are an address, using the conventional formulae of the prayer, to Apollo; 15-16, 21-22, 17-18 (in that order) are a six-line aside to Cerinthus; 19-26 resume and complete the prayer to Apollo.

It need hardly be said that once again the poem is less serious than some have believed (e.g. Bréguet _Sulpicia_305ff.).   The highly stylised and formal address to Apollo (1-2) is followed by a clearly humorous reason for his epiphany - he'll not find putting his hands on a beautiful girl unpleasant.   Perhaps, too, after the second urgent request for the god's presence (9), the picture of Apollo, the healing god, coming with his bag of medicines[20] and magic-spells is meant to be humorous (9-10)[21]. Certainly, we are not to take seriously the race to repay the vows in 23-4 or the jealousy of the gods who, after seeing this flurry of devotion, will all want Apollo's _artes_ themselves (25-6).

In Ovid's sickness poem (_Am_.2.13) Corinna is seriously ill after attempting an abortion (1-2).   Ovid's anger at her action takes second place to his fear for her safety, for which he feels a special concern since her was - or, at least, he believes he was - responsible for her pregnancy (3-6).   The prayer begins at 7: Ovid begs Isis to spare Corinna, and by doing so to spare himself as well (7-16).   Corinna has, the poet assures the goddess, been a loyal devotee (17-18).   At 19 he turns to Ilithyia to ask for help, promising votive offerings with a _titulus_ in return (19-26).   Finally, Ovid warns his girl to make sure that this was the last attempt at such action[22].

The poem is different from Propertius' and Pseudo-Tibullus' in that Ovid alone specifies the nature of his girl's illness, and in choosing an abortion as the cause of the malady Ovid provides himself with the

opportunity of new approaches to the theme. He is able to represent
himself in a dilemma, torn between fear for Corinna's safety and moral
indignation at her action (1-6), and he can even in this situation add
a touch of humour (sed tamen aut ex me conceperat – aut ego credo; / est
mihi pro facto saepe quod esse potest(5-6)). He is also able to
devote the following poem (Am.2.14) to a discussion of the moral aspects
of abortion[23], returning to the "personal" situation (that is, Corinna's
illness) at the end (41-4). Heinemann (Ep.Am.70) may be right in his
conclusion that Ovid is here developing a stock rhetorical theme. We
find the theme of abortion – with arguments against the practice – in
two late Greek prose-authors. In Theophylactus Ep.30 Rhodine upbraids
Calliope for her πανουργία in doing away with her unborn children.
What is particularly interesting about this letter is that Rhodine, like
Ovid, uses the example of Medea, claiming (again like Ovid) that Medea's
crime was less heinous than Calliope's since Medea was driven to it by
her husband:

Τῆς Κολχικῆς Μηδείας ἀπηνεστέρους ἀπεργάζη
τοὺς φόνους. παιδοκτονεῖν ἐκείνην ἐδίδασκεν
ἀγνωμονῶν ὁ ὁμόζυγος τὴν εὐεργέτιν καὶ τῶν
ἀγώνων τὴν σύμμαχον, σὺ δὲ διὰ τὴν τοῦ κάλλους
εὐπρέπειαν μυρίας συμφορὰς ἀπεργάζη, πορνίδιον.

(Ep.30.7-12)

cf. Ovid Am.2.14.29-31:

> Colchida respersam puerorum sanguine culpant,
>
> atque sua caesum matre queruntur Ityn:
>
> utraque saeva parens, sed tristibus utraque causis
>
> iactura socii sanguinis ulta virum.

Furthermore, in Chariton's romance, Callirhoe uses the same argument
when she is deliberating whether or not to abort the child she is
carrying:

> πάλιν δὲ μετενόει καὶ πως ἔλεος αὐτὴν
> τοῦ κατὰ γαστρὸς εἰσῄει. Βουλόμη τεκνοτονῆσαι,
> πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη, καὶ Μηδείας λαμβάνεις
> λογισμούς. ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Σκυθίδος ἀγριωτέρα
> δόξεις. ἐκείνη μὲν γὰρ ἐχθρὸν εἶχε τὸν ἄνδρα,
> σὺ δὲ τὸ Χαιρέου τέκνον θέλεις ἀποκτεῖναι...

>
>   (Chariton 2.9.15-20)

The three poems, then, are essentially different. Propertius' is a
dramatic representation of the different stages in Cynthia's illness;
Pseudo-Tibullus' is a prayer made by the poet, during the girl's
illness, as a "third party" on the lover's behalf; Ovid's is a
combination of a rhetorical theme and a prayer to save the sick girl.
And yet there are some striking internal similarities between the poems,
beyond the fact that all three poets pray for sick girls:

(1) Both Pseudo-Tibullus and Propertius claim that the girl's beauty
is a recommendation for her restitution to health by the deity: <u>tam formosa</u>

tuum mortua crimen erit (Prop.2.28.2), nec te iam, Phoebe, pigebit/ formosae medicas applicuisse manus ((Tib.)3.10(4.4)4.). Ovid only claims on Corinna's behalf that she digna est quam iubeas muneris esse tui (Am.2.13.22).

(2) All three poets make the observation that the preservation of the girl's life is actually the preservation of two lives, the girl's and the lover's[24]:

> si non unius, quaeso, miserere duorum!
>
> vivam si vivet; si cadet illa, cadam.
>
> <div align="right">(Prop.2.28.41-2)</div>
>
> Phoebe, fave: laus magna tibi tribuetur in uno
>
> corpore servato restituisse duos.
>
> <div align="right">((Tib.)3.10(4.4)19-20)</div>
>
> Huc adhibe vultus, et in una parce duobus[25].
>
> <div align="right">(Ovid Am.2.13.15)</div>

(3) Both Propertius and Ovid claim that, on the recovery of the girls, they will offer poetry to the deities concerned:

> pro quibus optatis sacro me carmine damno:
>
> scribam ego "per magnum est salva puella Iovem".
>
> <div align="right">(Prop.2.28.43-4)</div>
>
> adiciam titulum: 'servata Naso Corinna'.
>
> tu modo fac titulo muneribusque locum.
>
> <div align="right">(Ovid Am.2.13.25-6)</div>

(It is noticeable, however, that Ovid's _servata Naso Corinna_ is a _titulus_ which is to accompany the real votive offerings (_munera vota_ (24)), whereas Propertius' offering actually consists of verse. Presumably Ovid felt that poetry alone was not a sufficiently enticing _munus_ for Isis.) Pseudo-Tibullus, since he is a "spectator", simply says that Cerinthus offers _vota_ . . . _vix numeranda_ for Sulpicia's recovery ((Tib.)3.10(4.4) 12).

How are we to explain these similarities? Ovid is almost certainly indebted to Propertius, as Neumann (55ff.) convincingly argues. Apart from the coincidences noted above, _Am.2.13.17-18 saepe tibi sedet certis operata diebus./ qua tingit laurus Gallica turma tuas_ is certainly inspired by Prop.2.28.45 _ante tuosque pedes illa ipsa operata sedebit_, and Ovid (_Am.2.14.41-4_) seems to be following Propertius (2.28.5) in making Corinna's illness the result of divine punishment for a sin (though Ovid, unlike Propertius, is specific about the nature of the sin). The similarities between Propertius and Pseudo-Tibullus also seem to be explainable in this way: the author knew and imitated Prop.2.28.

This seems more reasonable than to postulate a common antecedent or to assume that the similarities result from Prop.2.28 and Tib.3.10(4.4) belonging to a genre. The latter is the claim made by Cairns (_GC_ 153ff.) who assigns the two poems to the genre _Soteria_, i.e. works of congratulation on the recovery of a friend[26]. We have no established rhetorical formula for this genre, and the only clear example of a poetic _soteria_ is Statius

Silvae 1.4, the <u>Soteria Rutili Gallici</u>[27].   By comparing Propertius'
and Tibullus' poems with this Cairns comes to the conclusion that they
are dramatised <u>soteria</u>, and he goes on to suggest that "it is more
than possible that Ovid meant (<u>Am</u>.2.13) to be understood as a
dramatised <u>soteria</u> of the same sort as those of Propertius and Pseudo-
Tibullus, the concluding cure being omitted in accordance with the
principle of omission" (<u>GC</u>157).

A comparison of Propertius 2.28 with Statius' poem will reveal one
fundamental difference.   Statius' poem is from the start a celebration
of Gallicus' cure (1-37), and the description of the concern and prayers
for Gallicus while he was ill is seen as a past event later in the poem
(38-57)[28].   Propertius' poem is of a very different structure, being
almost a "running commentary" on the course of Cynthia's illness, with
recovery attained only in the last four lines (59-62).   Cairns comments:
"The fact that the <u>soteria</u> is eucharistic and presupposes a cure implies
that the illness and cure will normally be narrated in examples of the
genre as past occurrences.   Thus the logic of the <u>soteria</u> guarantees
that the dramatic representation of illness, prayer and recovery found
in Propertius 2.28 is an abnormal and sophisticated mode of handling the
generic material" (<u>GC</u> 154).   Cairns seems to be arguing that Propertius'
poem belongs to the genre <u>soteria</u> because it involves not only Cynthia's
illness but also her recovery from it: we realise when we reach the
final four lines that what we have been reading all along is a <u>soteria</u>.
This seems to me unacceptable.   If we must apply the term <u>soteria</u> to 2.28

we would more accurately describe the poem as a dramatic monologue with (to meet Cairns half-way) a hint of a _soteria_ in its last four lines.   Furthermore, Propertius' poem is the only one which by any stretch of the imagination can be regarded as related to the _soteria_. Cairns's assignment of (Tib.)3.10(4.4) to the genre is dependent on his interpretation of _salva puella tibi est_ (16) as indicating a time lapse during which Sulpicia has recovered, and this, as we have seen, is not the case: when the poem ends, Sulpicia is still ill.   The · same is true of Ovid _Am_.2.13, and to claim that in this case "the concluding cure (is) omitted in accordance with the principles of omission" (_GC_157) is to beg the question.

That the coincidences between the poems are the result of the poets' conforming to the rules of a genre seems, in fact, less likely than the view that both the later poems are in large measure indebted to Propertius', that the theme and treatment of 2.28 were imitated both by Ovid and Pseudo-Tibullus.   The source from which Propertius derived the idea of his mistress's illness and his own anxiety for her we do not know, but it is not likely to have been comedy, where sickness is mainly confined to pregnancy (if that is an illness)[29], and it is difficult to see how it might have been treated in epigram.   Perhaps after using sick-visiting as a _Freundschaftsdienst_ in 2.9, Propertius decided to expand the theme into a whole poem.   It is possible, too, and perhaps even likely, that the theme was suggested to him by Callimachus.   The girl's illness and her lover's anxiety over it occur

also in Aristaenetus (Ep.1.10) and Ovid (Her.20 and 21), both of whom
are indebted to Callimachus' version of the story of Acontius and
Cydippe in the third book of the Aetia[30].   While Callimachean influences
in the elegists seem to be for the most part (except in the case of
Propertius Book 4) confined to smaller motives and poetic attitudes[31],
the story of Acontius and Cydippe appears to have enjoyed a special
popularity (cf. Ovid Rem.Am.381-2) and to have provided the inspiration
not only for Ovid Her.20 and 21 and Aristaenetus Ep.1.10 but also for
the "subjective" Propertius 1.18.[32]   It is to be noticed that both
Propertius on the one hand and Ovid and Aristaenetus on the other
emphasise the girl's broken oath and resulting divine vengeance as the
cause of the illness: cf.Prop.2.28.5ff; Ovid Her.20.107ff; Aristaenetus
1.10.71ff.. Cydippe had unwittingly sworn to marry Acontius and her
inability to fulfil the oath aroused the wrath of Artemis who visited
her with her illness.   Cynthia, too, has not fulfilled her oath and
is accordingly afflicted, the poet surmises, with a heaven-sent illness
(5-8)[33].   This story in Callimachus' most famous work may well have
influenced Propertius' treatment of the theme, if it did not suggest the
theme to him, and Ovid and Pseudo-Tibullus followed Propertius.

2.   The Mistress And Cosmetics

All three poets also use the motif of the mistress's/boy's preoccupation
with self-adornment.   In Prop.2.18c and Ovid Am.1.14 the girl's
preoccupation is with dying her hair;   Prop.1.2, Tib.1.8.9-16 and Ovid
Ars.3.101ff. and Rem.Am.343ff. deal with adornment generally (including
dress).   In this section, however, they will all be treated together,
as we are here concerned with the poets' attitudes rather than with the
details of the girls' toilet.

1.2, is, justifiably, regarded as one of Propertius' finest poems, though
it is not without difficulties[34].   The first 24 lines owe much to the
rhetorical schools.   Propertius begins with a protest made directly to
Cynthia: he wants to know why she insists on an ornate coiffure (1),
on wearing gowns of Coan silk (2), on drenching herself with Syrian
perfume (3).   Why, he asks, does she insist on "putting herself up for
sale" (vendere) in her foreign merchandise, and ruining her natural
beauty with artificial aids which are, in fact, no aid (4-8)[35]?   He
illustrates his thesis that natural beauty is best by comparisons
(parabolai) with nature (9-14) and by the examples (paradeigmata) of
famous women of antiquity (15-20)[36].   The latter were unadorned, and
they did not have the desire to collect lovers indiscriminately[37] - their
chastity was beauty enough for them (21-4).   But Propertius is not
arguing this from fear of competition with his rivals;   he just happens
to believe that a girl should want no more than one lover (25-6)[38].
Cynthia is accomplished as a poetess and musician, and will always have

Propertius' love — if she relinquishes these excesses of hers (27-32).

In 2.18 Cynthia is again chided by the poet for her enthusiasm for
cosmetics, but on this occasion Propertius limits himself to one aspect,
her hair-dying.   In colouring her hair, he claims, Cynthia is imitating
the Britons (23-4)[39].   He believes that a natural appearance is far more
becoming; in fact, foreign dyes are a disgrace for a Roman   (25-6)[40].
He curses the girl who dyes her hair (27-8) and he tells Cynthia that,
in his eyes, she is beautiful without hair-dyes if she "comes[41] to him
often (29-30).   Cynthia has no brother and no son, and so Propertius
asks to be allowed to be brother and son to her (33-34).   He asks that
their relationship (lectus (35)) act as a safeguard for her chastity, and
that she not wish to "sit overadorned" (35-6).   He will believe the tales
told of her, so she should refrain from misbehaving; rumour travels
quickly (37-8).   (In this summary I have omitted 31-2 which I find
incomprehensible in their present position and which make much better
sense if they are placed, as Lachmann suggested, after 26.   The train
of thought then is: "you are dying your hair, but natural beauty is
best and needs no foreign dyes.   I don't care if it is fashionable —
just because somebody else does it (quaedam) doesn't make it right.   In
fact, I curse the girl who dyes her hair . . .").

There is a noticeable similarity in movement between the two poems.   In
both Propertius starts from the proposition that natural beauty needs
no artificial foreign aids (peregrinis . . . muneribus (1.2.4), Belgicus . .

... _color_ (2.18.26)), but appears to end arguing that the aim of female
self-adornment is to attract several lovers[42]. In 1.2 the transition
is made be means of the examples from mythology, for whereas the
comparisons with nature simply illustrate the proposition that natural
beauty needs no cosmetic help the heroines of old are adduced as
examples not only on beauty unadorned but also of chastity (1.2.23ff.).
It should be noticed, however, that the transition is less abrupt than
some of Propertius' commentators[43] suggest, for _te . . . vendere_ in 4
surely means "advertise yourself for sale". This is the only use of
the verb _vendere_ in Propertius, but cf. Tib.1.4.59 _venerem vendere_;
ibid.67 _vendit amorem_; 1.9.51, _formam vendere_; ibid.77 _blanditias_
vendere; Ovid _Am._ 1.10.31,34. In fact, apart from Tibullus' _sedes_
. . . _avitas_ (2.4.53) nothing else is put up for sale in elegy, unless
it be _fides_ (Tib.1.9.32) which is an extension of the same idea (Ovid
_Am._1.10.37 _non bene conducti vendunt periuria testes_ is an apparent
exception, but this is, in fact, only an example which Ovid is using
to stop the girl asking for money for her favours). Thus we have a
suggestion of prostitution already by line 4, so that the equation of
the use of cosmetics with a plurality of lovers is made at the outset,
and the transition from one theme to another in the _exempla_ is facilitated.

In 2.18c the transition is made, or at least hinted at, in 29-30:

> deme: mihi certe poteris formosa videri;
>
> mi formosa sat es, si modo saepe venis.

mihi is repeated, and in both cases it appears in a prominent position

at the head of its word-group.   Propertius must be saying: "I find you beautiful unadorned, <u>even if others do not</u>".   Thus, in mid-poem, the suggestion is made that Cynthia's dying of her hair is connected with a desire to attract other lovers.   Now let us look at the rest of the poem.

In the next couplet 33-4 (that is, omitting the misplaced 31-2), Propertius makes an odd suggestion: he wants to play brother and son to his mistress.   Camps comments (2.141):   "this wording is only intelligible on this lover's lips if we suppose it to be a play of some cliché, unknown to us, of which the literal meaning was lost or softened".   Enk (2Comm.261) suggests the verses are to be taken closely with 29-30 and mean "tu mihi formosa sat es, si saepe venis. veni igitur ad me, tamquam ad fratrem aut filium".   Enk's interpretation is unacceptable because <u>venis</u> is clearly used in an erotic sense[44], but we need not, with Camps, accept complete defeat.   Propertius has, to this point, been giving Cynthia advice, and in 35f he goes on to talk about <u>custodia</u>.   Presumably this couplet explains his justification for giving advice;   Cynthia has no male relatives to protect her interests, and Propertius is volunteering his services[45].

Camps (2.141-2) is probably right in suggesting that <u>lectus</u> in 35 is equivalent to "your being mine", and so Propertius is urging Cynthia to keep herself chaste (i.e. true to Propertius) by remembering their affair.   So, in 36, <u>sedere</u> has, as Rothstein (1.257) suggests, "eine besondere Farbung".   Rothstein compares Martial 6.66.2 <u>quales in media</u>

sedent Sabura;   cf. also Ovid Pont.2.3.19-20 illud amicitiae quondam venerabile nomen/prostat et in quaestu pro meretrice sedet.   Shackleton Bailey (Propertiana 98) objects that "it would be futile to ask (Cynthia) not to make herself conspicuous if sedere meant anything so discreditable", but of course Cynthia does not have to be a bona fide scortum to have this said about her(in fact, we should compare with such usages the word scortum itself: cf. Hor. Od.2.11.21, Catullus 10.3 (with Quinn's note)).   Indeed, this meaning, or colouring, of the word suits the context very well, for,as we have seen,Propertius has already implied in 29-30 that the point of Cynthia's hair-dying is to attract other men.   It also parallels se . . . vendere in 1.2.4, so that in both poems Propertius suggests that his mistress's behaviour smacks of prostitution.

Tibullus 1.8 makes very different use of the "adornment" motif, which takes up only a small part of the poem.   The poet begins with an address to Marathus in which he claims to be an expert in love, taught by Venus herself and not drawing his information from lots or oracles (a clear manipulation of the erotodidactic topos that the praeceptor amoris is as reliable as an oracle (see Cairns GC73)), and he can see that Marathus is afflicted (1-8).   Of no use now, Tibullus continues, is Marathus' self-adornment;   this does not impress the girl (Pholoe), though she attracts him with her unadorned beauty (9-16).   Marathus has been bewitched, surmises the poet - but no, on reflection, it is not magic but simply the power of love (17-27).   Then, again as a praeceptor amoris,

Tibullus gives advice to Pholoe and tries to persuade her to accept
Marathus as a lover (27-66).   But his entreaties are in vain;   she
will not listen, and Marathus, who once mocked love, now feels its
torments himself (67-76).   But the girl, too, concludes Tibullus,
will be punished in future for her pride (77-8).

The motif of self-adornment, then, is confined to a small section of ·
the poem (9-16), and the point made by Tibullus is simply that it is
natural beauty, not beauty adorned, which has the power of attraction.
This is the point from which Propertius starts in 1.2 and 2.18c;   but
unlike Propertius Tibullus does not go on to associate self-adornment
with a desire to attract other lovers, or with prostitution.

However, Tibullus does put the theme to a new and interesting use.
What he does is "objectivise" the situation.   Instead of complaining,
as Propertius and Ovid (Am.1.14) do, about his mistress's or boy's
use of cosmetics, he looks from outside, as a third person, at the
love of Marathus for a meretrix (a technique which, we have already
seen, is imitated by Pseudo-Tibullus in 3.10 (4.4).   See above p. 243f).
In 1-8 and 8ff. he makes the personal link demanded by the conventions
of the genre;   he is a praeceptor amoris giving advice to Marathus,
with whom he himself has had a love-affair.   Tibullus' romantic
involvement is indicated by 23ff:

> Quid queror heu misero carmen nocuisse, quid herbas?
>
> Forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis:

> Sed corpus tetigisse nocet, sed longa dedisse
>
> Oscula, sed femori conseruisse femur.

Surely Tibullus' _heu_ (23) is not simply an exclamation deriving from pity for Marathus' unhappy situation, and why does he "complain"? What do we supply with _misero_ in the same line? Is it/(as André _ad loc._ baldly states) or _mihi_ (as Cornish's Loeb translation would have it)? Surely what we have here is a case of deliberate ambiguity. Tibullus, like Marathus, has been harmed, but by love, not magic. It is sexual contact that has brought on Marathus' unhappy afflication; Tibullus knows this because he has experienced the same thing (presumably with Marathus), and that is why he lingers over the physical details in 24-6.

