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INTRODUCTION

Quid haec elegia sibi velit, non ita facile dictu.

Although Petrus Enk's oft-repeated lament specifically refers to 1.1, it might just as easily apply to many of Propertius' elegies. To a large extent, the disagreements that readers have concerning the interpretation of 1.1 is based upon assumptions and methodologies that haunt their reading not just of 1.1, but of Propertius in general. Critics' most common, yet frequently unexpressed, assumption about Propertius concerns his loose 'logic', his apparent contradictions from poem to poem or even within a single poem. They expect that the poet should provide a single, coherent meaning within each poem. When Propertius does not offer such lucidity, their response is to transpose lines, offer emendations, or delete 'interpolated' couplets. In the past, scholars of the methodology of biographical criticism, who attempt to explain Propertius' poetry as autobiographical, have reinforced the perception that Propertius is neither logical nor consistent. For example, these scholars have not been able to reconcile Propertius' acknowledgment of Lycinna as his first girlfriend in 3.15 with his statement that Cynthia was the first (prima, 1.1.1).
Nor have they been able to determine whether the Gallus mentioned in 1.5, 10, 13, and 20 is the poet or even if it is the same Gallus in all four poems. Since A. W. Allen convincingly exposed the biographical fallacy in two articles over twenty-five years ago and insisted upon reading individual poems on their own merits without interjecting 'historical' information from other poems, few have tried to interpret Propertius from a biographical perspective or have attempted to read the details of other poems back into another poem.

Even though another methodology, New Criticism, was introduced into Propertian studies with the advent of Allen's articles, the same assumption, that Propertius' poetry has a single meaning, continues to persist. In general, New Critics stress the need to read a poem within its own self-contained and self-defined poetic limits. While such an approach helps readers better appreciate the individual poem, two consequences arise. First, such an approach encourages the critic to look for various devices that assist in unifying a poem, such as the repetition of key words or phrases to frame one section and to provide a transition to the next or the use of various genres and topoi to help structure a poem. While the recognition of such devices often reveals the poet's movement of thought, critics sometimes fail to rise much beyond a catalog of such techniques or else limit the meaning of the poem to the poet's use of such structural devices. In the process, the content of many poems is not adequately handled. The critic often reduces meaning to the 'fact' that the poet has used a genre differently from his
predecessors or has added a new detail to a common motif such as *servitium amoris* rather than explore the way in which such alterations affect the reader's understanding of the poem. And arguments, for instance, whether or not Propertius used the genre *soteria* in 2.28, still presuppose that determining the poem's genre will determine 'the meaning' of the elegy. Second, such a methodology as the New Criticism often only serves to isolate individual poems from the rest of the collection. As a result, critics of individual poems usually fail to mention other poems with similar content or to establish the poem's place within Propertius' *oeuvre*.

In the face of the emphasis upon technique over subject matter and upon the individual poem in preference to the collection, critics have returned most recently to an examination of the poet's content. For example, Hans-Peter Stahl, *Propertius: "Love" and "War", Individual and State under Augustus* (Berkeley 1985), has attempted to moderate between the biographical and the New Critical approaches. To begin with, he insists upon Propertius' reasonableness and logic, often going into long, philologically-based arguments why critics in the past have misinterpreted or given up on the text too quickly. Like the New Critics, he is eager to examine a text in some detail and to point to individual words as markers of the poet's argument. These markers, however, tend to be adverbs, conjunctions, and the tenses of verbs—rather than nouns and pronouns, the type of words which the New Critics often point out—which reveal the flow of Propertius' argument. Like those who
preceded the New Critics, he asserts that certain poems can influence other ones. Indeed, he rightly suggests that the story unfolds from poem to poem—not a biographical story, but a psychological one. Yet the *persona* which undergoes this journey is at times very close to the person Propertius. Moreover, he lays great importance upon historical figures within Propertius' life, such as Tullus, Vergil and Augustus, in order to show the reader how the real Propertius came to portray such a psychological journey as he presents in his collection. Finally, like both the New Critics and those who came before them, he still insists that there is one meaning—in his case, that of the individual struggling against the state. Indeed, the frequency of words such as "logic," "reason," and "argument" in his discussion of individual poems presupposes that there is but a single correct interpretation of Propertius.¹

Another book which is destined to be influential in further studies on Propertius and Augustan poetry has just appeared in the last several months. Theodore D. Papanghelis, *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge 1987), sees the key in understanding Propertius is his 'aestheticism', his interest in form, color, and texture rather than any sort of 'moral' or absolute significance. Drawing parallels from works of Pater, Gautier, Poe, and other late 19th century aesthetes, Papanghelis explains that Propertius' preoccupation with love and death is the result of a predilection for the sensuous and the sensory in a love affair. Indeed, Propertius, he concludes, speaks of love as death, of love reaching its fulfillment only in death, a concept similar to the
late Romantic notion of the Liebestod. This aspect of Propertius' poetry has not received its due, and indeed it meshes with and strengthens one of the implications of the imagery of death, the expression of lovers' delight in and loyalty in death. While important, this is only one aspect of death which can be seen in Propertius' poetry. Moreover, in examining the imagery of death primarily in Book 2, Papanghelis misses the development of the image from this relatively positive notion in Book 2 to those poems in Book 3 which ignore or even reverse this idea, which stress only its destructive and distancing effect in a relationship.

Although there are certain advantages to each group's approaches, ultimately they tend to limit the poet to one meaning, to insist upon an almost philosophically logical meaning for one who is decidedly not a philosopher. Naturally, part of this strait-jacketing of Propertius is the result of the critic's rhetorical purpose in attempting to show the relevance of the new data which has been accumulated or the new perspective which has been provided. All too often, however, in attempting to persuade us of his point the critic does not account for the several connotations which a word or phrase, story or image has, especially those which at first glance seem contradictory to his own interpretation.

Rather than to exclude certain interpretations of the poet from his text, I would like in the chapters which follow to provide a framework which will allow Propertius' elegies to have the multiplicity of meanings which indeed they must have as a reader proceeds through his text.
First, within the collection Propertius the writer presents two interconnected personae, poet and lover, both of whom may be called Propertius. Indeed, the poet is not the historical Propertius any more than the lover is, but a character created by the writer to express another side of the affair with Cynthia. The poet's presence is most obvious when he introduces himself into the poem as a poet (e.g. 1.7 and 9). Yet he is also present when he uses consciously traditional poetic techniques such as a high style in mythology or the role of advisor or praeceptor amoris (e.g. 1.1). The advantage of this added persona is that it allows another level of comment within the poem, such as advice, blame, or praise. For example, he elevates Cynthia to semi-divine status in 1.17 when he sees the winds as symbols of her power or he criticizes Paetus for traveling after wealth in 3.7. Yet another level of meaning is provided by the third member of this triad, Propertius the writer, who stands outside the poem proper, but within Propertius' creative world. In a poem such as 2.26, the writer asks us as readers to question the possibility of Propertius' and Cynthia's journey being as successful as the lover and the poet say it will be.

Second, although most critics view ancient poetry books as static, defined by interlocking and circular thematic structures, recently critics have begun to comment on their linear progression, psychological rather than chronological. In view of the way in which ancient books were constructed—rolls of papyrus which encouraged reading books of poetry in order rather than skipping from poem to poem—it appears logical to allow for Propertius' poems
and books of poems to develop sequentially. Hence, my interpretations of individual poems proceed line by line, image by image, in imitation of the way individual readers perceive a poem the first time through. But since Propertius often introduces words or images which encourage a second or even third reading, I will often return over what seems like the same tracks to try to describe what other levels of meaning emerge from signals given by the character of the poet and by Propertius the writer.

Propertius' use of imagery and metaphor also provides a convenient way to explore Propertius' development of ideas from book to book. In 1.1 Propertius defines the lover's situation in terms of four images: warfare, illness, slavery, and journey. The poet-lover enters into his predicament by being captured in war (cepit). Enslavement (domina) becomes a way to describe his permanent condition of captivity, but only its external manifestations. Mental illness (furor) characterizes his inner feelings of helplessness in the face of one so powerful. Finally, the only means to escape love or to find it is through journey (ferte per gentes). Thus, his predicament, characterized by slavery and madness, is caused by the wounds of warfare and is transformed or eluded by means of travel.

Near the end of 1.1, Propertius introduces yet another image, that of death, through an allusion to Catullus. His cry for his friends to transport him through and beyond the ends of the earth (ferte per extremas gentes et ferte per undas, 1.1.29) recalls the opening line of Catullus 101, which recounts Catullus' journey to
visit the grave of his dead brother (multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus, Cat. 101.1). Propertius' reference to Catullus' poem on death suggests that Propertius' journey too will entail some sort of death. That it does becomes clear at the end of the first book in 1.19 when Propertius indicates his willingness to love Cynthia even after he dies. Yet the poem is equivocal, for it is not entirely clear that Cynthia has the same level of commitment as Propertius nor that Propertius' assertion of fidelity after death can be realized. And the poem's ambiguity is mediated in large part through the poet's discussion of death. With 1.19, therefore, the imagery of death assumes a role of importance equal to the other metaphors. It also shows that Propertius' journey ends with death. In the first chapter I will therefore show how Propertius introduces each of these five key systems of imagery, first by showing how the poet uses the metaphors of warfare, slavery, illness, and travel to define his predicament in 1.1, and then by revealing how the imagery of death comes to share an equal importance with the other four metaphors and adds to the ambiguity inherent in them.

In the next four chapters, I will explore each of the four metaphors introduced in 1.1, how they change and develop from book to book and how they each interact with the imagery of death. For although 1.1 exhibits all four metaphors, no other poem in the collection employs all of them at the same time again. In part, because 1.1 is introductory and programmatic, the poet wants to introduce all of them at once in order to give his readers a glimpse
at the metaphors which govern his thought. Yet by developing images
at more length, the writer can explore ambiguities within each
metaphor and allow for the characters within a poem to take on
various roles associated with the metaphor. In short, they provide
different perspectives from which to view the characters as they
change within Propertius’ poetry. In Chapter II, I shall show how
Propertius as traveler is transformed from one who wants to escape
(in 1.17) to one who wants to keep Cynthia from being harmed on her
travels (in 2.26) to the rather smug lover of 3.7 who can tell
Paetus that the true lover does not traverse the open seas but stays
close to his mistress. Chapter III depicts Propertius as patient,
his furor amoris in 1.15 giving way to Cynthia’s contraction of the
same disease in 2.28 and finally to his plea to Bacchus in 3.17 to
be free from such a malady. In Chapter IV, we see that Propertius
warns others about becoming enslaved as he has in 1.4, 5, and 10,
and speaks of his death in Cynthia’s slavery in 2.1 and 2.13 while
he begins to make it clear in 2.20 and 3.15 that it is not the slave
but the enslaver who will suffer and die. Chapter V shows how
Propertius first takes up militia amoris in contrast to Tullus’
actual militia in 1.6, makes Cynthia his imperator in 2.7, yet in
3.8 removes himself from his puella’s camp and becomes her enemy,
and in 4.8 pokes fun at their renewed warfare. In the last chapter
I will attempt to integrate the development of the individual
metaphors within the larger framework of Propertius’ collection, and
also explore the final stage of the death theme in the light of 4.7.
In each case, there is the threat of death, whether it comes on the high seas or from sickness, out of loyalty or from combat. This threat can be overcome by using it as an occasion of fidelity, yet at the same time it can prognosticate the demise of the love affair, just as 1.19 hints. As the perspective of the speaker changes from book to book, he helps focus the multiple meanings inherent within each metaphor. Eventually, he comes to recognize the negative power of death within the relationship and attempts to end the love affair. In Book 1 we are introduced to the poet-lover and his attempts to define his relationship with his puella Cynthia and explain why it does not seem to be a mutual one. In Book 2, the poet-lover becomes more assertive in his role, even willing to die for his beloved, but there are signs that the poet is beginning to distance himself from the lover through irony and humor. In Book 3, the character of the poet completes his split from the lover, opting for a new type of poetry in 3.17 and putting an end to the literary love affair at the end of the book. In Book 4, love is viewed with a dispassionate, even ironical distance, and the characters of lover and Cynthia are exposed. It is significant that at no point does Propertius actually die. His death is always only a possibility, always hypothetical. Yet he makes clear that the relationship is over when he offers a picture not of himself dead, but of Cynthia after death, stripped of any last vestige of allure or respectability.
Introduction: Notes

1 For Enk's quote, see Petrus J. Enk, Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos), vol. 2. (Leiden 1946) (= Enk I) 2. For a more complete discussion of Propertius 1.1, see Chapter I.

2 For example, see Margaret Hubbard, Propertius, Classical Life and Letters (London 1974) 1-7 and her quotations of Postgate and Wilkinson there. Indeed, her underlying assumption is conveyed best by her own words (5):

It is natural to hope that one can know what an ancient poet said, and editors are understandably reluctant to admit that in many passages of Propertius this is impossible. They react in two ways. In the case of Propertius, the attempt of conjectural emendation has probably been more vigorous and persistent than in any other ancient author. . . . A course more damaging to the poet's reputation is taken by those who accept as much as they possibly can of what the manuscripts contain. Part certainly of Propertius' reputation for obscurity has come from editors' desperate attempts to defend the indefensible by torturing nonsense into a kind of sense and then claiming that in this writer, though not in most writers, the result is tolerable.

Although Hubbard comes much closer to seeing what Propertius is trying to do in many poems, she still feels the need to blame the manuscripts rather than the inability of the critic for not being sensitive enough to the many layers of meaning which Propertius offers his readers. While her caution is sensible, it must not be taken as a license to emend and transpose. Indeed, the sad history of such misguided attempts to make Propertius into the kind of poet acceptable to the scientifically guided textual critic has been chronicled by G.R. Smyth, Thesaurus Criticus ad Sexti Propertii Textum (Leiden 1970).

3 Even as recent an editor as L. Richardson, Propertius Elegies I-IV, The American Philological Association Series of Classical Texts (Norman, Okla. 1976) 146 is troubled by Lycinna. His solution is that Propertius "chooses to forget all earlier entanglements." Frederick M. Ahl, "Propertius 1.1," WS N.F. 8
(1974) 80-81, n. 2, rightly points out that Propertius is writing poetry, not historical autobiography, and he is trying to express something about Cynthia's importance to him as a poet and lover, not about whether she was the first or second or tenth woman he had dated.


6 A useful review of critics' use of various structural techniques, genres, and topos is William R. Nethercut, "Recent Scholarship on Propertius," ANRW 2.30.3 (1983) 1817-1836, yet like other New Critics Nethercut tends to emphasize technique over meaning, and Propertius' relationship to Rome over his relationship to Cynthia.

7 The list of articles would be lengthy indeed were I to cite them all here. The discussion by Francis Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry (Edinburgh 1972) 153-157 and J.C. Yardley, "The Roman Elegists, Sick Girls, and the Soteria," CQ N.S. 27 (1977) 394-401 on whether 2.28 is an example of soteria should be sufficient examples.

8 Although Stahl (1985) xi-xii allows for the possibility that Propertius' text may be illogical, he constantly stresses the logical organization of Propertius' text and the clear determination of its parts. A good example of the way this 'logic' affects our reading of Propertius is in his discussion of 1.1.1-8 on pages 26-36.

9 In his discussion of poet and persona, Stahl (1985) 340, n. 49, attempts to temper the New Critical tendency to ignore historical facts within a poem. However, Stahl's true feelings are revealed most in sentences such as "We may confidently say that the change from the first of the two stages [Poem 1.11] to the second [Poem 1.12] is of the highest autobiographical importance to Propertius, as a person and as a poet" (21). Moreover, the historicity of Tullus (highly disputed) and the recreation of Propertius' earliest memories (based on what we know of the general
history of the period and Propertius' slim references to his past in 1.22 and 4.1) in Chapter V are essential for Stahl's subsequent argument, an argument which isolates the individual Propertius' reactions to another individual, Augustus, and his relation to the state.

10 Although Papanghelis (1987) ix tries 'to exorcise' the spirit of Wagnerian Liebestod with which he began his study, he quotes among others Walter Pater to define his view of romanticism, a view which considers "sensuous beauty and excitement as the best part of love" (18-19), and Edgar Allan Poe, The Philosophy of Composition, on the most melancholy kind of death ('when it most closely allies itself with beauty') to preface his reading of 4.7 (145).


13 Although commentators have noted the four metaphors within 1.1, only Francis Cairns, "Some Observations on Propertius 1.1," CQ 24 (1974) 94-110 (illness) and Ahl (1974) 80-98 (military, slavery, and illness) note Propertius' imagery at any length, and neither adequately shows how they interact and are programmatic for Propertius' poetry. Others have commented on the metaphors of
warfare, slavery, and travel, but only R.O.A.M. Lyne, "Servitium Amoris," CQ 29 (1979) 117-130 and Eleanor Winsor Leach, "Propertius 1.17. The Experimental Voyage," YCLS 19 (1966) 209-232 have tried to show the importance of the images within Propertius rather than offering a general survey of the image throughout elegy or Roman literature. I disagree with both of them in significant ways. For my disagreements and further bibliography for each of the four metaphors, see the first note of Chapters II-V.

14 The imagery of death in Propertius has also been much noted, but inadequately explained in regard to its development, equivocal function, and unifying nature throughout the entire collection. Agnes Kirsopp Michels, "Death and Two Poets," TAPA 86 (1955) 160-179 and Papanghelis (1987) both appreciate Propertius' emphasis upon graphic and specific details associated with dying, such as his references to ossa and cinis, but neither examines the image in any systematic way as one progresses through the collection. For further bibliography, see Chapter I, n. 3.

15 Although many critics of 4.7 view Cynthia's claims of fidelity sympathetically, various details in the poem expose her rhetoric as self-centered, and her final promise in 93-94 reduces love to the purely physical. 4.8 also shows Cynthia after death, in this case, literally after the poem which depicts her as an umbra from the underworld. Although I will discuss 4.8 within the context of militia amoris, in many ways the poem acts as the perfect sequel to 4.7. For even though Cynthia is not literally dead in 4.8, many of the same qualities which she demonstrates in 4.7—e.g. self-pity, self-aggrandizement, and self-centeredness and others which signal the end of the relationship—reach their logical conclusion in 4.8. See my discussion in the last chapter.
CHAPTER I
Metaphors and Death in the Monobiblos

Few of Propertius' poems have received as much comment as his introduction to the Monobiblos, 1.1. Yet most scholars have concerned themselves with the vexed problems of what Propertius means by the phrase castas odisse puellas (1.1.5) or how he adapted the Meleager epigram (AP 12.101) or whether Milanion represents Propertius or not or why the poet mentions Milanion's preces and benefacta when he recounts only the hero's deeds. Fewer have attempted to examine the imagery in the poem, and even fewer have tried to show how the poem is programmatic, that is prepares the reader for subsequent poems within the Monobiblos and the rest of the collection. For the poem not only sets the tone for what is to follow, but also presents the materia, the imagery and themes for the rest of the collection. In particular, the poem introduces several images, several ways of viewing the speaker, his predicament, the way in which he found himself in it, and a potential way to escape it. Military imagery (militia) describes how he was wounded, captured, and led into slavery by a woman. Slavery (servitium), the state in which he finds himself after his capture, characterizes the way in which he acts toward his captor,
his external actions. Inside, moreover, the captive feels helplessness, despair, the unreasonableness of his plight, feelings which in their extreme form are closest to insanity (furor).

Finally, to the maddened and enslaved lover the only cure, the only escape, is to travel (iter). Thus, warfare is the means to a situation which is characterized both by slavery and madness, and from which the only escape is a journey. The first half of this chapter will be devoted to an understanding of these images within 1.1, not only to help elucidate some of the apparent contradictions of the poem, but also to offer the reader a set of images which are developed into metaphors or systems of thought, which continue to characterize and define the poet-lover throughout the rest of the collection.

While the images of 1.1 offer perspectives from which to view the many sides of the poet-lover, the imagery of death, Propertius suggests, influences all the others. In 1.1 Propertius' incurable illness, his helpless plight, is reinforced by allusively recalling the first line of Catullus' poem to his dead brother (101). Catullus' willingness to journey over many lands and seas not only captures his affection for his brother, but also acts as a reminder of the very real distance between the two brothers, between life and death. Propertius capitalizes on the ambiguity of this image throughout the rest of the first book, culminating in his poetic statement on the relationship between love and death in 1.19. Ostensibly, Elegy 1.19 is a promise of faithfulness even after death, but the imagery—enhanced by further allusions to Catullus,
this time to Poem 68—casts doubt on the efficacy of that promise. In the second half of this first chapter, I will show how the imagery of death as a metaphor for love in 1.19 reaches the potential to extend the boundaries of each of the other four metaphors, interacting with them to create ambiguity and depth.

*  *  *

Propertius' first poem introduces the poet-lover's predicament and his reaction to it. The first eight lines present in epigrammatic brevity the situation, the lover's capture, his enslavement, his madness, and the utter helplessness of his condition. The lines which follow constitute his reaction to his plight.⁴ The Milanion exemplum (9-16) provides a transition by presenting a mythological case which appears to parallel Propertius', yet it also offers a glimmer of hope that Milanion's success with Atalanta will adumbrate a similar success in Propertius' case. The further image, journey, symbolizes Milanion's success and Propertius' impossible situation. Lines 17-18, Propertius' transition from the myth, register his despair and lead him to ask for help in the third section. In 19-30, he solicits sorceresses and friends with three requests, first to the witches to make his mistress also paie with love (three distichs), then to his friends for a medicinal remedy for his own illness (two distichs) or for a trip to a place far away from women (one distich). His final request recalls Milanion's method of success, travel, but in a
perverted way, for instead of traveling to win a *puella*, Propertius runs away from her. Finally in the fourth section (31-38), the poet-lover advises others in love to avoid his mistakes and to stay with their mistresses.

In the first section (1-8), a panoply of images introduces Cynthia's capture of Propertius and describes its effect on him, one who had not felt love before.

*Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis contactum nullis ante cupidinibus. tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus, donec me docuit castas odisse puellas improbus et nullo uiuere consilio. et mihi iam toto furor hic non deficit anno, cum tamen aduersos cogor habere deos.* (1.1.1-8)

Within the first couplet, Propertius offers his readers a number of images in embryonic form. Cynthia, the first word of the poem and the name of his beloved, recalls the goddess of chastity and the hunt, Diana, who was born upon Mt. Cynthus on the island Delos. And since an ancient poetry book usually begins by mentioning the muse or the god Apollo, their absence here gives added importance to Cynthia's name as a substitute for the gods of poetry. *Miserum me* suggests that Propertius' poetry will treat love as a violent passion, just as Lucretius 4.1073-1085 describes it. *Cepit ocellis* brings to mind both the idea of hunt or warfare and the type of poetry we are reading. Cynthia has captured her prey not by means of the standard weapons of a hunter or soldier, but by her eyes. By describing the eyes through the use of the diminutive *ocellis*, we are also reminded of the type of poetry we are reading.
It is love poetry and its source of inspiration is not a god, but a woman. Contactum in the next line unifies two of the images of the previous line since it can mean both "pierced," as by the shaft of an arrow or a dart, and "touched" by illness. But these darts are no ordinary ones, this illness not a normal one, since the darts are cupidines, the illness the result of desire. Thus, in the first couplet images of disease, capture, and poetry are introduced, yet each image is a surprise since the hunter is a woman and her means of capture arrows that inflict a disease of helplessness (miserum) and desire (cupidinibus) and the architect of this subduing of Propertius (me) is not only related to the goddess of virginity but also acts in place of the muse of poetry.5

Cynthia’s role as goddess is enhanced in the next couplet because of the postponement of Amor until the end of line 4. In line 3, Cynthia, as the only subject mentioned in the poem thus far, appears to be the power capable of bringing the haughty low: constantis deiecit lumina fastus (3). In fact, the subjugation of fastus, an example of divine power, grants Cynthia a kind of divine, moral superiority and underscores her connection with divinity in line 1.6 In addition, the image of the hunt has been submerged and incorporated within the much more inclusive image of warfare, for a hunter does not usually speak of bringing the haughty low, but a victorious and self-righteous general would.7 To be sure, the images of capture, arrows, and wounds in the first couplet fit the context of military imagery well. The pentameter further enlarges the military image since caput impositis pressit ... pedibus
suggests more than a hunter trying to capture his prey, but rather a triumphant warrior, who expresses victory through the triumphant action of subduing the victim by pressing down with both feet. Moreover, the abrupt introduction of Amor at the end of line 4 has the effect of identifying Cynthia with the god of love, extending her power from virginity to love affairs. Thus, even though we finally learn that it is Amor who has cast Propertius' eyes down and put him in the role of captive of war, our notion of Cynthia's power can only be enhanced since she was the one who first captured Propertius and seemed, at least, the one who reduced him to the role of prisoner of war. Thus, Cynthia's actions are not simply further extended by Amor, but Cynthia in a sense becomes an incarnation of Amor.

The metaphors are continued and further solidified in the next four lines (5-8), but while the first four lines emphasize an external force (ocellis, 1) which causes Propertius' captivity and eventual enslavement, the next four point to an alternative, inner cause for Propertius' condition and a new metaphor which characterizes his mind's enslavement to Cynthia. Instead of the physical action of Cynthia/Amor's triumph depicted, Amor now teaches (docuit, 5), almost "brainwashes", his victim. The result of this brain-washing is a lover who has completely lost his senses: he hates castae puellae (5), he lives without reason (nullo vivere consilio, 6). It is not surprising that Propertius has left improbus (6) intentionally ambiguous, for the word characterizes not only Amor and his teaching, but also its results in his pupil. Only after
offering specific indications of his insanity does Propertius name his condition. It is madness, *furor* (7). *deficit* (7), a word frequently used with connotations of illness, brings out the metaphor of sickness which describes Propertius' inner state. The double meaning of *adversus deos* (8) shows that this madness exists both between man and the gods ("the gods against me") and among the gods themselves ("the gods opposed to each other"). The lover Propertius rightfully feels as if the gods have ganged up on him, yet they have a latent antagonism toward each other since Cynthia, a reminder of the goddess of virginity, has encroached upon the realm of the god of passion, Amor. In short, the second pair of couplets describe once again how Propertius came into his current condition, but this time stresses its effect upon his mind.  

Yet if the first eight lines are examined sequentially, the resulting picture is also a continuously unfolding picture which explains how Propertius got the way he is. First, he was captured, wounded (*contactum*) by the shafts of love. As a result, his demeanor has shifted from the disdain (*fastus*) which formerly characterized his disposition toward women to that of a prisoner of war who out of shame is unable to raise his eyes (3), and is pressed beneath the victorious warrior's feet (4). Indeed, his external actions show that he has been reduced to slavery. The process of defeat entails learning to do things that suggest madness (*furor*), already hinted at in *miserum* (1) and *contactum* (2), the madness to hate the kind of women (*castae puellae*) that a Roman of Cato's ilk would normally cherish. Finally, this mental illness is termed
furor in 7 and is said to have already lasted for a year. And as if it were not already clear from Amor’s action in line 4, Propertius repeats that the gods are indeed against him.10

What we have then is a gradually emerging picture of Propertius’ ultimate enslavement to Cynthia/Amor which results in the illness furor. Already there are indications that this madness affects not only the lover Propertius but also Propertius the speaker of the poem. Logically, he cannot be insane both because he was wounded by ocelli (1) and cupidines (2)—the ‘arrow shafts’ sent by Cynthia—and because he was taught to be mad by Amor (5-6). Moreover, the postponement of the name Amor in line 4 equates the god Love with the goddess of chastity, Cynthia. On the one hand, this helps explain what seems to be the repetition in line 8. As Stahl points out, the plural deos (8) is meant to act as a summary of the first eight lines by reminding us that both Cynthia and Amor act against Propertius. Yet the link between Cynthia and Amor also causes confusion because the god of love teaches Propertius to hate (odisse, 5) and the representative of the goddess of chastity teaches him to hate castae puellae. In short, the irrationality which Propertius feels within himself is reflected between the gods themselves. Yet all this confusion adds to our perception of the speaker’s madness and reinforces his helplessness—he cannot even express himself clearly.11 Yet despite the seeming contradictions, Propertius the writer is drawing a portrait of an amator furiosus that makes sense, that gradually builds through the piling up of images, but images that quite naturally give way one to the next to
provide a flow that does not strike the reader as unintelligible.

After introducing Propertius the captured, enslaved and maddened lover in 1-8, the example of Milanion and Atalanta (9-16), followed by a comment on the myth (17-18), introduces Propertius the poet.

Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores saevitiam durae contudit Iasidos.  
10 nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris, 
ibat et hirsutas ille videre feras; 
ille etiam Hylaei percussus vulnere rami saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit. 
ergo velocem potuit domuisse puellam: 
15 tantum in amore preces et benefacta valent, 
in me tardus Amor non uallas cogitat artes, 
nect meminit notas, ut prius, ire vias.  
(1.1.9-18)

Just as the first word of 1-8 suggested a divinity, so Propertius begins the next section with the name Milanion, clearly evocative of the mythical past. Moreover, the poet appropriates the language of heroic poetry through his use of the formal gerund and accusative construction (nullos fugiendo ... labores, 9), the epic saevitia and contudit (10), and the patronymic Iasidos for Atalanta.12 In form, as Richard Whitaker has pointed out, the entire passage (9-16) is constructed in the manner of epic ring composition whose opening and closing couplets state the thesis of the exemplum that the hero Milanion won his beloved (potuit domuisse puellam, 15) by his suffering (nullos fugiendo labores, 9) and his prayers and good deeds (preces et benefacta, 16).13 His direct address to Tullus recalls another familiar and traditional poetic technique, apostrophe. By representing a world that is set in the mythical past through the use of very familiar poetic techniques, Propertius
effectively introduces himself in the guise of poet. Yet by using an example that is so close to his own case, as we will see, he also equates poet with lover.

Despite the distance which the language and form of Propertius' mythological example imply, Propertius the poet-lover is trying to depict a situation similar to his own. Milanion is amens just as Propertius is miser (1), lives nullo consilio (6) and is sick with furor (7). Milanion is wounded (saucius, 14) just as Propertius was (contactum, 2), and the blows Milanion received (percussus, 13) echo the subjugation Propertius received from Amor (pressit, 4). Further, as Joy King has noted, Milanion is so helpless that he can only repeat the activities of his beloved Atalanta: Milanion's entrance into the forest and confrontation with wild beasts remind us she was a huntress, a second Diana as it were; his wandering in Parthenean caves recalls not only Atalanta's birth in just this location but also the location where she exposed her child Parthenopaeus; and his wounds from Hylaeus parallel her wounds on the Argonautic expedition, later healed by Medea. Thus, it seems Atalanta's spirit is everywhere and Milanion can do no more than provide an echo. The huntress Cynthia looms over Propertius in just the same way, and her slavery permits him no freedom. Thus, Propertius the poet offers a mythological exemplum in imitation of his role as lover. In turn, Propertius hopes that these parallels foreshadow a similar success in his relationship with Cynthia.
Yet Milanion is no Propertius. Indeed, the poet-lover juxtaposes his own situation immediately before and after the myth (8,17) in order to underscore the contrast between himself and Milanion. Unlike the Milanion who succeeds in winning his love, the gods are opposed to Propertius (adversos deos, 8) and in particular Amor devises no stratagems to help him: in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artes (17).15 Within the myth proper, we can see that Milanion, who undergoes a metamorphosis from hunted to hunter, from conquered to conqueror, from slave to enslaver, transforms the metaphors which described Propertius' plight in 1-8. Milanion begins as a puer delicatus, marked by his mad, aimless wanderings (amens errabat, 11). In the next line, he no longer wanders (with all the negative emotions associated with errare) but moves ahead (ibat, 12) with a purpose (hirsutas ... videre feras, 12). Commentators have had great difficulty with the word videre, attempting either to emend it to words such as adire, experiri, speculari, or indagere or to translate it in unusual ways.16 Yet videre contrasts with Propertius' lumina (3) which are cast down, wounded by Cynthia's steady gaze (ocellis, 1). Perhaps Milanion does "brave" these wild beasts, as Camps suggests,17 but more importantly, he is now confident enough to gaze upon and face steadfastly any difficulty with which he is presented. The next line bears this interpretation out since he is now engaged with the beast Hylaeus, struck by his club (vulnere rami, 13), and only then wounded (Hylaei percussus saucius, 14).
The high-styled vocabulary of these lines (11-14) continues that of the couplet opening the section (9-10) and reinforces the notion that Milanion is not part of Propertius' elegiac world. Although his situation may have paralleled Propertius' at the beginning, Milanion has now overcome his furor and has now subdued not the daughter of the hero Iasus (cf. the patronymic Iasidoe, 10), but rather a puella. While saevitia (10), a common attribute of the elegiac mistress, introduces Atalanta as a huntress who chases her terrified (amens) prey, velocem marks her now as the pursued. Meanwhile, Milanion has become more the hunter (12) since it is he who searches for wild beasts. Once again, however, the language of the hunt has now given way to the language of combat (percussus, 13; saucius, ingemuit, 14) and military merges into slavery (domuisse, 15), just as the same imagery changed in the opening section. One might say that Milanion is not overshadowed by Atalanta's spirit, but rather he has won her by doing the very things which had made her dura, had made her up until now a victor. Moreover, a new image, that of travel, brings out Milanion's transformation from aimless lover (errabat, 11) to resolute victor (ibat ... videre, 12). The imagery of the hunt has been subsumed within the metaphor of journey. Indeed, the latter has provided a larger context within which to understand Atalanta as pursued (velocem, 15). Thus, within the context of his journey, he appropriates her heroic actions for himself; he has conquered, and she has been reduced from semi-divine daughter of a hero who was characterized by saevitia to the pursued (velocem), to a mere puella (15).
Perhaps this imitation and appropriation of his mistress' acts are a lover's key to success in love. But when the exemplum is over, in line 17, unlike Milanion, Propertius is still relying upon Amor, his conqueror in 5-6, to offer him stratagems to win Cynthia's love. In 18, he affirms the imagery of movement and travel introduced in the myth, but unlike Milanion, he expects someone else (Amor) to take him on the paths which are known to lead to love (nec meminit notas ... ire vias, 18). What Propertius the lover does not realize is that Milanion did not journey a familiar path either, did not know where he was going at first either, nor were his benefacta typical for a standard heroic figure. Rather they involved doing as his beloved did, in acting in imitation of her. Propertius the poet-lover understands that Milanion was successful and that he is not. He even realizes that a journey is essential for success, but he does not understand what specific attitude and actions on the part of the traveler that journey entails, what—according to Propertius the writer—is the new way to achieve victory.

One sign of the poet-lover's lack of understanding is his use of the word preces (16) in his conclusion to the myth. Although the myth makes no reference to preces, the poet-lover adds the word in his summary of the myth as his own interpretation of why Milanion was successful. And he then ignores the benefacta upon which the myth had elaborated, and turns to sorceresses (19-24) and friends (25-30) with preces for a solution to his situation.
On one level, perhaps the most apparent, Propertius the lover appears ready to try any remedy to solve his predicament. First, he asks sorceresses to make his mistress as pale as he has become (et facite illa meo palleat ore magis, 22). Next, he turns to his friends and pleads for help (auxilia, 26) for his love-crazed heart (non sani pectoris, 26). Finally, he begs to be transported to a place far from any woman (ferte per extre masa gentes et ferte per undas/qua non nulla meum femina norit iter, 29–30). That these three solutions are inconsistent is irrelevant, says Allen, since Propertius is attempting to find a cure, any cure, that will relieve him of his distress. In addition, Allen suggests, Propertius presumes that there is no actual cure for his own disease; as often in ancient (and modern) medicine, he can only hope to mitigate some of his symptoms. 20

The imagery in all three wishes reinforces the notion of Propertius' madness. Propertius wants Cynthia to become mad (mentem convertite, 21) and wants her to become ill with the paleness of love (palleat, 22). When he turns to his friends for help, the imagery describes his own condition. lapsum (25) connotes one who
has sunk under the weight of illness, while auxilia (26) refers to the remedies brought by a doctor to the sick. But revocatis (25) suggests that Propertius' friends have arrived too late to cure him. Fire and iron (ferrum ... et ignes, 27), even travel to far away places (29-30), are known to be remedies for alleviating madness (non sani pectoris, 26). It is therefore not surprising that one who is inflicted by such an illness acts irrationally in praying for such conflicting remedies.

Yet the imagery of illness is not all that exists in these lines, especially 25-30. For lapsum recall the military imagery of contactum (2), percuassus vulnere (13), and saucius (14) earlier in the poem, since it is often used of a soldier fallen in battle. In addition, non sani pectoris can refer to a chest wound and auxilium to reinforcements. Thus, Propertius' friends are trying to save him from being totally obsessed with love by metaphorically trying both to cure him of his furor and to rescue him from his wounds on love's battlefield. And while fire and iron can suggest cures for amentia, they can just as easily imply the trials of war. Though wounded and fallen on the battlefield, Propertius is willing to undergo these trials if there is hope of freedom, not freedom from his disease or wound, but freedom to speak as his mood dictates.

Beyond the imagery of illness or of combat, fire and iron recall the condition of the slave suffering at the hands of his master, or in this case mistress, and his desire for freedom (libertas, 28) is confirmation of the metaphor. Thus, the mention of a military defeat (lapsum revocatis) suggests a type of slavery
(sit modo libertas) just as Amor's victory earlier pointed to a type of slavery (the defeated were not even able to raise their eyes and look their conqueror in the face, [3]). Now, however, Propertius clarifies the type of slavery. While in lines 3-4 Amor, strictly speaking, is the master, though the ambiguity of subject in 3-4 also puts Cynthia on par with Amor, Propertius' reference to his domina (21) makes it perfectly clear to whom he owes allegiance.

The mention of freedom (28) spawns a desire for even greater freedom, expressed as the desire to travel far from his mistress, no longer simply freedom of speech, but now relief from the cause of his illness (cf. suis ... ocellis, 1). Unlike Milanion, however, who in this began by traveling (errabat; ibat) and ended by facing the trials of battle (percussaus vulnere; saucius) in order to tame his beloved (domuisse ... puellam), Propertius the lover acts in a far different fashion. Rather than win Cynthia through his own actions, he first seeks the help of magic, an external force, to change Cynthia's mind. He promises to brave fire and iron, but it is not in order to win Cynthia, but to gain his freedom of speech, as a slave or captive might request permission to speak. When he finally does act, then it is as one enslaved who attempts to escape rather than face his difficulties and conquer his beloved.

Propertius, therefore, in every way has reversed Milanion's example of how to win one's beloved. His actions as soldier, then patient and slave, in enduring fire and iron are for the wrong reason. Rather than become the hunter who goes after his puella, he runs away. And the ultimate result is that he emerges neither
conqueror of his beloved nor free from his illness. As Allen points out, he knows that he cannot save himself and therefore appeals to others for aid. Yet Allen glosses over the fact that Propertius is not aware of the inconsistencies within his various appeals. Indeed, it is these inconsistencies which reveal more fully the poet-lover’s madness and desperation. Allen says that 19-30 is only a prayer that some remedy be found. Yet Propertius in 19-24 wants Cynthia to come down with his own disease, presumably so that they can share their love. In 25-30, however, he prays that he be removed from his beloved. Admittedly, love as a mutual experience or no love at all are both "solutions" to Propertius’ problem, but their radically opposed nature demonstrates to what extent Propertius has grown ill with amentia. In fact, retention of et in line 25, the reading of the better manuscripts, accentuates Propertius’ madness. Rather than try to avoid a difficult reading (et instead of aut at 25) for the sake of logical argument as Stahl does, it is better to retain et so that we can allow Propertius to be truly mad.

Finally in 31-38, the fourth section of the poem, Propertius the poet again reemerges, this time to offer advice or perhaps even a prophetic word to other lovers.

vos remane, quibus facili deus annuit aure, sitis et in tuto semper amore pares! in me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras et nullo vacuus tempore defit Amor. hoc, moneo, vitate malum: sua quemque moretur cura, neque assueto mutet amore locum. quodsi quis monitis tardas adverterit aures, heu referet quanto verba dolore mea!

(1.1.31-38)
In these lines, the two aspects of Propertius' personality, lover and poet, show their close connection. He assumes the role of praeceptor amoris in 31 (remanete) and, instead of praying for himself as he did in 19-30, warns other lovers how to respond to the condition of love as the result of his own experience. The continuation, however, of the imperative mood begun in the third section (convertite, 22; quaerite, 26; ferte, 29) with remanete (31) and vitate (35) underscores the identity of lover and poet. Moreover, his advice is based upon his less than happy experience as lover (33-34). Therefore, he makes the link between poet and lover explicit by juxtaposing his two personae, the poet/praeceptor in 31-32 and the lover in 33-34.

Indeed, the warning Propertius offers as poet turns out upon careful reading to be just as contradictory as the prayers the lover made in 19-30. Throughout the poem, Propertius the lover has acted helplessly and passively: he has been wounded (2, 25), undergone enslavement (3-4, 27-28), and his prayers have relied upon outside forces rather than his own spirit within to provide him with the answers to his love. Ferte (29) highlights this passivity and adds to the irony of the last section. On the one hand, he has asked his friends to extricate him from his predicament rather than do it himself. On the other hand, his advice to others is to remain in love that is assuetus (remanete, 31; neque assueto mutet amore locum, 36). Although he had asked to be taken far from love, earlier he had said that his love had already lasted for one year, certainly a love that might be called assuetus. Furthermore, the
situation that Propertius portrays for a lover who stays with his beloved is not a favorable one, if by staying one must endure wounds, captivity, enslavement and madness.

In addition, there are certain ambiguities within his definition of the "happy lover" in 31-2 that show that Propertius the writer might be aware of the inconsistency of Propertius the poet-lover's admonition. He defines the happy lovers as those quibus facili deus annuit aure (31), yet the only gods within the poem have been those who, like Cynthia or Amor, have caused so much grief to Propertius the poet-lover. If one of these is the god who favors them, should not these happy lovers better be warned about trusting such a god? Certainly Venus and Amor in 33-34 are not favorable. Secondly, Propertius the poet-lover understands pares (32) to mean a peer or equal in love, yet after all the military imagery within the poem, is not Propertius the writer perhaps indicating that the love of equals can also turn into a mutual (pares) combat?  

The poem, in short, reveals how Propertius the poet-lover explains his situation and how Propertius the writer encourages the reader to question the poet-lover's interpretation of his plight. In 1-8, he was captured, even conquered by love (and Love) with the result that he defines himself as mad (furiosus) and his relationship with Cynthia as one of slavery. The rest of the poem offers his response to his predicament. In 9-16, he elicits an example about Milanion and Atalanta which he thinks will parallel and elucidate his own situation. Its conclusion (tantum in amor
preces et benefacta valent, 16) leads him to hope that preces and benefacta will solve his dilemma. He therefore attempts to apply the same metaphors (and hence modes of action) to his own case. He does pray in 19-30, hoping that his prayers will be answered and that there will be some solution to his situation.

Critics have long complained that preces (16) do not fit any of Milanion’s actions in the exemplum as Propertius has it, or even in the myth itself. Yet preces are the poet-lover’s interpretation of how Milanion succeeded; they are yet another sign of the poet-lover’s inability to be reasonable or logical when it comes to his own case. Ultimately, he realizes that his case is special, that the gods are against him, that his pleas are in vain. His complaint about Amor in 17-16, the contrary-to-fact statement in his appeal to the witches (if you changed my mistress’ demeanor toward me, then I would believe all your other tricks), and the use of revocatis (25) in his appeal to his friends all indicate that he realizes that things are not working out for him as they did for Milanion. Even his advice to other lovers presupposes his own lack of success: if he cannot help himself, he can at least save other lovers in a similar predicament.

Despite this apparent self-knowledge, the poet-lover does not fully understand why he cannot be as successful as Milanion. His prayers in 19-30 show that he is trying the same metaphors and the same modes of action that Milanion seemed to use successfully. Propertius the writer provides the answer: the poet-lover is too furiosus to get these modes of action right. He has misconstrued
the implications of the Milanion exemplum in 9-16. He tries *preces* instead of *benefacta*. Instead of acting as soldier willing to suffer wounds, he cries for help. Instead of conquering his beloved through imitation of her actions, he asks witches to make her as love-sick as he is. He tries a journey in 29-30, but it is away from love. Then he admonishes other lovers to stay at home with their beloved. Yet the admonition which he proffers is no solution at all, since his warning to other lovers—don't change your love, don't leave your beloved—has not worked for himself.

In short, the writer has revealed the illogic of the poet-lover's wishes, prayers and advice, and has created doubt about his ability to handle this love affair. As a result, the writer's voice is able to be heard that much more clearly in contrast with that of the poet-lover.