Thus, his personal involvement in the situation established, Tibullus is able to use the themes of "subjective" love-elegy in an "objective" manner. This he does with the theme "real beauty needs no adornment". Instead of telling Marathus that beauty, not adornment, attracts (as Propertius does), he makes this same point by showing Marathus the facts of his own situation; Pholoe, though unadorned, attracts him, while, he, for all his cosmetic labours, cannot attract her. The motif is made all the more interesting by the fact that it is the male party in this case who is pre-occupied with self-adornment (see Smith on 1.8.9-14).

In the _Amores_, Ovid also adopts the standard elegiac attitude of

disapproval of his own mistress's concern with self-adornment.
Specifically, he does not like her dying her hair.   The poem is,
as we shall see, to some extent indebted to Propertius' "Hair" poem
(2.18c).   Let us first examine its structure.

Against his wishes, claims Ovid, Corinna dyed her hair, and now
she has lost it (1-2).   It was beautiful hair, too -- long,[46] fine
and attractively coloured (3-12).   It could be easily combed, and
Corinna's ornatrix was safe from punishment for hurting her mistress
(13-18).   Even uncombed it was beautiful (19-22)[47].   But it had to
withstand cruel treatment at the hands of its owner, despite Ovid's
pleas (23-30).   Now her hair is gone, and Corinna has only herself
to blame (31-44).   In future she will wear the hair of some foreign
captive, and when the hair will be praised the praise will, in fact,
be going not to Corinna, but to the captive (45-50).   At this point,
the poem develops dramatically.   Corinna, overcome with emotion,
breaks into tears, and is comforted by Ovid who tells her that her
hair will return (51-6).

There can be little doubt that Ovid knew and imitated Propertius'
poem on Cynthia's hair-dying[48].   Neumann (43) points to the similarity
between Prop.2.18.27-8:

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

and Ovid Am.1.14.36:

quid speculum maesta ponis inepta manu?

Neumann (42-3) states: "Ut Propertius eam puellam quae prima crines

tinxit ineptam appellat, ita Ovidius Corinnam alloquens eodem adiectivo

utitur". More significant, perhaps, is the fact that it occurs at the

same position in the pentameter in both poets. Furthermore, this is

the only usage of the adjective in Propertius, and it is not a common

adjective in Ovid, occurring only five times, apart from this instance,

in the Ovidian corpus (one of these, too, being tonsorial: Ars.1.306

quid totiens positas fingis inepta comas[49]).

However, much more remarkable than the similarities between the two

poems, are the differences between them. Propertius, as we have seen,

starts with the theme "natural beauty needs no adornment" but moves,

as he does in 1.2, into the theme of Cynthia's wishing to attract

other lovers. "Beauty unadorned is more attractive" is, in fact, a

red-herring; Propertius is actually concerned with a moral, not an

aesthetic question. There is nothing of this in the younger poet.

Ovid makes Corinna lose her hair, and gives the theme an entirely new

twist by looking at the past (3-44) and the future (45-50). After an

annoying "I told you so" opening (see Barsby ad loc.(Am.1.149)) he goes

on to consider the past, when Corinna had beautiful hair (3-22) but

maltreated is (23-30). In 23ff. Ovid personifies the hair and

excites our pity for it. After its past glory it had to withstand

disgraceful treatment (24-6)[50] despite Ovid's outcry against such a

crime (note the repetition of scelus in 27 scelus est istos, scelus,

urere crines).   Here Ovid seems to be developing some of the loci
communes of the conquestio suggested by Cicero (cf. especially De Inv.1.
107 primus locus est misericordiae per quem quibus in bonis fuerint et
nunc quibus in malis sint ostenditur . . . quartus per quem res turpes
et humiles et illiberales proferunter et indigna esse aetate, genere,
fortuna pristina, honore, beneficiis quae passi passurive sint . . .(109)
sextus decimus per quem animum nostrum . . . amplum et excelsum et
patientem incommodorum esse . . . demonstramus).

After exciting pity in this way for the personified hair, Ovid is able
to slip now into a parody of the language of epitaph and epicedion
(31ff.).   In 31-2 we have the solemn "obituary notice" ("so and so is
dead"):

> formosae periere comae, quas vellet Apollo,
> quas vellet capiti Bacchus inesse suo.

For similar "notices" cf. Hor. Odes 1.24.5, Ovid Am.3.9.5 and, in
parody, Catullus 3.3f., Ovid Am.2.6.1f.   In 31-4 we have the laudatio
of the dead person: cf. Hor. Odes1.24.6ff. and see Nisbet and Hubbard
ad loc. (Odes 1.284), Lattimore Themes 290ff.   In 35ff. we have a
humorous variation of the standard consolatory "uselessness of mourning"
topos (see Nisbet and Hubbard on Odes1.24.13 (286)): instead of saying
"why complain - it does no good" Ovid says to Corinna "why complain - you
did it yourself".

The humorous tone of this section is matched by 45ff. where Ovid turns to

the future, imagining Corinna in a German wig and receiving undeserved compliments. This is what produced Corinna's tears presumably (51-4) and these in turn produce Ovid's final consolation (55-6).

Finally we may briefly observe the instances of the "adornment" theme in the erotodidactic works of Ovid. At Ars.3.101-250 and, of course, in the fragmentary De Medicamine Faciei, the poet gives his female readers detailed advice on cosmetics and dress with no hint of disapproval. Quite the reverse in fact:

> simplicitas rudis ante fuit: nunc aurea Roma est,
>
> et domiti magnas possidet orbis opes
>
> (Ars.3.113-4)

Adornment is positively encouraged and the only hint of the "natural beauty is best" theme is the concession et neglecta decet multas coma (Ars.3.153). Indeed Ovid goes on to pick up the hair-dying theme, only now he seems to envy women their ability (denied a man) to hide their age by such means:

> nos male detegimur, raptique aetate capilli,
>
> ut Borea frondes excutiente, cadunt.
>
> femina canitiem Germanis inficit herbis,
>
> et melior vero quaeritur arte color,
>
> femina procedit densissima crinibus emptis
>
> proque suis alios efficit aere suos
>
> (Ars.3.161-166)

In the Remedia, however, the "natural beauty is best" theme makes a

reappearance, and is given a very clever and original twist.   Arrive

unexpectedly, says the poet to the lover desiring a cure, and catch

her before she has had time to cover herself with all her finery

(Rem.Am.343-8).   This will not, however, always work:

non tamen huic nimium praecepto credere tutum est:

fallit enim multos forma sine arte decens.

(Rem.Am.349-50)

But come when she is at work with her dyes and juices, and you will

surely be sickened to your stomach (351-6).

It can be seen, therefore, that the "beauty unadorned" theme is used

in two ways by the elegists.   First, there is the straightforward

"natural beauty needs no adornment" motif which we find in Tib.1.8.9ff.,

as a means of starting Prop.1.2 and 2.18c, and developed in a novel

and interesting way in Ovid Am. 1.14   and Rem.Am.343ff.; secondly,

there is the "adornment is aimed at attracting many lovers" motif.

which we find in both Propertian poems.   Now let us examine the

history of the motives.

i.   Natural Beauty Needs No Adornment

This appears most frequently as an epigrammatic theme, but extant

examples are confined to a period later than Roman Love Elegy, though

it is not unreasonable to suppose that it had been a theme of earlier

epigram.   It is used on several occasions by the satiric epigrammatists.

Lucilius (AP11.310) tells a woman that for the money she has spent on

aodrning herself she could have bought a face. Macedonius (AP11.370)

plays on the Pindaric ἄριστον ὕδωρ cliche, calling water φύκεος

ἐχθρότατον; cf.also 11.374 (Lucilius). Closer is an erotic,

non-satyric epigram of Paulus Silentiarius (AP5.270) which begins with

an example from nature (οὔτε ῥόδον στεφάνων ἐπιδεύεται).

Paulus is not close enough to Propertius to suggest that he borrowed

directly from him (see Viansino Paolo Silenziario132), and since examples

from nature occur in a "beauty unadorned" context in Philostratus Ep.

27,[51] we may plausibly trace back the association of examples from nature

with the theme to earlier (epigrammatic?) literature, and perhaps, as

Heinemann (Ep.Am.81) asserts, to the rhetorical schools.

The female propensity for self-adornment also provided an argument for

those pederastic epigrams in which homosexual and heterosexual love is

compared, to the latter's disadvantage[52]; cf. AP 5.19 (Rufinus), 12.192

(Strato).

"Natural beauty is best", however, is not confined to the epigrammatists,

and turns up even in late epic. At Dion.42.76ff. Nonnus describes

the beautiful Beroe:

$$\text{καὶ οὐ ξανθόχροϊ κόσμῳ}$$
$$\text{χρισαμένη Βερόη ῥοδοειδέα κύκλα προσώπου}$$
$$\text{ψευδομένας ἐρύθηνε νόθῳ σπινθῆρι παρειάς,}$$
$$\text{οὐ χροὸς ἀντιτύποιο διαυγέϊ μάρτυρι χαλκῷ..}$$

(Dion.76-9)

The result Nonnus gives us a few lines later:

$$\mathring{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha} \;\; \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}o\nu\tau\alpha \;\; \pi o\lambda\grave{\upsilon} \; \pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}o\nu \; \mathring{o}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\ddot{\iota} \; \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\rho\psi$$
$$\mathring{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota \;\; \kappa\lambda o\nu\acute{\epsilon}o\upsilon\acute{\sigma}\iota\nu \;\; \mathring{\alpha}\kappa\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau o\iota o \;\; \pi\rho o\acute{\sigma}\acute{\omega}\pi o\upsilon...$$

$$(84-5)$$

It is common theme in later Greek erotic prose literature, particularly
the erotic epistle; cf. Aristaenetus 2.21; Philostratus Ep. 22and36
(on foot-fetishism). Especially see Philostratus Ep.40, which
provides an interesting parallel for Propertius 1.2.5 (naturaeque decus
mercato perdere cultu), in that Philostratus tells Berenice, the letter's
addressee, that her make-up not only does not add to her beauty, but
actually does her a disservice by making her look old. In prose
literature, too, we find the theme used to contrast (unfavourably)
heterosexual with homosexual love; cf. Philostratus Ep.27; Ach. Tat.
2.38.2ff; Lucian Amores39-42. An avoidance of cosmetics and fine
clothes was also advocated by Hellenistic moralists who attacked
feminine extravagance (see J. Geffken Kunika und Verwandtes (Heidelberg
1909) 80ff; A. Oltramare Les Origines de la diatribe romaine (Geneva
1926) 52nr.39). The theme may even have occurred in tragedy, to judge
from Sophocles fr.846 (quoted by Plutarch Coniug. Praecept.141E) which
appears close to Tibullus 1.8.9ff:

$$\mathring{o}\upsilon \;\; \kappa\acute{o}\acute{\sigma}\mu o\varsigma, \mathring{o}\upsilon\kappa, \;\; \mathring{\omega} \;\; \tau\lambda\overline{\eta}\mu o\nu, \mathring{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \;\; \mathring{\alpha}\kappa o\acute{\sigma}\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$$
$$\varphi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu o\iota\tau' \;\; \mathring{\alpha}\nu \;\; \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota \;\; \acute{\sigma}\overline{\omega}\nu \;\; \tau\epsilon \;\; \mu\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma \;\; \varphi\rho\epsilon\nu\overline{\omega}\nu.^{53}$$

Such a widespread occurrence of the theme makes it difficult for us
to postulate an immediate source for the elegists. Epigram may have

been the medium through which it reached Elegy but the occurrence of
the theme in popular philosophy indicates that it was a common topic
of everyday discussion – at least in Hellenistic Greece – and there
is no reason to suppose that it was confined to this genre of poetry.
What our examination of the later Greek authors does reveal is a
connection between examples from nature and the "natural beauty is
best" theme, and this, since it occurs also in Propertius, we may
plausibly trace back to pre-Propertian antecedents and perhaps
eventually to the rhetorical schools.

ii. Adornment as an attempt to attract many lovers

We have seen that Propertius, unlike Tibullus and Ovid, moves from the
idea that natural beauty needs no adornment to the idea that his
mistress's use of cosmetics is designed to attract other lovers, and
that he uses the theme to assert the morality of the elegist, i.e.
faithfulness to a single lover.   In this, as Wheeler[54] maintained, he
may be indebted to Comedy.   In Plautus Most.157ff. the lena Scapha
tries to persuade Philematium, a young meretrix, not to confine herself
to her lover Philolaches, but to take many lovers.   The lena has no
success and is, in fact, upbraided by Philematium, whereupon she
proceeds to flatter the young girl and to preach "beauty unadorned"
(cf. also Poen.300ff. and see Wheeler CP6(1911)70ff.).   In Menander
we find the statement that no "decent" woman should dye her hair: Τὴν
γυναῖκα γὰρ τὴν σώφρον οὐ δεῖ τὰς τρίχας ξανθὰς ποιεῖν.
(fr.679Koerte).   It is clear, then, that in comedy the use of cosmetics

indicates an attempt to take more than one lover.   In comedy-related

literature, cf. Lucian <u>Dial.Mer.</u>6.3, where the <u>meretrix</u> lyra's

success at her profession is attributed to her deft use of cosmetics

and Alciphron <u>Ep.</u>2.8.3 where "rustica uxor" associates the corrupt

mores of the city with τὸ πρόσωπον ἐπίπλαστον.

This contrast between morality and cosmetics is not, however, confined

to comedy; we can also trace it back to Hellenistic philosophers

(see Geffken <u>op.cit.</u>80ff.).   It appears frequently in later works

which are indebted to Hellenistic popular philosophy (or 'diatribe'[55])

cf. <u>Epist. Pythag.</u> 11 (Hercher 607)χρὴ ὧν τὰν σώφρονα καὶ ἐλευθέραν

τῷ κατὰ νόμον ἀνδρὶ ποτῆμεν ἀουγὰ κεκαλλωπισμέναν ἀλλὰ

μὴ πολυτελῶς, ἦμεν δὲ τᾷ ἐσθᾶτι λευκοείμονα καὶ καθάριον καὶ

ἀφελῆ, ἀλλὰ μὴ πολυτελῆ καὶ περισσάν· περαιτητέον γὰρ αὐτᾷ

τὰν δίαυγῆ καὶ διαπόρφυρον καὶ τὰ χρυσόπαστα τῶν ἐνδυμάτων.

ταῖς ἑταίραις γὰρ τάδε χρήσιμα <u>ποττὰν τῶν πλεόνων</u>

<u>θήραν</u>, τὰς δὲ ποθ' ἕνα τὸν ἴδιον εὐαρεστούσας γυναικὸς

κόσμος ὁ τρόπος πέλει καὶ οὐχ ἀι στολαί.

Plutarch <u>Coniug. Praecept.</u>26, 141E also contrasts luxurious adornment

with "adornment of character": κοσμεῖ δὲ τὸ κοσμιώτεραν τὴν

γυναῖκα ποιοῦν. ποιεῖ δὲ τοιαύτην οὔτε χρυσὸς οὔτε

σμάραγδος οὔτε κόκκος ἀλλ' ὅσα σεμνότητος εὐταξίας

ἀιδοῦς ἔμφασιν περιτίθησιν.

We cannot tell whether diatribe influenced comedy or vice versa[56], or

whether, indeed, we have a case of "influence" at all.   In fact, it

may well be that we do not.   We are dealing with a widely-dispersed
theme, and it is possible that the comic poets and Hellenistic
philosophers were, independently of each other, reflecting a widely-
held attitude towards cosmetics, and female extravagance.   The use of
cosmetics, particularly excessive use, was associated, as it has been
at many or even most points of history, with prostitution (cf.e.g.
Philostratus Ep.22.13-15;   Alciphron 4.6, where two courtesans have
quarrelled over remarks made by one on the other's cosmetics;   cf.
also Lucilius 266-7 with Krenkel's note).   Thus it was associated
in the minds of moralists, pagan and Christian alike[57], with immorality,
and this association is found in "everyday life" as well (cf. e.g.
Dessau Ils8513 = CE 1037; Lysias De Caed.Eratosth.14,17).   This
association of cosmetics with prostitution we have seen in both
Propertius' poems (1.2.4, 2.18.36).   Thus, while Wheeler may be correct
in seeing comic influence in 1.2, we cannot rule out the possibilities
that, for both poems, Propertius has taken a common theme of popular
philosophy (diatribe), or, indeed, of "everyday life", and made it into
poetry.

CONCLUSION

From a study of only a selection of themes general conclusions are
not easy to draw, but one or two observations can be made on the basis
of what we have seen so far.   First, while the shared themes which we
have examined all have a literary history, often quite a long one,
antedating elegy, the elegists have for the most part wrenched these
themes from their traditional settings and made them serve their own
purposes.   Moreover, the treatment of these themes can vary greatly
from elegist to elegist.   Another conclusion can also be drawn
concerning the sources of the elegists in general.   The old idea,
discussed in the introduction, that the elegists wrote a kind of
Greek poetry in Latin — that they were following closely a number of
Greek "subjective" elegists — is clearly mistaken, but so too is the
notion that Greek themes were derived from or channelled into elegy
almost exclusively through a major Greek genre such as erotic epigram.
That many, perhaps even the majority, of themes do come from the major
genres of epigram and comedy may be true, but there are others, as we
have seen in chapters four and five, which do not.   The elegists, like
most poets, were open to suggestions from many sources, from different
genres of literature (even epic[1]), from rhetoric, from life itself.   I
wish to conclude by examining a poem in which several different kinds
of influence seem to be at work at the same time.

In 4.7 Propertius reports the appearance of Cynthia's shade to him
after her shabby funeral which he did not attend.   The theme of the
girl's unattended funeral occurs briefly in Tibullus (2.4.43ff.),
and this may have suggested it to Propertius.   Tibullus declares
that a greedy girl will (like Cynthia) have no mourners at her
funeral:

> seu veniet tibi mors, nec erit qui lugeat ullus
>
>> nec qui det maestas munus in exsequias.
>
> at bona quae nec avara fuit, centum licet annos
>
>> vixerit, ardentem flebitur ante rogum:
>
> atque aliquis senior veteres veneratus amores
>
>> annua constructo serta dabit tumulo
>
> et "bene" discedens dicet "placideque quiescas,
>
>> terraque securae sit super ossa levis".

> (Tib.2.4.43-9)

It is noticeable that Tibullus has incorporated in this passage two
frequently-recurring topoi of the funeral epigram.   For bene quiescere
(48)cf. CIL6.22711, 24138, 24227, 25022 etc. (see Lattimore, Themes
72 note 390 for more examples).   terraque . . . sit super ossa levis
is clearly a variation on the popular terra tibi levis sit formula of
epitaphs; see Lattimore Themes 71ff.   Often the two topoi are found
together, as in Tibullus: cf. CIL6.14811, 28124, 28267; 11.7243;
14.2348 etc.

Propertius' poem, one of the finest, if not the finest, in the fourth

book, does much more with the theme.   Again (as in Tibullus) elements

of the funeral epigram are to be found, as Schulz-Vanheyden (151ff.)

has well demonstrated, but the poem also contains other elements and

provides us with an excellent example of how a poet can fuse together

strands from different literary (and perhaps, in this case, non-literary)

traditions.   Let us now examine these.

First, as all commentators on the poem note, Propertius was evidently

familiar with Patroclus' appearance to Achilles in Iliad.23.   The

poem contains many deliberate reminiscences of the episode:

1.   Sunt aliquid Manes, letum non omnia finit,

              luridaque evictos effugit umbra rogos.

          Cynthia namque meo visa est incumbere fulcro[2]. . .

                                              (Prop. 1-3)

> ὦ πόποι, ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι καὶ ἐιν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι
> ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον, ἀτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἐνι πάμπαν·
> παννυχίη γάρ μοι Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο.
> ψυχὴ ἐφεστήκει γοόωσά τε μυρομένη τε

                                              (Homer 103-6)

Clearly this is a case of direct imitation;   both poets claim a belief

in a life beyond the grave, and then explain their reasons — a person

(named in both cases) has returned from the dead.

2.   eosdem habuit secum quibus est elata capillos

eosdem oculos

(Prop. 7-8)

πάντ' αὐτῶ μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα καλ' ἐικυῖα.

(Homer 66)

The resemblance here is not so close, although both poets do refer to
the eyes of the dead person being the same as when he or she was alive.
Homer, however, refers to eyes and size (because he is talking about
a hero); Propertius refers to eyes and hair (because he is talking
about a once-beautiful woman).   Propertius goes well beyond Homer in
lines 8ff; he represents Cynthia not as being exactly as she was in
life (as Patroclus was) but as having suffered the ravages of the
funeral pyre.

3.   in te iam vires somnus habere potest?

          iamne tibi exciderant vigilacis furta Suburae

          et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis?

(Prop.14-16)

εὕδεις, αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο λελασμένος ἔπλευ, Ἀχιλλεῦ.

(Homer 69)

The lines are not close verbally but both poets represent the returning
ghosts as beginning their speeches with a rebuke to the live friend/
lover for being forgetful of them and for being able to sleep so soon
after the loved one's death[3].

4.   inter complexus excidit umbra meos

(Prop. 96)

ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ὠρέξατο (sc. Ἀχιλλεὺς) χερσὶ φίλῃσιν
οὐδ' ἔλαβε· ψυχὴ δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἠύτε καπνὸς
ὤχετο τετριγυῖα...

(Homer 99-101)

Again the poets are not close verbally, but both men are represented
as attempting to embrace (unsuccessfully) the departing shade.

5.   Cur ventos non ipse rogis, ingrate petisti?

(Prop. 31)

στὰς ἀπάνευθε πυρῆς δοιοῖς ἠρᾶτ' ἀνέγκοισι,
Βορέῃ καὶ Ζεφύρῳ, καὶ ὑπίσχετο ἱερὰ καλά...

(Homer 194-5)

Here we have not imitation, but a deliberate reminiscence of the Homeric
passage by Cynthia who complains about Propertius' lack of concern about
her burial.   Propertius, she claims, failed to do what Achilles actually
did do.