The writer in 1.1 also adumbrates the impossibility of the relationship succeeding: the poet-lover is wounded and ill and there is no cure for his affliction. This wound, this illness, can only metaphorically lead to some sort of disaster. And the metaphor that Propertius chooses to epitomize this disaster is the metaphor of death. In his cry to his friends to transport him beyond the ends of the earth (*ferte per extremas gentes et ferte per undas*, 29), he alludes to the opening line of Catullus' poem to his dead brother (*multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus*, Cat. 101). Most apparent is the echo of the anaphora *ferte per* [accusative] ... *ferte per* [accusative] with *multas per* [accusative] ... *multas per* [accusative]. Both poets also include all the known world by
mentioning gentes in the first half and the sea (undae; aequora) in the second half, and both contrast living peoples with the unpersonified waters of the sea. Finally, both emphasize the passivity of the speaker (ferte; vectus), in Propertius’ case because of his own enslavement and illness, in Catullus’ because of the death of his brother. The allusion within Propertius’ programmatic poem is significant not simply because of the memorable quality of Catullus’ elegy, but also because of the contrasting emotions which the latter poem communicates. On the one hand, Catullus’ poem depicts the fondness Catullus had for his brother and his willingness to travel great lengths to visit his grave. On the other hand, the uncrossable gulf between the two brothers, their ultimate separation, is a cause for grief and the knowledge that they cannot be together again. In many ways, the dichotomy between affection and lament, between love for his brother and hatred for his departure recalls the same conflicting feelings which characterize many of Catullus’ love poems, epigrammatically summarized by Poem 85, odi et amo. Even Catullus recognized the similarity of emotions since he included a lament of his brother within his longest love elegy, Poem 68.91-100.27

Propertius is conscious of picking up from the climactic moment of Catullus’ relationship with Lesbia. Propertius’ poem in many ways is about love and hate, about one who is in love hating castae puellae, about a lover whom the gods of love oppose. Yet Propertius expands upon the Catullan epigram, and through his use of myth and metaphor creates a new character.28 And rather than quote
one of Catullus' love poems, he chooses Catullus 101, a poem which will extend the boundaries of his character and his reflections upon relationships. The pentameter of Propertius' couplet is symbolic of the way in which Propertius changes the Catullan reference. He wants to escape love, or more precisely, women. His attempt to mediate a solution to his problem illustrates the dichotomy between his desire to have Cynthia love him (19-24) and his desire to escape her, between an opportunity to show his affection for her (hexameter) and the impossibility of doing so (pentameter).

Beginning with this hint of death in 1.1, Propertius explores three aspects of death throughout the rest of the book, culminating in his proclamation in 1.19 of faithfulness not just until death, but even after death. Early in the book the poet begins with metaphorical meanings, such as dying of unrequited love or being madly in love, that are common in comedy and earlier poetry. As the book progresses, more literal ideas of death, such as a willingness to die for or because of one's beloved, are gradually introduced, motivated by the characters and subject matter of the poem. Thus, the imagery arises naturally from the context of the poem in which it occurs. The interaction among these various aspects of death leads the poet to introduce a further metaphor, the idea of death as separation. Thus, when the reader reaches 1.19, the last poem in the collection addressed to Cynthia, ideas of death have become the dominant image. In 1.19 Propertius presents a collage of customs and myths culled from the Roman and Greek world that explore what his commitment to her would mean even after his death. In the rest
of the chapter, therefore, I will show examples of each of death's three aspects: the ordinary metaphor of dying of unrequited love (1.4), the introduction of the literal meaning of death (1.6), and death as separation (1.11). I shall then discuss at greater length how these three aspects interact in 1.19, how the metaphor achieves a complexity and depth which parallels and shapes the other four metaphors within the collection.

In 1.4 when Propertius is forced to defend his love to another man, he makes the first overt connection between love and death. In addition to Cynthia's beauty, he declares, it is pleasure to die (perire iuvat, 1.4.12) for even greater things: her natural color, skill in many arts, and secret joys (gaudia, 13-14). Clearly, the collocation of perire iuvat and gaudia suggests that 'dying' here means to die in love, with the suggestion of achieving sexual gratification. Although this is a common metaphor in earlier Latin literature, there is the hint here of commitment, a willingness to go to great lengths to satisfy her, yet we must not take this promise of fidelity too seriously. For there is the suggestion that she should satisfy him, preferably physically. There is a deliberate play on the meaning of gaudia tacita. Coming after multia decus artibus, there is the assumption that these are lovers' intimate secrets shared sub pectore. But the speaker surprises us by making sub veste the location where these secret joys are shared. At this stage, the reader would view this reference only within the standard metaphorical allusions to 'dying' that lovers have pledged since the earliest love affairs, perhaps with a bit
more consciousness than most and a sense of playfulness, but without implications for the rest of the collection.

In speaking to Tullus in 1.6, Propertius picks up the metaphor of sexual satisfaction introduced in 1.4:

\[
\text{multi longinquo periere in amore libenter,} \\
\text{in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat.} \\
\text{(1.6.27-28)}
\]

The first line appears to speak only of the metaphorical death of losing oneself in love-making, but the pentameter advocates a more literal meaning as well. In addition, the context of war and death to which Tullus is exposing himself suggests an explanation for taking the metaphor literally: he wishes to be counted among the 'dead' lovers when he is finally buried just as the soldier Tullus wishes to be counted among the heroic dead when he dies for his fatherland. Thus, Propertius enriches the very common metaphor of dying = 'achieving sexual satisfaction' through the graphic imagery of burial and lends to the image the element of commitment.

Indeed Propertius prepares his reader for the transformation of the metaphor of 'dying in love'. The context of the poem is risk, the risks of seafaring and warfare, as well as of love. A bold statement of bravery opens the poem in words that anticipate the opening of 1.19: non ego nunc ... vereor (1.6.1).30 He shows no fear at accompanying Tullus on his journey to Asia. Even though Cynthia denies that she belongs to Propertius and threatens him (9),31 Propertius cannot endure to live one hour without her and says, "if there is anyone who can love slowly or unpassionately (lentus), may he perish (a pereat, 12)." As Camps rightly points
out, the imprecation has lost its literal force by the time Propertius is writing, but the poem's context of risk gives it new force. Loving unpassionately is the lover's equivalent to fighting lethargically; anyone who does so, Propertius argues, should not be allowed to live—no more than the soldier who fights sluggishly.

The restoration of its literal meaning becomes more clear in the second half of the poem, when Propertius speaks more about Tullus. For Tullus has never been idle, but instead has always worried about defending his country (armatae ... patriae, 22). Propertius, however, describes himself as one whom fortune desired to lie prostrate—the word used, iacere (25), means to lie both in bed and in the grave. He also asks Tullus to allow him to 'die' in ultimate profligacy, using the phrase animam reddere (26) to suggest death. Even though each allusion to death is couched in less than the most evident terms, taken together along with the context of risk and warfare, we can see that Propertius is attempting to overstate his case that as a lover he takes more risks than Tullus will as a soldier, even to the point of death. By speaking not just of 'dying' in love, but also of being buried in love (28), Propertius rejuvenates the literal meaning of the metaphor and adds another voice to the voice of faithfulness. On the one hand, the logic of the voice of faithfulness is: just as death is the desire of every patriotic soldier, so it is also the desire of every lover. Death is the lover's means to show his great loyalty to his puella. Realistically, however, death was not the desire of every soldier, and burial (terra tegat, 28) represents the harsh finality
of the battlefield only too well. Thus, the presence of actual as well as metaphorical death in the poem adumbrates the conflict that becomes more apparent as the book progresses.

The water imagery of 1.11 recalls Cynthia's attempted voyage in 1.8, but now Cynthia has actually left Propertius. More importantly, her departure initiates, unlike previous poems in which Propertius is responding to his friends, Propertius' first expression of his fidelity to her in terms of life and death: sine te vitae cura sit ulla meae? (1.11.22). As Propertius goes on, it is clear that Cynthia means everything to him: she takes the place of home and parents. She is even all time of happiness to him:

\[
\text{tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes, omnia tu nostrae tempora laetitiae. (1.11.23-24)}
\]

No matter what his mood, sad or gay, Cynthia is the reason (\textit{Cynthia causa fuit}, 26). Even though Propertius utilizes the metaphor of life and death as only one of the images to suggest Cynthia's power over him, the setting near the seat of the Sibyl, the mention of Thesprotus' realms and Cape Misenum, even the Lucrine lake and Teuthras, all suggest death and the underworld.\textsuperscript{35} Moreover, the shores of Baiae are said to cause destruction (\textit{discidium}, 28). At the end of the poem, therefore, Baiae has taken on not only Propertius' fears of Cynthia's being unfaithful, but also the mood of death. \textit{Discidium} (28), the destruction of life as well as the separation of lovers, and especially the last line of the poem, brings these two thoughts together: \textit{ah, pereant Baiae, crimen amoris, aquae} (30). Propertius makes clear through \textit{crimen amoris}
that the waters represent the evils of Baiae. In addition, his curse of the waters of Baiae (ah, pereant), given the context of death in the poem, acts as a way for Propertius the lover to shift the blame from Cynthia to the waters, to make the waters responsible for the possibility of death through separation. Still his love for Cynthia will 'die' because of their separation.

In short, when Cynthia presents to Propertius the first real possibility of leaving him, Propertius chooses vocabulary of life and death to represent her effect on him. As in the other poems we have seen, the background of the poem (Baiae and its location near Avernus and the purported entrance to the underworld) provides the motivation for introducing the imagery of death. Yet unlike the poems in the first half of the book, here the idea of the mythological underworld and its association with actual death offers Propertius an opportunity for a new metaphor of death, namely the separation of lovers. Indeed, the imagery of the poem is equivocal since on the one hand it points to his commitment to Cynthia (she is life for him) while foreshadowing the possibility that the two may not be able to stay together (cf. discidium).

After Propertius' brush with death because of his illness in 1.15 and because of his voyage in 1.17, poems which we will refer to in later chapters, we as readers are prepared for Propertius' statement on love and death in 1.19. 1.19 is the culmination of the three aspects of death in Book 1, its use as a metaphor for fidelity, as a metaphor for separation, and as a literal reminder of the end of human existence. On the one hand, Propertius is eager to
prove his love to Cynthia one more time, and it appears that he has even reconciled himself to death if only she will tend to his funeral. Yet this expression of loyalty is countered by the implicit possibility of Cynthia's unfaithfulness. Cynthia cannot be faithful in the way Laodamia was, and the end of the poem creates doubts about the lover's interpretation of Cynthia's actions. But what makes the relationship come into focus most is the emphasis upon the reality of death throughout the entire poem. Earlier poems had hinted at it, but always in conjunction with other images. But death's reality is the central image of 1.19, casting doubt upon Propertius' pledge of fidelity and reinforcing the notion that Cynthia cannot be faithful.36

The poem breaks into four main sections that are in a chiastic as well as an interlocking arrangement:

**Figure 1: Poem 1.19**

Section 1 (lines 1-6): P's fearlessness and love in the present
1-2, P's lack of fear of death
3-4, P's fear that Cynthia will not tend to his funeral rites
5-6 even P's ashes will love C.

Section 2 (lines 7-12): P's love for C. after death, Part I
7-10, Protesilaus loved Laodamia after his death
11-12, after death Propertius, too, will be Cynthia's *imago*

Section 3 (lines 13-20): P's love for C. after death, Part II
13-16a, Greek heroines of underworld will not dissuade P. from loving C.
16b-18, P. will love C. even when she is old
19-20, P's request that C. be feeling at his grave

Section 4 (lines 21-26): Propertius' fear and solution
21-24, even a *certa puella* can be forced not to love
25-16, let's love *dum licet*
Thus, sections 1 and 4 deal with the present and focus on essentially Roman funerary customs while sections 2 and 3 speak of a hypothetical future when Propertius will demonstrate his love to Cynthia. In both middle sections, the poet uses an example from Greek mythology to illustrate the future.

How does Propertius the lover make his commitment real to Cynthia in 1.19? He begins by conjuring up the world of death (Manes, fata, and rogo, 1-2) and boldly asserts his freedom from fear of this world:

*Non ego nunc tristes vereor, mea Cynthia, Manes,*
*nec moror extremo debita fata rogo.*

(1.19.1-2)

Propertius' lack of fear in the face of death is emphasized by the word placement of contrasting ideas at the beginning and end of each line. The emphatic beginning of the first 2 lines (non ego, nec moror) and the placement of vereor just before the caesura of the first line contrast with the death (Manes and rogo) at the end of each line. This placement asserts Propertius' independence from death and suggests the limits of death's power over him.

Lines 3-4 maintain the motifs of fear and death and introduce a third element, love or more precisely the lack of love.

*sed ne forte tuo careat mihi funus amore,*
*hic timor est ipsis durior exsequiis.*

(1.19.3-4)

Lack of Cynthia's love (careat ... amore, 3) is equated with fear (timor, 4) and the harsh realities of funerals (ipsis durior exsequiis, 4). There is doubt, but qualified doubt: "if by chance (forte) my funeral should lack your love, this fear would be harsher
than my own rites of burial." But after such a positive statement in the opening lines, we must consider this as only chance. Love will not be lacking even in death. Moreover, the use of the comparative degree suggests that Propertius believes the opposite is true. Cynthia's love would help him conquer death and its harsh manifestations. Thus, the stark contrast between the reality of death and the lack of fear concerning death's power over him in the first couplet is continued in the second, this time between love and death. Lack of love would be much worse than funeral processions, but lack of love, Propertius assures himself, is impossible.

Furthermore, Propertius gains reassurance by his compliment in 5-6: love has so attached itself to Propertius that he cannot forget Cynthia even in death.


non adeo leviter nostris puer haesit ocellis,
   ut meus oblitio pulvis amore vacet.
(1.19.5-6)

Similar vocabulary reinforces Propertius' rhetoric. Rather than show a lack of love (cf. careat amore, 3), oblito ... amore vacet reveals love's forceful presence even after death. Indeed, love is inescapable: it even clings to him (haesit, 5). And the similarity between extremo ... rogo (2) and meus ... pulvis (6) increases the persuasiveness and boldness of his statement: the ashes from my pyre will never forget Cynthia. Perhaps Propertius will not be able to see clearly because of Amor's arrows, but at least he will be able to feel love for Cynthia. The first 6 lines, therefore, move from negation to affirmation, from lack of fear of death to a commitment on Propertius' part to be faithful even beyond death.
Once again, we witness Propertius playing with and extending ideas of death current in his own society in order to help shock his readers into a new understanding of love and death and to clarify his love for Cynthia. Most commentators devalue the impact of the language of death in the opening line, yet each word suggests beliefs held by Romans about death and the afterlife. The Manes, though given the euphemistic appellation 'friendly' (cf. their etymology from manus 'good'), were believed to have considerable power, including the power of life and death. And inscriptions and archaeological evidence imply the sentience of the Manes, too.38

Since individuals in the Roman world took care to secure their tendence after death through their wills, we should not be surprised that Propertius speaks of the Manes having power or his 'dust' being sentient. In addition to the archaeological and epigraphical evidence, there are passages in Propertius himself that suggest that the Manes inhabit and share a person's physical remains and have an existence of their own:39

\[ \text{deinde, ubi suppositus cinerem me fecerit ardor.} \\
\text{accipiat Manes parvula testa meos.} \]

\[ \text{(2.13.31-32)} \]

\[ \text{Sunt aliquid Manes: letum non omnia finit.} \]

\[ \text{(4.7.1)} \]

What is suprising then is that Propertius asserts that he has no fear of the Manes and speaks in terms of his remains loving. In other words, Propertius is taking ordinary beliefs but carrying them to their next logical step. He says that there is an afterlife, but he is almost Epicurean in his adamance that it is nothing to be
afraid of. He admits that his remains will feel not only food and drink, but even love. Thus, by playing on beliefs that were widespread, Propertius not only lends a certain credibility to what he is saying, but also heightens the impact of his words. If the dead are sentient, why shouldn’t they feel love? Yet what a striking way to express one’s affection for one’s beloved!

The elegy continues with another six line section, once again ending in the last couplet (11-12) with a personal expression of his love for Cynthia. This time, however, he draws this conclusion from an analogy from Greek mythology about death:

\[
\text{illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros} \\
\text{non potuit caecis inmemor esse locis,} \\
\text{sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis} \\
\text{Thessalus antiquam venerat umbra domum.} \\
\text{illic, quicquid ero, semper tua dicar imago:} \\
\text{traicit et fati litora magnus amor.} \\
\text{(1.19.7-12)}
\]

Facts of his funeral (funus, 3; exsequiis, 4), the funeral pyre (rogo, 2), and his remaining dust (pulvis, 6) as well as the spirits of the dead (Manes, 1) lead him quite naturally to speak of the underworld (illic, 7). And ocellis captured by Amor suggests the dark places of the underworld (caecis locis, 8). It is the shift in language to epic style (Phylacides ... heros, caecis ... locis, inmemor) signals the shift from a Roman to a Greek view of death. Propertius’ love is so great that he is like the hero Protesilaus who, even in the underworld, could not forget his wife. In fact, his love for her was so great that, though in an altered condition, he returned to his home in Thessaly to be with her, as Propertius puts it, to attain joys, attingere gaudia (9).
The first and last words of line 11 (illic, imago), moreover, link the Protesilaus example with Propertius and the world of Greek mythology with the Roman world. Illic (11) separates Propertius the poet from Propertius the lover and puts Propertius the lover firmly in the underworld, just as illic (7) put Protesilaus there. And imago, not only recalls the Homeric ἀναγκαία καμάντων, but also reminds us of the Roman vocabulary of death in the opening section by suggesting the Roman custom of funerary imagines that are worn in the funeral processions. Even the general statement that closes the first half of the poem is linked with the Protesilaus example: the shores of fate that love transcends calls to mind the shores of Troy on which Protesilaus was to step as the first of the Greeks (hence, his name). By equating himself with Protesilaus, therefore, Propertius becomes not only a soldier who is willing to die heroically, but also a lover who is eager to come back from the grave to be with his young bride.

The setting of the Trojan war in the Protesilaus example is made more explicit in the third section (13-20).

\begin{quote}
illic formosae veniant chorus heroinae, 
quas dedit Argivis Dardana praeda viris; 15 
quarum nulla tua fuerit mihi, Cynthia, forma 
gratior, et (Tellus hoc ita iusta sinat) 
quamvis te longae remorentur fata senectae, 
cara tamen lacrimis ossa futura meis. 
quae tu viva mea possis sentire favilla! 
tum mihi non ullo mors sit amara loco. 20 
\end{quote}

Once again, epic vocabulary and high-styled syntax lend significance to this second exemplum (formosae ... chorus heroinae, Argivis Dardana praeda viris, 13-14). Now, however, instead of substituting
a surrogate hero in the exemplum, Propertius makes himself the hero of the second exemplum: let the beautiful women who were part of the Argive loot come as a chorus to me; none of them will be more pleasing to me than you, Cynthia. In 15-16 Propertius gradually shifts back from Greek versions of the afterlife to Roman, from a chorus of Greek maidens to the Roman Cynthia. For example, mention of Tellus iusta recalls not only the Roman goddess, but also Demeter thesmophoros. But the metaphor from finance—the earth keeps faith by returning on the seed put in her—is a typically Roman idea. The basic idea here is that of Mother Earth, and especially Tellus as the resting place of the dead. The representations of Terra Mater in sepulchral art are associated with the notion of immortality as union with the Earth goddess: cinis sum cinis terra est terra dea est ergo mortua non sum (CIL 6.4, 29069). The suggestion of Earth bringing immortality adds to Propertius' wish that Cynthia live for a long time as well as his promise that even when she does die, he will cherish her remains.

In the last couplet of the section (19-20), Propertius returns to the idea expressed at the beginning: Cynthia, please love me when I am dead. In the first section, Propertius had said his love was so great that it would extend beyond the grave. The first myth was meant to offer evidence that love could go beyond the grave. The second to show that his love would last beyond the grave and could be deterred by no threats. Now when he returns to his request of Cynthia, he asks in confidence for her to attend to his rites at his grave, fully expecting her to be persuaded by his arguments and to
be moved while standing before his cremated, still glowing, embers: *quaer tu viva mea possis sentire favilla* (19). Then death could not be better for him. The word order of 19 also recalls the opening line. Instead of *ego*, there is *tu* (Cynthia). Instead of *nunc*, there is *viva*. Instead of *Manes*, there is *favilla*. The correspondence suggests more clearly why Propertius is not afraid of the *Manes*. It is because Cynthia will cherish his remains. Although line 19 is a wish, it is a wish that one might term rhetorical. Propertius fully expects by this point in the poem that Cynthia will respond to his remains as he has promised to do for her. Moreover, through his arguments he has convinced himself that she will tend his remains, and the voice of commitment has reached an emotional pitch with words of line 20: *tum mihi non ullo mors sit amara loco*.

What he is really worried about is not Cynthia but the threat contained in the last section (21-26).

*quam vereor, ne te contempto, Cynthia, busto abstrahat a nostro pulvere iniquus Amor, cogat et invitam lacrimas siccare cadentes! flectitur assiduis certa puella minis.*

quare, dum licet, inter nos laetemur amantes: 25

*non satis est ullo tempore longus amor.*

(1.19.21-26)

It is *Amor* (22) that he fears. Will Love drag her away from his remains before she has a chance to honor his grave? Verbal parallels recall his fear from the first section of the poem, but reinforce the notion that Cynthia is not responsible for this fear. *Vereor* recalls the lack of fear Propertius has in line 1. *Busto* represents the final stage of the funeral pyre whereas *rogo* (2)
which, like busto, falls at the end of the line, represents an earlier stage in cremation. And pulvere (22) recalls pulvis (6), Propertius' remains that do not forget and hence are faithful. The words seem to suggest fidelity in contrast to the devious designs of Amor who would drag Cynthia away from Propertius' sentient, loving, faithful remains. And we are not surprised that Amor is capable of doing such a thing since it is Amor who with his arrows compels people to fall in love involuntarily. His power has already been seen in lines 5-6 since it was Amor who forced Propertius to fall in love to begin with. Amor will force (cogat 23) Cynthia to dry her tears, even though she is unwilling (invitam 23). Cynthia is also a certa puella, one who is faithful and whose faithfulness will only be destroyed through Amor's constant threats (assiduis ... minis, 24). Any slim doubt Propertius had from lines 3-4 about Cynthia's loyalty seems to have been dispelled.

In response to Amor's power, however, Propertius ends the poem with an injunction, given more force by the repetition of nasals and liquids:

quare, dum licet, inter nos laetemur amantes:
non satis est ullo tempore longus amor.
(1.19.25-26)

Let us love while Amor's threats are not present (dum licet, 25). While 25 is an answer to Amor's threats, the last line reaffirms Propertius' belief in the eternity of love: there is never enough time (non ... ullo tempore, 26) for long loving. The implication is, therefore, even if Cynthia and Propertius start loving now and continue after death, there will never be enough time to express
their love with or without Amor's threats. As Butler and Barber summarize, "for love eternity itself is all too short." 

As we have seen, the lover's language of fidelity is not the only language in the poem. Propertius has indicated in the last section that Amor poses a threat to Cynthia's faithfulness. Although Propertius is the only speaker in the poem and his language is the language of fidelity, the writer counters with a language of doubt, the possibility of Cynthia's unfaithfulness. This language is the domain of Cynthia, but since she is not allowed to speak in the poem, we can only see it work through double meanings of words and phrases. We learn of her feelings and the quality of her commitment to Propertius in the way he talks of her, pleads with her, suggests her actions.