It is quite clear that Propertius intends us to note his indebtedness to
Homer, and to see how he has used the Homeric episode[4].   He begins and
ends his poem with Homer, and within the framework of the poem includes
some unmistakeable reminiscences of Achilles' vision.

But within this framework, too, we find certain details which belong to
the sphere of sepulchral epigram.   The opening three words (sunt aliquid
manes), for instance, are not simply a Homeric reminiscence but a positive
answer to the conventional scepticism of funeral epigrams.   For such

scepticism cf. Buecheler CE428 (CIL10.8131) 14 si sapiunt aliquid post

funera Manes, CE132 (CIL 6.12735)1 si qui estis Manes, CE1057 (CIL

6.24520)15 si sunt di Manes, etc.   In Greek, where it is less common,

cf. AP7.23.6 εἰ δὲ τις φθιμένοις χρίμπτεται εὐφροσύνα.

cf. also Kaibel Epigr. Gr. 700, 720.   See further Lattimore Themes

59ff., Schulz-Vanheyden 152[5].   (Shackleton Bailey ("Echoes of Propertius"

Muemosyne 5(1952) 330)considers the CIL examples to be Propertian

reminiscences, but the existence of such scepticism in Greek funerary

epigram suggests rather that Propertius was consciously imitating the

language of epitaph.)

Other elements also derive from funerary epigram.   At 79-80 we should

read with Sandbach:

                pone hederam tumulo, mihi quae praegnante corymbo

                    mollia cantortis alliget ossa comis.

The mss. read pelle (79) and alligat (80), but it is difficult to see

why Cynthia, a poetess, should want ivy "driven" from her tomb[6], and

especially difficult to see how it cauld be driven from the tomb of

a person recently buried (nuper humata (4))[7].   But whether we read

pone or pelle Cynthia's instructions are to be seen in the light of the

convention which associates ivy with poets' graves.

At 85-6 we find an epitaph comprising a single distych which is to be

inscribed on a stone to be set on her tomb at Tibur:

HIC TIBURTINE·IACET AUREA CYNTHIA TERRA

ACCESSIT RIPAE LAUS, ANIENE, TUAE.

As Schulz-Vanheyden has demonstrated (90f), this couplet follows the

conventions of real sepulchral epigrams. Hic iacet is the Latin

equivalent of ἐνθάδε κεῖται , for which cf. SEG8.11.1-2;

Kaibel Epigr.Gr.425.1-2; AP7.94.1-2 (Anon.) etc. For hic iacet

cf. Buecheler CE481 (CIL13.1393), Tib.1.3.55f, Ovid Trist.3.3.73

etc. In the pentameter, Propertius' statement that praise will

come to the banks of the Anio because Cynthia is buried there is

reminiscent of the epitaphs in AP 7 where a place wins renown

because a poet is buried in its soil; cf. AP 7.1.7-8 (Alcaeus of

Messene on Homer), 7.14.5 (Antipater of Sidon on Sappho), 7.39.4

(Antipater of Thessalonica on Aeschylus). It is also significant

that the form of Cynthia's epitaph is also the form of some single-

distych Greek epitaphs, with the facts of the death or burial given

in the hexameter, and a comment on or praise of the deceased in the

pentameter: cf. AP7.453 (Callim.), 7.509 (Simonides). See also

Werner Peek Griechische Grabgedichte (Darmstadt 1960) 34-36; 55.

At 94 Cynthia finishes her utterance with the line mecum eris et mixtis

ossibus ossa teram. The gruesome nature of the statement is in accord

with Cynthia's larva-like appearance (see below); few would accept

Camps' suggestion that "the sentence as a whole perhaps is meant to

say only that her shade will hold his in a tight embrace"[8]. Burial

in the same tomb, or urn, is by no means an uncommon theme in

sepulchral epigram.   Schulz-Vanheyden (153) quotes AP7.330 (Anon.)

3-4;   7.378 (Apollonides) 3-4;   15.8 (Anon.) 1-2;   Peek Griechische

Versinschriften (Berlin 1955) 679.1-2, 1117.1-2;   Buecheler CE68

(CIL1.1217) 5 (all husbands and wives);   AP7.323 (Anon.), 7.474

(Anon.) Peek op.cit.1263.5-6, 1715 (all brothers and sisters) Omitted

by Schulz-Vanheyden but perhaps of more significance are a number of

Latin funeral inscriptions which appear to indicate that mixtis ossibus

is almost a technical expression;   cf.Dessau ILS8469 ossibus permixtis,

8640 commixta ossa.   For ossa miscere cf. also Consolatio ad Liviam 163;

Buecheler CE 1136 (CIL6.9693)2;   Propertius 2.8.23;   Ovid Met.11.707

(for more literary examples, see Fedeli on Prop.4.7.94).

At 51ff. Cynthia says:

> iuro ego Fatorum nulli revolubile carmen
>
> tergeminusque canis sic mihi molle sonet,
>
> me servasse fidem . . .

which is a strange oath for one whose perfidy the poet constantly rails

at, and who in the very next poem is represented as taking a trip to

Lanuvium with yet another of Propertius' rivals (4.8.16, 23ff.).   Why,

then, does Cynthia insist upon her fides in this poem?   Surely because

dead women are always praised for their fidelity in epitaphs;   the highest

praise for a dead woman is that she was, like Cornelia (4.11.36), "univira":

cf. Dessau ILS8442, 8444 etc. (univira);   8527, 8456 (casta);   8434

(fide vixit);   8419 (fidem bonam secum apstulit) cf. 8436, 8418 etc.

Cynthia, moreover, sees herself as one of the sine fraude maritae (63),

and the expression <u>sine fraude</u> can also be paralleled in Roman

epitaphs; cf. Dessau <u>ILS</u>7547.   Much more common, however, are

<u>sine querella, sine lite, sine crimine</u> and <u>sine controversia.</u>

For these and other <u>sine</u> formulae used of dead women, see Lattimore

<u>Themes</u> 279 notes 107 and 108.   cf. also Prop.4.11.45 <u>sine crimine</u>

<u>tota</u> (sc. <u>aetas</u>) <u>est.</u>

It is not surprising that Propertius, in a poem concerning his dead

mistress, should (like Tibullus at 2.4.43ff.) use the themes of

sepulchral epigram, but neither Homeric nor epigrammatic influence

will explain completely why Propertius chose to represent Cynthia

as he does, or why she is made to say the things she says.   (Nor

is there an "elegiac tradition" to explain this;   the ghosts of dead

mistresses rebuking their live lovers and accusing their slaves of

murder is by no means a standard elegiac theme[9].)   First consider

Cynthia as she appeared to her lover.   Recently buried (<u>nuper</u> (4)),

she appears to Propertius at night.   She is a "<u>lurida</u> . . . <u>umbra</u>"

(2) and has a frightening appearance; ·her hair and eyes are the same

as when she was "carried out" — not as when she was alive, but as

when she was taken out for burial — but her dress is burnt, the ring

on her finger has been eaten away by the pyre and her lips are parched

by Lethe's water[10].   Her temper and voice are unchanged, but her hands,

with which she gesticulates to the poet, are those of a skeleton[11].

Butler and Barber (360) are surely correct in their judgement that

"the angry ghost has been given to some extent the form of a <u>larva</u>"

(or perhaps, more correctly, a _lemur_, though the two are often confused;
see L. Collison-Morley _Greek and Roman Ghost Stories_ (Reprinted Chicago
1968) 7ff[12].   The distinction is made by Apuleius _De Deo Socratis_
152-3).

Cynthia's behaviour is in accord with the behaviour of ancient ghosts.
She has returned to Propertius for two reasons.   First she has come to
rebuke him;   after all that had passed between them (17-20) Propertius did
not even arrange a proper funeral for her (21-6) and he did not attend
her funeral himself (27-34).   Then she immediately turns her attack on
Lygdamus and Nomas, two of her slaves;   these, she claims, are her
murderers, and Propertius must see that they are punished (35-8).   Since
Cynthia then launches into an attack on Propertius' latest mistress (39ff.),
we are expected to infer that she was somehow involved in the plot.   Both
of these motives for a return from the dead are typical of anicent ghosts.

At Lucian _Philopseud._27 Eucrates claims to have been visited by his wife
just seven days after her burial.   She returned to him, he claims, to
rebuke him for not cremating one of her sandals with her.   Like
Eucrates, Propertius is rebuked by a recently-buried loved one for failing
to carry out the burial ceremony properly[13].   Desire for burial as a
motive for a ghost's appearance goes back as far as Homer _Iliad_23.71ff.
(Patroclus);cf. _Od._11.74ff.(Elpenor).   For a desire for a proper burial
as a motive,cf. Pliny _Ep._7.27.

At _De Div._1.57[14] Cicero tells the famous story of the traveller who was

murdered by his innkeeper. Two friends on a journey arrived at a
certain town and parted company for the night, one going to an inn,
the other to the house of a friend.. The man at the inn was murdered
during the night for his money by the innkeeper, and his body was
placed in a dung-cart under the dung for removal from the city the
following morning. Meanwhile, the dead man appeared to his friend
and told him what had happened. The friend took action and had
the cart stopped at the gates of the city. The body was discovered
and the innkeeper duly punished. Cynthia's ghost, like the ghost
of the traveller, also appears with the motive of exacting vengeance
on her murderers through the agency of a living person. For a
similar revelation of a murder by a ghost,cf. Apuleius Met.8.4
(the story of Thrasyllus, killed by his friend on a hunt).

It is not, of course, suggested that Propertius was influenced
directly by these stories, only that in his representation of Cynthia's
apparition he followed the conventions of the ancient ghost-story.
Cynthia, to a Roman reader, has the characteristics of a larva or
lemur, and her motives for appearing are those of an ancient ghost.
There are other elements in the poem, too, which appear to belong to
this tradition.

First there is Cynthia's appearance. She is not exactly as she was
in life; she bears the marks of the funeral pyre. Ancient ghosts
which have suffered some unfortunate experience usually make their

appearance bearing the marks of that experience.   So at Apuleius
Met.8.8.   the ghost of Tlepomenus, appearing to Charite, has a
sanie cruetam et pallore[15] deformem . . . faciem because his death
was caused by a boar.   Remus, too, is covered in blood when he
appears to Faustulus and Acca (Ovid Fast.5.457).   In elegy cf.Tib.
1.10.37-8 and see Smith's note.   A confusion between the physical
and the spiritual is, in fact, common to ghost stories of different
civilisations;   cf. Stith Thomson Motif Index of Folk Literature
(Bloomington 1932-6) E.422 1ff.   Tibullus, too, sees Nemesis' sister
as a larva when he says to Nemesis:

> sis mihi lenta veto,
>
> ne tibi neglecti mittant mala somnia manes,
>
> maestaque sopitae stet soror ante torum,
>
> qualis ab excelsa praeceps delapsa fenestra
>
> venit ad infernos sanguinolenta lacus.

> (2.6.36-40)

In Propertius' poem, however, Cynthia does not bear the marks of
an event which brought about her death, but - even more gruesome -
she bears marks produced by her cremation (cf.Tib.1.10.37 ustoque
capillo)

At 93-4 the ghost says to the poet:

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

We have seen that <u>mixtis ossibus</u> is a formula of epitaph, but, as

Tränkle (<u>Sprachkunst</u> 138) and Lilja (215) maintain, <u>mixtis ossibus</u>

<u>ossa teram</u> probably has an erotic significance as well[16].   What

Cynthia is saying is that Propertius may have other girl-friends

now, but in the near future (<u>mox</u>) he will be hers, and they will

be joined for ever in a single funeral urn[17].   Cynthia is therefore

foretelling Propertius' death, and this is something which again

comes from the sphere of ghost-stories.   An apparition is often

a herald of death, as Plutarch informs us on more than one occasion.

Both Dion and Brutus saw such apparitions (Plut. <u>Dion</u>.2) and

Cleonice's ghost told Pausanias of his impending death (Plut.

<u>Cimon</u>6).   Drusus also saw an apparition before his death, according

to Dio (55.1).   Ghosts have the power of prophecy;   one need think

only of two of ancient literature's most famous ghosts, Creusa (Verg.

<u>Aen</u>.2.780ff.) and Darius (Aesch. <u>Pers</u>.800ff.), and of the <u>Katabaseis</u>

of Odysseus and Aeneas.   Even when the ghost is mute a man may

sometimes infer his own death from its appearance, as Fannius supposed

that he would die after he was visited by Nero's ghost (Pliny <u>Ep</u>.5.5).

Cynthia's portrayal, then, owes much to ancient beliefs concerning

the appearance of ghosts.   She has the appearance of a <u>larva</u>, has the

standard "ghostly" reasons for making her appearance, and departs with

a "ghostly" prophesy.   The fact that Propertius has followed the

conventional outlines of an ancient ghost story does not, of course,

detract from the poem's literary worth;   two of English literature's

greatest ghosts, those of Banquo and Hamlet's father, owe much to the same tradition.   To this Propertius has added reminiscences of Homer and sepulchral epigram and produced one of the most unusual poems of Augustan literature, and one of its best.

APPENDIX 1

<u>Features of the rixa in elegy</u>

N.B. m — male antagonist

f — female antagonist

1. Hair-pulling

Propertius	2.5.23 (m)	Tibullus 1.6.71(f)
	3.8.5 (f)	1.10.53(m)
	4.5.31 (m)	
Ovid	<u>Am.</u> 1.7.11-12, 49 (m)	
	2.7.7 (f)	
	<u>Ars.</u>2.169 (m)	
	2.451 (f)	
	3.570 (m)	
	cf.<u>Her.</u>20.81 (f)	

cf. also Hor. <u>Odes</u> 1.17.27 (m), <u>AP</u> 5.248 (Paulus Sil.) (m), and,
for cutting of girl's hair, Lucian <u>Dial.Mer.</u> 8.1(m), <u>AP</u> 5.218
(Agathias) (m), Menander <u>Periceiromene.</u>

2. Clothes-tearing

Propertius	2.5.21 (m)	Tibullus 1.10.61 (m)
	3.8.8 (f)	
Ovid	<u>Am.</u> 1.7.47 (m)	
	<u>Ars.</u>2.171 (m)	

Appendix 1

    Ovid   Ars.3.569 (m and f)

cf. also Hor. Odes 1.17.28 (m), Lucian Dial,Mer. 8.1.

3. Face-scratching

    Propertius   3.8.6 (f)   Tibullus 1.6.70 (f)

    Ovid   Am. 1.7.50 (m)

                 Ars. 2.452   (f)

                       3.568   (m)

                       3.678   (f)

           cf.Her. 20.82   (f)

4. Punching/bruising

    Propertius   2.5.24 (m)   Tibullus 1.10.55-6 (m)

    Ovid   Am. 1.7.3-4 (m)

                 Ars. 2.533   (f)

cf. also AP 5.41.1 (Rufinus) (m), 5.43.6 (Rufinus) (m), 5.218.6

(Agathias) (m); Theophylactus Ep.48 (f); Theocritus 14.34 (m).

5. Breaking of girl's doors

    Propertius   2.5.22   Tibullus 1.10.54

    Ovid   Ars. 3. 567

cf. also Terence Ad.101; Herodas 2.35ff., 64ff.

APPENDIX 2

<u>COPIA IN PROPERTIUS 1.9.15</u>

> i quaeso et tristis istos compone libellos,
>
>   et cane quod quaevis nosse puella velit!
>
> quid si non esset facilis tibi copia?   nunc tu
>
>   insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam.

<div align="right">(Prop. 1.9.13-16)</div>

What is the <u>facilis</u> . . . <u>copia</u> in 15?   Some older editors, such
as Paley, took it to be <u>scribendi materies</u>[1].   Postgate, however,
thought the line meant "what if you were debarred from your love?",
taking <u>copia</u> as <u>copia amoris</u> or <u>copia puellae</u>, and recent commentators
(Butler and Barber and Enk <u>ad loc.</u>, Shackleton Bailey (<u>Propertiana</u>
26-7) and, most recently, Stroh (23ff.)[2]) have concurred in this.
Ponticus has easy access to the girl, who is a slave (<u>et tibi nunc
quaevis imperat empta modo</u> (4)), although he foolishly fails to see
this (<u>nunc tu/insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam</u> (16)).

The strongest argument for interpreting <u>copia</u> as <u>copia amoris</u> or
<u>copia puellae</u> is that adduced by Shackleton Bailey (<u>Propertiana</u> 27),
that <u>copia</u> in Propertius always has an erotic context.   However, it
should be noted that Propertius uses the word only on three other
occasions, and that in two of these a dependent genetive gives the

Appendix 2

word its precise meaning (2.20.24 <u>lecti copia</u>; 3.8.39 <u>furandae copia</u>
<u>noctis</u>) while the immediate context of the third makes its meaning

clear (2.33.43-4 <u>semper in absentis felicior aestus amantes:/elevat</u>

<u>assiduos copia longa viros</u>). In 1.9 neither a dependent genitive nor

the immediate context suggest that <u>copia</u> be understood as <u>copia</u>

<u>amoris</u> or <u>copia puellae</u>.

Quite the reverse, in fact. What Propertius is talking about the

lines immediately preceding this one, in 9-14, is not love but poetry.

The transition is, therefore, as Jacoby[3] long ago maintained, very

awkward.   Nor is this difficulty solved by Stroh's contention (29)

that 9-14 are to be seen as a kind of parenthetic comment on love-

poetry, with 15 continuing the line of thought which Propertius left

at 8.   It is also difficult to see what force, if any, <u>etiam</u> has in

<u>necdum etiam palles</u> (17), if what Propertius has said in the previous

couplet is "You have easy access to your girl" [4].   The strongest

argument against this interpretation, however, is that if Ponticus

does have easy access to his girl, why is he <u>miser</u>(9)?   Indeed,

Propertius is well aware of Ponticus' condition from his own experience

of <u>dolor et lacrimae</u> (7), and he knows that Epic poetry will not be

efficacious for him in his love-affair (9-11).   This would all be

very strange if Ponticus does, in fact, have "easy access" to his girl.

Appendix 2

It is preferable, therefore, to assume that copia takes its colouring from what immediately precedes it (as, indeed, copia does at 2.33.44). Ponticus is told by Propertius to drop his epic poem and cane quod quaevis nosse puella velit (14). The copia which he possesses is, therefore, a copia canendi (cf. Vergil Aen.11.378 larga quidem, Drance, semper tibi copia fandi[5]). This can also be defended on other grounds. Propertius, telling Ponticus that he is unaware of his possession of the facilis copia, expresses this by the words nunc tu/insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam. As Shackleton Bailey points out, the proverb almost invariably refers to want amid apparent plenty and has its origin in the myth of Tantalus[6], but here Propertius uses it of failure to see the obvious[7]. Why, then, we may well ask, has he chosen to use a well-known proverb in this unusual way? The answer is probably that he wants his readers to see in aqua more than a literal meaning. It is here, as often, the symbol of inspiration[8], the inspiration which Ponticus cannot find although he is in a situation in which inspiration comes easily to a love-poet, namely a love-affair. The identification of the composition of love-poetry with the experience of a love-affair has, of course, already been established in this book and, in particular, it appears at the beginning of the other poem addressed to Ponticus, 1.7. There Propertius tells the Epic poet:

Appendix 2

> Dum tibi Cadmeae dicuntur, Pontice, Thebae
>
> armaque fraternae tristia militiae . . .
>
> nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores . . .
>
> (1.7.1-2,5)

where agitamus amores clearly refers both to erotic activity and to poetry.

So in lines 13-16 Propertius is telling Ponticus that he does have a facilis copia, a wealth of material from which to draw inspiration for writing quod quaevis nosse puella velit[9]: Then, in 17ff., he goes on to tell Ponticus that his love will deepen, and so the necessity for writing love-elegy will be all the more pressing. Thus etiam in 17 does indeed have a force, adding a further reason for Ponticus to start writing elegy now. The train of thought from 9 to 24 is: "Ponticus, write elegy to win over your girl. You do have plenty of material on which to draw, even if you do not see it in your passionate state. Furthermore, your condition is going to get worse (so get down to writing now)."

POEMS	girls/boys always provide a reason for love	plurality of love-affairs a "vitium"	modesty/ forwardness attract
Ovid Amores 2.4	(10)	(1-2)	(11-14)
Prop. 2.22A		(17)	
Prop. 2.25			
Tib. 1.4.	(10) (10)		(13-14) (13-14)

girl's singing attracts	dancer's arms attract	skin-colour attracts	well/poorly dressed girl attracts
(25–6)	(29–30)	(39–40)	(37–8)
(16)	(5)		
		(41–2)	(45–6)

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

[1] For a useful compilation of such themes, see Richard Müller Motivkatalog der römischen Elegie; eine Untersuchung zur Poetik der Römer (Zurich 1952). Müller, however, has nothing to say about the origin of the themes, and only little about the treatment of them by individual elegists.

[2] For a more detailed examination of the problem, see Butler and Barber xxxv - lxii, Day Origins 1-36, Enk 1.29-40.

[3] See Butler and Barber xlii - iii for more references to the Alexandrian poets in Propertius and Ovid.

[4] It should be noted that Leo did not, in fact, rule out direct comic influence: he claims (Plaut. Forsch. 129): Dagegen kannten Properz und Ovid und ohne Zweifel auch Tibull die attische Komödie, und in keinem einzelnen Falle ist die Möglichkeit in Abrede zu stellen, dass der römische Elegiker den attischen Komiker selbst gelesen hat. Nur wenn man die Verzweigung derselben Motive durch die erotische Litteratur der Griechen und Römer ins Auge fasst und sie an dem engen Zusammenhang zwischen griechischer und römischer Elegie misst, den uns die erotischen Epigramme deutlich machen, wird man es als die einzig natürliche und in der Sache begründete Erklärung erkennen, dass die römischen Elegiker die mit der römischen Komödie zusammentreffenden Motive von den griechischen

Notes To Introduction

Elegikern und diese sie aus der attischen komodie entnommen haben.

[5] A. Otto De Fabulis Propertianis part. prior (Diss. Vratislav 1880),
Mallet Quaest.Prop. (1882).   The postulation of a "subjective" Greek
elegy was made at least as early as C. Dilthey's De Callimachi
Cydippa (Leipzig 1863), who is mentioned (with Leo) as one of the two
main proponents of it by Gollnisch in his 1905 dissertion (Gollnisch
Quaest.Eleg. 1).

[6] Apart from Otto op.cit. (note 5) and Mallet (Quaest. Prop.) cf.
also Volkmar Hölzer De Poesi Amatoria a Comicis Atticis exculta ab
Elegiacis imitatione expressa (Diss. Marburg, 1899), Burger De Ov.Carm.,
Gollnisch Quaest. Eleg., F. Wilhelm "Zu Tibullus 1.8 und 9" Philologus
60 (1901) 579-592.   See Smith in his Introduction (23 note 21)for
further literature.

[7] On this see Mario Puelma "Die Vorbilder der Elegiendichtung in
Alexandrien und Rom" Museum Helveticum 11 (1954) 101-116.   The
relevant sections in Callimachus are Aet. fr.1.21ff., Hymn Ap. 105ff.
That is not, however, to deny that many reminiscences of the Alexandrian
poets (especially Callimachus) occur in the elegists (for a recent study
of such reminiscences in Tibullus, for example, see A.W. Bulloch
"Tibullus and the Alexandrians" PCPS 199 (1973) 71-89 (espec. 74ff.).
It may, however, be true to say that few of the major themes or situations

Notes To Introduction

of Roman elegy derive from Alexandrian narrative elegy (Propertius 1.18,
clearly inspired by Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe (see Francis Cairns
"Propertius 1.18 and Callimachus Acontius and Cydippe" CR n.s. 19 (1969)
131-4) seems to be something of an exception).   Of course, the sparse
remains of such poets as Philetas and even Callimachus preclude a firm
answer to this question.

[8] For an excellent discussion of the other passages in which Propertius
and Ovid claim Alexandrian poets as their models (Tibullus never mentions
his) see Day Origins 1-36.   Philetas, mentioned with some frequency by
both poets (cf. Prop.3.1.1, 3.3.52, 3.9.44, 4.6.3;   Ovid Ars.3.329, Rem.
Am.759, Trist.1.6.1,Pont.3.1.57) may have been less well-known than
Callimachus;   see Bulloch op.cit.(note 7) 84.

[9] The best known example of this tendency is perhaps the belief
current in antiquity that the story of Corydon and Alexis in Eclogue 2
derives from the passion of Vergil for a slave-boy of Pollio's called
Alexander (cf. Servius ad Ecl.2.1;   Martial 8.55.12;   Apuleius Ap.10.14).

[10] In fact, it is now generally accepted that the ancients themselves did
not distinguish between a "subjective" and an "objective" elegy;   see E.
Paludan "The Development of the Latin Elegy" Classica et Medievalia 4
(1941) 204-229 (espec. 206ff.), F. Solmsen "Tibullus as an Augustan Poet"
Hermes 90 (1962) 295-325.   (J.K. Newman Augustus and the New Poetry

Notes To Introduction

(Brussels 1967) 365ff. makes the obvious, but valid, point that all poetry is in a sense "objective" (i.e. artificial); nevertheless I retain the terms "objective" and "subjective" in this discussion in their conventional meanings of "narrative" and "personal" (i.e. about me)). It must, however, be admitted that the distinction does seem to have been made, as Stroh (1) has pointed out, by Statius, who writes of his friend L. Arruntius Stella, an elegiac poet (cf. Schanz Hosins 416a): hic iuvenum lapsus suaque aut externa revolvit vulnera (Silv. 1.2.100-101).

[11] On the opposition μῦθοι/λόγοι see Burnet Phaedo note 60d.1.

[12] Inst.10.1.93. In the same section he makes the famous claim Elegia quoque Graecos provocamus, evidently not making a distinction between "subjective" and "objective" elegy.

[13] "Zur Entstehung" 67ff. So, too, F. Skutsch Gallus und Vergil (Leipzig 1906) 127ff. and, more recently, Brooks Otis in his review of Copley Excl.Am. (AJP 79 (1958) 199-200) and John Barsby (Am.1.10).

[14] Rostagni 76. So, too, Crusius "Elegie" RE 5.2292, Elizabeth Paludan "The development of the Latin Elegy" Classica et Medievalia 4 (1941) 204-229 (esp.205-9), Williams TORP 471. Most recently Margaret Hubbard has stated that "the transition between the two genres (sc. epigram and

Notes t'o Introduction

elegy) can be seen in the poetry of Catullus, whom it is reasonable to reckon the inventor of Roman elegy" (_Propertius_ 12).

[15] The latest commentator's contention that Catullus "is rejecting Mallius' assumption that he must have lots of material on hand (just completed or nearing completion)" is even less acceptable (Quinn _ad.loc._, reviving the idea of Merrill that _scriptorum_ (33) is the genitive of _scripta_ ("writings") and not _scriptores_).

[16] "The Poetry of Ovid" _L'Influence Grecque sur la Poesie Latine de Catulle à Ovide._ Fondation Hardt _Entretiens_ 2 (Geneva 1953) 242-3.

[17] See Alexander Dalzell "Maecenas and the Poets" _Phoenix_ 10 (1956) 151-162 (esp. 160-1).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1 cf. AP 5.103.1 (Rufinus) for παρακλαύσομαι.

2 It may also have been called a θυροκοπικόν or κρουσίθυρον ("door-knocking song"): see Trypho ap Athenaeus 14.618c. See also Headlam-Knox Herodas 83.

I see no need to follow Francis Cairns (GC 6) in abandoning the term paraclausithyron in favour of komos. Cairns follows Copley (Excl.Am., 145 note 6) who says: "the word used by the ancients to designate it (sc. the song) is not paraclausithyron, but κῶμος , together with the corresponding verbs κωμάζειν and ἐπικωμάζειν.". He then quotes, for κῶμος , AP 5.165.2; 190.2, 8; 12.23.2; 119.1; 167.2 (all Meleager); AP 5.281.1 (Paulus Sil.); for κωμάζειν Theoc. 3.1; AP 5.64.4 (Asclep.); 12.117.2-3 (Meleager); 115.3; 116.1 (both Anon.); for ἐπικωμάζειν AP 12. 118.1 (Callim.). In fact, all of these examples involve the entire komastic activity following the symposium, culminating, presumably, in the paraclausithyron (see Gow, Theocritus, vol.2, 64). Whether or not this word was known before Plutarch's time we cannot tell, nor does it matter. We have examples of such songs from the time of Alcaeus, and since they exhibit similar features and topoi, the genre was certainly known, whether or not it was actually called the paraclausithyron. It is to such songs, presumably, that Lucian refers at Bis Acc.31 (ᾠδάς τινας ἐρωτικάς),

Notes to Chapter 1

and Eupolis at 366 (Kock) when he talks about one Gnesippos as the inventor of νυκτερίν' ἀόματα which bring women out of doors. In what follows, then, I shall retain the term paraclausithyron to refer to the actual song of the shut-out lover.

3 Copley (Excl.Am., 107ff. and 134ff.) also includes as elegiac paraclausithyra Tib.1.5 and Ovid Met.14.698ff. These, however, are not, strictly speaking, paraclausithyra. Certainly at 1.5.67-8 Tibullus says heu canimus frustra, nec verbis victa patescit/ianua, but we are surely not to suppose that the whole poem has been recited at the girl's doors: the motif of the exclusus amator is only one of a number of themes which make up the elegy (in fact, this poem contains none of the topoi, apart from the closed door, associated with paraclausithyron). Ovid Met.14.698ff., where Iphis upbraids Anaxarete before committing suicide outside her door, recalls, it is true, the komastic situation, but is not a paraclausithyron in the sense that Am.1.6 is.

4 Cf. Phrynicus Arabius (Bekker Anecd.42.31) θυροκοπεῖν ~ ἐπικωμάζειν.

5 For the lover wondering whether the girl is alone, cf. AP 5.191. 5 (Meleager) and 5.213.1 (Poseidippus): cf. also Ovid Am. 3.11,12, Met.13.788, Hor. Sat. 1.2.64-7 (komastic situations rather than paraclausithyra). I cannot understand Copley's contention (Excl.Am.

Notes to Chapter 1

159 note 29) that "the rival . . . figures scarcely at all in the Greek _paraclausithyron_". For drunkenness and desire together cf. e.g. _AP_ 12.118 (Callim.), 5.167.1-2 (Asclep.), Powell _Lyr. Alex._ _Adesp._ 3.14-15 (κωμαστης).

6 The refrain is not, in fact, a regular feature of the _paraclausithyron_ and does not appear in it again until Ovid _Am._ 1.6.

7 See G.L. Hendrickson "Verbal Injury, Magic, or Erotic Comus?" _CP_ 20 (1925) 297 (quoted by Enk _ad.loc._).

8 προς ταις εμαυτου νυν θυραις εστηκ' εγω. εμαυτου is here emphatic: "I am standing now outside _my own_ doors (not hers)". See Sandbach ad _Mis._ A6.

9 There seems to be a striking similarity between the threat of the goatherd at 53 (κεισευμαι δε πεσων) and that of the young man at Aristophanes _Eccles._ 963 (καταπεσων κεισομαι).

10 Cairns's arguments for taking Idyll 6 as a _paraclausithyron_ "with a vicarious speaker" (_GC_, 194-5) seem less convincing. While it is true that the Idyll contains "komastic elements" (see especially 32 αυταρ εγω κλαψω θυρας), this does not permit classification of the poem as a _paraclausithyron_, any more than a few propemptic elements in Tib.1.3 warrant classifying that poem as a _propempticon_ (see below p. 80).

Notes to Chapter 1

[11] Straton's poem is somewhat different from the others in that the
address is made (Romano more) to the door rather than the girl. It
is, of course, possible that early instances of addresses to the door
in epigram have not come down to us. For addresses to doors outside
epigram, cf. Callim. Hymn Ap.6-7, Vit.Hom.Hdt. 33C (The Samian
Eiresione; Edmonds Lyra Graeca 3.522.): αὐταὶ ᾽ανακλίνεσθε θύραι.
On these passages see K.J. Mckay CQ 17 (1967) 184-94, answered by G.
Wills CQ 20 (1970) 112-18.

[12] For a discussion of genres and topoi, see Cairns GC 5-7. It
hardly need be pointed out that not all the topoi will occur in all
examples of the genre.

[13] Only those topoi which occur very frequently or are of relevance
to elegy are listed here. For others see Copley Excl.Am., 19-20 and
relevant notes.

[14] So also John Barsby, Am.1, 81. See, however, Brooks Otis's
objections in his otherwise favourable review of Copley, AJP 79 (1958)
197.

[15] See, e.g., Copley Excl.Am., 28f., Cairns GC 93, E. Fraenkel,
Plautinisches in Plautus, (Berlin 1922) 101ff., M.B. Ogle "The House-
Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folklore" AJP 32 (1911) 251ff.

Notes to Chapter 1

[16] "The Curculio of Plautus: An Illustration of Plautine Methods in Adaptation" CQ 15 (1965) 84-100.

[17] For a consideration of Hor. Odes 3.10 as a paraclausithyron, see Williams Odes 3.77-79. For other komastic elements in Horace, see Cairns GC 88-9, 210-11.

[18] Copley argues that furtivus amor is implicit in postisque superbos/unguit amaracino which, he claims, is a reference to the lover smearing the hinges with perfume — an oil substitute — to prevent the door creaking. In fact, the perfume has a religious significance; see below p. 37f.

[19] There is no agreement on the legal status of the girls of elegy. However, it is clear that on some occasions, at least, they are represented as married women. Cynthia is certainly married at Prop. 2.23.19-20 and 4.7.13ff., Delia at Tib. 1.2.41 and 1.3.83ff. and Corinna in Ovid Am. 1.4 (espec.64) (and in 1.10 and 3.14 she is clearly not a meretrix). See Williams, TORP, 531ff.; Susan Treggiari "Libertine Ladies" CW 1971, 196-8. For the other side, see E. Courtney "The Structure of Propertius Book 111" Phoenix 24 (1970), 52-3; Georg Luck "The Woman's Role in Latin Love Poetry" in Perspectives of Roman Poetry ed. Galinsky (Texas 1974), 15-31.

Notes to Chapter 1

[20] On the difficulties of the interpretation of line 2, see

Shackleton-Bailey, Propertiana, 46. A recent suggestion which

deserves consideration is that of D. Little ("Propertius 1.16.1-2"

CQ 22 (1972) 138) who suggests that the line means "known to

Tarpeia as a girl" and that "Propertius is saying.that the door

has not only an illustrious history . . . but a long one".

[21] Who the interlocutor is meant to be is a problem as yet unresolved.

The most likely answer seems to be that it is Catullus himself. L.

Richardson ("Catullus 67: Interpretation and Form" AJP 88 (1967),

423-33) argues, implausibly, that the interlocutor is a bride. He

claims that "the speaker must be a woman and the mistress of the house

. . . for no one else would greet the door spontaneously as dulci

iucunda viro" (424), and so, he concludes, the poem is the bride's

address to the door (and the door's reply) before she enters it on

her wedding day. While this could be correct, one cannot help

feeling that if a poet of Catullus' calibre had meant this to be the

poem's situation he would have made it more clear.

[22] See Norden, Agnostos Theos, 143-4.

[23] It must, however, be noted that kissing the door post occurs in

AP 12.118 (Callim.) and in (Theoc.) 23.18, where it has no religious

significance. It is, of course, possible that what was simply a

Notes to Chapter 1

sentimental gesture for the Greek authors had a greater significance
for the Roman.

24 The Greek parallel would be ἱκέτης , which does not occur in any
extant Greek paraclausithyron.   This may, however, be only because no
examples have survived.   In Aristaenetus 2.20, which contains many
komastic topoi, an excluded lover is referred to as ἱκετεύων , and
Aristaenetus could, as often, be following a Hellenistic model.

25 So Rothstein, Enk and Camps ad.loc..Butler and Barber are too
cautious, calling the interpretation "ingenious, but too far-fetched
to be probable".   The interpretation of ocultis manibus in 44 is
still a problem, on which see Shackleton-Bailey Philologus 108 (1964)
115-6, Lloyd Jones ib. 109 (1965) 305-6, Witke CP 64 (1969) 107-9.

26 For Hercules as an exclusus amator see W.S. Anderson "Hercules
Exclusus: Propertius 4.9" AJP 85 (1964) 1-12.

27 Williams TORP 498ff.

28 There are, however, reminiscences of other poems;   71 recalls Prop.
3.21.16 qualiscumque mihi tuque puella vale, and 31 recalls Tib. 2.4.39
quae pretio victos excludis amantes.

29 So, too, Zingerle 91.

Notes to Chapter 1

[30] See Deferrari et.al., A Concordance of Ovid, 1377.

[31] It also occurs in the expression pandere vela at Ars. 3.500 (cf. Prop.2.21.14).

[32] For Hercules as an exclusus amator, see W.S. Anderson loc.cit. (note 26).

[33] Barsby(Am.1.73) contends, implausibly, that fulmen "gains from the context a hint of a false derivation from fulcire, creating a play on the senses "thunderbolt" and "doorbolt".

[34] For the lover's poor physical condition in elegy, cf. Tib. 2.3. 9-10; Prop. 2.12.17-20, 3.16.19, 4.3.27; Ovid Am.2.9.14, Her.3.141,11. 27, Ars.1.729ff. (cf. also Met.3.399, 9.536, Catullus 89.1). In Greek literature cf. Theoc. 2.88, AP 12.71 (Callim.), 5.280 (Agathias), 5.264 (Paulus Sil.), Xen. Eph. 1.5.2, 1.5.5. See also Brandt on Am. 1.6.5 and Smith on Tib. 2.3.9-10.

[35] One could perhaps argue that the third person is the "current lover", but it is difficult to see how a "current lover" would be in a position to lock up the girl. Certainly at Prop.2.23, 2.32.45ff., and 4.7.15-20 Cynthia is represented as a married woman, and the vir in Ovid Am.1.4, since Corinna can be iure coacta (64), must be a husband. It seems reasonable to suppose that whenever we meet references to custodes or

Notes to Chapter 1

custodia or to the girl slipping out to meet the lover she is not a
meretrix but a married woman.   (On the legal status of the girls of
the elegists see above note 19).

[36] With these lines compare Calliope's words to Propertius at 3.3.47-50:

> quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantis
>
> nocturnaeque canes ebria signa fugae,
>
> ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas,
>
> qui volet austeros arte ferire viros.

The comic provenance of the idea is perhaps further suggested by ferire
in 50, which has a distinctly comic ring (see Elaine Fantham Comparative
Studies in Republican Latin Imagery (Toronto 1973) 31 and note 20).

[37] Barber reads sub crimine with Langermann, but see Shackleton-Bailey
Propertiana 114.

[38] Alternatively, Tibullus may be developing the idea of 1.1.56 where,
describing his vigil outside the house, he says sedeo duras ianitor
ante fores (an idea which Ovid imitated at Am. 3.11.12 excubui clausam
servus ut ante domum;   cf. also lines 17-18.)

[39] On the military metaphor in ancient poetry, see Spies Militat Omnis
Amans (esp.pp.51-73 for elegy), and, more recently, Murgatroyd
"Militia Amoris".

Notes to Chapter 1

[40] Prop.3.25.9   limina iam nostris valeant lacrimantia verbis is
perhaps meant to recall the topos.   Propertius inverts it by
making the door rather than the lover shed tears.

[41] On sicca luna see Francis Cairns "Further adventures of the
locked-out lover: Propertius 2.17" (University of Liverpool
Inaugural Lecture 1975) 16f. Cairns demonstrates, with examples
from Pliny the Elder (cf. especially NH 17.57), that by luna sicca
Propertius means the interlunium, the period between the old and
the new moon.   This period was believed by the ancients to be
particularly stormy (see Nisbet and Hubbard on Odes 1.25.11).

[42] One might perhaps add 2.14.21 pulsabant alii frustra dominamque
vocabant, where Propertius' rivals are inflicting violence on the
door.   It is also possible that 4.8.49ff. is an inversion of the
violent komastic situation: Cynthia, like the violent komast,
bursts into the house at night to reach her lover.

[43] Neumann 93-103.   See also Woldemar Görler "Ovids Propemptikon"
Hermes 93 (1965), 344-5.

[44] Citatos (23) could be taken as a participle ("I will call and
question").   So Postgate and Camps (who quotes Ovid Her.7.101).

Notes to Chapter   1

[45] Menander's work is entitled ΠΕΡΙ ΠΡΟΠΕΜΠΤΙΚΗΣ

and is to be found in Spengel Rhet. Graec. 3.395-399.   It must,

of course, be remembered, as Professor M.L. Clarke cautions in

his review of Nisbet and Hubbard's Horace Odes 1 (CR N.S. 21 (1971)

204), that Menander's prescripts are for speeches, not poems.

Nevertheless, the strong similarity between what Menander prescribes

and what we find in the examples of poetic propemptica seems to

suggest that the rules governing the content of both were not very

different.

[46] Since Felix Jäger's Das antike Propemptikon und das 17 Gedicht

des Paulinus von Nola (Diss. Munich 1913), most notable are Kenneth

Quinn (LE 239-242) and Nisbet and Hubbard in their introduction to

Hor. Odes 1.3 (40-44).   Woldemar Görler ("Ovids Propemptikon" Hermes

93 (1965), 338-347) has considered aspects of the genre which are

relevant to Ovid Am.2.11.

[47] On this passage see Cairns GC 52ff.   Cairns sees the rest of the

poem (10-29)as fulfilling the precept, later laid down by Menander,

that the speaker μεμνῆσθαι τῆς πάλαι συνηθείας,

τῆς εὐνοίας, τῆς φιλίας καὶ παραμυθεῖσθαι

τὴν ἀπόστασιν μνήμαις καὶ λόγοις. (398.27-9)

Notes to Chapter 1

It must be noted, however, that this poem marks the end of a love-affair, and one might rather attribute the dwelling on the happy times of the past to this than to a "generic consciousness" on Sappho's part.

[48] See Kiessling – Heinze's introduction to the poem.

[49] Jones – Wilson p. 124.

[50] Gow (vol.2.145) notes that "though it is not untrue to describe the song as a propempticon, the description is incomplete, for the good wishes for Ageanax's voyage are conditional upon his granting his favours to Lycidas (55), and the latter's rejoicing, it is hinted not ambiguously, will be as much for Ageanax's complaisance as for his safety".

[51] s.v. κωρύκος.

[52] Paulinus Nol. Carm.17. On Paulinus' use of the traditional features of the propempticon and his additions to it, see R.P.H. Green The Poetry of Paulinus of Nola, Collection Latomus 120 (1971) 34-5.

[53] Cairns GC 1ff., 165. Cairns regards Tib.1.1., in fact, as an "inverse epibaterion" which includes (in its opening lines) a

Notes to Chapter 1

propempticon.   The difficulties raised by Cairns's classification
are discussed briefly below.

[54] So, e.g., Nisbet and Hubbard Odes 1.42.

[55] Cichorius Untersuchungen zu Lucilius (Berlin 1908) 256ff., accepted
by Görler 342.   The fragments in question are 102-104, 107-8 and 109
(Marx).

[56] For such encomiastic propemptica, cf. Himerius Or. 31, esp. 9ff.
(to Ampelius) and Or.36.9ff. (to Flavianus, probably the proconsul
of Africa A.D. 397-61).   However, that these distinctions were not
rigidly maintained is demonstrated by Or. 10.15-18, an encomiastic
section in a propempticon to an inferior (a pupil of Himerius: cf.31.1).