Cynthia's possible infidelity is hinted at in the first section:

\[ \text{sed ne forte tuo careat mihi funus amore,} \]
\[ \text{hic timor est ipsis duriior exsequiis.} \]  
\[ (1.19.3-4) \]

Although it seems to be a remote possibility (forte 3) that Cynthia will not love him in death, a look at the entire opening section (1-6) reveals the dichotomy between Propertius' attitude and Cynthia's. On the one hand, Propertius makes emphatically clear that he does not fear death (\text{non ego ... vereor ... Manes; nec moror ... fata}, 1-2). The possibility therefore that he fears anything at all, in this case, Cynthia's ignoring his funeral, becomes all the more striking and ominous. The subsequent statement of his love beyond the grave, that even his cremated dust will not forget her,
also heightens the contrast between their attitudes. Propertius expresses his lack of fear and his unending love so boldly (his dust will not forget her) that even the slightest indication of Cynthia's hesitancy to tend his funus casts doubt upon her own faithfulness and her ability to match his commitment. His fear must be greater than he seems to let on.

In the next couplet (5-6), the litotes "not so lightly has Love clung to my eyes (non adeo leviter)," juxtaposed with nostris in line 5 underscores the contrast between Propertius' love and Cynthia's. Propertius' love is not trivial and the graphic verb haesit suggests the intertwining of that love. On the other hand, there is the implication that Cynthia's love is trivial (leviter). And the double meaning of oblitto amore brings out this contrast even further. As we noted above, Propertius' love is so strong that even his dust will not forget his love for Cynthia. Editors point out that oblitus can have a passive sense. And surely they are right in supporting what is the logical meaning of the phrase, given that Propertius is attempting to express how great his love is. Yet more commonly oblitus has an active sense and we may translate: "nor has the boy clung to my eyes so lightly that my dust would be free from your (Cynthia's) forgetful love." In short, the contrast between lack of fear and fear, the lack of love and love, emphasized by the vocabulary, points to a possible lack of reciprocity in the relationship on Cynthia's part. Such bold statements on Propertius' part (1-2, 5-6) in contrast to 3-4 suggest either that Cynthia in fact will not love him beyond the grave or that this is only a fear
Propertius holds concerning Cynthia. In either case, the writer underscores the contrast between the lover's feelings and a lack of reciprocity on Cynthia's part which becomes more pronounced in the next section of the poem.

Although section 2 continues Propertius' statement of fidelity, it also contains images and language that throw more doubt upon Cynthia's part in the relationship. Naturally, Phylacides ... heros is meant to represent Propertius, whose love crosses beyond the bounds of the grave. Yet in the first line of Propertius' treatment of the myth, he calls to mind Protesilaus' wife, Laodamia. The chiastic word order abba (Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros, 7) and the contrast between the epic flavor of Phylacides heros and the simple words iucundae coniugis highlights her presence here.51 One is never meant to think only of Protesilaus' love, but also of Laodamia's. This becomes even more true because earlier versions of the myth, when they speak of love at all, emphasize not Protesilaus' love, but rather Laodamia's. Even though Propertius has changed the myth to illustrate his love for Cynthia, earlier versions of the myth emphasize Laodamia's love and fidelity. All these versions state that in some way Laodamia committed suicide out of grief for her dead husband. Yet as we have just seen in the first section of the poem and in earlier poems of Book I, the chances of Cynthia following Laodamia's examples are dubious. Therefore, Propertius' use of myth serves to bring out not only his love for Cynthia but also through the contrast with Laodamia, Cynthia's inability to respond to Propertius' love.
Although the writer has changed the myth to emphasize Protesilaus' fidelity, through allusions to the style and to certain key words he calls to mind Catullus' influential version of the myth in Poem 68, a version which stresses Laodamia's commitment. First, in line 7 the artificial style of the language (abba) and the contrast between epic patronymic (Phylacides ... heros, 7) and simple, unpoetic words (iucundae coniugis, 7) suggest the neoteric style of Catullus 68. Yet Propertius does not maintain this style throughout the poem but alternates between it and a more colloquial style (e.g. 11-12). The more colloquial style of 11-12 recalls the conversational style of the opening lines of the poem and makes that much more explicit the asyndeton between the two lovers in the myth and the two protagonists in the poem.

The repetition of key words and ideas from Catullus' poem also highlights Propertius' purposeful change of the myth. Propertius underscores Laodamia's role within the myth by giving coniugis (7) a prominent position in the first line of the myth within his own poem. Catullus emphasizes the union and marriage of Protesilaus and Laodamia by also opening the myth with coniugis and emphatically echoing it three more times, all within the Laodamia sections of the poem (Cat. 68.73, 81, 84, 107). Its repetition throughout Catullus' poem underscores Laodamia's loyalty and devotion to Protesilaus. In addition, the epithet iucunda which Propertius applies to coniunx is the same word which Catullus used of his brother in line 93 (ei misero fratri iucundum lumen ademptum), whose amor was a significant influence in Catullus' life (quae tuus in vita dulcis alebat amor,
Cat. 68.96). Moreover, Lesbia fails to match the commitment of either of these two paradigms of true love, either of Laodamia or of Catullus' brother (Cat. 68.135-138). In the same way, Propertius uses *iucundae coniugis* to recall the unfavorable comparison between Lesbia and Laodamia and between Lesbia and Catullus' brother to point to Cynthia's inability to equal Laodamia's devotion.

The site of Protesilaus' and Laodamia's rendezvous, *domum* (10), is the final word of Propertius' version of the myth. It recalls the one of the most variable terms in Catullus' poem. On one level, *domus* is the spatial realization of his commitment with Lesbia. Likewise, it represents the house where Protesilaus and Laodamia first came after their marriage (73-74). Yet in each case that house is seen as a *locus* of misfortune: Lesbia steps on the threshold, a sign of bad luck for her relationship with Catullus. It is also the house begun in vain (*incepta frustra*, 75), in vain because Protesilaus and Laodamia did not perform the correct sacrifices and because their love will not be completely realized as a result of Protesilaus' premature death. Finally, the house is the image that epitomizes what Catullus has lost through the death of his brother (93-95). Thus, the house can be viewed as a place of joy where the two lovers meet, but it has too many ominous overtones of bad luck, ill-starred marriages, and death to offer much hope to the reader. Its presence in Propertius, therefore, creates the same skepticism about the fulfillment of love as the implied comparison of Cynthia with Laodamia had in the first line of the myth.
The third section (13-18) continues the dichotomy between Propertius' hopes and desires and Cynthia's actions. Once again the heroic language after the more conversational and sincere language of 11-12 seems intended to indicate to the reader a further exemplum and to elevate Cynthia's stature in our eyes. This chorus of beautiful women, the Trojan women, suffered the ultimate disgrace, becoming the booty of the victorious Greeks. For Propertius, forma suggests pudicitia. These women, therefore, were not only beautiful—as all heroines are—but also chaste and faithful.57 Propertius' comparison of Cynthia with them, specifically in regard to her forma (15-16), is bold, but points to Propertius' criticisms of Cynthia in 1.2: she is beautiful, but she does not live up to her beauty by being chaste and loyal. Within the context of 1.19, Cynthia once again fails to match Propertius' expressions of faithfulness: she might not tend his funus, she cannot match the model of Laodamia. And now, by specifically linking her with her portraits in Book 1, Propertius shows that she does not meet his expectations of her. But as A.J. Boyle points out, Propertius is not ready to give up on her yet. The Laodamia paradigm was an unrealistic paradigm, for Cynthia, unlike her mythological counterpart, is unlikely to hasten to join her lover in death (cf. 3-4). These Trojan women, on the other hand, are a more realistic model. Though chaste and faithful, they were also victims of Argive heroes: Dardana praeda 14. Cynthia, too, will be put in such a situation in lines 21-24 when her fidelity will be challenged by Amor's threats.58
Judgment must still be reserved for her, yet lines 17-18 add further questions about Cynthia's potential fidelity. Although Propertius prays to Mother Earth to grant Cynthia a long life, the language of the compliment echoes Propertius' language in section 1. There, Propertius expressed his lack of fear of death (1-2) and linked it with his love for Cynthia, a love that would survive the grave (5-6). Propertius was unwilling to delay (nec moror, 2) the fates (debita fata, 2) and the death they bring. Now the fates are delayed; Cynthia will not die. Admittedly it is the very fata that eventually bring death that delay Cynthia's own death, but there is the suggestion once again that Cynthia is unwilling to make the leap of faith that Propertius is willing to do when he says that he is ready to die because he knows his love will last beyond the grave.

The language of the fourth section (19-24) presents even more doubts about Cynthia's response to Propertius. Propertius has just made as conclusive an argument as possible about how strong his own love will be even after he dies: his dust will be sentient and loving, his love will be like Protesilaus' when he returned to Laodamia from the underworld, he won't even flinch when he is approached by the beauties of the underworld—he will remain true to Cynthia. Yet in 19-20 he expresses the hope that Cynthia be able to respond to him as he has to her. First of all, it is not a statement of Propertius' faith in her, it is only a hope, a wish. More importantly, this wish is expressed with so little certainty that it appears Propertius realizes how little chance he has of Cynthia responding as he would: "May you be able (possis, 19) to be
moved, i.e. to feel something (anything), before my glowing embers (mea favilla) while you (on the other hand) are so alive (viva)."

His hope is not that she will love him, only that she vaguely be aware of his death, a death that is so recent that his cremated embers are still glowing (favilla). He dares not even hope that her "feeling" will last beyond the funeral pyre being fully extinguished. Propertius' ensuing claim that then death will not be bitter anywhere (ullo ... loco, 20) consequently sounds flat, becomes pathetic and just words.

Propertius' rationalization (21-24) that Cynthia will remain faithful but may be deterred in loving him because of the threats of the unjust god Amor also sounds like so much bravado. The repetition of vereor (21), this time without a preceding negative, reveals that Propertius has not overcome his fear yet, despite his exertions to the contrary in the middle two sections of the poem. The collocation contempto, Cynthia, busto (21) suggests that it is not Amor who will spurn his extinguished pyre, but Cynthia. Moreover, the perfect tense indicates that it has already occurred before unjust Love has dragged her away. In addition, iniquus amor (22) need not refer only to the god, but also to the discrepancy concerning the quality of love of Propertius and Cynthia. Their love has never been 'equal'; the complication is that Propertius has always given more in the relationship than Cynthia and here is just one more indication of the inequality of their affection for one another. The fact then that Propertius says that Cynthia will dry her tears unwillingly (invitam, 23) becomes another vain hope on
Propertius' part that their love is not in fact unequal. Finally, the constant threats (assiduis ... minis, 24) that will cause Cynthia's love to bend is particularly ironic because minae in Propertius, outside of the few times they are used of inanimate objects such as winds and waves, always refer not to the threats that a lover uses to influence his beloved, but to the threats that a mistress uses to get her way with her lover. Thus, the threat to Cynthia is not external, but within her own makeup. She will decide to have another lover if she wants to, and she may not even stay long enough to see Propertius' funeral pyre die out.

In short, Propertius, though he does not want fully to admit it, is plagued with doubts about Cynthia's fidelity, especially after he is dead. His self-assurance in 1-2, we realize at the end of the poem, is rather precarious. In effect, while it seemed as though he was trying to persuade Cynthia of his love for her and concomitantly convince her to respond in kind, Propertius ends up trying to persuade himself that Cynthia will even come to his funeral and 'feel' something on his behalf. In the process, we perceive not only his utter commitment to her, but also his complete dependence upon how she perceives him. His closing statement, therefore, becomes both a wish (again) that love will be long-lasting, but also an indictment of their relationship: let us love while it is possible (dum licet, 25), that is while I can still be sure of having you, because you will never live up to the ideal of Laodamia, nor even that of formosae heroinae in the underworld. It is a brief, tenuous love that they can hope to rejoice in. Like
the flat, brave, but foolish statement (20) following Propertius' self-deceiving prayer (19), line 26, with its brave statement that there is never enough time for long love (longus amor, 26), is reduced to the physical act. Long love-making can only occur while we are alive (dum licet, 25). The implication is, let's do it now. The questionableness of Cynthia's love results in the denial of any type of love outside of time just as the uncertainty of Cynthia's feelings at Propertius' favilla precludes Propertius' uncertainty in feeling loved in any place, even though dead (20). Doubt has reduced love to space and time.61

Propertius' perception (whether conscious or not can be debated) of Cynthia's inability to respond to love suggests at the end of the poem that Propertius' fearlessness in the face of death can no longer stand. Propertius' genuine fear of Cynthia's inattentiveness to his tomb leads to a genuine fear of death because the one thing that helped alleviate his fear previously was Cynthia's love for him. Now that the possibility of that commitment has been removed, his fear of death returns and by looking at the language of death in the poem, we can begin to see even more clearly the bravado of the first two lines for what it is. Propertius asserts his lack of fear of death and the beyond in every section of the poem, yet the language used indicates an underlying, impending reality of death, which does not allow for the possibility of loving beyond the grave.
Although Propertius attempts to persuade us that death holds no fear for him, the quantity of the images and words used of death and the richness of the vocabulary used of death begins to reveal, despite the apparent ease of the poet in talking about his own death, the grim reality of that which, beneath this apparent ease, he claims no fear. Most of the vocabulary of death in the opening section tends to be abstract and the Manes are tristes, 'grim' and 'sad,' the two commonest human responses to death, fear and sorrow.62 Fata can mean 'fates' and 'death,' two mutually reinforcing ideas, as well as 'dead body.'63 Moreover, debita fata recalls Simonides' famous aphorism that all men are a debt to death.64 Yet Propertius takes the image one step further by the addition of the concrete image of the pyre (rogo, 2). As Williams points out, that each man owes a corpse to a pyre is a grim idea.65

More words add to the horrible picture of death. The ambiguity of funus, 'death,' 'dead body,' 'funeral' or 'grave,' suggests many potential aspects of the reality of death.66 Exsequiai calls to mind the feretrum being slowly carried outside. Finally, the concreteness of meus pulvis after so many abstract and connotative terms is a fitting conclusion to the section as it is the end of the funeral process.67 It also calls to mind the many ideas in Greek and Roman literature that dust is all men are.68

If the first section connoted the horrible reality of death in the rites Romans used to dispose of their dead, the second and third sections reveal the irreversibility of death even within the world of Greek mythology. Although Protesilaus was unable to forget his
wife, he is still in dark, gloomy places (*caecis locis*, 8). His desire to attain joys is made tangible by *palmis*, but undercut by *falsis*. The joys he hopes for, whether spiritual joy by the union of two lovers, or specifically joy in the pleasures of the body, cannot be attained by one who is no longer substantial. *Thesalus* (10), likewise, not only describes who Protesilaus is but also intimates hope for a return to his home there. But this hope is undercut at the end of the line by *umbra*. His return leads to an affirmation of the reality that the dead are dead, that intercourse between the dead and the living is impossible, much as Odysseus' attempt to embrace his mother, Anticleia, fails in the same way. The potential for Propertius to love beyond the grave is given as little hope as for Protesilaus. Thus, the belief that love's ability to transcend the *fati litora* (12) only serves to recall the banks of the Styx and the insubstantial world beyond.

As I mentioned before, section 2 suggests Propertius' adaptation of the Protesilaus-Laodamia myth, especially in Catullus 68, but the collocation of *gaudia*, *domum* and *amor* also recalls Catullus' comment upon his dead brother in the same poem:

```
ei misero fratri iucundum lumen ademptum,
tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus,
omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra,
  quae tuus in vita dulcis alebat amor.
```

(Cat. 68.93-96)

Catullus speaks of the death of all his joys with the death of his brother. Moreover, the connection between *gaudia* and *amor* is explicit: love used to nourish these joys. When the source of that love passes away, not only the love but also the joys disappear.
That these images in these lines are memorable in Catullus is apparent. *Lucundum* is the first word of a three word group after the caesura and emphasized by the repetition of the um/un sound in the three words. *Domus* and *amor* occur at the end of the line and *gaudia* is placed just after a bucolic diaeresis, a typical Alexandrian play on epic hexameter lines. Moreover, the last three lines are repeated verbatim twice in the poem (22-24, 94-96) and the latter passage acts as the focal point of the concentrically-arranged structure of the poem. With death, Catullus says all joys perish, especially joys once nurtured by *amor*. What is explicit in Catullus is less so in Propertius, but Propertius builds on the memory of Protesilaus-Laodamia/Catullus-Lesbia in Catullus 68 and uses the repetition of key words from Catullus' poem to augment the language of the reality of death in his poem. As Catullus says in 95 (at the death of his brother) joy is dead, Propertius says that it is unattainable because of the 'false hands' of the dead Protesilaus. Catullus' brother's life is depicted as a 'pleasant light' but Propertius' Protesilaus is in the dark realms of the underworld (*illic ... caecis locis*, 7, 8), a world of shadows (*umbra*, 10; *imago*, 11) and insubstantiality (*falsis ... palmis*, 9). His home too is dead and buried (because of his brother's death) while Protesilaus' return home in Propertius is as an insubstantial shade, not as a flesh and blood lover. His household, his union with his young wife can never be restored now that he is dead. Finally, love used to nourish these joys, this life for Catullus, but with death, that love must cease to exist as well, thus offering
a more ominous alternative to Propertius' bold statement that love will endure even the shore of fate. Thus, Catullus' more realistic language about death augments the language of the reality of death that infuses Propertius' poem.

After so much questioning of Propertius' declaration to be able to love beyond death in the first two sections, the language of section 3 initially appears to reject the language of death. Women are beautiful heroines (formosae heroinae, 13) in the underworld, yet the fact that they were also the booty of men even before they came to the underworld points to a reality of life that even Propertius does not want to admit. And Cynthia, who has not died yet, is more beautiful than these victims of war, Propertius asserts, but then asks Mother Earth (normally a reminder of the death and birth of all things) to grant Cynthia a long life and therefore logically the diminution of beauty. The charade clearly comes to an end in the final line of the section by playing on cara, potentially referring to a living puella or domina, but actually modifying ossa. The movement from life to death, beauty to bones, therefore is suggested by the gradually increased questioning of life and beauty beginning with praeda, to Tellus, to lacrimis ossa.

With the mention of ossa, Propertius moves from the mythological realm to realities of death and burial: favilla, mors amara, busto, pulvere detail the process of death from funeral pyre to men's response to death (bitterness) to an extinguished funeral pyre to the physical remains of life, dust. While Propertius'
weakened request to Cynthia that she be moved at his death (19) reinforces the doubtfulness of Propertius' hope that Cynthia will love him, the contrast between viva and favilla explains why Cynthia cannot love him after his death. How can one love a smoldering ember in the same way one loves a person of flesh and blood, or thoughts and feelings? The fact that the bustum has been scorned seems reasonable in the light of death's finality (pulvere, 22). Why should Cynthia not fall in love and move on to a new life? If death is irrevocable, why not enjoy life, why not be in love? Is that not what line 25 suggests: let us love while it is possible, while we are alive. As R.O.A.M. Lyne states, "the conclusion tacitly admits what in fact has become increasingly evident in the poem: Propertius' disbelief in the ability of love effectively, satisfactorily to transcend death." Yet the final line of the couplet denies even this: long lasting love is never enough at any time (ullo tempore, 26) to combat the reality of death.

A bleak conclusion for a poem that set out to demonstrate commitment. Propertius has enlarged upon his reference to Catullus 101 in 1.1 and revealed the equivocal nature of the imagery of death. The writer has shown that the poet-lover's promises of fidelity until death do not assure success in love, are no cure for insecurity in love. The remedy which the poet-lover recognized in 1.1, however imperfectly, was the example of Milanion's journey. His attempts to use traveling as a cure for his madness and enslavement in the first three books reveal that trips, their
motivation and results, can be just as ambiguous as the imagery of death. As we shall see in the next chapter, his attitude toward travel as a solution for his condition changes.
Chapter I: Notes


^ As far as I can tell, no scholar has divided the poem in this way (i.e. 1-8 and 9-38). Normally, if it is divided in half, 1-24 and 25-38 are grouped together, or 1-18 and 19-38 are.

5 On Cynthia's name as an allusion to Diana, see Ahl (1974) 81-82 and E.N. O'Neil, "Cynthia and the Moon," CP 53 (1958) 1-8. Allen (1950) 259-261 points out the significance of miser as a word which connotes a love which is madness, furor and rabies. Hanslik (1976) 188 explains that ocellis replaces a word such as arrow or javelin. Ahl (1974) 82 also notes that the diminutive ocellis, as opposed to the more formal oculus, tells us that we are in the world of amatory poetry. W.A. Camps, ed., Propertius Elegies Book 1 (Cambridge 1961) (= Camps 1) 42 points out the military and medical connotations of contactum.

6 On the connection of Cynthia and Amor because of the postponement, see Allen (1950) 266 and Ahl (1974) 82-83. Stahl (1985) 29 argues that the postponement of Amor has only the effect of allowing Propertius to contrast suis ocellis (1) with mihi lumina (3). While this is certainly true also, Propertius is certainly capable of writing poetry which renders more than one meaning at a time.

7 Hanslik (1976) 187-188 denies the existence of the hunting motif in the opening lines as well as the possibility of Cynthia being anything more than a mere puella, but ignores Propertius' verbal clues which very nearly give her divine status. Indeed, the hunting motif helps bring out her similarity to goddess Diana. The fact that it is quickly submerged within the military metaphor should not disturb since it undergoes the same process in the
Milanion myth. Since it does not allow the poet to explore the reaction of the victim as much as the military metaphor does, Propertius does not dwell upon it because it is a metaphor which is relevant for Cynthia's actions, but not for his own feelings.

8 Stahl (1985) 29-32 elucidates the import of the triumphal action of pressing one's feet upon the victim.

9 No one, to my knowledge, has discussed the complementary nature of 1-4 (external) and 5-8 (internal). On castas odisse puellas (5), the most useful summary of the previous scholarship is Stahl (1985) 36-41. On deficit, see Cairns (1974) 103-104 and Ahl (1974) 85. Ahl (1974) 86 points out the double meaning of adversos deos (8). For adversos deos meaning "the gods against me" and "the gods against each other," see OLD s.v. adversus 9, 8, respectively.

10 Stahl (1985) 26-36 emphasizes the sequential nature of the lines, but focuses almost exclusively upon their 'logic'. He differs from my approach in two ways. I examine the sequential aspect of the passage in terms of the sequence of images and their interconnection. I also see the sequential view as complementary to the external/internal grouping in lines 1-4 and 5-8.

11 Stahl (1985) 36 points out the summarizing effect of the plural adversos deos (8), but ignores the double meaning of the phrase pointed out by Ahl (1974) 86. More importantly, neither one has adequately explained the effect the speaker's illogic has upon our perception of him. His contradictions—and despite Stahl's insistence on Propertius' logic, they are contradictions—encourage us to pity the speaker and help us to realize more fully his love-sick condition. They also qualify our ability to believe everything he says.

12 Hermann Tränkle, Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache, Hermes Einzelschriften 15 (Wiesbaden 1960) 12-16 points out the formal poetic language of the exemplum.

13 Richard Whitaker, Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy, Hypomnemata 76 (Göttingen 1983) 111-113 notes Propertius' use of ring composition within the Milanion exemplum.


15 Whitaker (1983) 111-112 explains that the ring composition of the exemplum extends to the lines immediately before and after the myth (8, 17).

16 On the problem of videre (12), see in particular D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Propertiana (Cambridge 1956) 3-4; Tränkle (1960)
15-16; and Cairns (1974) 94-98. None of them points out the echo of ocellis (1) and lumina (3).