[57] Menander's actual words are (Spengel 396, 4-6): σχετλιάσει
(sc. ὁ συνήθης προπέμπων τὸν φίλον) πρὸς τὴν
τύχην ἢ πρὸς τοὺς ἔρωτας ὅτι μὴ
συγχωροῦσι θεσμὸν φιλίας διαμένειν βέβαιον.
In Roman rhetorical theory the equivalent to a schetliasmos was
perhaps the conquestio: cf. Cic. De Inv 1.109, and see G.L.
Hendrickson "Horace's Propempticon for Virgil" CJ 3 (1907-8) 101ff.

[58] See previous note.   Perhaps Simonides' tearful propempticon
(Himerius Or.31.2) was "schetliastic".

Notes to Chapter 1

[59] Menander, in fact, mentions two σχετλιασμοί, the second
of which is intended to deter the friend (though presumably the
first is designed to have this effect also); σχετλιάσεις πάλιν
ὡς βουληθεὶς πεῖσαι, εἶτα ἀποτυχὼν, καὶ ἐπάρας
λέγων · οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ δέδοκται καὶ νενίκημαι
φέρε δὴ καὶ τῆ βουλήσει συνδράμωμεν.
(Spengel 397.13-16).   Cairns is, I feel, clutching at straws when
he claims that periura in Prop.1.8.17 represents the second schetliasmos
(GC 150).

[60] See Hendrickson op.cit. (note 57) 103-4.

[61] The book's most recent editor, G.M.H. Murphy (Ovid Metamorphoses XI
(Oxford 1972)),notes (p.65) that "Alcyone's speech of reproach . . . is
elegiac rather than epic in inspiration" but his only comment on the
propemptic nature of the speech is that "distress at the prospect of
an impending sea voyage by the loved one is a frequent motif in Latin
elegy. cf. Propertius 1.8.1, where the poet, in the same style,
accuses Cynthia (about to sail for Illyria) of cruelty".

[62] So Servius tells us in his note on line 1:

> "Hic autem Gallus amavit Cytheridem . . . quae eo
>
> spreto euntem Antonium ad Gallias est secuta."

Notes to Chapter 1

63 κἂν μὲν πεζεύειν μέλλῃ, διάγραφε τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν δι' ἧς πορεύεται.

The "route-map" of a sea-journey is, however, also found quite frequently: cf. Statius Silv. 3.2.107ff., Cinna fr.1 (Morel); cf. Martial 10.104.4ff., Lucilius fr.102-4, 107-8, 109 (Marx).

64 It is, of course, possible, and even likely, that propemptica with erotic content existed in Greek poetry. This is suggested by Menander's reference (395.13) to the ἦθος ἐρωτικόν of the "equal to equal" category (cf. also Himerius Or.12.9,15; 36.7,15,17) and by the erotic formula animae dimidium meae at Hor. Odes 1.3.8 (so Nisbet and Hubbard ad loc.). More important, perhaps, is the clearly erotic content of Lycidas' propempticon at Theoc. 7.52ff.; cf. also Callim.fr. 400.

65 It is now generally agreed that 1.8 is a single poem employing dramatic development (i.e. between 26 and 27 we must assume a lapse of time): one may compare 2.28, the "running commentary" on Cynthia's illness (see below p.241ff) or 1.15, where we are expected to understand Cynthia objecting, between lines 24 and 25, to what Propertius has already said. Dramatic development of this type within a poem is found in some epigrams of the Palatine Anthology (e.g. 5.177 (Mel.), 178 (Mel.), 181 (Asclep.)) and seems to occur as

Notes to Chapter 1

early as Anacreon PMG 356, on which Hor. Odes 1.27, which also employs
such development, is modelled. (For further examples and secondary
literature on the technique, see Nisbet and Hubbard Odes 1 `310-11.
See also Margaret Hubbard Propertius 50ff.) The division of Prop.
1.8 into two poems to suit notions of numerical symmetry of lines
(e.g. O. Skutsch "The structure of the Propertian Monobibles" CP 58
(1963) 239 note 1) involves circular argumentation.

[66] Margaret Hubbard (Propertius, 46) comments: "If nothing else,
the position of the poem in the book, framed as it is by two elegies
that show a parallel volte face in Propertius' poetic friend Ponticus,
would suggest that it is a single poem . ...".

[67] See Neumann 93-102; Görler 344.

[68] The topos is, admittedly, a very widespread one in Roman poetry,
but its occurrence in two poems on the same theme can hardly be
fortuitous. On the theme see Kölblinger 3-23 (for the difference
between the two passages in question, see especially 14-16).

[69] Neumann (95ff.) mentions other details which he believes Ovid
borrowed from Propertius:

(a) Propertius mentions the dangers of the sea at 5 and 19;
Ovid does so (in greater detail) at 9-10, 17. 18ff. But

Notes to Chapter 1

in "schetliastic propemptica " this is surely to be

expected and there are no verbal similarities between

the passages.

(b) Prop.1.8.30 destitit ire novas Cynthia nostra vias

is compared by Neumann (95) with Ovid 2.11.7-8

ecce fugit notumque torum sociosque Penates/fallacisque

vias ire Corinna parat. Again verbal similarities do not

warrant the assumption of direct imitation, (only vias is

found in both). In fact, the Ovidian lines would be

better compared with 1.8.17 sed quocumque modo de me,

periura, mereris, where periura, like Ovid's fallacisque,

carries a charge of perfidy (though Cairns (GC 57) sees

this as a "principal schetliastic topos").

(c) Neumann (96) states that "Ovidius Propertium imitatus de

Corinna tertia persona usus dicit, cum locis ceteris eam

altera persona usus alloquatur". But in the first part of

Propertius' poem Cynthia is addressed directly, and it is

only in the second part (27-46) that Propertius switches

to the third person. In fact, Ovid frequently follows up

a statement about Corinna with addresses to her: cf. e.g.,

2.13.1ff. (3rd person) and 27ff. (2nd person); 2.17.7 (3rd

person) and 11ff. (2nd person); 2.19.9ff. (3rd person) and

19ff. (2nd person).

Notes to Chapter 1

[70] Görler (342-3) suggests that Ovid may here be playing with the "route-map" motif of the propempticon. Other writers tell their friends what they will see on their journey; Ovid tries to detain Corinna by telling her what she'll not see.

[71] Neumann (102ff.) sees Am.2.12 as connected with 2.11 as Prop. 1.8.27-46 is connected with 1.8.1-26, the shout of joy which begins Am.2.12 recalling that in Prop.1.8.26ff. Reitzenstein (Wirklichkeitsbild 91 note 121) comments, correctly: "in 2.12 ist von dieser Situation (sc. propempticon) keine Rede mehr . . . Sein Gefuhl entspricht nicht . . . dem von Prop.1.8b sondern dem von 2.14 (the "victory" poem after a successful night with Cynthia). One might, however, argue that Ovid expects the alert reader, who would know Propertius 1.8, to assume at the start of 2.12 that Ovid is doing the same thing (i.e. celebrating Corinna's decision to stay), especially since the word vicimus begins line 2 (vicimus: in nostro est, ecce, Corinna sinu) in the same way as it does Prop.1.8.28 (Vicimus: assiduas non tulit illa preces). At line 3 the reader is surprised when the poem takes a different direction.

[72] Görler is thus mistaken in his statement that Ovid has in this section "die konventionellen Bahnen . . . verlassen". (I fail to see, with Cairns (GC 60), a hint of the topos at Prop.1.8.26). For a recent, but unconvincing, discussion of the poem of Lycidas, see Gustav Seeck "Zu Theocrit Eid. 7" Hermes 102 (1974) 384.

Notes to Chapter 1

73 See above p.76

74 Could there be here perhaps a sly dig at the _Aeneid_ and the _Penates_ which pious Aeneas' ship carries?   cf. _Aen._ 1.67-8 gens inimica . . . navigat aequor . . . portans victosque Penates; 1.378-9 sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste Penatis classe veho mecum;   3.12 feror exsul in altum cum . . . Penatibus et magnis dis. cf. also 1.6, 6.68. and Ovid _Her._ 7.77 (a clear reference to the _Aeneid_).

75 For the description in these lines (excipiamque umeris et multa sine ordine carpam oscula) cf. _Heroides_ 18.101 (Hero and Leander) excipis amplexu feliciaque oscula iungis.

76 See Nisbet and Hubbard's introduction to the poem (_Odes 1_ 45).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 See Day <u>Origins</u> 91ff., A.L. Wheeler "Erotic Teaching in Roman
Elegy" <u>CP</u> 5 (1910) 440-50; 6(1911) 56-7.   Erotodidaxis is regarded
as a genre by Cairns (<u>GC</u> 72), who argues for a "pre-Callimachean
tradition of serious erotodidaxis" on the basis of Callim.<u>Iamb.</u>5.
Since erotodidaxis was a frequent theme of comedy (the mother-<u>lena</u>
instructing her daughter seems to have been a common type; see
note 21 below), it seems to me likely that Callimachus was simply
playing with a comic theme.

2 Luck (35) declares: "I maintain that the influence of Menander,
Plautus and Terence can be disregarded, at least in the case of
Tibullus and Propertius."   See, too, A. Guillemin "Sur les origines
de l'Elégie Latine" <u>REL</u> 17(1939) 282-292, who concludes that "si
l'elégie et la comédie ont des situations et des developpements
communs, cette resemblance trouve sa cause dans la solidité de la
tradition qui s'imposait à toutes deux" (292).   For the other side,
see Wheeler <u>CP</u> 6 (1911) 76; Butler and Barber xlviii - l; Day
<u>Origins</u> 85ff.

3 See, e.g. Hermogenes Περὶ Εὑρέσεως 4.11 (Spengel 2.256.
3ff.), Alexander Περὶ Σχημάτων 3.18.16ff. (Spengel).   See
Spengel's index s.v. Menander (3.523) for other uses by the rhetoricians,

Notes to Chapter 2

and, in general, see Day Origins 60ff.

4   So Leo Plaut.Forsch.129, accepted by Wheeler (CP 5 (1910) 442);
Day Origins 87ff; Elizabeth Paludan "The Development of the Latin
Elegy" Classica et Medievalia 4(1941) 210-11.

5   e.g. And.68 at 8.5.4, Eunuch.46 at 9.2.11, Phorm.36 at 1.7.22
(for more examples. see the index s.v. Terentius at the end of
Winterbottom's OCT.). Caecilius is mentioned three times by him
(1.8.11, 10.1.99, 11.1.39), but Plautus only once (10.1.99; perhaps
also 1.4.25), Quintilian even admits, in discussing what comic
authors children should read, that Latini quoque auctores adferent
utilitatis aliquid (1.8.8).

6   Prop.2.21.25-8 may be quite revealing with regard to Propertius'
attitude to Menander. Here the poet, imagining what he will do in
Athens after running away from Cynthia, lists Greek authors in
descending order of difficulty, so that we presumably are given an
ascending order of enjoyable literary pursuits. The order is:
Plato, Epicurus, Demosthenes, Menander.

7   See Day Origins 91ff. Gollnisch (25-50) has a useful chapter
on the correspondences between Philostratus' letters and the elegists,
though he is of course arguing for a subjective Alexandrian elegy as
the common source of these motifs.

Notes to Chapter 2

8
   The manuscripts read <u>non dicit de Pythia Terentiana sed quae</u>
<u>apud Lucilium comoediographum inducitur</u>, but Orelli's emendation of
<u>Lucilius</u> to <u>Caecilius</u> must be correct.

9
   See Gollnisch 23ff., Day <u>Origins</u> 89-90. Boucher (<u>Etudes</u> 435) quotes
as a parallel <u>Eunuch.</u> 1-80, also a "dialogue de ses amours avec un
esclave" but nothing like as close as <u>Heaut.</u>285-310. On the form of
the poem, see also Reitzenstein <u>Wirklichkeitsbild</u> 62ff.

10
   It may also be significant that Propertius promises Lygdamus his
freedom if the quarrel with Cynthia is resolved - the standard bribe
offered to the clever slave by the lover to obtain his services (cf.
Plaut. <u>Poen.</u> 428ff; <u>Merc.</u>152ff.; <u>Miles</u> 1192).

11
   For Propertius' characterisation of Cynthia as a <u>femina furibunda</u>,
see below (note 35) and see Lilja 144-5.

12
   <u>Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery</u> (Toronto 1973)85.

13
   The <u>Eunuchus</u> was clearly a very popular play in the Republican
and Augustan periods. We have seen already Horace's adaptation of
the opening scene at <u>Sat.</u>2.3.259ff. Cicero, in his section on love
at <u>Tusc.</u>4.76,also quotes this scene.

14
   See Rothstein <u>ad loc.</u>, Tränkle <u>Sprachkunst</u> 133.

Notes to Chapter 2

15 Tränkle Sprachkunst 128. For Moecha cf. ib. 121, and for Comica ib. 129. "Offensichtlich will Properz die Komödiensprache bei dieser Erwähnung anklingen lassen", Trankle (121)correctly observes.

16 "Elegiac Themes in Horace's Odes" Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood ed. M.E. White (Toronto 1952) 200. Kolblinger has a chapter devoted to "Die geschlagene Geliebte" (54-85).

17 It should, however, be noted that rixa in elegy has three distinct meanings:

i. Sexual intercourse; cf. Prop.2.15.4, Catullus 66.13 (Pichon sv. rixa (254) wrongly, assigns Prop.3.8.1. to this category.)

ii. The rixa ante fores in which the lover sometimes engages in a fight with his rivals; cf. Prop.1.16.5, 2.19.5; Tib.1.1.74; Ovid Ars.3.71, Rem.Am.31.

iii. The lovers' quarrel; cf. Prop.3.8.1; Tib.1.10.57; Ovid Ars. 3.374; Hor. Odes 1.13.11.

18 The themes of Lucian's Dialogi Meretricii are drawn from comedy, as the scholiast noted on the first of them: ἰστέον ὡς αὐται πᾶσαι αἱ ἑταιραι κεκωμῴδηνται καὶ πᾶσι μὲν τοῖς κωμῳδιοποιοῖς, μάλιστα δὲ Μενάνδρῳ, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ πᾶσα αὐτη ἡ ὕλη Λουκιανῷ τῷ προκειμένῳ εὐπόρηται.

19 See the parallels cited by Shackleton Bailey in his Appendix

Notes to Chapter 2

(Propertiana 299). Tränkle (Sprachkunst 181) believes that tu minitare
oculos subiecta exurere flamma (7) is a "scherzhaftem Anklang an
epische Wendungen", and he quotes as a parallel Virgil Aen.2.37
praecipitare iubent subiectisque urere flammis. It is quite clear
that Propertius is indebted to Virgil for the hexameter ending, but
that is not to say that the language of the line is peculiarly epic.
Shackleton Bailey is right in his comment that "the threat is
reminiscent of many in Comedy" (loc.cit.).

20 See previous note. Kölblinger (67) notes that in 1-8
the list of violent acts is in ascending order, going from insults
(2) to kicking over the table (3), throwing cups (4), hair-tearing
(5), face-scratching (6), burning of eyes (threat of, 7) and
clothes-tearing (8).

21 cf. Plaut. Truc.401ff; Lucian Dial.Mer.3; 6; 7; 12.1.

22 See Margaret Hubbard "Propertiana" CQ N.S. 18(1968) 314-5.

23 The comic "ancestry" of Propertius' poem can perhaps help with
the problem of the poem's unity (i.e. the inclusion of lines 35-40,
which most editors regard as a separate piece). Comic influence
is, as we have seen, pervasive in 3.8, and significantly at line 38
there appear two comic types, the socer and the mother-lena (see

Notes to Chapter 2

Camps ad.loc.). For other arguments on the poem's unity, see
Margaret Hubbard op.cit. (note 22) 315.

24 The amantium ira amoris integratio est theme is also common in
comedy; see Otto Sprichworter s.v. amare (3).

25 Kölblinger (69) notes that teneras is not an apposite epithet
for a man's cheeks (it occurs in the rixa at Tib. 1.10.55, but of
a woman's cheeks) and concludes: "Die Verwendung von teneras hier
als Attribut für die Wangen des Mannes scheint wohl eher aus der
Galäufigkeit der Verbindung als aus inhaltlichen Gründen zu erklären
zu sein".

26 For this common piece of erotodidaxis, cf. Ovid Am. 1.8.78,
Ars. 2.447ff; Lucian Dial.Mer.9.4,12.1; Aristaenetus 1.2. etc.

27 So Spies Militat Omnis Amans 52-3, David West Reading Horace
(Edinburgh 1967) 67.

28 The notion perhaps derives from Hellenistic poetry, and from
Callimachus in particular. The Catullan example occurs in the
adaptation of Callimachus' "Lock of Berenice", and Aristaenetus
Ep.1.10.111 uses the phrase νυκτομαχήσας ἐρωτικῶς
(cf. nocturnae . . . rixae at Cat. 66.13) in a letter which is
heavily indebted to Callimachus (see Albin Lesky Aristaenetos:

Notes to Chapter 2

Erotische Briefe (Zurich 1951) 144). - Agathias (AP 5.294.18) also
uses the expression ἐννυχίης ἀεθλοσύνης which may
derive from Callimachus (see Pfeiffer Philologus 87(1932) 183 and
Callimachus vol.1. 112). For the sexual act as a wrestling-bout,
cf. also Nonnus 48.183; Musaeus 197 etc. (more examples in Viansino
on Agathias 90 (=AP 5.294.18).

29 This scene, in which Cynthia's fury is unleashed upon her lover
after it has been directed against the girls, is probably directly
inspired by comedy, where the husband is sometimes caught in a
compromising position with a meretrix by his jealous wife; cf.
Plaut. Asin.909ff., Merc.783ff. Indeed, the couple at Asin. 880ff.,
have, like Propertius and his girls, been engaging in an after-
dinner game of dice in which the "lover's" throws are seen as an omen
before the wife's entrance (Asin. 904ff., Prop.4.8.46). Comic
influence is suggested, too, by the position of Lygdamus in the poem.
He appears to be completely innocent of wrong-doing and simply serves
his master at table (37), but Cynthia regards him as the cunning
slave who by his guile protects his master and furthers his love-affair
(79-80).

30 One may perhaps add as a "neutral example" Horace Odes 1.6.17-18
(nos convivia, nos proelia virginum/sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium/
cantamus vacui). Horace here refers to the rixa simply as a typical
theme of erotic poetry.

Notes to Chapter 2

[31] cf. Donatus' comment on Eunuch.648 (ut ego unguibus facile illi in oculos involem venefico)} unguibus, quibus armatur hic sexus. Ovid, however, makes no such distinction between the sexes; cf. Ars. 3.568, Am.1.7.50.

[32] cf. Ovid Am.1.5.13ff.

[33] See Rothstein, Enk and Camps on Prop. 2.5.21ff., Smith on Tib. 1.10.53f. and Putnam on Tib. 1.10.61ff.

[34] "Propertius in his literary relations" 276. Solmsen also makes the point that the closest Tibullus comes to a description of a rixa in Book 2 is 2.5.101ff., where "the manifestations of jealousy on the occasion of a rural feast are considerably more restrained" (ingeret hic potus iuvenis maledicta puellae/postmodo quae votis inrita facta velit:/nam ferus ille suae plorabit sobrius idem). Tibullus may, Solmsen suggests, have taken to heart the criticisms levelled at him in Propertius' poem, which will have appeared between the publication of the first and second books of Tibullus. Such an argumentum e silentio carries little conviction.

[3] Propertius uses the verb audere of himself three times and on each occasion it is qualified by non. At 2.19.21 he wouldn't dare fight lions, and (more significantly) at 1.3.17 he didn't dare disturb Cynthia's sleep. She is, of course, a femina furibunda elsewhere,

Notes to Chapter 2

too: cf. 3.8.1.ff., 4.8.51ff., 3.16.9-10.   See Lilja 144-5.

36 Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. Odes 1.17.26. The prominence of the hands in such contexts may go back to a Greek source;   see the examples quoted by Nisbet and Hubbard.

37 It occurs only once in Propertius (3.13.51) where it is used literally (of Brennus);   twice in the Tibullan corpus, both literal uses (2.4.26, 3.5.11);   and twice elsewhere in Ovid's erotic works, (Ars. 1.435 sacrilegas meretricum . . . artes;   Rem.Am. 367 et tua sacrilegae laniarunt carmina linguae (of Virgil's detractors)).

38 cf. also δεσπότις at Paulus Sil. AP 5.230.8.

39 Note, too παντολμοις χερσίν at AP 5.218.4 (Agathias), which is also indebted to Menander.

40 For arguments drawn from "personal experience" in elegy, see Smith on Tib.1.4.33-4.   This is a common rhetorical trick (see Nisbet and Hubbard Odes 1. 213 and add Quintilian 5.10.12 for autopsy as a rhetorical proof) which can be seen developing as early as Homer (cf. the formula καὶ γάρ ἐγώ ποτε at Od.17.419, 18.138, 19.75;   cf. also Il.1.590ff.).

41 cf. Prop.3.12, 3.5.2ff. (for greed as a motive for war, see Shackleton Bailey Propertiana 222).

Notes to Chapter 2

[42] For _barbarus_ as a derogatory adjective, see Enk 2 Comm. 231.
We do not, therefore, have to divide the poem after 14 (as Sandbach
PCPS 5 (1958-9),1ff. suggests) because the rival is a _praetor_ in 1
and a _barbarus_ in 27.   In fact, Ovid's reference (albeit indirect)
to the "barbarity" of his rival is a further argument for the poem's
unity.

[43] See Lefèvre _Propertius Ludibundus_ 66.

[44] The last line of Ovid's poem (_tam male quaesitas pulvere mutet_
opes) is ambiguous, presumable intentionally so.   The _opes_ refers to
either the rival's wealth, ill-gotten through bloodshed, or the
munera acquired from him by the girl, ill-gotten through her degradation
(For _opes_ in this latter sense, cf. _Am._1.10.22, _Ars._1.420;   Tib.2.4.40).

[45] See the Diegesis' summary of the poem (Pfeiffer vol.1 474).
See also J. Dawson "An Alexandrian Prototype of Marathus" _AJP_ 65
(1946), 1-15 who, however, makes many unwarranted biographical
inferences from the poem (9ff.).

[46] Illyria was governed by _legati_ in the years immediately following
the Illyrian war (35-33 B.C.) and presumably by a _proconsul_ after it
was handed over to the Senate in the settlement of 27 B.C. (Dio 53.12).
It is therefore assumed that the poet uses the term _praetor_ in 1 to
refer to as _legatus pro praetore_ (so Butler and Barber 164) or,

Notes to Chapter 2

generically, to "a provincial office-holder of some kind" (Camps
2.130, also suggested as an alternative by Butler and Barber loc.cit.).
What is perhaps more significant for those who do not regard the poem
as a biographical account of an event in the poet's life is the
selection by Propertius of Illyria as his rival's area of jurisdiction,
for this was a barbarous province which had recently experienced a
bloody war.

47 On the development of the character of the miles, see O. Ribbeck
Alazon: ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie (Leipzig 1882) 18ff.
Ribbeck traces the character back to Lamachus in Aristophanes'
Acharnians.   For his appearance in other literature related to
comedy, cf. Alciphron Ep.2.34., Philostratus Ep.38, Lucian Dial.Mer.
9. cf. also Theophrastus 23.2 (with Ussher's note).

48 Nor, indeed, has any other commentator taken up the suggestion
made by Enk in his Commentarius Criticus.

49 Plaut. Bac.548, 945, 1088; Cap.656; Ep.421; Amph.1028;
Aul.415; Mil.1024; Trin.199. Ter.And.470; Heaut. 545.

50 On the status of Cynthia and the other girls of elegy, see
cap.1, note 19.   Whatever her actual status, her status in the
poetry seems to vary according to the demands of the individual poem.

Notes to Chapter 2

[51] For the motif of the incompatibility of love and athletics, see Nisbet and Hubbard Odes 1 108ff. They correctly point out that the palaestra — the Greek equivalent of the Campus Martius — was associated with homosexuality, so that a young man in love had good reason to avoid it. This was note the case in Rome, but neither Propertius nor Horace (Odes 1.8.4) worried about the inconsistency.

[52] On the poem's humorous ending, see Lefèvre Propertius Ludibundus 136f., R.E. White "descriptive power and humour in Propertius" Studies in honor of B.L. Ullman Ed. Charles Henderson (Rome 1964) vol.1.150ff. On the Aphrodisios Horkos, see Kiessling—Heinze's preface to Odes 2.8; Luck 94; Enk on Prop.2.16 47–8.

[53] See above p.76

[54] There is also reference made to a Caesar (Julius) in Ovid's poem (52) but it is hardly a flattering one. It is possible that the idea of this contemporary reference was suggested to Ovid by the reference to Augustus in Propertius' poem.

[55] On this see Smith on Tib.2.4.13–20 and Stroh passim.

[56] This cynical treatment of the Danae Story is popular with later epigrammatists (cf. AP 5.33 (Parmenion), AP 5.217 (Paulus Sil.) AP 12.239 (Strato)) but does not occur in pre-elegiac epigram. Ovid's

Notes to Chapter 2

source may have been Antipater of Thessalonica's poem AP 5.31, since Antipater may well have been acquainted with Ovid (see Reitzenstein RE 1.2514).

57 On Propertius' sources, see L. Alfonsi, "L'Antiope di Pacuvio e Properzio III. 15", Dioniso 35.2 (1961) 5-10. Alfonsi argues that Propertius is indebted to Pacuvius, but the loss of Pacuvius' play makes this very difficult to substantiate and Alfonsi's comparison of the fragments of Pacuvius with Propertius' poem is not very convincing.

It seems to me likely that Propertius is following some Alexandrian model. H.J. Rose, commenting on Hyginus Fab.7, which is very close to Propertius in some of its details, claims that the Hyginus version of the myth is a "recentiorem fabulae formam". For his arguments, see his Hygini Fabulae (Leyden 1933) 9. Further, the scholiast H. on Odyssey 11.260 (Την δε μετ Αντιοπην ιδον, Ασωποιο θυγατρα) tells us that, whereas Antiope is Asopus' daughter in Homer, Νυκτεως αυτην οι νεωτεροι ιστορουσιν. In Propertius, she is Nycteos (3.15.12).

58 E.g. Luck 119; Camps 3.126; Rothstein vol.2.124; R. Helm Properz: Gedichte (Berlin 1965) 267. Some have shown undue scepticism: e.g. Postgate in his introduction (xvii); Leon

Notes to Chapter 2

Herrmann "De Ovidianae Corinnae vita" <u>Atti del Convegno Internazionale
Ovidiano</u> (Rome 1959) 308; Enk 1.7 (Enk's scepticism is mystifying;
he accepts that Lycinna is an <u>ancilla</u>, but will not commit herself
on whether or not she is <u>Cynthiae serva</u>!) Most recently, Barsby
(<u>Am.1</u> 129) states: "It is perhaps surprising that the <u>ancilla</u> plays
no part in the affairs of Propertius and Tibullus".

59 See Reitzenstein <u>Wirklichkeitsbild</u> 70.

60 One may compare the "autobiographical" links in some of Horace's
<u>Odes</u>; e.g.1.7 (Teucer), 3.11 (Hypermnestra), 3.27 (Europa). There
is, however, a major difference between the Propertian and Horatian
technique: Horace, unlike Propertius, does not return from his
mythological "digressions" to the "personal" situation. This perhaps
goes some way to account for the longer life of the "biographical
fallacy" in the case of Propertius' poems.

61 Oddly enough, though, in their commentary on 3.15 (300) they
claim that "in both cases (i.e. 3.15 and 1.20) the setting to the
legend may be real or fictitious".

62 It would serve no purpose to add more to this list of scholars
who believe in the biographical Lycinna. Of interest, however, is
Leon Herrman's suggestion that she was Ovid's Corinna who took up
with Ovid after she was jilted by Propertius (<u>op.cit.</u> (note 58) 307-9).

Notes to Chapter 2

63 _Hellenistische Dichtung_ (Berlin 1924) 236 note 1:   "nicht mehr
hedeutet der scheinbar ganz persönlich Eingang von 3.15, das nur die
Antiopegerschichte erzählen will.   Nur weil die Verknüpfung schlecht
gelungen ist, darf man glauben dass an dem Verhältnis mit Lycinna
etwas Wahrheit ist".

64 The difficulty arises in this poem with testis erit (11), which,
it is argued (see Camps ad loc.), is used elsewhere by the poet only
to prove a point already made but which here introduces a new point.
See, however, Shackleton Bailey _Propertiana_ 186, who cites 1.18.19
as a parallel.   It might be added that Propertius' technique here
resembles that of 1.2, where the mythological exempla (15-24),
following the examples from nature (9-12) which simply support the
initial thesis that "beauty needs no adornment", introduce the new
idea of Cynthia's infidelity (see Allen 140ff., but note also the
objections of Otto Skutsch "Readings in Propertius" _CQ_ n.s. 23
(1973) 316-317).

65 K.P. Schulze _Römische Elegiker_ (5th ed. Berlin 1910) 168.
The argument is found at least as early as Kuinoel's 1805 edition
(Vol.1, xxxvl), and its most recent occurrence is in Frederic Ahl
"Propertius 1.1.".   _WS_ 87 (1974) 80 note 2.

66 On dramatic development within a poem, see cap.1. note 65.

Notes to Chapter 2

[67] It is tempting to see here the fruits of Ovid's rhetorical training. However, caution must be exercised in this: see T.F. Higham "Ovid and Rhetoric" _Ovidiana_. _Recherches sur Ovide_ ed. N.I. Herescu (Paris 1958) 32-48.

[68] See Zingerle 3.12.

[69] See note 40 above.

[70] For more examples see Headlam-Knox _Herodas_ xlvi, note 1.

[71] See Trenkner _Novella_ 86-7.

[72] Tacitus _Annals_ 12.53 Suetonius (_Vesp._2) also mentions the law but wrongly assigns it to Vespasian (see Furneaux _ad loc._).

[73] Similar to this is the "Epicurean" theme that prostitutes are to be preferred to freeborn women, a theme frequently occurring in comedy: cf. Eubolus _Pannychis_ fr.84K. _Nannion_ fr. 67K. Philemon _Adelphi_ fr. 4K. See also F. Rosenmeyer _The Green Cabinet_ (California 1969) 81-2. That this was a tenet of Epicurus himself is doubtful (see Bailey _Lucretius_ 3.1303).

[74] In Roman epigram cf. Martial 1.84, 3.33, 6.71.

[75] For this same question (the comparative propriety of man-slave girl and woman - male slave relationships) see also Musonius Rufus 12 (Lutz).

Notes to Chapter 2

[76] <u>Aristaenetus: Erotische Briefe</u> (Zurich 1951) 173.

[77] For a variation on the theme in Roman epigram cf. Martial 11.23.8.

1   For the problems involved in the notion of the "biological evolution" of one genre from another, see Ben Perry _The Ancient Romances_ (Berkely 1967) 8-17.

2   Most editors (e.g. Butler and Barber, Enk, Postgate) read _quovis_ with the _deteriores._ See, however, Shackleton Bailey _Propertiana_ 25. To Shackleton Bailey's argument add the fact that 1.9.14 (_et cane quod quaevis nosse puella velit_) is surely meant to echo _quaevis_ in 4.

3   I see no reason to reject 23-4, as had been suggested recently (E. Courtney "The Structure of Propertius" Book 1 and Some Textual Consequences" _Phoenix_ 22 (1968) 250ff.). The _iuvenes_ are not, as Courtney argues, an "irrelevant interruption", but an indication of Propertius' opinion of himself as a love-poet. Butler and Barber (164) correctly maintain that "the awkwardness of the transition is lessened by the fact that Propertius has said _praeferar_ not _praeferes me_". Moreover, the _iuvenes_ are prepared for by 13-14 (_me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator,/ et prosint illi cognita nostra mala_). The _iuvenes_ are surely _neglecti amatores_ helped by Propertius' poetry, and Propertius is claiming that he will have the glory he expresses a desire for in 10 (_hinc cupio nomen carminis ire mei_). For detailed discussion of this point, see Stroh 15f.

Notes to Chapter 3

4   On quo pereas (33), see Butler and Barber ad loc.   For the theme
"confession brings relief" see Stroh 32 note 72.   Stroh (29ff.)
convincingly argues against the view that Ponticus is urged to confess
his love in love elegy.   See also F. Jacoby "Drei Gedichte des
Properz" RM 69 (1914) 402ff. who correctly cites as parallels Horace
Odes 1.27 and Catullus 6.

5   See cap.2, note 40.

6   In other late prose literature cf. Alciphron Ep.1.16, Aristaenetus
1.17.

7   So Trenkner Novella 26-7, E. Rohde Der griechische Roman und seine
Vorlaufer (3rd ed. Leipzig 1914) 157 note 4.

8   AP 12.99.1 Ἡγρεύθην ὑπ᾽ Ἔρωτος ὁ μηδ᾽ ὄναρ....
(perhaps in imitation of Meleager AP 12.23.1, which also opens with the
word Ἡγρεύθην); AP 12.101.1 Τόν με πόθοις
ἄτρωτον ὑπὸ στέρνοισι Μυΐσκος ὄμμασι τοξεύσας
(probably the model for Prop.1.1.1ff.   See Gow and Page HE vol.2.661).

9   Cf. also the "late-learner" of Theophrastus (Char.27)

10   In epigram cf., AP 11.54 (Palladas).   In diatribe cf. Teles 10.6
γέρων γέγονας · μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου.
(This is, in fact, very close to Philemon fr. 179 γέρων γενόμενος μὴ
φθόνει νεώτερα, μηδ᾽ εἰς ὄνειδος ἕλκε τὴν σεμνὴν πολιάν.
and see A. Oltramare Les Origines de la diatribe Romaine (Geneva 1926)
48.24b.

Notes to Chapter 3

[11] Cf. Alciphron Ep.2.7, 2.31, 4.17.1; Theophylactus Ep. 60.

[12] See Stroh 35-6 and note 79.

[13] See Jacoby op.cit. (note 4) 398ff.

[14] As Jacoby (op.cit. (note 4) 399) points out, this is not the point in Antiphanes fr. 235K, usually cited by commentators on Propertius 1.9.5-8. For the topos of "oracular expertise" in erotodidactic situations (Prop.1.9.5-6; cf. Tib.1.8.3ff.) see Cairns GC 73 and note 7.

[15] E.g. by Nisbet and Hubbard in their introduction to Hor. Odes 1.22 (262-3).

[16] A pentameter has been lost between 25 and 25a, and it is generally assumed that it referred to the protection of the poet by Venus (or amor, though this seems less likely in view of amore in 27 and the fact that Venus was the subject of the lines preceding 26). For some examples of lines composed by the early humanists to fill the gap, see Smith on line 25 (211).

[17] See Butler and Barber ad loc. (303). For the motif of the lover's burial by his beloved, a favourite topic of Propertius (though one should hesitate to argue for "Propertian morbidity" therefrom), cf. AP 12.74 (Meleager).

Notes to Chapter 3

[18] We should, of course, make no biographical inference from
totum annum (9). For the problems this has caused, see Allen
113ff. On Cynthia's portrayal see cap.2, note 35.

[19] feriat may be the right reading here: see Margaret Hubbard
"Propertiana" CQ 18 (1968) 318-9.

[20] On sanguine parvo see Shackleton Bailey Propertiana 188.
On the lover's poor physical condition see Brandt on Am. 1.6.5ff.,
Smith on Tib. 2.3.9-10 and see above cap.1 note 34.

[21] See previous note.

[22] See cap. 2, note 40.

[23] On the interpretation of 15-16, see above p.48

[24] This is the only mention of Scythia in Longus and the
adjective Scythicus occurs only once in Propertius (at 3.16.13
quisquis amator erit, Scythicis licet ambulet oris), where he too
is talking about the power of love. Both authors may have been
influenced by a common (epigrammatic?) antecedent.

[25] Rothstein and Schuster (on Prop.3.16) add AP 5.25.1ff. (Philodemus)
as a parallel for the footpads:

Notes to Chapter 3

Ὁσσάκι κυδίλλης ὑποκόλπιος, εἴτε κατ ἦμαρ
εἴτ᾽ ἀποτολμήσας ἤλυθον ἑσπέριος
οἶδ᾽ ὅτι πὰρ κρημνὸν τέμνω πόρον, οἶδ᾽ ὅτι ῥιπτῶ
πάντα κύβον κεφαλῆς αἰὲν ὕπερθεν ἐμῆς.

If ἀποτολμήσας (2) refers to the perils of the night,

Rothstein and Schuster are right. Gow and Page (GP 375), however,

argue that the word refers to the risk of meeting the girl's husband

(though the girls of epigram are usually hetaerae and unmarried).

Perhaps in AP 12.117 (Meleager) the Τολμά imputed to the

drunken lover by his soberer self (see Gow and Page HE 618) is his

readiness to entrust himself to the dangers of the night. Hoelzer

(De poesi amatoria a comicis Atticis exculta ab elegiacis imitatione

expressa (Diss. Marburg 1899) 62) cites as a parallel Alexis fr. 107K,

but this is not relevant (the speaker simply fears that he may be

robbed by a group of komasts).

26 I am accepting here the traditional dating of c.26 B.C. for

Tibullus (see Putnam 4, Lilja 11), c.22 B.C. for Propertius (see

Margaret Hubbard Propertius 43-44, Butler and Barber xxv-xxvii),

after 25B.C. for the first edition of Ovid's Amores (on this vexed

question, see Munari xiii-xv and especially Alan Cameron "The First

Edition of Ovid's Amores" CQ N.S. 18 (1968) 320-333, espec.331-333).

Notes to Chapter 3

27 E.g. Enk "Lucubrationes Propertianae" _Mnemosyne_ 14 (1961) 41, Tränkle _Sprachkunst_ 99, Solmsen "Propertius in his literary relations" 277-81.

28 See Forcellini s.v. _sacer._

29 While I accept Solmsen's conclusion that Propertius' debt is to Tibullus rather than to Greek antecedents, I cannot accept his assertion that "the epigrams in which Hellenistic poets declare that in the service of love they will brave all the terrors of the elements or if necessary defy Zeus himself are not even superficially similar" ("Propertius in his literary relations" 278). They are quite clearly similar, as most scholars have noted, and even if Propertius is indebted entirely to Tibullus, Tibullus was certainly influenced by Greek epigram.

30 It is tempting to connect _exclusus fit comes ipsa Venus_ (20) with the "komastic ancestry" of the theme. This, I think, may be the point Camps is trying to make in his comment on the line (3.130): "in line 19 the lover's immunity has begun to be attributed to his pathetic condition; and "exclusion" and "immunity" are juxtaposed in Tibullus 1.2.7ff. and 25-8, passages which Propertius had somewhere in his mind when writing this elegy." However, Propertius has obviously been invited by Cynthia, and there is no question of his

Notes to Chapter 3

being exclusus. et cuius sit comes ipsa Venus is surely what
Propertius wrote (the suggestion of Shackleton Bailey (Propertiana
189) that "Cynthia being in Tibur, Propertius finds no welcome at
her house in Rome" seems to me unlikely).

31 See Lefèvre Propertius Ludibundus 47ff., G. Krokowski "De
Propertio Ludibundo" Eos. 29 (1926)90.

32 See cap.2, note 35.

33 This it does very successfuly.   The poem is one of the liveliest
and best in Book 3, and for that reason was chosen by Ezra Pound
for one of his more successful "adaptations" (A Homage to Sextus
Propertius 3).   It seems to have found favour in antiquity, too:
lines 13-14 were inscribed on a wall in Pompeii by someone whose
admiration for the poem surpassed his recollection of it (CIL. 4.
1950 reads Scythiae for Scythicis in 13;   feriat for noceat on 14.
On the latter reading, however, see Margaret Hubbard "Propertiana"
CQ N.S. 8 (1968) 318-9).

34 In fact, Gow and Page (HE 576) quote this line together with
frag. Grenf. 15 Συνοδηγὸν ἔχω τὸ πολὺ πῦρ
τοὺν τῇ ψυχῇ μου καιομένον) as a parallel for the
komastic epigram AP 12.116.4 (Anon.) μέγας φανός ἐμοὶ
Θεμίσων.

Notes to Chapter 3

35 Am. 1.15.27-8, 3.9; Ars.3.334, 536; Rem.Am. 764.

36 On verbal reminiscences of Propertius in Ovid see Neumann 7-12
(this example is, however, omitted by Neumann). The assumption
commonly made that all Propertian imitations are consciously and
intentionally made by Ovid (for a recent exposition see Kathleen
Berman "Some Propertian Reminiscences in Ovid's Amores" CP 67 (1972))
is well countered by Elizabeth Thomas "Ovid at the Races" Hommages
a Marcel Renard (Collection Latomus 101: Brussels 1969) vol.1.
710-24.

37 Kiessling, therefore, thought correctly that the poem was
humorous. See also Fraenkel Horace 185ff. and Nisbet and Hubbard's
introduction to the poem (Odes 1 261-4). For a serious interpretation,
see R. Reitzenstein "Philologische klei;nigkeiten" Hermes 57 (1922)
357-363.

38 Prop.4.1.147ff. (nunc tua vel mediis puppis luctetur in undis/
vel licet armatis hostis inermis eas,/vel tremefacta cavo tellus
diducat hiatum:/octipedis cancri terga sinistra time!) is not really
parallel, either: what Horus seems to be saying is that Propertius
need not fear shipwreck or violent death - he need fear only Cynthia's
avarice. Nor can I follow Quinn's contention (LE 186) that Prop.
2.27.11f. toys with this motif.

Notes to Chapter 3

39 Nowhere else, to my knowledge, is the lover "sacred" and protected
at all times.   The closest examples are probably Tib.1.5.57-8 where
the reference is to heaven's smooth direction of love-affairs and
(Tib.) 3.10.15 where the poet simply states deus non laedit amantes.
Neither is really very close.

40 I cannot accept the view of Luck (170) that "2.10 seems like a
preparatory sketch of 2.4".   The poems are developments of two
different, if related, epigrammatic themes, as I hope will be
demonstrated here.

41 See Neumann 63-68, Zingerle 1.116., That Ovid was acquainted
with this poem is clear not only from his imitation of it here, but
also from Am. 1.8.23 (scis here te, mea lux, iuveni placuisse beato)
which is a reminiscence of the first line of Prop.2.22A (scis here
mi multas pariter placuisse puellas).   One should, however, reject
without hesitation the recent suggestion that in putting into the
mouth of the lena this Propertian reminiscence Ovid is "creating a
background against which the rest of her speech can be read" and
suggesting that "men may look out for themselves first and thus deal
cynically with women (as Prop.2.22A demonstrates), but they become
angry when women treat them in the same way". (Kathleen Berman op.cit.
(note 36) 174)

Notes to Chapter 3

42 On such dramatic development within a poem, see cap.1, note 65.

43 This is, of course, a very different _persona_ from that projected elsewhere by the elegists, especially Propertius. Quinn (LE 162) suggests that this was a Propertian experiment to find "new ways of writing about love without jettisoning altogether the role of the victim of irresistible infatuation".

44 It does not occur at all in Tibullus, and Ovid's one instance of it is a specific reference to Argos (Am.3.13.31). It occurs only twice elsewhere in Propertius, one of which refers specifically to Argos (1.15.22). The other instance (1.19.14-15 illic formosae veniant chorus heroinae/quas dedit Argivis Dardana praeda viris) is a clear exploitation of the epic flavour of the word to give a high-flown ring to the couplet. It is, in fact, an established epic word (10 times in the Aeneid and 9 times in Statius' Thebaid and once in the Achilleid (not at all in the Silvae)). It occurs only twice in Catullus, both times in the longer poems (64.4., 68.87). It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that Ovid's reference to veteres heroidas was inspired by the epic flavour of Propertius' line.