17 Camps 1:43.

18 Ahl (1974) 86-88 elaborates on the imagery of the hunt in the exemplum and how Milanion reverses the roles of hunter and hunted, but does not notice how lines 11-15 reveal the process of Milanion's metamorphosis from hunted (errabat) to hunter (velocem), how the other imagery in the lines help explain this process, nor how the travel metaphor ultimately subsumes and transforms the imagery of hunting.

19 On preces, Stahl (1985) 317, n. 67, once again offers a useful summary of the debate, but his solution is a non-solution: Propertius uses preces only in the conclusion of the myth so as not to repeat himself and thereby be uneconomical. Stahl's implication is that preces introduces further meaning to the passage, but does not attribute this to the speaker's own interpretation of the myth.


22 Ahl (1974) 93-94 explores the military imagery in the poem only from line 25ff., but does not mention the metaphor of enslavement in these same lines.

23 Shackleton Bailey 6 sees the metaphor of enslavement within lines 27-28, but not the metaphor of madness (furor), nor does he see Propertius' journey in 29-30 as springing from his desire for freedom from slavery and a cure for his disease. Hodge and Buttimore (1977) 69-70 link madness and enslavement in these lines, but do not comment on the military imagery.


25 Allen (1950) 270-275 has the most persuasive argument why et (25), the reading of the better manuscripts, should be retained, but as I pointed out earlier, he does not allow the implications of the contradictory nature of Propertius' wishes come to the fore. Most other commentators, most recently Stahl (1985) 43-44 and Due (1985) 164 opt for the 'more reasonable' approach and emend et by aut, yet aut would imply only two wishes when there are actually three, one to the witches (19-24) and two to his friends (25-28; 29-30).

26 On the more sinister implications of pares (32), see Ahl (1974) 94.

28 No one, to my knowledge, has commented on Propertius' reference to Catullus 101 in 1.1.29, although critics have pointed out Propertius' allusions to the Catullan theme odi et amo. See e.g. Allen (1950) 266-267; Otis (1965) 11.

29 For the metaphor of 'dying', used of either or both partners in intercourse, see Adams (1982) 159. On gaudia, see Brandt on Ovid, Amores 3.7.63 and Adams (1982) 197-198. Sub tacita veste can have a more literal meaning and hence be associated with the pleasures of the bed, despite Camps' efforts to see only a more abstract meaning. Cf. Camps 1:53. In general, Sweet (1973) 218-222 points out the uniqueness of the Roman elegists' ideal of love which continues after the death of one of the lovers. In addition, Elaine Fantham, Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery, Phoenix Supplement, 10 (Toronto 1972) 86 notes the use of words such as perire and mori in Roman Comedy, but the imagery does not reveal the depth and many levels of meaning which it does in Propertius.

30 1.6 opens, non ego nunc Hadriae vereor mare noscere tecum, while 1.19 begins, non ego nunc tristes vereor, mea Cynthia, Manes. In addition, 1.2.25 states, non ego nunc vereor, ne sis tibi vilior istis. Thus, Propertius the lover's boldness and statements of courage increase throughout the Monobiblos, from woman's actions to seafaring and finally to death.

31 Recalling her threats in 1.3.35ff.

32 Camps 1:58.

33 On the association in Propertius of iacere with lying in the grave, see 1.7.18, 24 below and 2.13.35, 55; 2.14.32; 3.6.29-30; 3.18.3; 4.7.85; 4.11.36; and perhaps 2.26b.36.

34 On animam reddere = mori, see Vergil, G. 3.495; Ov. Ep. ex Pont. 2.11.7; Val. Max. 3.5.3; cf. Rothstein 1:98; Enk 1:67; Camps 1:59-60.

35 On the Sibyl's connection with the Underworld, there is no need to comment. For Thesprotus and Cape Misenum, see Richardson 176. On the Lucrine lake and Teuthras, see Enk 1:103. Cf. also F.H. Sandbach, "Notes on Propertius," CR 52 (1938) 213.

36 Hubbard (1974) 35-36 and Michels (1955) 174-177 emphasize the importance of the physical reality of death, but Lyne (1980) 100-102, 140-146, is the only one to draw any conclusions from
this. However, he does not take into account other details within the poem that suggest the two other voices. Gordon Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford 1968) 766-775, appropriately points out the juxtaposition of concrete and abstract within the poem. Eckard Lefèvre, Propertius Ludibundus: Elemente des Humors in seinen Elegien (Heidelberg 1966) 142-145, underscores the importance of the final couplet and the poet's preparation for its surprising effect upon the reader. A.J. Boyle, "Propertius 1.19: A Critical Study," Latomus 33 (1974) 895-911, examines the underlying aspect of Cynthia's infidelity in the poem, but does not take into account how Propertius modified the clues about her character by being the sole speaker in the poem. In addition, he goes too far at times in seeing Cynthia in phrases uttered by Propertius. Theodore D. Papanghelis, Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death (Cambridge 1987) 10-19 explains that the poem explores the question, "will there be amor without formal embodiment?" Ultimately, Propertius comes to the conclusion that there is not. While Papanghelis highlights the sentient nature of love in the next world, he downplays Propertius' emphasis upon the stark reality of death and its antagonism with love.

37 Prof. Charles Babcock pointed out to me the verbal parallels in this paragraph.

38 On the etymology of Manes, see OLD, s.v. manus; K. Latte, Römische Religionsgeschichte, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5.4 (Munich 1960) 99, n. 3; Richmond Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (Urbana 1962) 95. On their power over life and death, there is the well-known story in Ovid (Fasti 2.547-556) that once, when the Romans had neglected the rites of the dead, the spirits of the dead revealed their annoyance by howling hideously and traversing streets and fields until honors had been paid to their tombs.

The story from Ovid corroborates the evidence from archaeology and epigraphy that the Romans believed that the dead maintained some sort of existence in or near the tomb and had to be offered sustenance. Funerary meals and libations shared with the dead, especially through pipe burial, offer abundant evidence that living Romans felt the need to keep their buried kin 'alive' after death. See Keith Hopkins, Death and Renewal, Sociological Studies in Roman History, 2 (Cambridge 1983) 233-234, nn. 40-41; J.M.C. Toynbee, Death and Burial in the Roman World (London 1971) 37. Grave-goods, such as toys for children, mirrors and jewelry for women, tools and drinking cups for men, suggest further belief that the needs of the dead in the next world should be tended. See Hopkins (1983) 229, n. 35; H.J. Rose, "Ancient Italian Beliefs concerning the Soul," CQ 24 (1930) 129-132. And inscriptions imply the sentience of the Manes and urge their cult. See Lattimore (1962) 92.

Yet Roman poets, especially Vergil in the Aeneid, incorporate Greek ideas about the dead within the Roman concept Manes. See Cyril Bailey, Religion in Vergil (Oxford 1935) 241-243, 256-262; Latte (1960) 100.


In Roman literature, see Pacuvius, Protesilaos in O. Ribbeck, Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, 2 vol. (2nd ed.: Leipzig 1871) 116; Laevius, Protesilaodamia, frg. 13-19 in Carolus Büchner, Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum Praeter Ennium et Lucilium, post W. Morel (Leipzig 1982) 72-73; Cat. 68; Ov. Her. 13; Stat. Silv. 2.7.124ff.; Hyg. Fab. 103-104; Minicius Felix, Octav. 11.8; Servius, on Aen. 6.447. For further references, see W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, 6 vol. (Leipzig 1884-1937) 3.2, col. 3155-3172.

John Sarkissian, Catullus 68: An Interpretation, Mnemosyne Supplement, 76 (Leiden 1983) 42-44 points out that all earlier versions of the myth seem to emphasize Laodamia's great love, not Protesilaus' (as Propertius emphasizes). For further discussion, see also Godo Lieberg, Puella Divina. Die Gestalt der göttlichen Geliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung (Amsterdam 1962) 209-218.

On attingere gaudia, Lyne (1980) 144, says that the phrase suggests both 'to touch his beloved' and 'to attain joy.'

Rothstein, 1:183-184.

Williams (1968) 772.

Williams (1968) 772; Toynbee (1971) 37.

On the association of Manes and ashes, see 2.13.31-32; Hubbard (1974) 36.

See also 1.1 on Amor's power, especially line 8 where Amor is said to compel the lover (cogor) against his will.

Butler and Barber, 181.

Richardson 199; Camps 1:91; Butler and Barber 181; Enk 1:169; Rothstein 1:183, all say that, contrary to expectation, oblitio must be treated as a passive. However, in support of the passive meaning of oblitus, they cite only Ecl. 9.53. None of them make any attempt to explain its significance if it is also interpreted in an active sense.

Williams (1968) 769; B. Axelson, Unpoetische Wörter (Lund 1945) 35.


Eust., on Homer, Il. 2.701, p.325.


On favilla, see W.J.N. Rudd, "Favilla with Special Reference to Propertius 1.9.17-18," Hermathena 79 (1952) 30-33.

minae most often are threats uttered by a mistress to her lover. See 1.6.9; 1.7.12; 1.10.26; 2.25.18; 3.8.7. It is also used to describe Cleopatra, Antony's and Rome's domina, in 3.11.42.

Otis (1965) 14 is aware of the contrast in the last line when he summarizes, "Cynthia is both a harsh burden that never leaves Propertius and a joy that never satiates. Each aspect is part of the picture." But he does not explore these implications throughout the poem nor the contrast between physical love and a more general, spiritual type of love.

Williams (1968) 766-768.

64 Sim. (AP 10.105); Williams (1968) 767; Enk 1:168; Rothstein 1:182; Lattimore (1962) 170-171.
65 Williams (1968) 767.
67 Williams (1968) 768.
68 Lattimore (1962) 78-86.
69 On falsis ... palmis and Thessalus ... umbra, see Lyne (1980) 144, 101, respectively.
Already in 1.1 we have seen that the imagery of the journey of love (iter amoris) serves as an important metaphor for Propertius' predicament. In fact, Propertius the poet-lover considers travel of the utmost importance in winning one's beloved. After his own lack of success in love (1-8), he offers the myth of Milanion as an example of successful love. Milanion wanders at first (errabat, 1.1.11), but then treads resolutely ahead (ibat ... videre, 1.1.12) and wins his beloved. By utilizing the same imagery of travel in his conclusion of the myth (nec [Amor] meminit notas, ut prius, ire vias (1.1.18), Propertius shows that he believes in the power of journey to win one's beloved, but that, in his case, it does not work. Significantly, he blames Amor for his lack of direction (cf. nullo vivere consilio, 1.1.6) instead of making the journey himself. Later in the poem he still considers a journey the ultimate solution for his predicament. He asks his friends, ferte per extremas gentes et ferte per undas (1.1.29). Yet in the next line he shows that he has altered the goal of the journey--from winning his beloved to escaping all women: ferte ... qua non ulla meum femina norit iter (1.1.29-30). As we saw before, this
distinction of purpose between pursuit and flight is not necessarily conscious for the maddened lover. And the reference to Catullus 101 and the imagery of death in these lines portends the ambiguity of the journey's results. Yet in the last section of the poem he admonishes 'happy lovers' not to leave their beloveds. By utilizing the imagery of travel for himself, therefore, he implies that for the lover the journey of love is a given. And although he is not as successful as Milanion, if he is to win in love, he too must travel the right paths.²

When ultimately Propertius does set out, he encounters in 1.17 the disasters of storm and shipwreck. Although he has travelled far from Cynthia (journey as escape), he begins to realize that it is better to be near her, even in death, than to die far from her comforting embrace. This knowledge, the same as the advice which he offered other lovers in 1.1.31-38, is reflected in 2.26. In this elegy, Propertius appears ready to jump off a cliff when Cynthia is in danger of drowning and promises to remain with her wherever she might travel in the future. Thus, the journey physically continues, but now the couple travel together rather than separately, as we saw in Book 1. In 3.7, however, Propertius asserts that the iter amoris need not involve physical movement. In fact, he castigates a certain Paetus for his ocean-going trips and says that it is preferable to remain at home with one's beloved (3.7.71-2). Thus, he finally decides to follow the advice which he offered 'happy lovers' at the close of 1.1, to stay with their puellae.
Two considerations will shape our view of Propertius' physical movement from seafarer to landlubber and his intellectual journey from flight to proximity to one's beloved. First, who is traveling and why? In 1.17 it is Propertius who has ostensibly left Cynthia in order to distance himself from her, but there is some sense that through his departure he is also trying to win Cynthia back (e.g. 1.17.11-12). In 2.26 the situation is reversed: Cynthia now confesses her lies to Propertius, presumably to win back his good will and affection. Yet it is unclear why she has left Propertius to start with. In 3.7 it appears that love has no place in Paetus' life: he journeys the mortis iter (3.7.2) rather than the iter amoris, and he searches after wealth, rather than his beloved. Yet in the poem's closing couplet (3.7.71-2) the speaker contrasts his own preference for proximity to his beloved with Paetus' wanderings after wealth. By introducing the elegiac lover into the poem at this point, Propertius the writer encourages us to re-read the poem in the light of the iter amoris. Seen from this new viewpoint, it becomes clear that Paetus is also an elegiac lover, like Milanion and Propertius, who hopes to win his beloved's affection through the wealth and presents he will bring her. Thus, not only Propertius but also Cynthia and others journey in pursuit of love. Yet just as we saw in 1.1, there is ambiguity concerning the voyage's purpose; in each case, winning one's beloved is balanced by flight from her.

Second, the idea of death figures prominently in each of the three poems, 1.17, 2.26, and 3.7. Death at sea, though a commonplace in ancient literature, was justifiably a real and
frequent phenomenon. This fear of death at sea, far from friends who could perform the proper rites of burial, initiates Propertius' reflections upon his separation from Cynthia and ultimately causes him to regret having left Cynthia and Rome. Additionally, the picture of Cynthia tending to his grave is for Propertius a token of her fidelity. In 2.26 imagery of death lends support to Propertius' expressions of faithfulness: he appears willing to risk his life to save the drowning Cynthia (2.26.19-20) and to wish that Cynthia be buried even if he is not (2.26.44). Yet this imagery is equivocal, for fear (metus, 2.26.20) interrupts his dream before he can dive and save her. And though he is willing to let Cynthia be buried even if he is not, this also means that Cynthia and Propertius will not be close together in death, as Propertius had hoped in 1.17. In the last two lines of 3.7, when Propertius says that the lover prefers to be buried near his mistress' threshold, he once again equates fidelity with the willingness to face death. At the same time, he rejects the idea of a physical journey as he castigates Paetus for being foolish enough to journey and risk death at sea. Yet Paetus too is depicted as an elegiac lover who is pursuing his beloved. In criticizing Paetus, therefore, Propertius not only diminishes the importance of travel as a means of winning one's mistress, but also implicitly condemns his own hard-won revelation—that closeness to one's mistress is preferable to travel—since he is not alive, but buried at her door (3.7.71-72).
Propertius ventures upon his first journey in 1.17 only after reflecting upon the *iter amoris* in several preceding poems in Book 1. In particular, four poems have journeys (1.6, 1.8, 1.11, 1.17), either actual or anticipated, as the overt occasion for their composition. And all four explore the ambiguity posed in 1.1 between pursuit and escape. In the first two, Propertius delivers two separate *propemptica*, the first before Tullus departs for Asia (1.6) and the second in order to keep Cynthia from leaving for an unannounced destination (1.8a). In the second pair, the journeys are realized and the focus is upon the separation of the two lovers. In 1.11 he warns the vacationing Cynthia about the dangers of Baiae, especially the threat of rival lovers. Finally, in 1.17 Propertius is at sea, far from Cynthia and Rome.

Within this sequence, the progression of ideas and imagery reflects a change in Propertius' relationship with Cynthia and shows why 1.17 acts as a climax within the sequence. Although Propertius wishing Tullus a prosperous voyage is the primary emphasis of 1.6, i.e. an encomiastic *propempticon*, there is also the sense that Propertius himself has been asked to accompany Tullus to Asia. For although he asserts that he is not afraid of going to sea or even traveling beyond the home of Memnon (1-4), he must excuse himself from joining Tullus' tour because of Cynthia's complaints and entreaties not to leave her (5-18). She delays his departure by means of her embraces (5) and prayers (6), her changing color (6) and her threats (9), her facial disfigurement (18) and her hope that the winds delay Propertius' departure (17). Most important and
placed last is her accusation that he is unfaithful (et nihil infido
durius esse viro? 1.6.18). In other words, to prevent Propertius
from leaving her, Cynthia has delivered her own propempticon to keep
Propertius from going with Tullus and which Propertius reports to
Tullus in the form of his excuse. The threat that Propertius might
leave her, already hinted at in 1.4.1-2 (quid mihi tam multas
laudando, Basse, puellas/mutatum domina cogis abire mea?), is
overcome through Cynthia’s implied schetliastic propempticon in
1.6.5-18 within the more general encomiastic propempticon to Tullus.

In 1.8a Propertius pronounces his own schetliastic
propempticon, full of complaints and indignation, to forestall
Cynthia’s imminent departure. Like Cynthia in 1.6, Propertius
worries about a potential breach of their commitment, but he goes
beyond Cynthia’s general concern in 1.6 by specifically mentioning a
rival lover (1.8a.3-4). As in 1.6, he hopes here that winds delay
her departure (9-11), but he goes farther, even praying that once
she does set out, the winds never subside (13-14). Yet, typical of
most schetliastic propemptica, the final section (17-26) reveals
that Propertius has relented. He hopes her trip goes smoothly
(18-20) and even asserts his faithfulness despite her departure.

nam me non ullae poterunt corruempere, de te
quin ego, vita, tuo limine acerba querar.
(1.8.21-22)

There are even hints of Propertius’ affection for Cynthia in the
schetliastic portion. He wonders if Cynthia can bear to listen to
roar of the sea (vesani murmura ponti, 5) and to lie upon the ship’s
hard floor (in dura nave iacere potes, 6), whether her tender feet
(pedibus teneris, 7) can endure frost and snow. Yet these signs of concern are missing in Cynthia's implied propempticon in 1.6. One can, of course, argue that the bitter complaints and fights are a sure indication of affection—as Propertius does in 3.8—or that Propertius has reported only a portion of Cynthia's propempticon to him in 1.6, yet the fact is that Propertius hints at his concern even within the schetliasmos proper of 1.8a. In addition, Cynthia's destination includes a potential new lover (1.8a.3) among the place names listed in her travels whereas Propertius' only destinations are places—Athens or Asia (1.6.13-14). Admittedly, Cynthia implies that Propertius is unfaithful (1.6.18), but Propertius takes care to point out his faithfulness to Cynthia in both poems (e.g. 1.6.15-6; 1.8a.20-26). And perhaps this is why Cynthia responds favorably to his pleas in 1.8a by staying with him in 1.8b: Hic erat! Hic iurata manet (1.8.27).

While both Propertius and Cynthia forego journeys in 1.6 and 8, both feared that their partner might leave. And in 1.8 is added the possibility that this flight from love, which both feared, might also simultaneously include the pursuit of love, the desire to win a new lover. As early as 1.2 he had wondered if Cynthia might be abducted and taken away to some distant place, although this fear was veiled in the guise of the mythological examples Phoebe and Hilaira, Marpessa, and Hippodamia (avecta externis ... rotis, 1.2.20), all of whom were carried off by various suitors. Now in 1.11 journey becomes reality. When Propertius writes to Cynthia, she is already at leisure in Baiae, but the opening lines make clear
that we should put the poem in the context of the *iter amoris*. Cynthia has stopped (*cessantem* 1.11.1) at Baiae near the road (*semita*, 1.11.2) built by Hercules. Moreover, later in the poem he pictures the waters delaying her boat (*moretur*, 1.11.10), even holding her back (*teneat clausam*, 1.11.11), reminding us of the prayers in 1.6 and 8 that the winds delay the lover’s departure.

Additionally, Propertius, disconcerted and disillusioned, explains his understanding of her departure in the terms defined in 1.1, flight and pursuit. First, he asks if she spends nights thinking of him, if she has any room for him at "the edge of love":

\[
\text{nstri cura subit memores, ah, ducere noc~\text{\text{-}}\text{tes?}} \\
\text{ecquis in extre~\text{\text{-}}\text{mo restat amore locus?}} \\
\text{(1.11.5-6)}
\]

In both questions, Propertius is trying to learn whether Cynthia has truly left him or has merely gone on vacation, whether she still has love for him or is ready to call off the relationship. In the next couplet, Propertius alters the question from one about flight from him to one about pursuit of another man:

\[
\text{an te nescio quis simulatis ignibus hostis} \\
\text{sustulit e nostris, Cynthia, carminibus?} \\
\text{(1.11.7-8)}
\]

This second anxiety is repeated in the form of a wish: better that the waves delay and hold you back than to listen to another’s seductive whispers (1.11.9-14). In contrast to the suggestions of Cynthia’s flight and pursuit, Propertius pictures her as his home and his parents (*tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes*, 1.11.23), using images of stability and fixedness not only to convince himself of her firm love but also to provide alternative...
patterns for Cynthia to follow instead of traveling to Baiae.

Significantly, Propertius never accuses Cynthia directly of abandoning him. Through the use of questions and wishes, he tones down his complaints. Indeed, after his second reference to a potential rival lover, he even adds a generalizing rationalization to allay any doubts she may have that he is accusing her: when there is no guardian nearby, a girl sometimes slips and forgets her former promises (1.11.15-16). By generalizing his statement from Cynthia to an indefinite puella and by shifting the blame from the puella to her absent guardian (amota ... custode, 1.11.15), Propertius tries to defuse Cynthia’s feelings that he is accusing her of being unfaithful. Moreover, he also asks forgiveness (ignosces) if his libelli caused her any grief (1.11.19-20). Finally, in his conclusion, after asking her to leave Baiae, he deflects the blame from Cynthia to the waters of Baiae (1.11.30). Thus, just as he had in 1.8a, Propertius tries to shift the blame away from Cynthia through his use of questions, wishes, generalizing statements, and pleas for forgiveness. Yet in spite of these attempts to delude himself about Cynthia’s intentions and Cynthia about his anxieties, her journey has been realized. Just as Propertius suspected in 1.2 and 1.8, she has left him. And despite his attempts to shift the blame away from Cynthia, he suspects that her journey involves the pursuit of another man (1.11.13-14).

In 1.6, 8, and 11, therefore, the idea of travel has been altered from the view that the lover posed in 1.1. A trip no longer appears to be a remedy but rather a source of irritation between
himself and Cynthia. If he goes with Tullus, Cynthia will be upset. And of course he does not want Cynthia to leave in 1.8 or to be away in Baiae in 1.11. Although Cynthia may be traveling as a cure to her love-sickness, Propertius the lover certainly does not see matters this way. It is not she who is sick, but he himself (cf. 1.15). Indeed, Cynthia's departure in 1.11 and failure to return in 1.12 mark a downturn in their relationship that continues in the second half of the Monobiblos. After his inability to bring Cynthia back from Baiae, Propertius can no longer offer Gallus the confident advice in 1.13 that he did in 1.10. In 1.15, moreover, Cynthia has returned to Rome but dallies in coming to his aid when he is ill. Propertius therefore returns in 1.17 to the solution programmatically presented in 1.1, namely that travel can provide a cure in his situation. At first, he sees no alternative but to escape women, but in the course of his journey he realizes that this trip might also present an opportunity for him to win back Cynthia's sympathy and affection. Just as Cynthia left him for Baiae, perhaps in the pursuit of new loves, Propertius now combines flight and pursuit as a remedy for his affair, only in this case he hopes not to win new love but to win back Cynthia.

When the poem opens, it is clear that Propertius has already left Cynthia and is stranded in some deserted place far from a friendly harbor where the only life nearby consists of some lonely halcyons:

Et merito, quoniam potui fugisse puellam!  
nunc ego desertas alloquor alcyonas.
nec mihi Cassiope solido visura carinam,  
omniaque ingrato litore vota cadunt.  
(1.17.1-4)

Certainly he has left his mistress (fugisse puellam, 1.17.1) and it is quite likely that his ship has been disabled since it will not make it to a safe harbor (3). Furthermore, he must be either on or near an unwelcoming shore (ingrato litore, 1.17.4).\(^{13}\) Yet various details illustrate his physical location not nearly as well as his emotional condition and the emotional content of the landscape.\(^ {14}\) The isolation of the landscape, deserted except for a few birds (desertas ... alcyones, 1.17.2) reflects his own emotional loneliness;\(^ {15}\) neither is he safe upon solid land (nec ... solido, 3);\(^ {16}\) and his prayers are apparently useless since they fall upon an unappreciative (ingrato, 4) shore. Most importantly, he is willing to shoulder the blame for his disasters, opening the poem elliptically, yet emphatically, et merito (1).

In the next section the landscape becomes even more hostile, building on the progression in 1-4 from desertas to nec ... solido to ingrato litore.

quin etiam absenti prosunt tibi, Cynthia, venti:  
aspice, quam saevas increpat aura minas.  
nullane placatae veniet fortuna procellae?  
haecine parva meum funus harena teget?  
(1.17.5-8)

Now the winds take a more active role against Propertius, perhaps even threatening his life (saevas ... minas, 6). In fact, the winds are personified as Cynthia's agent in punishing Propertius for abandoning her. They aid Cynthia (prosunt, 5), even when she is absent, and their gusts even sound like fierce threats (saevas_
incrat auram minas, 6), utterances typical of a wronged mistress. In addition to the personification of the winds, Propertius' direct address to Cynthia (5), juxtaposed with venti at the end of the line, enhances the link between mistress and her proxy. The winds not only act on Cynthia's behalf, but they even sound like her. Indeed, we might recall her threats in 1.6.5-18, specifically illa meam mihi iam se denegat, illa minatur (1.6.9).

In the next couplet, the personification of the winds continues in that they are termed placatae ... procellae (7). More to the point, Cynthia's wishes have evidently been carried out since Propertius now pleads that the winds be calmed. The situation now appears so hopeless that he is even worried about death and lack of a proper burial. The vocabulary has changed from the bleak but relatively unthreatening desertas (2) and nec solido (3) to the unreligious shore (ingrato litore, 4) to active agents of Propertius' destruction: the winds aid Cynthia in meting out propertius' punishment, utter severe threats (saevas ... minas, 6) and now must be pacified (placatae, 7) before Propertius is left dead and unburied on this hostile shore (8).

Throughout these opening lines, as the situation turns from desolate and unsafe to hostile and threatening, Propertius turns more and more to Cynthia for help. In 1-4 he refers to her in the third person as his puella (1). When his prayers have failed in line 4, he cries her name aloud (Cynthia, 5), though the situation only gets worse. After contemplating his possible death in 8 and having seen her almost divine control of the winds in 5-8—just as
she had threatened in 1.6 (osculaque opposito dicat sibi debita
vento, 1.6.17)—in 9-12 he prays to her directly with the request
that she no longer direct her wrath against him; nature itself is
sufficient punishment.

\[
\begin{align*}
tu \ tamen \ & in \ melius \ saevas \ converte \ querelas: \\
sat \ tibi \ & sit \ poenae \ nox \ et \ iniqua \ vada. \\
an \ & poteris \ siccis \ mea \ fata \ reponere \ ocellis, \\
ossaque \ nulla \ & tuo \ nostra \ tenere \ sinu? \\
\end{align*}
\]

(1.17.9-12)

We should not be surprised by his prayer to Cynthia in 9 since
lines 5-8 follow the form of a standard Roman prayer. He mentions
her by name in 5 and personifies the winds in 6-8 with attitudes
typical of a wrathful female, thereby identifying her haunts among
the winds.\textsuperscript{18} And his concession to her according to the pattern of
do ut des occurs in the next line (10): the elements will suffice as
punishment if only she will relent. Cynthia has therefore been
transformed from puella (1) to semi-divine mistress of the elements.

Unlike 1.1 where she was also attributed divine standing, his
prayer this time reaches out to her rather than to sorceresses and
friends. His strategy in addressing her directly becomes most
apparent, if not already, in the second couplet of the section
(11-12): How could Cynthia forget about his fates with dry eyes and
not hold his bones close to her breast?\textsuperscript{19} The particle an indicates
that Propertius expects her answer to be "no".\textsuperscript{20} Of course, Cynthia
will give in and feel sorry for him, especially after he has died.
As we look back through the first 12 lines we can see that the lover
has deliberately created an increasingly hostile picture in order to
play on Cynthia's sympathies. And what he finally asks is not for
her love, but for her sympathy after he has died (cf. mea fata = funus [8] and ossa nostra [12]). Moreover, the picture of death evolves naturally out of the situation of being in danger at sea near or on a hostile shore. Unlike the more subconscious use of death in 1.11, which describes his inner feelings about Cynthia's danger at Baiae, here he uses the fact of his potential death to win back her favor.21

Finally, he concludes this opening section with an aphoristic injunction against the inventor of the first sailing vessels:22

ah pereat, quicumque rates et vela paravit
primus et invito gurgite fecit iter!
(1.17.13-14)

In the opening words of the elegy (et merito) he had made clear that any suffering he endured was in retribution for his flight (fugisse puellam). Admittedly, Cynthia must be angry with him, he reasons, but the winds, Cynthia's agents, were giving Propertius merely what he deserved. When he makes his request (9-10), he is careful not to offend by demanding too much: he asks vaguely only that her complaints turn into something better, not that she favor him. Moreover, the forces of nature will still act as sufficient punishment (10). The generalized curse in 13-14, then, works in the same way. It reinforces the notion that Cynthia is not to blame for his predicament, and at the same time reiterates his own fault for attempting to travel upon the open sea just as the first navigator had.
The generalized nature of 13-14 also allows the poet-lover to switch from second person address to Cynthia to third person remarks about Cynthia and concomitantly to reflect on his own situation, just as he had in 1.8b and 1.12.23

\[
\text{nonne fuit levius dominae pervincere mores } \\
(\text{quamvis dura, tamen rara puella fuit}), \\
\text{quam sic ignotis circumdata litora silvis} \\
\text{cernere et optatos quaerere Tyndaridas?} \\
(1.17.15-18)
\]

Here he makes conscious the purpose of his journey: _dominae pervincere mores_ (1.17.15). Indeed, we have already seen in 1-14 that he is attempting to win her pity, and hopefully her affection, in response to his increasingly more desperate plight. Whatever mild criticism he makes (e.g. _dura_, 16) is softened by praise (_rara puella fuit_, 16) and by recalling his misfortunes along with his responsibility for those misfortunes in 1-4. The _litora_ (4, 17) are mentioned as well as the sense of danger and desolation (_ignotis_, 17; _ingratam_, 4).24 In addition, _cernere_ (18) recalls _visura_ (3): in 3 he had hoped to see the friendly harbor of Cassiope in Corcyra,25 but could not, while in 17-18 he certainly would rather not see some unknown and possibly dangerous strand. Even _quaerere_ (18), "to look for and fail to find,"26 echoes the frustration of his ineffectual prayers in 4. Thus, Propertius' predicament is no less hopeless than it was in 1-4. The difference is that he now verbalizes his desire to win Cynthia back instead of merely playing on her sympathy.
In fact, *fugisse* (1) and *pervincere* (15) evoke the two motifs of flight and pursuit that we have observed in the other poems, detailing the iter amoris in Book I. Their placement in the opening line of each half of the poem as well as in the same position within the line is meant to suggest not two separate views of journey, but rather two aspects of the same journey. It is not that Propertius in 1.17.15ff gives up the idea of flight, for in 25-28 he asks that the daughters of Doris further his journey to peaceful shores (*mansuetis ... litoribus*, 28). Instead, he hopes that his iter amoris will be successful, that he will reach shores that are *mansuetus*, rather than ones which are "ungrateful" or "unknown." Indeed, *mansuetus* is carefully chosen by Propertius to evoke the attributes of successful love, its meaning in the two other passages in which it occurs.27

In the next section (19-24) not only has Propertius' situation become worse, but his attempt to win Cynthia's love has become stronger:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{illic si qua meum sepelissent fata dolorem,} \\
&\text{ultimus et posito staret amore lapis,} \\
&\text{illa meo caros donasset funere crines,} \\
&\text{molliter et tenera poneret ossa rosa; } \\
&\text{illa meum extremo clamasset pulvere nomen,} \\
&\text{ut mihi non ullo pondere terra foret.} \\
&(1.17.19-24)
\end{align*}
\]

In the first couplet he builds on the idea from line 8 that he might die and in 11-12 that Cynthia could not help but shed a tear if he did perish. Now he pictures himself not only dead, but buried (*sepelissent*, 19). Moreover, Cynthia must have already placed her hair on the tomb and cried out his name, since the pluperfects
donasset (21) and clamasset (23) indicate actions already complete at the time of his burial (sepelissent, 19). Yet the conditional contrary-to-fact statements point to the hypothetical nature of these events. Propertius has not yet died on his journey, but he wants to use his potential death as a means to evoke Cynthia's pity. In addition, he portrays Cynthia tending to his grave as a paradigm for how she should act if he were to die and as reassurance to himself that his prayers will be answered and that she will be faithful when his corpse is finally washed ashore (illic, 19).

The deliberate repetition of sound, phrasing, and sense in these six lines is meant to reflect Propertius' insistence that Cynthia will really perform these acts of concern. The phrasing verb-noun-noun at the end of five consecutive lines (19-23) is reinforced by the alternation in sound between -issent/-asset and -aret/-eret, coming just before the caesura in the hexameter lines and just after the caesura in the pentameter lines, and is rounded off by the phrasing noun-noun-verb in 24. In addition, the coldness and bleakness of dolorem (19) and lapis (20) give way to her signs of affection at the end of each of the next three lines: crines (21), rosa (22), and nomen (23). And by the repetition of some form of me/meus in four of the six lines, the poet-lover hopes to increase Cynthia's pity for him. Finally, the repetition of s, r, and p sounds in the second half of each line, introduced by the l and M alliteration, produces an incantatory effect perhaps similar to that of a funeral dirge. In short, Propertius paints a sonorous, verbal picture to emphasize how he hopes Cynthia will treat him.
In the final section of the poem (25-28) Propertius invokes the goodwill of the Nereids to speed him to a safe shore.  

\begin{verbatim}
   at vos, aequoreae formosa Doride natae,
   candida felici solvite vela choro:
   si quando vestras labens Amor attigit undas,
   mansuetis socio parcite litoribus!
\end{verbatim}

(1.17.25-28)

Significantly, this prayer not only parallels his request to Cynthia in 9-10 but also acts as a final plea to Cynthia's mercy. Both begin with the second person pronoun plus a disjunctive adverb (tu tamen, 9; at vos, 25). Furthermore, the attributes of the Nereids recall Cynthia's characteristic epithets. Their mother Doris is formosa (25) and the sails which their goodwill will allow to be unfurled are candida (26). Moreover, the nymphs' dance (felici ... choro, 26) perhaps also reminds us of Cynthia's love of music in 1.2 and 3.30 Finally, he asks the nymphs to be beneficent because they too have been affected by Amor (27). This, just as crines (21) and rosa (22) in the previous section, the vocabulary of the last two couplets is meant to remind Cynthia of the times Propertius has praised her and therefore to effect her sympathy.

In 1.17, therefore, the lover's fear of his own death at sea far from his mistress is mitigated by his idealistic picture of Cynthia tending to his burial after he dies. In 1.19, as we have seen, the lover complements this portrait of the survivor caring for the dead lover by asserting that the lover continues to love even after he has died. Other Cynthia poems in the first book also stressed the need for the two lovers to be physically together. Indeed, much of the poet-lover's rhetoric of shifting the blame from
Cynthia to some other person or thing is the result of his desire to be close to her.

While in Book 1 what is important to the poet-lover is his unity with his beloved, the programmatic poem of Book 2 marks a more active role by the lover in this book:

laus in amore mori; laus altera, si datur uno
posse frui: fruar o solus amore meo!
(2.1.47-48)

Death is no longer merely an occasion when lovers will be together but an opportunity for the lover to demonstrate his affection for his beloved. 2.26, like many of the poems of Book 2,\textsuperscript{31} picks up on this theme while pursuing those introduced in the Monobiblos, namely, the fear of death apart from one's beloved and death as an occasion for lovers to be together. If Cynthia dies, Propertius in 2.26.19 appears ready to die, too, and even in death to make sacrifices for her proper burial (2.26.43-44). The shift in the imagery of death is accompanied by a new understanding of travel. After learning of the horrors of separation in 1.17, the two lovers journey together with confidence in their mutual affection. The occasion upon which these themes are developed is Propertius' dream of Cynthia's shipwreck. Propertius' dream (1-20), therefore, provides a chance for Cynthia to confess her deceptions (3-4) and for Propertius to risk his life because of her (19). Their reconciliation occasions Propertius' joyous outburst (21-58), first about Cynthia's constancy (21-28), then their journey together (29-34), his eagerness to endure any trial for her (35-44), his forecast that the gods of wind and sea, since they were lovers once,
will not endanger them on their journey (45-56), concluded by a third profession of his willingness to die with her (57-58).

It is helpful to view the reconciliation and journey of 2.26 within the context of the second book, especially in the light of the six poems which lead up to 2.26. In 2.20 Cynthia weeps more than the heroines Briseis and Andromache because of Propertius' perfidy, yet in 2.21 we learn that Cynthia's lover has rejected her in favor of a wife. Propertius then turns to other women in 2.22 and 23. Yet Propertius would not have acted in this way and been condemned as nequitiae caput, according to 2.24, if Cynthia still favored him (2.24.5), if she were not so fickle (2.24.18). In 2.20 Propertius' protestations of loyalty involved doing noble deeds on Cynthia's behalf (2.20.9-12; cf. 2.1.47-48) while in 2.24 he compares his eagerness to please her with a rival lover's trepidation, even refusal, to act as Propertius would act (2.24.23-34). Yet the end of 2.24 shows that Propertius still has doubts about her fidelity to him because of her previous conquests (2.24.41-46) and her continued dressing up, a sign of her simulatum ... amorem (2.24.47) and potential interest in other men (et se plus uni si qua parare potest, 2.24.48). And clearly, in 2.25, they have not yet been reconciled since he still cannot tell her, "come and come often" (2.25.2). Thus, the dream in 2.26.1-20 is not only Propertius' attempt to win Cynthia over, as Colin Macleod has pointed out, but also a reconciliation between the two lovers.32
In explaining his erratic behavior in 2.22-23 as a response to the dishonor he felt when Cynthia discarded him, Propertius in 2.24.1-10 had already begun to ask for her forgiveness. It is therefore important for Properitus to know that Cynthia will admit her past deceits, including the lover of 2.21, so that together they can continue the iter amoris hand in hand. Her confession comes quickly in the opening section of 2.26:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vidi te in somnis fracta, mea vita, carina} \\
\text{Ionio lassas ducere rore manus,} \\
\text{et quaecumque in me fueras mentita, fateri,} \\
\text{nec iam umore graves tollere posse comas,} \\
\text{qualem purpureis agitatam fluctibus Hellen,} \\
\text{aurae quam mollis tergo vexit ovis.} \\
\text{quam timui, ne forte tuum mare nomen haberet} \\
\text{atque tua labens navita fleret aqua!} \\
\text{quae tum ego Neptuno, quae tum cum Castore fratri,} \\
\text{quaeque tibi excepi, iam dea Leucothoe!}
\end{align*}
\]

The first two lines sketch quickly Cynthia's precarious situation. She is in the Ionian sea (Ionio ... rore, 2), her ship is wrecked (fracta ... carina, 1), and she is weary (lassas ... manus, 2). In the next couplet but still in the same sentence, she confesses (fateri, 3) her past lies (mentita, 3) against him. Even her demeanor is contrite since the heaviness of the sea water prevents her from lifting her head in a proud way (cf. 1.1.1-4). To soften the blow of shipwreck and her admission of guilt, Propertius quickly moves to pay her a compliment, comparing her to the inundated daughter of Athamas, Helle (5), who is remembered for naming the Hellespont.
With the introduction of the mythological allusion, Propertius makes us more cognizant that Cynthia's journey is both the dream of the apprehensive lover and a poetic trip into the world of Argonauts and epic nostoi. On the one hand, the lover fears for Cynthia's life (quam timui, 7) and prays for her welfare (quae tum ego... excepi, 9-10). On the other hand, the poet enjoys the idea that he has Cynthia under his poetic spell, that she is becoming reconciled to him. His compliment in 5-6 is expanded in 7-8 through the ambiguity of tuum mare nomen, where tuum probably refers to nomen, but could modify mare. The double-headed meaning of tuum is resolved in the pentameter, where it is definitely tua aqua. She has indeed become Helle. The lover's prayers to travelers' patron deities is also the source of more poetic playfulness, for Leucothoe, now a goddess (iam dea Leucothoe, 10), was Ino, Helle's stepmother and persecutor, and also a puella who drowned. Through his reference to Helle's persecutor, perhaps he is subtly warning Cynthia not to renege on her confessions.

The next ten lines follow the same pattern as the first ten: the first six focus on Cynthia while the last four emphasize Propertius' reaction to Cynthia's predicament.

at tu vix primas extollens gurgite palmas
saepe meum nomen iam peritura vocas.
quodsi forte tuos vidisset Glaucus ocellos,
esses Ionii facta puella maris,
et tibi ob invidiam Nereides increpitarent,
candida Nesaeae, caerula Cymothoe.
se tibi subsidio delphinum currere vidi,
qui, puto, Arioniam vexerat ante lyram
iamque ego consabar summo me mittere saxo,
cum mihi discussit talia visa metus.  
(2.26.11-20)
Instead of a couplet on Cynthia's danger followed by one on Cynthia's remorse, as we saw in 1-4, each idea is telescoped into one line (11: danger; 12: remorse). Cynthia's crying out Propertius' name could also indicate a cry for help. But before any help can come (17-20), the poet must play. The repetition of iam at the beginning of the second hemistich of the pentameter in two successive couplets (10, 12) shows that Cynthia, like Leucothoe, is about to become a goddess. Yet instead of her name becoming famous (tuum mare nomen, 7), the poet reminds us that it is his name (meum nomen, 12) which is on her dying lips. In the next four lines (13-16), the poet-lover expands upon his compliment in 5-6: Glaucus would make her his mistress (Ionii ... puella maris, 14), and all the Nereids, in turn, would become jealous (ob invidiam ... increpitarent, 15). Indeed, the poet-lover might have even had Glaucus in mind as a substitute for himself, Glaucus who had remained faithful to Scylla even at the expense of incurring Circe's wrath. The poet-lover would not have minded having other girls, like the Nereids, upset at him if he could have Cynthia as his mistress.

Finally help arrives in 17-20. First, a dolphin rushes out to help Cynthia and at the same time (iamque, 19) Propertius prepares to risk his life for her. Rather than think of Propertius' jump as unneeded and even illogical after the dolphin's appearance, each couplet is meant to represent Propertius in his guise first as poet, then as lover. For the dolphin clearly is a poetic dolphin, the one which saved Arion, and therefore acts to save Propertius' ingenium,
the inspiration and content of his poetry. Thus, when Propertius prepares to jump in 19, he repeats the action of the poetic dolphin, only this time as lover in order to show his willingness to die for her. Then just as quickly the dream is over. Fear at his peril and consequently fear for his loss if she did die make his vision vanish.

Cynthia has confessed her past deceits (3-4) and admitted her dependence on Propertius (12). Propertius’ responses, in turn, show that he cares. His fear and prayers (7-10) are followed by his actions as Glaucus, dolphin, and leaper. At the same time, as poet he has taken advantage of Cynthia’s situation to play with her predicament through light humor and sarcasm. As a means of elegiac reconciliation, the dream has worked:

nunc admirentur, quod tam mihi pulchra puella
serviat et tota dicar in urbe potens.
non, si iam Gygae redeant et flumina Croesi,
dicat: ‘de nostro surge, poeta, toro!’
nam mea cum recitat, dicit se odisse beatos:
carmina tam sancte nulla puella colit.
multum in amore fides, multum constantia prodest:
qui dare multa potest, multa et amare potest. 25
(2.26.21-28)

Cynthia is now subservient to Propertius (serviat, 22) and it is Propertius who is master (potens, 22). She worships at his shrine (26). The lover succeeds precisely because his poetry is more persuasive than all the wealth of Lydia and Persia. His success as lover depends upon his role as poet. Thus, poet and lover still act as a unit. Cynthia makes this clear when she addresses him as poeta (24). And the last two couplets of the section present first the poet, then the lover. As poet, his carmen (the dream) has convinced
her to reject wealthy suitors (odisse beatos, 25). As lover, his fides and constantia have helped him win her (in amore ... prodest. 27). In contrast, other lovers cannot remain as constant as Propertius has been (28).

Now that the two lovers have been reconciled, now that their fides is secure, Propertius returns to the metaphor of journey in 29ff., only now their journey will be together.

```
seu mare per longum mea cogitet ire puella,
hanc sequar, et fidos una aget aura duos,
umum litus erit sopitis unaque tecto
   arbor, et ex una saepe bibemus aqua.
et tabula una duos poterit componere amantes,
   prora cubile mihi seu mihi puppis erit.
onnia perpetiar: saevus licet urgeat Eurus
   velaque in incertum frigidus Auster agat,
quicumque et venti miserum vexastis Ulixen
   et Danaum Euboico litore mille rates,
et qui movistis duo litora, cum rudis Argus
dux erat ignoto missa columba mari.
```

(2.26.29-40)

In the first three couplets the repetition of the adjective unus five times emphasizes the unity of which Propertius boasted in 21-28. Indeed, his symbolic jump in 19 has allowed him to join Cynthia on her interrupted sea voyage. In the next three couplets, Propertius as poet returns to the themes of the great epic sea voyages of the Argonauts (Helle) and Ulysses (Leucothoe and Glaucus), already alluded to in 1-20, in order to demonstrate his faithfulness as lover. No winds or storms can separate him from Cynthia. Those winds had once destroyed the Greek fleet returning from Troy, but Ulysses survived. Perhaps we are to remember Leucothoe as his savior in Odyssey 5. In a like manner, those same winds almost destroyed the Argo, but it was saved by a dove sent
ahead as dux. 40

Most importantly, his real fear as well as an expression of his faithfulness come out in the two couplets concluding this section.

illa meis tantum non umquam desit ocellis,
incendat navem Iuppiter ipse licet.
certe isdem nudi pariter iactabimur oris:
me licet unda ferat, te modo terra tegat!
(2.26.41-44)

While on their journey, he asks not to be torn from her eyes, even if Jove incinerates their ship. Yet even this reveals their unity, for they will be tossed on the same shores together, naked no less. It is clear that he was willing to endure all things in 35-40 with her, for they are still on the same ship when Jove's storm destroys it.