45 For modesty as an attractive feature of a boy, cf. AP 12.96.3-4 (Anon.) εἶδος μὲν γὰρ ἄμωμον, ἐπ' ὄμμασι δ'ἁ περίσαμος / αἰδώς, καὶ στέρνοις ἀμφιτέθαλε χάρις.

Notes to Chapter 3

46 For a matrix analysis of the contacts among the three elegists in their use of this theme, see Appendix 3.

47 I see no reason to connect this, as older scholars have done, with the "love is blind" theme (in which the girl's unattractive features are seen as attractive by the lover) which we find at Plato Rep.474D, Lucretius 4.1160ff. Hor. Sat.1.3.38ff. (So Bürger De Ov.Carm. 19, E. Hübner Hermes 14(1879) 311, F. Wilhelm "Zu Tibull 1.4" Satura Viadrina (Breslam 1896) 53-4). For this theme in elegy cf. Ovid Ars.2.657ff. and (inverted) Rem.Am. 325ff; a hint of it occurs at Prop.3.24.5-8. cf. also Aristaenetus 1.18.

48 On the erotodidactic topoi of this poem compared with those of Ovid's Ars. Amatoria, see Wilhelm op.cit. (note 47) 48ff.

49 This is, however, found elsewhere in epigram, as Wilhelm op.cit. (note 47) 54 points out: cf. AP 12.192.3-4 (Strato). cf. also Lucian Am. 45 and see Wilhelm 54 for more examples.

50 On this Romanisation of a motif of Greek eoritc literature, in which the palaestra was associated with homosexuality (see previous note), see Nisbet and Hubbard Odes 1 108-110.

51 E. Hübner "Die Priaposelegie des Tibullus" Hermes 14 (1879) 311

Notes to Chapter 3

calls it a topoi of the Musa Paidike, comparing with Tibullus' poem
AP 12.96.3-5 (Anon.): εἶδος μὲν γὰρ ἄμωμον,
ἐπ' ὄμμασι δ'ἁ περίσαμος ἀιδώς, καὶ
στέρνοις ἀμφιτέθαλε χάρις, οἷσι κἀι
ἠιθέους ἐπιδάμνασαι. While I suggest here that
Tibullus' originality lies in the "types" to which he is attracted,
the possibility cannot be disregarded, in view of the aforegoing
(see also note 49), that Tibullus knew of an epigram, now lost, in
which the poet claimed to be attracted to different boys by virtue
of their physical activities and modesty/forwardness.

52 This is in accord with Propertius' love of making a theme more
vivid and immediate by tying it to a particular time and place.

53 See cap. 1, note 65

54 On the use of quaeris in Propertius, see Schulz-Vanheyden 42ff.,
J.C. Yardley "Prisce iubes again" CR n.s.22 (1972) 314-5.

55 SeeSchulz-Vanheyden 140-141 and Lefèvre Propertius Ludibundus
31-2. Schulz-Vanheyden notes that "Sentenz" is characteristic of the
endings of many sepulchral epigrams (cf. AP 7.8 (Antipater); 26
(Antipater); 74 (Diodorus); 160 (Anacreon) etc. More examples in
Schulz-Vanheyden 141 note 5), but that it is also not uncommon in
erotic epigram (cf. AP12.31 (Phanias); 121 (Rhianus); 153 (Asclep.) etc.

Notes to Chapter 3

More examples in Schulz-Vanheyden 141 note 7).

[56] The interpretation of Prop.2.22A given here follows that of

Reitzenstein (Wirklichkeitsbild 50-52).

[57] Almost certainly P. Pomponius Graecinus, cos.suff. A.D. 16,

addressed by Ovid in three letters from exile (Pont.1.6, 2.6, 4.9).

[58] Not that the literary reminiscences in the poem are all

Propertian.   Lines 31ff. may well be an imitation of Tibullus

1.1ff. (so Bürger De ov. carm. 17), and 35-6 at mihi contingat

Veneris languescere motu,/cum moriar, medium solvar et inter opus.

embody the same idea as Philetaerus fr.6K οὐκ οἶσθ ὅτι

ἥδιστον ἐστιν· ἀποθανεῖν βινοῦνθ' ἅμα.

(for the same idea, cf. also fr.9K.).

[59] For a similar conceit, cf. AP 12.166 (Asclepiades) where the

poet asks the lovers to leave him alone or else kill him outright.

[60] Viansino (Paolo Silenziario 151) maintains that in this poem

Paulus "ha voluto solo descrivere la capricciosita del cuore

femminile", but in putting his poem in a woman's mouth Paulus is

simply varying a commonplace of erotic epigram.

[61] Cf. also, in epistolography, Theophylactus Ep. 39 (quoted by

Burger(De ov. carm. 39) and Heinemann (Ep.Am. 96)) where the theme is

Notes to Chapter 3

inverted (οὐ δύνασαι Θέτιδος καὶ Γαλατείας
ἐρᾶν. οὐ τεμαχίσεται πόθος· οἱ γὰρ Ἔρωτες
οὐ μερίζονται.).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

[1] Cf. <u>Gnomol. Vat.</u> 23 πᾶσα φιλία δι' ἑαυτην αἱρετή· ἀρχην δ' εἴληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς ὠφελείας. On "Freundschafts-Utilitarismus" in Greek literature, see F.A. Steinmetz <u>Der Freundschaftslehre des Panaitios</u> (Wiesbaden 1967) 40-41.

[2] See Fraenkel <u>Horace</u> 91-4; N. Rudd <u>The Satires of Horace</u> (Cambridge 1966) 20-21.

[3] So common that when Propertius in 1.15 says <u>aspice me quanto rapiat fortuna periclo</u>/ <u>tu tamen in nostro lenta timore venis</u> (3-4) an ancient reader would certainly construe the situation as being a failure on Cynthia's part to fulfil her <u>officium</u> to her lover by attending his sick-bed (so, too, Catullus (38.1ff.) feels no need to spell out the situation; he is ill and Cornificius has failed to visit him.) For <u>periculum</u> = sickness, see Shackleton Bailey <u>Propertiana</u> 42. (It is difficult to accept the recent suggestion of Alva Bennet that <u>periculum</u> here is "an evocative variant upon the idea 'fear' used - in trepidation - of a new set of imponderables that his love for Cynthia now forces him to face" ("The Elegiac lie: Propertius 1.15", <u>Phoenix</u> 26 (1972) 35)).

Notes to Chapter 4

4 Solmsen ("Philostratus" RE 20,166) warns that "es ist abwegig
wie M. Heinemann . . . es tut, nach 'Quellen" für einzelne Briefe
zu suchen, und etwa fur das Motiv des armen Liebhabers oder des
φυγάs als Liebhaber philosophische διατριβαί uber
πενία und φυγή als Quelle anzusetzen". In fact, Heinemann
traces this particular motif to libris rhetorum, qui de paupertate
disserebant (46), but even if we heed Solmsen's warning against
searching for individual sources for individual letters on the ground
that the motives may have been more widely disposed in Greek literature,
we must still, in view of the parallelism between Tibullus and
Philostratus, assume the existence of this motif in pre-Tibullan
Greek erotic literature.

5 For other, though rather different, instances of sick-visiting
in Ovid, cf. Am.2.2.21-2 where the girl uses the excuse of visiting
a friend's sick-bed to evade the watch of Bagoas (cf. also, on the
same theme, Ars.3.641-2, Martial 11.7.7), and Am.3.11.25f. where
Ovid, hearing of the girl's sickness, came running to visit her only
to find that she was entertaining his rival.

6 Pietas does not occur at all in Tibullus, and its three instances
in Propertius are all "literal" ones (3.13.48, 3.15.35, 3.22.21). It
occurs twice elsewhere in the Ars. (not at all in the Amores), both

Notes to Chapter 4

times in religious contexts (1.641, 3.39).   The uses of the adjective
pius in love-elegy are also interesting. It, too, is very rare in
reference to sexual relationships.   In Tibullus it is only found in
such reference at (Tib.) 3.17 (4.11)1 where, significantly, it is
used of Cerinthus' attitude towards Sulpicia's illness: estne tibi,
Cerinthe, tuae pia cura puellae,/ quod mea nunc vexat corpora fessa
calor?   In Propertius we find it used of the Indian women ready to
practise suttee on their husbands' deaths and of Penelope's "pious"
fidelity (3.13.18, 24).   All other Propertian usages are "literal",
except for 2.9.47 si forte pios eduximus annos, and we remember that
in 25-8 of this poem Propertius referred to his sick-visiting (so
his years have, indeed, been "pious").   In Ovid's erotic works it
is used of Penelope's chastity at Ars.3.15 and of Corinna's lack of
fidelity at Am.2.16.47 siqua mei tamen est in te pia cura relicti,
inspired by (or the inspiration of) (Tib.) 3.17 (4.11)1 (above).
Elsewhere in the Amores and Ars. it occurs only in religious or mock-
religious contexts.

7   For the duties of the attendant, see Orth "Jagd" RE 9.558-603,
especially 568 ("Der Jäger und sein Gahilfe").

8   Orth, op.cit. (note 7) 568.

9   Cf. 3.14.6, 3.16.3-4 See Bréguet Sulpicia 38f.

Notes to Chapter 4

10 Vergil, Ecl. 3.74-5.

11 Kölblinger 98-99. Kölblinger devotes a chapter to "der gemeinsame Jagd" (87-122) but does not discuss sources.

12 See Brandt on 2.185ff. For the difficulties involved in the Propertian passage see now Francis Cairns "Some observations on Propertius 1.1." CQ n.s. 24(1974) 94-110. Cairns's contention that "there . . . is not enough evidence to show that Ovid was imitating Propertius closely" (95) I find difficult to accept, as I do his argument (95ff.) that the difficulty of modo (Prop.1.1.11) can be resolved by assuming that it means ἄρτι rather than ἐνίοτε μέν.

13 For a humorous development of this stock Hellenistic erotic motif, cf. Alciphron 3.31, where the parasite Dipsanapausilypus saw a girl in a procession, fell in love with her and lost his appetite. For love versus athletics, see Nisbet and Hubbard's introduction to Horace Odes 1.8 (108-9).

14 For the σταλίκες (stakes or net-stays), see Oppian Cynegetica 157 and Mair's note ad loc.

15 Cf. Ipsa ego in Tib.4.3.12 and 13 which fulfils the same purpose. This, however, is not in itself enough to suggest that Nonnus knew the Corpus Tibullianum.

Notes to Chapter 4

16 See Gennaro D'Ippolito Studi Nonniani (Palermo, 1964), 70ff.

17 There can certainly be no question of elegiac influence on Phtarch, whose Roman quotations and sources in the Moralia are very sparse (see W.C. Helmbold and E.W. O'Neil Plutarch's Quotations (A.P.A. Philological Monographs No.19 (1959)) 17).

18 Cf. Apuleius Met.8.4. Thrasyllus lusted after Charite, the wife of Tlepomenus, and ingratiated himself with Tlepomenus in an effort to gain access to her. In this passage his ingratiation is so successful that he is found hunting with the ill-starred Tlepomenus, who is, in fact, killed by a boar , aided by Thrasyllus. It seems likely that Apuleius' use of the hunting-together motif is intended to heighten the horror of the situation.

19 See Orth, loc.cit. (note 7).

20 One may perhaps add Prop.1.1.16 tantum in amore preces et benefacta valent, following the example of Milanion. The word benefacta occurs only once elsewhere in Propertius, at 2.1.24 Cimbrorumque minas et benefacta Marii, where it may be meant to recall Marius' own words (see Enk ad.loc.). It does not occur at all in Tibullus, and only once in Ovid (Met.13.270). It is clearly not a "good" elegiac word, and perhaps Propertius meant it to have a technical ring, echoing the unmetrical beneficium, so common in

Notes to Chapter 4

"friendship" contexts; see Thesaurus 2.p. 1879 (beneficium = munus, officium hominum), and note especially Cicero Lael.29 confirmatur amor et beneficio accepto et studio perspecto. This, incidentally, answers the question of E. Courtney ("The Structure of Propertius' Book 1 and some Textual Consequences" Phoenix 22 (1968) 258) "Is 'going to look at wild beasts' one of the benefacta . . . which overcame Atalanta's hard heart?" The answer, we now see, is yes. Beneficium also has political overtones; see D.O. Ross Style and Tradition in Catullus (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), 90.

21 This is the interpretation of Nemethy and Smith ad loc. (Nemethy 75; Smith 276-7). The latest commentator on Tibullus, however, suggests that Priapus is referring not to a pleasure-boat, but to a ship (Putnam 93). But 42-4 surely refer to a walk (see Smith ad loc.), and so the levem . . . ratem (46) is probably a pleasure-boat (for which cf. Prop.1.11.10). Further, since the other examples of obsequium cited in the passage, apart from the walk, are activities pleasurable for the boy (hunting and fencing), it stands to reason that it is not a long and arduous sea-journey but a pleasure-boat trip that Tibullus is talking about.

22 See Enk on 2.26.28.

23 Cf. also Tib.2.6.1-4 where Amor is a comes:

Notes to Chapter 4

> Castra Macer sequitur: tenero quid fiet Amori?
>
> sit comes et collo fortiter arma gerat?
>
> et seu longa virum terrae via seu vaga ducent
>
> aequora, cum telis ad latus ire volet?

[24] One may compare what Medea says of Jason at Met.7.66-8:

> nempe tenens quod amo gremioque in Iasonis haerens
>
> per freta longa ferar; nil illum amplexa verebor
>
> aut, siquid metuam, metuam de coniuge solo.

[25] Notice, too, that Laodamia says that she will go with Protesilaus sive – quod heu timeo – sive superstes eris; that is, she will attend him even to the underworld. This of course, she does eventually do, according to the myth (H.J. Rose OCD[2], 890-1). Ovid had this in mind, but he also probably had in mind the fact that the service which Laodamia was offering had a good mythological precedent in the story of Pirithous and Theseus.

[26] See Spies Militat Omnis Amans and Murgatroyd "Militia Amoris".

[27] Kiessling-Heinze, in the introduction to their commentary on Odes 2.6, suggest that Catulllus is parodying the theme. If so, they are right in their judgement "das auch die Poesie das Motiv schon vielfach verwendet hatte". But it is not obviously a parody (see Fordyce ad loc. (124-5)).

Notes to Chapter 4

28 See Kiessling-Heinze's introduction to the poem (486-7).   For

the propemptic elements in the poem, see Cairns GC 141.

29 For the far west, cf. Odes 2.6.1 where Gades represents it

(cf. the scholiast's comment Oceani, ad Hispaniae oram ultimam.   See

also Orelli-Hirschfelder on Odes 2.6.1).

30 See previous note.   Horace elsewhere refers to it as remotis

Gadibus (Odes 2.2.10cf. terrarum finis Gades in Silius Italicus 17.637.

31 For the proverbial shipwrecking qualities of the Syrtes, see

Pease on Vergil Aen. 4.41.

32 See Gordon Williams ad loc. (Odes 3 51).

33 E.J. Wood Rhipaei Montes OCD^2 923.

34 Ovid Am.2.16.21-22 is, in fact, cited as a parallel for the

opening lines of Propertius 1.6 by Francis Cairns ("Some Problems

in Propertius 1.6" AJP 95 (1974) 150-1).

35 See PIR^2 III 133.

36 See Vollmer ad loc. (504-5).

37 Legal aid as a Freundschaftsdienst we have already seen in the

discussion of sick-visiting (cf. Epicurus ap. Seneca Ep.1.9.8 (Usener

Notes to Chapter 4

fr. 175), Lucian <u>Toxaris</u> '18, Horace <u>AP</u> 423-5).   It is not surprising,
in view of the standard elegiac antipathy to "public" occupations
such as the law that this particular service finds no place in the
<u>officia</u> of the elegist.   It does, however, occur as an example of a
favour which a lover - but not an elegist - can confer on a girl in
the <u>Ars.</u>(3.531).

38   For legal aid, see previous note;   for sick-visiting see above
pp.199ff.

39   Cf. Catullus 11.1, Statius <u>Silv.</u>5.1.127, 3.5.18;   in an erotic
context, Tib. 1.4.41, Ovid <u>Am.</u>2.16.17, <u>Her.</u>13.161. cf. also Tib.2.6.2.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

[1] On the textual problems of Book 2, see now Margaret Hubbard *Propertius* 41ff. For an excellent discussion of 2.28 from a "unitarian" viewpoint see 47ff: see also F.R.B. Godolphin, "The Unity of Certain Elegies of Propertius" *AJP* 55(1934) 62-66, R.E. White "The Structure of Propertius 2.28. Dramatic Unity" *TAPA* 89 (1958) 245-61. For the"separatists'"viewpoint, see Karl Barwick "Catullus c.68 und eine Kompositionsform der romischen Elegie" *WJA.* 2(1947) 8-9, U. Knoche "Gedanken zur Interpretation von Properzens Gedicht 2.28" *Miscellanea Properziana* (Assisi 1957), 49-70.

[2] *op.cit.* (Previous note) 65-6.

[3] Margaret Hubbard *Propertius* 53. The further argument put forward by Knoche (*op.cit.* (note 1) 54) that Propertius would not, in a prayer to Jupiter, go on to address, as he does, Persephone and Hades (47-8) is circular in that it assumes that the poem is *in toto* a prayer to Jupiter.

[4] Most editors transpose 33-4 to follow line 2: see, however, Margaret Hubbard *Propertius* 53-5. On the sickly season see Brandt on *Ars.* 2.315-20 (92).

Notes to Chapter 5

5   In 35-38 Propertius is apparently resorting to magic as a
cure for Cynthia.   However, H.J. Rose ("On Propertius 2.28.35-8"
Ut pictura poesis: Studia Latina P.J. Enk Oblata (Leiden 1955)
167-173) has argued that the magic used here always has erotic
purposes and is never associated with healing.   He may well be
right in his suggestion that the lines do not belong to the poem.
Margaret Hubbard's suggestion that Propertius' magic is intended
to cure Jupiter of his love for Cynthia (the real reason for her
sickness) is ingenious but somewhat far-fetched (Propertius 55).

6   This is the structure suggested by R.E. White op.cit. (note 1).
White rightly argues that Cynthia is not represented as cured
until 59-60 since "47-58 throughout give the appearance of a plea
for something unattained rather than of thanks for something granted"
(257).

7   Cf. AP 5.6.3-4 (Callim.), Plato Symp.183B, Philebus 65c, Ovid
Ars.1.631-6, Am.1.8.85-6, Tib. 1.4.21-6.   It goes back at least to
Hesiod; cf. Apollodorus Bibl.2.5.   More examples in Bürger (De ov.
carm. 92) and Brandt on Ars. 1.633 (54).

8   The association of Cynthia's plight with that of Semele is made
clear not only by the suggestion that Semele will believe Cynthia
because of her own experiences but also by the expression suo docta

Notes to Chapter 5

puella malo. By 2.28 we have become accustomed to the idea of Cynthias as a _docta puella_: cf. 1.7.11, 2.11.6, 2.13.11 (cf. also 2.3.20).

9 Reading _ei mihi_ with Damste (accepted by Barber). Cairns (_GC_ 156) argues that the ending of (Tib.) 3.10 (4.4) is "an excellent argument for retaining the _et mihi_ of the _mss_ . . . with its erotic implications." However, as we shall see, the end of (Tib.) 3.10 (4.4) is addressed to Apollo, not Cerinthus (as Cairns believes) and is not erotic. Hubbard seems to me to be right in claiming that "the rueful _diminuendo_ (sc. of 61-2) restores the mood of the opening lines" (_Propertius,_ 57).

10 Constance Carriere (_The Poems of Tibullus,_ (Indiana 1968) 101) sees it as a "first-person" poem, with Sulpicia praying, in the third-person, to Apollo for herself ("Come near, Apollo, come and make me well" she translates the first line). Nothing in the poem suggests that it should be so interpreted.

11 On Pseudo-Tibullus' verbal parallels with the other elegiac poets in (Tib.) 3.8-12 (4.2-6) see Bréguet _Sulpicia_ 267-275 (this particular example she has missed).

12 Bréguet (_Sulpicia_ 308) suggests a different significance for the lines: "la maladie est considérée comme une souillure dont l'eau

Notes to Chapter 5

purifie; puis on jette dans la mer les καθάρσια charges alors
de la souillure μίασμα ". She compares <u>Iliad.</u> 1.314.

13 This "change of tone" is reminiscent of that of the <u>exclusus</u>
<u>amator</u> (see above p.42).

14 On the transposition see J.J. Hartman "De Tibullo Poeta",
<u>Mnemosyne</u> 39(1911) 381-3.

15 See Kuhner-Stegman 1.119.7.

16 For <u>tristis</u> in this erotic sense, cf. Prop.1.6.9, 1.10.21.
Tib.1.8.28. See Pichon s.v. <u>Triste</u> (283).

17 <u>frustra credula turba sedet</u> Clearly refers to the rivals of
Cerinthus who are now <u>exclusi amatores</u>: see Hartman <u>op.cit.</u>(note 14)
382 who comments: "nihil unquam legi festivius: adsidet Sulpiciae
foribus amatorum turba, sed frustra credunt miseri unquam sibi apertum
iri ianuam". For credula turba cf. Ovid <u>Rem.Am.</u> 686.

18 See Appel 125.

19 <u>Felix</u>, Cairns notes (<u>GC</u> 252 note 31), sometimes has an erotic
meaning; cf. Pichon s.v. <u>felix</u>, to which Cairns refers. The
point is, however, that <u>felix</u> only takes its erotic colouring from
the context and will not impart an erotic flavour to an otherwise
non-erotic context.