A fortunate outcome for their journey is assured, moreover, because the gods who might have hindered them were once lovers.

sed non Neptunus tanto crudelis amori,
Neptunus fratri par in amore Iovi.
testis Amymone, latices dum ferret, in Argis compressa, et Lernae pulsa tridentem palus.
iam deus amplexu votum persolvit, at illi aurea divinas urna profudit aquas.
cruelam et Borean rapta Orithyia negavit:
hi deus et terras et maria alta domat.
crede mihi, nobis mitescit Scylla nec umquam alternante vacans vasta Charybdis aqua;
ipsaque sidera erunt nullis obscura tenebris,
purus et Orion, purus et Haedus erit.
(2.26.45-56)

Neptune, after rescuing Amymone from the clutches of a lecherous satyr, slept with her (amplexu, 49) and became her protector and benefactor. By creating the spring at Lerna for her, he brought her search for water to an end (47-50). Boreas, too, was the lover of Orithyia, the daughter of Erechtheus. 41
These two gods' goodwill toward Propertius and Cynthia is extended to parallel divinities associated with travel, including Scylla and Charybdis, and Orion and Haedus, by gradually transforming them from individual divinities to natural phenomena. By shifting the emphasis from their divine power to their physical importance, he shows that they will help the two lovers in either guise. In the first example, Neptune, though normally an equivalent for "the sea", becomes an individual who takes a personal interest in Amymone and answers her prayers (votum persolvit, 49). Boreas, whose name often refers to any wind, is specifically Orithyia's lover (51). Yet in the pentameter Propertius is at pains to present his natural powers: hic deus et terras et maria alta domat (52). Scylla will become soft (mitescet, 53), an ambiguous term used of both persons and nature, but with Charybdis, Orion or Haedus there is no attempt to demonstrate their individuality, only their command of the environment. Just as he has been presenting himself as both lover and poet throughout the poem, here he presents two aspects of nature, personal and divine, alongside their impersonal and physical qualities. Nature will be kind to the two lovers because, defined as individual gods, it too has experienced love.

Finally, in the last couplet Propertius returns to the idea of the unity of lovers.

quod mihi si ponenda tuo sit corpore vita,
exitus hic nobis non inhonestus erit.
(2.26.57-58)
In 19 he showed himself willing to risk his life to be with her. In 43-44 he offered to sacrifice his own proper burial if it meant that she would receive a proper one. Now he echoes the sentiment of 2.1.47-48. Although Romans considered death at sea an evil to be avoided, Propertius asserts through a meiosis that "it will be glorious, indeed" (non honestus erit, 58). We remember his dramatic statement about the glory of dying in or for love in 2.1.47-8. Now he clarifies under what conditions the death of a lover is honorable; not just if he enjoys one love, but also if he is with her, physically, at the end. For tuo corpore (58) should be taken as a locative ablative, "upon your body" or "at your side."

He thus reiterates the unity that he had hoped for in 1.17.19-24 when Cynthia would tend to his funeral. And he clarifies the potential disaster depicted within the dream in 1-20: he would jump if she were to die so that they would be together. Only now his death would occur while they are on the iter amoris together. Evidently, his vision, his poetry has brought about their reconciliation and a new view of the journey of love, one in which they would jointly travel for their entire life.

Or has it? The use of the passive periphrastic coupled with a future less vivid condition (si ponenda ... sit, 57) in these final lines is a harbinger of doubt, doubt about his fidelity and sincerity. "If he must die" suggests that perhaps he would rather not. Of course, one could argue that after such a reconciliation the two lovers would want to live forever. And this necessity is only the necessity of their physical death. Yet if we re-examine
the two previous declarations of fidelity in death, we may see that the writer wishes for us to question Propertius' sincerity throughout. For his first statement (19-20) is, as other commentators have pointed out, quite ambiguous. Does his jump from the rock refer to his attempt to put an end to his life in order to be with his beloved in death or to kill himself because he has not saved her before the arrival of the dolphin or to suffer the punishment of adulterers at Rome who were forced, as Tarpeia was, "to send" (mittere) themselves from the Tarpeian rock? Why, furthermore, does fear end his vision? Because he was concerned about his own personal safety, or because he was afraid that Cynthia's loss would be the end of his love affair and of his elegies, or because he could not imagine himself dying for Cynthia? In the second expression of commitment (43-44), his concern for her burial without regard for his own is expressed in such a way as to undercut what he had said in the hexameter of the couplet, which epigrammatically formulates the unity that he had stressed throughout the poem. Both will be washed onto the same shores (a symbolic unity similar to their sharing everything as one [ unus] in 29-34), yet the wave will carry Propertius' body out to sea while the earth covers Cynthia's. licet signifies a contrast in their fates; despite Propertius' protestations, their journey will end in death, but not in unity. And in 57-58 they will be unified, physically, one body next to the other, but one will be dead while the other is not.
The problem with Propertius' expressions of fidelity here is that they are too extreme and hide implicit contradictions to the physical and spiritual unity that he hopes for elsewhere. In addition to his assertions of faithfulness in death, several other aspects of the poem, placed there by the writer, call in to question the couple's reconciliation, namely the dream itself, the mythology, and the lover's attitude in the second half of the poem.

First, the writer tells us from the beginning (*vidi te in somnio*, 1) that the reconciliation that he speaks of occurs not in the real life of the poet-lover, but only in his imagination. Cynthia never confesses her lies, he only believes that she has. She never calls out to him for help or in remorse, he only dreams that she has. Additionally, his fear which ends the dream is equicoval. Although Propertius the poet-lover would have us think that it is fear for Cynthia's safety that causes him to wake up, by not specifying the source or reason for the fear, the writer leaves the equally plausible notion that Propertius fears for his own life. Such fear is hardly the stuff of commitment. Finally, Propertius never actually jumps from the rock. Perhaps if he had, Cynthia would have a reason for believing in their reconciliation.47

Colin Macleod has argued that we should understand the entire dream as a sort of lover's wooing, as a mixture of various elements in a *propempticon*—what dangers Cynthia risks by leaving him (a type of *schetliasmos*) combined with prayers for her safety (9-10) and eulogies of the beloved (e.g. 5-6, 13-16)—in order to keep her close to him.48 If this is true, why is Cynthia going away? The
attitude which this approach presupposes indicates that there is something wrong with the relationship that causes Cynthia to separate herself from Propertius. Although Propertius appears in 21-28 to have won her back through his poetic dream/propempticon, this raises a question about the lover's attitude in the second half of the poem (29-58). For on the one hand, he appears to describe a voyage in which they share everything; on the other, he seems to continue to woo her back. For example, he says, *omnia perpetiar* (35), and then proceeds to list all the trials which he will endure on their journey, ending with *me licet unda ferat, te modo terra tegat* (44). Even more extreme, the examples of Amymone and Neptune, Orithyia and Boreas seem to be meant as paradigms for how Cynthia should respond to him. When Propertius fulfills his vows to her, she should return his embrace. Further, she should deny that he has been cruel, even though *rapta*. Rather she should behave as Scylla, who because of her faithfulness to Glaucus alone was transformed into a sea monster by a jealous Circe.

A reason for his continued attempts to persuade her of his love and to suggest ways in which to act can be found in the mythology. For example, he offers prayers to Neptune, the Dioscuri, and Leucothoe, all patron divinities of travelers, yet they are perhaps less than the best choices. Neptune, as we read later in the poem, saves Amymone from a satyr, but after removing his rival, sleeps with the *puella* himself. The most well-known, erotic story about Castor and Pollux is their battle with their cousins Idas and Lynceus, brought on by their abduction of Phoebe and Hilaira, who
were already betrothed to Idas and Lynceus.\textsuperscript{51} Leucothoe, in her mortal form Ino, instigated Helle's flight because of her hatred for her stepchild.\textsuperscript{52} If Cynthia is to become another Helle, Propertius could have hardly prayed to less propitious divinities. Either they threaten him as potential wooers of Cynthia or else they are jealous.

This trend is exacerbated later in the poem. Glaucus, Propertius admits, is a notorious lady-killer, who will, if he gets the chance, acquire her as his own mistress (13-14).\textsuperscript{53} The Nereids, like Leucothoe, will be jealous (\textit{ob invidiam}, 15). No wonder Propertius fears for Cynthia's welfare. The list of potential rivals is extended even further in the second half of the poem. Neptune, who got along so well with Amymone, might try the same with Cynthia. Likewise, Boreas might act in a similar fashion since he was not, the writer suggests, the perfect gentleman (\textit{rapta Orithyia}, 51).\textsuperscript{54} The fact that Orithyia denied it (\textit{negavit}, 51), moreover, suggests the opposite, that it did indeed happen. Orion, too, had a reputation for chasing women, in particular the daughters of Atlas, the Pleiades.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, the mention of \textit{Naedus} the goat, a creature known in antiquity for its voracious sexual appetite, in the same line only serves to reinforce this idea.\textsuperscript{56} Certainly the presence of so many divinities, either erotically threatening to Cynthia (such as Leucothoe and the Nereids) or potentially hostile to himself (the rivals Neptune [twice], the Dioscuri, Glaucus, Boreas, and Orion) does not bode well for a happy and prosperous voyage together.
Propertius the poet-lover, as Propertius the writer implies, should be concerned about Cynthia, but not because of her potential drowning. Instead, he should be worried about why she is on a voyage without him to begin with, about whether he will be replaced by potential rivals such as Neptune and Boreas, and about whether his dream can ever be real. Indeed, the poet-lover may in some sense realize the ambiguity of his fear (20) since he continues to profess the extent of his commitment (especially 35ff.) even after she has supposedly been convinced by his poetry, even after they have been reconciled. Once again, flight and pursuit, the twin aspects of journey in Book 1, cannot be submerged too far beneath the surface of this seemingly idyllic poetic journey.

At first glance, 3.7 may not appear to fit the theme iter amoris. Certainly it deals with travel since its subject is the death of Paetus at sea. His journey, apparently in search of wealth and riches, is a mortis iter (3.7.2). The speaker of the poem not only laments the death of one so young, but places much of the blame on pecunia. Yet as the poem progresses, it becomes clear that the speaker blames not simply pecunia in some abstract sense, but those who journey to pursue it. Ultimately, in the final couplet the speaker reveals his identity as a lover and contrasts himself with Paetus: he prefers to stay at home and, most importantly, with his mistress rather than risk his life as Paetus had. By portraying himself as lover who does not wish to travel, the speaker redefines the generic boundaries of the poem. It is no longer simply a lament, no longer simply a diatribe on wealth; it can also be an
implied statement about the *iter amoris*. The lover has ceased to advocate travel either as means to flee one's beloved or to win her back as in 1.17 or as a metaphor to describe a successful relationship as in 2.26. Instead, he has returned to the advice which he offered lovers in 1.1: *vos remanete* (1.1.31), *neque assuesto mutet amore locum* (1.1.36). On the surface it would seem that the lover has grown in his understanding of love, from abandoning Cynthia in 1.17 to promising to be faithful to her in 2.26 to his statement that two lovers reveal their love by remaining at home near each other instead of wandering from each other. We will have to see whether this optimistic development is indeed true.57

The poem can be divided into four main sections.58 In 1-12 the poet sets up the initial dichotomies of the poem, between land and sea and between pecunia and Paetus: too bad that Paetus' journey ended in disaster. In 13-28 the speaker addresses questions in the first four distichs to the gods Aquilo and Neptune and then to Paetus in order to contrast the savagery of the gods with the young man's helplessness. In the next four distichs the speaker tells of Argyinnus' drowning and Agamemnon's reaction, followed by a prayer for a proper burial and a sort of epitaph delivered by a passing sailor. The fear (*timor*, 28) which Paetus' death forebodes balances Orithyia's fear (*timor*, 13) at the hands of Aquilo. The irony of 29-30, caused ostensibly by the speaker's grief, marks a transition to a diatribe on wealth and leads into the third section. In 31-46 the speaker's grief leads him to expostulate on man's greed and impiety. Just as in section 2, a pair of questions is followed by a
general statement in the first four distichs followed by a two
couplet mythological account of Ulysses' tears for his lost
companions and two couplets containing the speaker's reaction to the
account. *terra* (31, 46) marks the limits of mankind's proper
environment and also rounds off the third section. In the fourth
section (47-72) the speaker completes the story of Paetus' 
drowning. The first five distichs offer a description of Paetus
just before death, and the next four relate his final words. This
time it is the dying man--rather than the narrator--who utters a
pair of questions to the gods of the Aegean followed by a general
statement. But the speaker takes over again, narrating Paetus'
death in one couplet and then calling on the Nereids and Thetis. He
ends by admonishing the nymphs for not helping the young man and
then by stating his own reluctance to go to sea: he would rather lie
*ineras* before the doors of his mistress.

These structural building blocks (narrative and questions,
mythology, narrator's reaction), especially in the last three
sections, provide a framework for the development of several
themes. First, in the more narrative sections the forces of the sea
engulf more and more of the natural world, encroach more and more
upon the land, so that when Paetus is about to die, the only source
of safety is a *parvum lignum* (53), an insignificant, yet symbolic
piece of *terra firma*. Second, with each mythological example the
destructiveness of water increases until Paetus dies: first comes
the delay of Achaeans from Aulis because of the death of
Argyronnus, then the same fleet is demolished upon its return to Cape
Caphareus off Euboea. Paetus then becomes a second Ulysses, the lone survivor, in his fight against the watery elements. Yet even the sea nymphs who saved Ulysses offer Paetus no help, though they should have, according to the narrator. Third, the speaker utilizes a large number of techniques and themes found in Roman epicedia—thoughts on the inevitability of death, indignation against destiny and the gods, and the hope that the dead will eventually be received by the gods. Yet by the third section these words of comfort give way to criticism of mankind and Ulysses in the third section and then of the Nereids and implicitly Paetus at the end of the fourth. Finally, the poem moves from life (vitae, 1) to death (condar, 72).

The opening twelve lines read like an epigram which precedes the rest of the poem and which introduces the themes and images of the poem:60

Ergo sollicitae tu causa, pecunia, vitae!
per te inmaturum mortis adimus iter.
tu vitiis hominum crudelia pabula praebes;
semina curarum de capite orta tuo.
tu Paetum ad Pharios tendentem linteae portus
obruis insano terque quaterque mari.
nam dum te sequitur, primo miser excidit aevum
et nova longinquus piscibus esca natat;
et mater non iusta piae dare debita terrae
nec pote cognatos inter humare rogos,
sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa marinae,
nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est.

(3.7.1-12)

In the first two couplets we learn that pecunia is responsible for an anxious life (sollicitae vitae, 1) and an early death (inmaturum mortis ... iter, 2). Such is the influence of pecunia that even attributes of growth and life have been perverted. Instead of
providing the food of life, it offers vitis hominum crudelia pabula (3) and instead of the seeds of life, it sows semina curarum (4). In short, it has appropriated life, travel, and the sources of life.

With the introduction of Paetus in the second pair of couplets, the scene shifts from images of the earth, its roads, its means of life (iter, pabula, and semina) to those of the sea (tendentem lintea, 5; piscibus esca, 8). And even though pecunia is the primary cause for Paetus’ demise (obruis, 6), the sea acts in tandem with pecunia as its agent of destruction (insano ... mari, 6). Indeed, the rhythm of terque quaterque mari represents in words the regular rhythm of the sea washing over Paetus out at sea. More importantly, Paetus becomes a specific instance of pecunia’s propensity for destruction and the perversion of the sources of life. He dies in the prime of life (primo ... excidit aevoc, 7) and becomes food for faraway fish (longinquus piscibus esca, 8). The apostrophe to pecunia (tu/te refers to pecunia in each of the first four hexameters as well as in the first pentameter) and the allusion to its haunts and powers suggests that the speaker thinks of pecunia as some kind of malevolent deity, a god so powerful that Paetus had no chance of surviving. Such is the power of pecunia that by the time we learn that Paetus had pursued wealth (dum te sequitur, 7), it is no longer clear that he was in control. Such a situation could only evoke our sympathy for the young man cut off in the bloom of youth.
By now the epigrammatic nature of the first eight lines should be clear. In the first couplet, life (vitae, 1) opposes death (mortis, 2). Images of land (iter, 2; pabula, 3; semina, 4) fill the first two couplets while counter-images of the sea (tendentem lintea, 5; piscibus esca, 8) occur in the second pair of couplets. Moreover, pecunia’s haunts (roads) and power over the means of life are generalized in the first two distichs but particularized in the second pair. Finally, the juxtaposition of tu [pecunia] Paetum (5) at the beginning of the second pair of distichs underscores the transition from generalization to particularization and points to the opposition between the two figures. Even though pecunia’s power extends over life, death, land, and sea, its contrast with Paetus, the victim of its fury and the symbol of life, emphasizes its destructive qualities and its alliance with the sea.

Once pecunia has accomplished its destructive task and Paetus’ death has been assured, it no longer needs to be specifically mentioned. Indeed, the second pair of couplets (5-8) reveals the poet shifting the emphasis from pecunia to Paetus. In lines 5-6, pecunia still acts as the subject and Paetus the receiver of pecunia’s actions (tu Paetum .../obruis, 5-6). But in 7-8, their roles are reversed (dum te sequitur, 7) so that the speaker can isolate Paetus in his helplessness as he dies and floats upon the water (primo miser excidit aevo/ et nova longinquus piscibus esca natat, 7-8). Now there remains only what will happen to the corpse. Although the youth’s mother would like to honor him with proper funeral rites (9-10), his grave will be attended only by the
birds of the sea. Earth which is pia (9) will not cover his body; instead, the Carpathian sea will act as his tumulus (12). In isolating Paetus in 9-12, the narrator reduces pecunia to the visible symbols of its power, the watery elements, and aligns Paetus with the land, since that should be his proper resting place. Moreover, the shift from pecunia to Paetus which we observed in 5-8 allows the narrator, moved to pity through the mention of his mother in 9-10, to refer to Paetus in the second person in 11-12, thereby increasing the audience's sympathy for the young man.

The chiastic effect of the third pair of distichs (9-12) emphasizes the opposition between land and sea as the young man's proper resting place. Earth (terrae 9), which ends the first line, and sea (mare, 12), which ends the fourth, frame the section. Similarly, the chiasmus cognatos... rogos (10) and volucres... marinae (11), placed either before the caesura or at the end of each line, adds emphasis to the fact that the relatives who should offer last rites to Paetus have been replaced by the birds that hover (astant 11) over his bones. The bones (ossa 11) which should be buried in the earth (humare 10)—both words second last in the line—cannot be on the sea. And the first words of the two framing lines, et mater (9) and nunc reveal the depersonalizing effect of the sea—the mother should (debita) offer last rites for her son, but as it is now (nunc) there is no one on the sea to do this. The specificity of person and rites has been replaced by the impersonality and immensity of the entire Carpathian sea (omne mare 12). In the process of developing this contrast, the narrator is
able to increase the audience’s sense of fellow-feeling with Paetus because of his powerlessness to withstand the sea and implicitly pecunia.

Furthermore, the proper order of affairs has been perverted just as we saw in 1-4, but now it is particularized: Paetus will not receive a proper burial on pia terra at his mother’s hands. Instead, the sea and its destructive qualities have taken over all of the earth’s proper functions: the food it produces for its inhabitants is human (8) and the symbolism of piling earth upon the dead is taken away from the land and given to the sea (12): the very word for tomb that implies earth being piled high—tumulus—is applied to Paetus’ grave on the seas (12). In short, the pervasiveness of death in 9-12, both on land and sea, adds to Paetus’ pathos and completes the speaker’s epigrammatic introduction to the poem. Yet the ultimate victory of the sea in 11-12 paves the way for the next section which opens with two questions addressed to the gods of storm and sea, Aquilo and Neptune.

In lines 13-28, the speaker’s indignation against the forces of nature continues and he continues to utilize motifs from dirge and epigram:

infelix Aquilo, raptae timor Orithyiae,  
quae spolia ex illo tanta fuere tibi?  
aut quidnam fracta gaudes, Neptune, carina?  
portabat sanctos alveus ille viros.
Paete, quid aetatem numeras? quid cara natanti mater in ore tibi est? non habet unda deos.  
nam tibi nocturnis ad saxa ligata procellis  
omnia detrito vincula fune cadunt.  
sunt Agamemnonias testantia litora curas,  
quae notat Argynnus, praeda minantis aquae:
hoc iuvene amisso classem non solvit Atrides, pro qua mactata est Iphigenia mora. reddat corpus humo, posita est in gurgite vita; Paetum sponte tua, vilis harena, tegas, et quotiens Paeti transibit nauta sepulcrum, dicat: 'et audaci tu timor esse potes.'

The two questions which open the section are reminiscent of epicedia in that they reveal the speaker's indignation, yet his bafflement why the gods would allow such a terrible act: that ship was carrying sancti viri, men who were under a vow to the two gods. The extraordinary avariciousness of Aquilo (tanta, 14) and the haughtiness of Neptune (gaudes, 15) personify the sea's power and extend its quality of engulfing everything with which it comes in contact, a quality which we noted in 5-12. We also realize that the speaker has returned to the climactic point of the story. The imperfect portabat (16) indicates that Paetus' crew has perished, but the questions addressed to Paetus in the present tense (quid ... numeras? 17; quid ... est? 17-18) suggest that, though tossed upon the waves (natanti, 17), he is still alive and is calling upon his mother in despair.

The parallel form—apostrophe, two questions, statement—highlights the differences between the gods and Paetus. Aquilo is concerned with how many spoils he will win from the wreckage (quae spolia ... tanta fuere tibi, 14) while Paetus counts only his brief span of years (quid aetatem numeras, 17). Neptune rejoices (gaudes, 15) while Paetus calls on his mother (mater in ore, 18). Most importantly, the statement which follows each pair of questions unexpectedly contrasts the piety of men with the impiety of the
gods. Since Aquilo and Neptune fail to fulfill the vows of Paetus' crew by wrecking their ship, the waves no longer appear to have any gods (non habet unda deos, 18). It is useless to try to evoke their pity by reminding them of one's youthfulness or one's mother. Although the references to the victim's age or relatives regularly evoke pity in epicedia, in the face of such devastation, the speaker can only be pessimistic. Indeed, as if to prove his point, the speaker eliminates any reference to the gods in 19-20. His flashback to the beginning of the storm mentions Aquilo only in his unpersonified form (procellis, 19). Furthermore, the fierceness and greed of the wind in 19-20, robbing the land of everything that was securely anchored, prepare us for the example of Argynnus yet to come and implicitly provide a counterpoint to the calm before the Greeks departed from Aulis.