Notes to Chapter 5

20 On sapores, see Bréguet, Sulpicia 186 note 1, who rightly states: "ce qu'il (Apollo) apporte avec lui, ce sont des moyens de guérir: son pouvoir personnel (medicas manus), des remèdes (sapores) et des formules magiques (cantus)."

21 It is, however, true, as Bréguet notes (Sulpicia 309), that Apollo is similarly equipped in the Soteria Rutili Gallici (Statius Silvae 1.4.60ff.).

22 Both goddesses are, of course, particularly appropriate in the circumstances, Isis for her associations with the demi-monde and Ilithyia as a goddess of childbirth. However, the fact that the two are addressed in the same poem could be taken as a further argument against Knoche's view (see above note 3) that in 2.28 Propertius would not, after addressing Jupiter, go on to address other deities.

23 On this see W.J. Watts "Ovid, the Law and Roman Society on Abortion" Acta Classica 16 (1973)89-101. Watts concludes that the poems are "neither effective as pamphlets . . . nor readable as literature . . . but they are interesting as documents in the history of ideas". This seems rather hard on Ovid. Watts, moreover, seems unaware of the parallels for Ovid's anti-abortion stance in Theophylactus and Chariton, which may well suggest that this was a rhetorical theme and that Ovid's arguments were perhaps derived therefrom.

Notes to Chapter 5

24 On this theme see E. Bréguet "In una parce duobus: theme et cliches" Hommages a L. Herrman (Collection Latomus 44 (1960) 205-14). Bréguet traces the theme back to the speech of Aristophanes in Plato's Symposium.

25 Ovid was obviously taken by the theme; cf. also Her. 11.60, 20.223-4; Met. 9.780, 11.388 and especially 3.473 (an ingenious application of it to the story of Narcissus).

26 Cairns's view is refuted at length here not only because of the importance of his book but also because his remarks on the soteria have been recently accepted by at least one scholar: cf. Jennifer Moore-Blunt "Catullus xxxi and Ancient Generic Composition", Eranos 72 (1974) 118 and note 50.

27 Cairns does, however, assign to the genre Catullus 44, Horace Odes 2.17 and 3.8, and Himerius Orat. 45, but these are so very different in content that to classify them as "generic" is not very useful. Even a comparison of Himerius Orat. 45 (a Λαλιὰ εἰς τὸ ὑγιαίνειν τὸν ἑταῖρον) with Statius Silvae 1.4 will fail to produce a "generic pattern" or topoi for the genre which would help our understanding of the elegiac poems.

28 Cf. Himerius 45.2 οὐκοῦν οὐκ ἀπεικὸς καὶ ἡμᾶς

Notes to Chapter 5

τάξιν πληρῶσαι τὴν πρέπουσαν καὶ μετὰ τὴν νόσον
τοὺς ἔρωτας αὖθις διὰ μέλους ἀσπάσασθαι...
μετεῖχον γάρ, ὦ φίλοι, τοῦ πάθους καὶ πρὸς τὴν
νόσον ἐμερισάμην τῷ πόθῳ, καὶ μὴ κάμνοντος
τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν ἤλγουν δεινότερον.

One might perhaps argue from this (though Cairns, in fact, does not)
that the in una parce duobus theme was a topos of the soteria. It
is, however, a widespread topos, not confined to illness, and
particularly strong in Freundschaftslehre. See Nisbet and Hubbard
on Horace Odes 1.3.8 (48) and F. Steinmetz Die Freundschaftslehre des
Panaitios (Wiesbaden 1967) 138ff.

29 The theme of sickness was probably excluded from Menander's
plays: see E.W. Handley The Dyskolos of Menander (London 1965) 13.

30 For the remains of the story, see frs. 67-75 Pf..Fr.74Pf. seems
to be from a soliloquy of Acontius on the subject of Cydippe's illness
(λιπὸς ἐγώ, τί δέ σοι τόνδ' ἐπέθηκα φόβον;)
See Pfeiffer ad loc. (vol.1.76).

31 See H.E. Pillinger "Some Callimachean Influences on Propertius
Book 4" HSPh 73 (1969)171-199 and Pillinger's earlier doctoral dissertation

Notes to Chapter 5

<u>Propertius and Hellenistic Poetry</u>: <u>The Narrative Elegies</u> (Diss.
Harvard 1966) especially cap.1; A.W. Bulloch "Tibullus and the
Alexandrians" <u>PCPS</u> 199(1973) 71-89 (especially 74-78 on the smaller
motives taken over by Tibullus).

[32] See Francis Cairns "Propertius 1.18 and Callimachus <u>Acontius
and Cydippe</u>" <u>CR</u> n.s.19(1969) 131-4.

[33] Cf. also Ovid <u>Am.</u>2.14.43-4, where Ovid returns from the discussion
of the moral aspects of abortion to the particular instance of
Corinna's illness.

[34] For an excellent appreciation of the poem, see Allen 139ff.
His views, however, have been challenged recently by Otto Skutsch
"Readings in Propertius" <u>CQ</u> n.s.23(1973) 316-7.

[35] R. Lucot "Mécène et Properce" <u>REL</u> 35(1957)195ff. has put forward
the interesting idea that the opening lines of the poem are a
compliment to Maecenas' poetry. One line of Maecenas' poem on
Octavia survives in Priscian <u>Inst.</u>10.47 (Keil 2.536) <u>pexisti capillum
naturae muneribus gratum.</u> Lucot believes that the context of the
line was a compliment on Octavia's unadorned beauty, and Propertius,
in developing the theme of beauty unadorned, begins with Cynthia's
hair (<u>ornato</u> . . . <u>capillo</u>). More persuasive, perhaps, is the verbal
similarity of Prop.4-5 <u>vendere muneribus naturaeque decus</u> . . .

Notes to Chapter 5

36 See Margaret Hubbard *Propertius* 22ff.

37 Skutsch (*op.cit.*(note 34)316) wishes to read *fuco* for *vulgo*
in 23. On *vulgo* he comments: "What an absurd thing to say . . .
and how tangential to the theme of the poem, that these women were
not anxious to prostitute themselves! As though the poet were
here openly accusing Cynthia of doing just that. The point and
the only point of what the poet is *saying* is that they contented
themselves with the beauty which their chastity lent them". But,
as we shall see, Propertius is certainly hinting that Cynthia is
"prostituting herself" and Skutsch's view of the poet's "only point"
seems to be based solely on what he wants the poem's theme to be.

38 This interpretation of 25-6 is based on Shackleton Bailey
(*Propertiana* 10-11), who himself follows Keil *Observationes Criticae*
in Propertium (Diss. Bonn 1843) 9f. See also Skutsch *op.cit.*
(note 34) 316-7, who would read *sis* for *sim* in 25. Skutsch's
view again is supported by no arguments and depends only on a
desire to see in 1.2 "a simple poem which, though the idea of other
lovers is not wholly absent, yet in what it says never strays from
the theme of 'no artificial aids to beauty'". The fact that Allen's
interpretation gives us a more complex poem is, however, no argument
against the mss. readings.

Notes to Chapter 5

[39] Camps (2.140-141) correctly points out that since the Britons dyed their bodies, not their hair, with woad, the point of comparison here is "simply that she is using dye to alter her appearance and that this calls to mind the ways of northern barbarians".

[40] On _Belgicus . . . color_ see Butler and Barber _ad loc._ (222). It is probably to be identified with the _Sapo, Galliarum hoc inventum rutilandis capillis_ of Pliny (_NH_ 28.191) and the _spuma Batava_ of Martial (8.33.20).

[41] See Pichon s.v. _venire_ (289).

[42] This point is also made by Propertius at 1.15.5-8. During Propertius' illness (on _periclo_ (3) see cap.4 note 3) Cynthia is concerned only with self-adornment, i.e. she is trying to attract other lovers. Thus the examples in 15ff. are examples of _constancy_ and Propertius can state in 23 _quarum nulla tuos potuit convertere mores_.

[43] E.g. Butler and Barber _ad loc._ (157-8), Skutsch _op.cit._ (note 34) 316-7.

[44] See note 41 above.

[45] This is essentially the view of Lilja (214). However, Lilja contends (214 note 3) that "the _custodia_ of a woman was the responsibility

Notes to Chapter 5

of her father and, after him, of the nearest male relation", implying
that custodia was a legal term.   Custodia does, indeed, have a legal
meaning, but it is inapplicable here (see Alan Watson The Law of
Obligations in the Later Roman Republic (Oxford 1965) 72f.).
Presumably Lilja is referring to tutela, and this may be the sort of
relationship Propertius had in mind in 33-4 (the theme, of course,
goes back eventually, via Catullus 72.3, to Iliad.6.429).   Custodia
in 35 must therefore be taken as meaning simply "protection" (sc.
for Cynthia's "chastity").

46 On contigerant (4) see Barsby ad loc. (Am.1. 149) who correctly
observes that the verb is ambiguous in this position: Ovid could
be talking about the hair's actual length or its potential length
(taking contigerant as part of the apodosis of si passa fores (3)).

47 Cf. Ars.3.153 et neglecta decet multas coma.

48 It is also clear that he knew Prop.1,2:   cf. Ars.2.8-Prop.1.2.20;
Am.2.11.13-14-Prop.1.2.13.

49 This section of Ars.1 is, in fact, an interesting variation on the
"natural beauty is best"theme.   It is the story of Pasiphae, who
despite her purple gowns and cosmetics and ornate coiffure, is unable
to attract the bull like a cow (with her "natural beauty").   Brandt
ad loc. (29) compares Prop.1.2.1ff: it is, of course, much closer to
Tib.1.8.9-16.

Notes to Chapter 5

50 On *ferro . . . et igni* (25) see Barsby *ad loc.* (*Am.* 1 151). It refers to heated tongs, but one cannot forget the usual usage of the phrase (see OLD s.v. *ferrum* 5c.).

51 Cf. also Aristaenetus 2.21. Habrocomes, writing to Delphis, an "unadorned beauty" says: καὶ ὅσον τὸ ῥόδον φαιδρότερον τῆς ἄλλης πέφυκε πόας καὶ λίαν καθ' ἑαυτὴν εὐδοκιμούσης, τοσοῦτον καὶ τῶν ἐπισήμων γυναικῶν ὑπερφέρεις. (2.21.12-15) This is not exactly an example from nature, but it is not unlikely that the rose-comparison was suggested to Aristaenetus by the fact that it occurred in earlier "beauty unadorned" contexts (cf. Paulus Silentiarius AP 5.270.1), perhaps deriving ultimately from rhetoric.

52 On this theme see Christ-Schmid 2⁶1 (1920) 22 note 2.

53 Pearson *ad loc.* (3.58) notes that the fragment appears to coincide with views on ἀκοσμία subsequently held by Cynics and Stoics, but does not consider the possibility of an erotic interpretation.

54 "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy" CP 6(1911) 70ff. Wheeler sees here the influence of the τέχνη ἐρωτική of the *lena* on New Comedy.

Notes to Chapter 5

55 I use the expression "diatribe" in the broad sense given it by
Oltramare op.cit. 9 ("La seule définition que nous puissions proposer
est d'une expression forcement très générale: l'histoire de la
diatribe, dirons nous, est celle de la littérature moralisante
populaire").

56 On the question of the relationship between Comedy and Diatribe,
see Oltramare 66ff.

57 Cf.Prodicus ap.Clem.Alex. Paed.2.11; Juvenal 6.457ff. In the Church
Fathers cf. Basil Ep.1.22 (100) (dress and shoes) Ep.1.2(74) (cosmetics)
Serm. 19.4(574) (cosmetics used by ἡ ... ἄσεμνος καὶ πολλοὺς
ἀγρεῦσαι τῇ παγίδι τοῦ κάλλους προαιρουμένη).
Clem.Alex. Paed. 3.11 (p.42 Migne) (a woman's best adornment is work,
not κόσμον ἄκοσμον καὶ ἀνελεύθερον καὶ ἑταιρικόν).
ib.2.8 (p.473 Migne) (hair-dying). An interesting instance is Clem.
Alex. Paed. 3.11 (p.638 Migne) which shares the "other girl's hair"
theme with Ovid: τίνι γὰρ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐπιθῇσι
χεῖρα; τίνα δὲ εὐλογήσει; οὐ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν
κεκοσμένην, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀλλοτρίας τρίχας, καὶ δι᾽
αὐτῶν ἄλλην κεφαλήν.

NOTES TO CONCLUSION (6)

[1] See Margaret Hubbard _Propertius_ 152ff., S. Evans "Odyssean Echoes in Propertius 4.8" _Greece and Rome_ 18 (1971) 51-3, H. Macl.Currie "Propertius 4.8 - A Reading" _Latomus_ 32(1973) 616-622.

[2] On line 3 note the imitation by Ovid at _Met_.11.657 f where Morpheus appears to Halcyon as the ghost of Ceyx: _tum lecto incumbens fletu super ora profuso/haec ait_ . . . That Ovid had Propertius' poem in mind in his description of Morpheus' appearance is clear from 674-5 _lacertos per somnum corpusque petens amplectitur auras_ (cf. Prop. 96 _inter complexus excidit umbra meos_) and especially 706-7 _si non/ ossibus ossa meis, at nomen nomine tangam_ (cf. Prop.94 _mecum eris et mixtis ossibus ossa teram_). Surprisingly, Ovid's debt to Propertius is not mentioned by G.M.H. Murphy, the recent editor of _Met_.11.

[3] Cf. the remark made by Achilles' ghost at Ovid _Met_.13.445/6 "_inmemores_" que "_mei disceditis_", inquit "_Achivi,/obrutaque est mecum virtutis gratia nostrae!_"

[4] It is no coincidence that the only other Cynthia poem (unless 5 be considered a Cynthia poem) in the book (4.8) contains Odyssean echoes (see Evans _op.cit._ (note 1))

[5] Outside epigram cf. Isocrates _Egin._42; Sophocles _Electra_ 356;

Notes to Conclusion(6)

Plato <u>Menex.</u>248b.   In elegy cf. Prop.4.6.83 and cf. Ovid <u>Trist.</u>
4.10.84–5 for a clear reminiscence of Propertius <u>si tamen extinctis</u>
<u>aliquid nisi nomina restat/et gracilis structos effugit umbra rogos.</u>

6   For ivy adorning the tombs of poets, cf. <u>AP</u> 7.21.3–4 (Simias
on Sophocles), 7.22.1ff. (Simias on Sophocles), 7.23.1 (Antipater
of Sidon on Anacreon), 7.30.4 (Antipater of Sidon on Anacreon), 7.36.
1–2 (Erycias on Sophocles).

7   Stroh's ingenious, though implausible, defence of <u>pelle</u>, that
"jezt will Cynthia von dem Ruhm durch die Elegien nicht mehr wissen,
und so fühlt sie durch den Efeu nur ihre "weichen Knochen" bedrängt"
will not, of course, solve the difficulty of ivy growing on a fresh
grave.   The same difficulty faces Rothstein <u>ad loc.</u>, who quotes
Pliny's remark that ivy destroys grave stones (<u>NH</u> 16.144).   It was
perhaps a knowledge of ivy's destructive power and an ignorance of
the sepulchral epigrammatic tradition on the part of a scribe which
caused the corruption in the first place.

8   Camps 4.125.   Camps' suggestion is based on three things:
1) <u>ossa</u> at 4.11.20 and 102 appears to mean only a "shade" of the dead.
2) At 4.7.19 <u>pectore mixto</u> is used of two living people.
3) At 4.2.62 <u>fero</u> appears to mean simply "press hard", without any
suggestion of friction.   But, as Camps himself admits, "the primary

Notes to Conclusion (6)

meanings of the words . . . are hard to escape from". <u>Ossibus mixtis</u>

is, in fact, almost a technical term in epitaphs, and a Roman reader

would almost certainly take it literally. Once that argument falls,

the rest must follow.

[9] It is possible, though by no means certain, that Calvus had written

a poem in which his dead wife Quintilia returned from the underworld to

reproach him (see E. Fraenkel "Catulls Trostgedicht fur Calvus" <u>WS</u> 1956

278ff.). We can perhaps assume that the real Cynthia (Hostia) is

dead and to this attribute the poem's inspiration. The arguments

produced by such scholars as Krokowski ("De Propertio Ludibundo"<u>Eos</u>

29(1926) 91ff.), Lake ("An Interpretation of Propertius 4.7" <u>CR</u> 51

(1937) 53-5) and Guillemin ("Properce, de Cynthie aux poemes Romaines"

<u>REL</u> 28 (1950) 190f.) that Cynthia was still alive at the time of the

poem's composition are inevitably based upon the tastelessness of the

poem's juxtaposition with the humorous 4.8, but we do not know that

Propertius arranged the order of Book 4 himself and, anyway, a live

Cynthia is in even worse taste.

[10] Camps (4.116) suggests that <u>triverat</u> here means simply "had

touched" and he quotes as a parallel Verg. <u>Ecl.2.34 nec te paeniteat</u>

<u>calamo trivisse labellum</u>. This is possible but the context suggests

rather Butler and Barber's "had frayed". Moreover, <u>tero</u> is used

Notes to Conclusion (6)

nowhere else in Propertius to mean "touch", and it is used twice in
this poem to mean "rub" or "grind" (16,94). The meaning here is
probably that death (Lethe's water: see Camps ad loc.) has shrivelled
her lips.

11 On fragiles increpuere manus (12) Camps comments that "fragiles
might suggest lean boniness as of a skeleton, but it need not refer
to anything but the slenderness of Cynthia's hands". But there is
surely a contrast between spirantes animos et vocem and fragiles
increpuere manus, parallel to the contrast between eosdem . . .
capillos, eosdem oculos and lateri vestis etc. in 6-10. At in 11
is thus adversative, and Propertius is contrasting Cynthia's temper
and voice, both unchanged by death, with her body, which is now almost
a skeleton.

12 See also George Thaniel "Lemures and Larvae" AJP 94(1973) 182-7.

13 One may note, too, another motive for Cynthia's return: she wants
Propertius to burn for her (that is send to her, as Eucrates did his
wife's sandal) her poetry: et quoscumque meo fecisti nomine versus/
ure mihi: laudes desine habere meas. (77-8)

14 Val.Max. 1.7ext.10 and Aelian (The Souda sv. τιμωροῦντος = fr.82)
give the same story; cf. also Chaucer The Nun's Priest's Tale 164ff.

Notes to Conclusion (6)

(Canterbury Tales 4174ff.).

[15] Cf. Prop.4.7.2 lurida . . . umbra cf. also Ovid Her.13.109.

[16] Supported recently by Steele Commager A Prolegomenon to
Propertius (Cincinnati 1974) 18 note 39.

[17] Burial in una olla is, as far as I have been able to ascertain,
confined to members of the same family (see p.280 above for examples).
In this case one naturally thinks of a husband-wife relationship,
especially since, as we have seen, Cynthia does use the motifs of
epitaph which are appropriate to married women.   One may perhaps
compare Ovid Met.4.154ff. where Thisbe, about to take her own life,
begs that she and Pyramus be buried together.   Thisbe is obviously
at pains to "formalise" the relationship between herself and Pyramus:

> hoc tamen amborum verbis estote rogati;
>
> O multum miseri meus illiusque parentes,
>
> ut quos certus amor, quos hora novissima iunxit,
>
> componi tumulo non invideatis eodem.

$$\text{(Met.4.154-7)}$$

Note the archaic-sounding future imperative estote rogati (see Neue,
Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, vol.3.150-1) which suggests
that Thisbe is asking that their union be regarded as legitimate
marriage (iunxit (156)) so that burial together would be permitted

Notes to Conclusion (6)

(the parents agreed and their remains were buried _in una urna_ (166)).

NOTES TO APPENDICES

[1] So, too, Phillimore. Broekhuyzen compared Ovid Am.1.1.19-20 nec mihi materia est numeris levioribus apta/aut puer aut longas compta puella comas. Rothstein glosses it as "Begabung".

[2] Rudolf Helm, Properz: Gedichte (Berlin 1965) translates: "Schlimm wohl wär' es, wenn dir die Möglichkeit fehlte!" and Watts, in the Penguin translation, "It's not as if she shunned you". The interpretation is at least as old as Kuinoel's edition.

[3] "Drei Gedichte des Properz" RM 69(1914) 411.

[4] Enk saw this difficulty and referred his readers to his comment on 1.3.11: "in hac verborum inuctura etiam supervacuum est".

[5] Cf. also Quintilian 10.5.8 for copia in this rhetorical sense.

[6] Shackleton Bailey Propertiana 27. To his examples add Lucretius 4.1100 and, more important, Ovid Am.3.7.51 (of Tantalus) sic aret mediis taciti vulgator in undis.

[7] Cf. Ovid Trist.5.4.9 nec frondem in silvis, nec aperto mollia prato/gramina, nec pleno flumine cernit aquas. Ovid makes it clear that he is using the proverb in its "new" sense by adding two other examples of failure to see the obvious; cf. also Petronius fr.35.5 (= PLM 95.5) flumine vicino stultus sitit.

Notes to Appendices

[8] Cf. 3.1.6 quamve bibistis aquam?   3.3.1;   15-16, 2.10.25-6. Vergil Ecl.6.64ff., Callimachus Hymn Ap. 110ff., AP 7.55.5-6 (Alcaeus Mess.), 9.64.5 (Archias).   See Pfeiffer ad schol. Callim. fr.2 (vol.1.11). If the metaphorical significance of Propertius' lines were pushed to its limits, the flumine in 16 would be the Permessus (see Enk on Prop. 2.10.25-6).

[9] I would not deny the possibility that copia is deliberately ambiguous (see J.T. Davis "Quid si non esset facilis tibi copia?:   A Note on Propertius 1.9.15" Latomus 31 (1972) 503-6), but to take it in its erotic sense alone is clearly wrong.

Index Locorum

Ovid

Ars. = Ars Amatoria

Propertius

Tibullus'