The second half of the section, also eight lines, uses a mythological exemplum, a prayer, and a motif from sepulchral epigram—the passing sailor. Each item adds to the contrast between the powerlessness of Paetus and the savagery and avarice of the sea. Agamemnon's young boyfriend Argynnus, drowned in the river Cephisus, becomes the booty (praeda, 22) of water. And because of his death more death results, for Agamemnon refuses to let the Greek fleet sail for Troy while he is still in mourning and ultimately must kill his own daughter for the delay. The deaths of Argynnus and Iphigenia, two such youthful victims, foreshadow Paetus'. Although Paetus was still crying for help in 13-20, the narrator now assumes the worse. Yet his only response is a polite request to the
sea, so polite that he not only uses the subjunctive, but also refrains from mentioning the name of the force petitioned. Indeed, he essentially grants that the sea controls life (posita est in gurgite vita, 25); therefore, it is up to the sea to return what is dead to the earth so that vilis harena (26) might cover the corpse. Death (corpus, 25) is juxtaposed with life (vita, 25); water (aqua, 22; gurgite, 25) opposes land (litora, 21); motion (in gurgite, 25) is contrasted with motionlessness (tegas, 26). The same elements which we saw in the opening section are recorded, but in the speaker's attempt to salvage the corpse, land is no longer pia (9), but vilis (26).

The speaker's view of Paetus' drowning, reported through the sailor's epitaph, is no more optimistic. Normally in the motif of the tomb addressing the passerby, the viator is asked to convey a message, usually of comfort, to the dead man's family or, at the very least, a description of where and how he has died. Instead, the sailor speaks and it is hardly comforting: et audaci tu timor esse potes (28). Moreover, the sepulcrum is typically a cenotaph for someone who has not yet made it to shore, but Paetus' sepulcrum is the entire Carpathian sea. Thus, the second section ends on a note similar to the first, with the image of the vast immensity of the sea swirling, churning, and despite the expectation, no message of hope, only the heavy reiteration of Paetus' fate.
In the third section, lines 29-46, the speaker, spurred by his reference to the passing sailor, increases the size of his audience by addressing all mankind with a series of sententiae and the example of Ulysses:

ite, rates curvas et leti texite causas:  
esta per humanas mors venit acta manus.  
terra parum fuerat, fatis adiecimus undas:  
fortunae miseras auximus arte vias.  
ancora te teneat, quem non tenuere penates?  
quid meritum dicas, cui sua terra parum est?  
ventorum est, quodcumque paras: haut ulla carina  
consennuit, fallit portus et ipse fidem.  
natura insidians pontum substravit avaris:  
ult tibi succedat, vix semel esse potest.  
saxa triumphales fregere Capharea puppes,  
naufraga cum vasto Graecia tracta salo est.  
 paulatim socium iacturam flevit Ulixes  
in mare, cui soliti non valuere doli.  
quodsi contentus patrio bove verteret agros  
verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea,  
viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penates,  
apauper, at in terra, nil ubi flere potest.  
(3.7.29-46)

Now near the midpoint of the poem, the speaker's despair appears to give way to irony, and the imperatives startle in comparison with his politeness in 25-26. Employing a favorite trope of rhetoric, he enjoins men to do what he actually condemns: "go ahead, build curved ships and weave methods of destruction" (29). The sailor who has just pronounced Paetus' epitaph seems to have no regard for the warning he has just uttered. Thus, the narrator addresses him, but also all mankind, as the plural imperatives indicate. The pentameter confirms his despair and sets the theme for the entire passage: "death comes through human hands" (30). The bitter vehemence and irony of the narrator's words and his accusation not just of the elements or of greed, but of all mankind, allow the
seeds of doubt about the sincerity of his lament for Paetus to enter our minds.

Following this keynote couplet are two couplets in which the themes of the first section return. *terra parum* (31, 34) begin and end the section, reiterating the theme of the smallness of the earth in comparison with the sea. *terra* and *undas*, moreover, frame the first line (31) and circumscribe the two elements in conflict, yet unlike the previous passages, it is not the sea which receives all the blame, but mankind: *fortunae miserae auximus arte vias* (32). The travel imagery, the use of the first person plural is reminiscent of the first pentameter of the poem (*per te inmaturum mortis adimus iter*, 2). But because of the speaker's condemnatory style, we no longer credit the use of the first person plural as an attempt to console by saying, in effect, that we all must die sometime. Instead, *fortunae* and *auximus* have connotations of avarice which was not so explicit in line 2.70 Clearly, all people are being implicated in the pursuit of wealth.

The second couplet introduces a pair of rhetorical questions which recall the pairs of questions to Aquilo and Neptune and to Paetus in the previous section. Metonymies of sea (*ancora*) and land (*penates*) bracket the first question (33) and seem to frame the question as in section two, but the repetition of *teneat-tenuere* in the same line reveals the new intent: the earth is too small (*terra parum* 31, 34), the speaker concludes, not because man has chosen the sea over the land, but because he has chosen grasping for wealth (*tenere*) over stability and the *mos maiorum* (*penates*). Finally, the
irony of the two queries acts as a reminder of his irony at the beginning of the section (29), but is now more pointed. He no longer addresses all mankind with the second person plural, but instead particularizes his accusations to an individual with his use of the second person singular (te, 33; dicas, 34. Cf. also paras, 35; tibi, 38).

The ambiguity of the second question is answered in the next two couplets. The answer to "What does man deserve (meritum, 34)?" depends on who answers the question. But the speaker's response is equally ambiguous. The grammatical subject of est (35) is the relative clause quodcumque paras, but its postponement until after the main clause causes the listener to think first that its subject is the individual to whom the question was put in the previous line. Thus, the response allows for both man and his inventions to be subject to the wind's dominance. Furthermore, man will continue to be possessive (avaris, 37), but only nature will have ultimate possession of whatever man creates. By the second couplet (37-38), it is not just men that are to blame, no longer just the winds and the sea, but all of nature (natura, 37) is greedy, for it ensnares men who are greedy by laying a road (substravit, 37) for them, namely the road to death (mortis iter, 2).

As in the second section, the speaker now introduces two interrelated exempla from epic, first the destruction of the Greek fleet upon its return from Troy just before it reaches the promontory Caphareus off of Euboea (39-40), then the weeping of Ulysses at the loss of his companions (41-42). At first the exempla
do not seem very apt, except that Ulysses' men died by drowning just as Argynnus, just as Paetus. Yet, after the narrator's emphasis upon the greed of men and nature's way of repaying them in the previous lines, the epithet triumphalis conjures up a Roman fleet returning from a successful expedition in the East laden with spoils. And naufraga (40) recalls Neptune's delight in fracta... carina (15). As in the first exemplum from the Trojan cycle, this one enlarges the scope of the dilemma through time. Even in the mythical past, man has always been avaricious.

The narrator's reaction to this exemplum offers a contrast to his reaction at the end of section two. There he was moved by the deaths of Argynnus and Iphigenia and politely requested the return of Paetus' body. Now he appears to address the lone survivor of Greek fleet, Ulysses, apparently alluding to Ulysses' ruse to escape enlistment in the Greek army which was to fight at Troy: if he had kept to the plow and considered my advice, he would live happily at home, close to his household gods. Although the narrator uses the second person singular to address the Greek hero, coming so soon after his castigation of individual men in 33-36, we can only conclude that he continues to admonish them through the example of greed par excellence, Ulysses. Indeed, the repetition of tu/tuus throughout the third section not only emphasizes man's guilt for seeking riches, it also recalls the many times the speaker used it of pecunia itself in the opening lines. What began as a lament seems to have been transformed into a diatribe.
The last section, 47-72, returns explicitly to Paetus and the picture sketched of Paetus in the 2nd section is now completed:

non tulit hunc Paetus stridorem audire procellae
et duro teneras laedere fune manus,
sed thyio thalamo aut Oricia terebintho
effultum pluma versicolore caput. 50
huic fluctus vivo radicitus abstulit ungues,
et miser invisam traxit hiatus aquam;
hunc parvo ferri vidit nox inproba ligno:
Paetus ut occideret, tot coiere mala.
flens tamen extremis dedit haec mandata querelis,
cum moribunda niger clauderet ora liquor:
' di maris Aegaei, quos sunt penes aequora, venti,
et quaecumque meum degravat unda caput,
quo rapitis miserros primae lanuginis annos?
attulimus nocuas in freta vestra manus? 60
ah miser alcyonum scopolis affligar acutis,
in me caeruleo fuscina sumpta deo est.
at saltem Italiæ regionibus evehat aestus:
hoc de me sat erit, si modo matris erit.' 
subtrahit haec fantem torta vertigine fluctus;
ultima quae Paeto voxque diesque fuit.
o centum aequoreae Nereo genitore puellae,
et tu, materno tracta dolore, Theti,
vos decuit lasso supponere bracchia mento:
on poterat ille gravare manus. 70
at tu, saeve Aquilo, numquam mea vela videbis:
ante fores dominae condar oportet iners.

Although the speaker seemed to have given up Paetus for dead after the first mythological exemplum of Argynnus and Iphigenia, we recall that the young man was still crying out for help in 17-18. But coming after the second mythological exemplum of Ulysses, we are meant to think of the drowning man as a second Ulysses. Indeed several images in the passage recall the Greek hero, his crew all dead, weathering the storm in *Odyssey* 5. After his ship wrecked and his men drowned, Ulysses, like Paetus, was kept afloat on a slight plank of wood (*Od. 5.370-371*) *parvo ligne*, 53). Ulysses, too, was nearly thrown against the rocky coast (*Od. 5.401-405*) as Paetus
implies in his prayer that he himself was (61). The epic hero also 
prays that he might reach shore (Od. 5.445-450). Moreover, the 
repetition of flere just before he utters his prayer (55) recalls 
Ulysses weeping in section three (41). Finally, epic diction and 
syntax calls the world of epic poetry to mind, especially in the 
lines immediately before and after Paetus’ dying prayer: flens ...
haec mandata, 55; penes, 56; quaecumque degravat, 58; quo rapitis, 
59; caeruleo deo, 62; evchat aestus, 63. And in the couplet after 
his speech (65-66) there are the matter-of-fact statement of his 
drowning (subtrahit), a formula for speaking (haec fantem), fluctus 
for unda, and finally the formula -que ... -que.

But the similarity between Ulysses and Paetus is not meant to 
be complimentary. The narrator has just finished admonishing 
Ulysses and those who travel after gain, having characterized the 
Greek ships as triumphales puppes (39). Indeed, Ulysses himself was 
well-known, at least from the fifth century on, as an archetype for 
the avaricious man. Now the speaker pictures Paetus in a bedchamber 
panelled with special and exotic woods (thyio thalamo aut Oricia 
terebintho, 49), his head propped up by a multi-colored pillow 
(effultum pluma versicolore caput, 50), suggestions of exceptional 
luxury. Moreover, the repetition of flere just before Paetus utters 
his prayer (55) not only recalls Ulysses’ grief at the loss of his 
companions (flevit, 41), but also the narrator’s stern words to 
those who tempt nature through their sea-voyages in pursuit of 
wealth: viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penates,/ pauper, at in 
terra, nil ubi flere potest (45-46). Although he has not yet
explicitly condemned Paetus as he did Ulysses and those who travel after wealth, he is clearly drawing unfavorable parallels between Paetus and a Greek hero who represents the lust for pecunia.

There are other indications that Paetus' fate in section four exemplifies the general statements made by the narrator in 35-38. By ending the first line with procellae (47) he reminds us of the destructive and greedy winds we have already seen (13, 19, 35), to which belongs everything. The juxtaposition/combination of fluctus vivo radicitus (51) reminds us of the contrast between the destructiveness of the waves and the life-giving qualities of the earth: the wave tears away his nails by the root from the living flesh (huic fluctus vivo radicitus abstulit inques 51). Indeed, the hateful water (invisam ... aquam 52) has taken over all life and all land so that the only piece of land left to Paetus is a single, small piece of wood (parvo ligno 53) to which he clings precariously. The darkness of night (nox 53) and wave (niger liquor 56) foreshadowed by nocturnis procellis (20), join forces to symbolize Paetus' demise. And the lips (ore 18) which pleaded "mother" now make their final prayer.

In the prayer which follows (57-64), Paetus in his own words follows the pattern of apostrophe, pair of questions, statement, previously spoken only by the narrator. He begins by addressing the two gods previously addressed in section two, Aquilo and Neptune, but now in their natural forms as venti (57) and unda (58). Yet his questions pick up the tone and content of the narrator's second pair of questions, those to the drowning youth: miseròs prìmae lanuginis
annos (59) recalls quid aetatem numeras? (17). His second question—"Did I bring destructive hands against your waters?"—is even more naive and pathetic, yet the placement of manus at the end of the line reminds us of the beginning of the third section: ista per humanas mors venit acta manus (30). Of course, Paetus did not intend any harm, but the all-engulfing sea does not care: "devious nature paves for the greedy a path to destruction" (cf. 37). The passivity of the young man's statements after his questions underscores his helplessness to counter the greed of nature: he is wounded by rocks (61), Neptune's trident is picked up and used against him (62). Even his final plea to be washed ashore so that his mother might have his corpse indicates his powerlessness: "may the seething waters carry me home to Italy." While the youth's helplessness was the primary element in evoking our pity in the first half of the poem, after the narrator's diatribe in section three, it now serves primarily to emphasize the precariousness of existence for those who travel the seas.

Yet in spite of the speaker's condemnation of those who travel the seas, in the last part of the final section he seems moved by Paetus' prayer and death. He now turns to specifically friendly divinities, the Nereids, including one who has felt grief before, Thetis, to make his own prayer. The epic language signaling the close of Paetus' prayer in 65-66 is continued in the speaker's address to the Nereids and marks it as the final mythological exemplum of the poem. They are given a genealogy through the patronymic Nereo genitore (67) as well as an epithet aequoreae
The speaker reminds Thetis of her own maternal pleading at the foot of Jove on behalf of her son Achilles (**materno tracta dolore**, 68). We now expect a proper request like the one he delivered after the first exemplum in 25-26; instead, the speaker chides the Nereids for not ferrying the corpse to shore: "you should have supported his limbs; he couldn't have weighed down your your hands" (69-70). Yet his final mythological example proves his point. Though presumably friendly and easily moved by maternal love, they remain part of the sea, and as sea deities they will not release Paetus' body.

Their actions have confounded his earlier request in 25-26 to return the body to shore. Now in the final couplet of the poem (71-72), he takes to heart the passing sailor's epitaph for Paetus: 'et audaci tu timor esse potes' (28). He says that he will never go to sea; instead he must stay near his mistress. In short, he contrasts his manner of life with Paetus'. In so doing he explicitly condemns Paetus' lifestyle and consequently Paetus himself. The speaker prefers the earth to the sea (**numquam mea vela videbis**, 71) and stability (**ante fores ... condar ... iners**, 72) to travel. And the categorical nature of his rejection of Paetus' way of life (**numquam**, 71) and the necessity of pursuing his own (**oportet**, 72) allows no room for any other except his own.

To be sure, the intrusion of the first person (**mea**, 71; **condar**, 72) impresses the narrator's presence upon us now, but it also reminds us of his presence throughout the elegy. Perhaps we realize that he was already preparing us for his condemnation of
Paetus and his lifestyle from the beginning of the poem. He had said that Paetus pursued wealth (*dum te sequitur*, 7), but at the time it appeared only to be an attendant circumstance to Paetus' death. In retrospect, the phrase carries more weight. Furthermore, it was not accidental that the speaker addressed Paetus in line 11 with no more preparation than the second person possessive adjective *tua*. After the repeated use of the second person pronoun to refer to *pecunia* in the first eight lines (six times in eight lines), he wants us to associate *pecunia* with Paetus, if only for a moment, in order to link the pursuit of wealth with Paetus' downfall. Later after he has addressed Paetus more directly with a pair of questions (17-18) and had a sailor address him (28), he confronts the individual auditor of his poem with his questions and comments in the second person singular once again (*te*, 33; *dicas*, 34; *paras*, 35; *tibi*, 38). Admittedly, he has broadened his appeal to all men with the ironical imperatives in 29 (*ite, rates curvas et leti texite causas*) and all-inclusive statement in 30 (*ista per humanas mors venit acta manus*), but his return to the second singular in 33-38 reminds us that Paetus' traveling upon the sea is perhaps not so different from that of all other men.

He then recounts the destruction of the Greek fleet at Cape Caphareus and Ulysses' grief (39-42), only to criticize the hero for not heeding his words (*verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea*, 44). Most consider the passage to refer only to Ulysses. Yet inasmuch as Ulysses is an archetype for the avaricious man, the use of the singular should also include the individual auditor who was
specifically addressed and admonished in the six lines preceding the exemplum. Further, the lines anticipate the speaker's rejection of Paetus in the fourth section, not just because the speaker's portrait of Paetus in section four deliberately calls Ulysses to mind, but also because of what the speaker says in these four lines. The apodosis of the contrary-to-fact condition applies more aptly to Paetus than to anyone else: *viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penates* (45). The repetition of the idea of living in *viveret* and *conviva* underlines the fact that the speaker thinks of Paetus as dead. "But he would be alive as my table companion, if he had heeded my words." Ulysses, on the other hand, does not perish as the result of his sea voyage, and he does return to his ancestral hearth. Thus, editors who see that the speaker's chiding words refer also to Paetus are right. Though his words most naturally refer to Ulysses, implicitly they fit Paetus just as well and prepare us for his final rejection of Paetus and his lifestyle at the end of the poem.78

Yet the final two lines do more than condemn Paetus' way of life. They introduce an alternative manner of living, that of the elegiac lover:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{at tu, saeve Aquilo, numquam mea vela videbis:} \\
\text{ante fores dominae condar oportet iners.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.7.71-72)

The allusion to Aquilo ties the passage neatly with preceding lines since Aquilo is associated with the destructiveness of the sea, yet he was also named earlier as the ravisher of Orithyia (13). The *fores dominae* not only suggest land, houses and doors, but also
reveal an unmistakable reference to lover’s trysts and
paraclausithyra. Vela not only implies travel but also the reason
why: the hope for fine linens and silks. Iners evokes the
stability of earth as well as the characteristic lover’s desire for
otium. Condar, especially when linked with iners, not only means
"lie hidden" or "fix firmly," but also "be buried," an example of
the lover’s commitment up to and including death. The speaker,
therefore, not only criticizes, but proposes an alternative
lifestyle. If Paetus had only lived the vita iners of a lover, he
would be safely buried at home, no longer bait for fish, no longer
crying for his mother.

The references to the lover’s burial and his domina and their
association with the elegiac way of life summon us back to the
opening lines to reexamine them from the perspective of the speaker
in the last line. The imagery of the final lines links them with
the opening of the elegy. Condar (72) opposes vita (1) and suggests
mortis (2), iners (72) contrasts sollicitae (1). Moreover, vela
(71) echoes lintea (5), saeve (71) recalls crudelia (3). More
importantly, we realize in the light of the speaker’s elegiac
stance, that the opening lines are charged with elegiac amatory
vocabulary that force us to reinterpret the dichotomies anew.
Sollicita vita is not only a life of worrisome concern, but the
elegiac life of love. For example, in the paraclausithyron in 1.16,
the door reports the lover’s complaint about anguished delays
(sollicitas... moras, 1.16.40) caused by his mistress. And in his
prayer to Bacchus, Propertius asks for a wine-induced sleep to
relieve his head from the anxiety of love: atque hoc sollicitum
vince sopore caput (3.17.42). Vitium (3) too is a lover's word,
synonymous with amor and suggestive of love as a disease. For
eexample, in 2.1.65, after describing his love sickness (57-64), the
speaker says that if someone can take away this vitium, he alone
will be able to put the apple in the hand of Tantalus. Again in
3.17 Bacchus is asked to release love-sickness (vitium, 6) from the
speaker's heart. And in 1.16, the lover protests that he is
slandered by his mistress' love affairs (vitiis, 47) with other men.

The references to sollicita vita, vitium, and also cura (4) in
conjunction with the sea call to mind the familiar motif of the Sea
of Love with its perils. It occurs in Propertius as well as in many
other ancient writers: the waters of Baiae are treacherous for
lovers (1.11.9-14). In Book 2 we learn that the prospering winds of
love are deceitful (mendaces ludunt flatus in amore secundi,
2.25.27); better to keep one's sails trimmed when it comes to love
(in tacito cohibe gaudia clausa sinu, 30). And in 3.7, the forces
of the sea are depicted as jealous lovers. In line 6 the sea is
insanum, a word commonly used in love poetry to depict a love-sick
lover. In 13 the speaker thinks it important to depict the North
Wind as the ravisher of Orithyia. Even nocturnal gales are said to
loosen the chains (vincula, 20) which normally bind a lover to his
mistress (19-20). Argynnus is described as the loot of threatening
water (praeda minantis aquae, 22), just as Orithyia was part of
Aquilo's spoils (spolia, 14). Finally, the port, normally a haven,
is deceptive and untrustworthy (fallit portus et ipse fidem, 36).
The sea, personified as a jealous lover, will not let Paetus return with his gifts for another girl. It takes him and the gifts together as its spoils.

The mythological exempla from epic also provide parallels which suggest Paetus is an elegiac lover. To begin with, all three exempla refer to the Trojan War, a war noted not only by the avarice of the Greeks, but initiated in order to win back a woman. In the first exemplum, even though Argynnus, like Paetus, drowns, Agamemnon is meant as the true point of comparison: he is mentioned twice in the four lines and is the acting subject in both couplets. And in the first line of the exemplum the speaker introduces Agamemnon as an elegiac lover, using the special word of lovers—curae—to refer to his love for Argynnus (Agamemnonias ... curae, 21). In the second couplet, the delay (mora [24] is a word often used of lover's trysts) which results from Agamemnon's meeting with his young boyfriend (hoc iuvene, 23) is responsible for Iphigenia's death.

Ulysses, too, was known not just for his greed, but also for his amorous exploits. Propertius was quite aware that Calypso, Circe, and Nausicaa had fallen in love with him and plays with the idea of his infidelity in contrast with Penelope's commitment. Moreover, in 2.26.37-38 Propertius compares himself with the hero and promises to endure just as many trials and sufferings as miser Ulysses.

Ulysses, like Agamemnon, eventually tests the sea in search of wealth and of love instead of remaining content (contentus, 43) before sweet (dulcis, another word from erotic elegy) Penates. His failure too is explained with elegiac vocabulary. Just as Agamemnon
and Ulysses search for love, so does Paetus. In the third exemplum (67-70) the story of Thetis’ pleading for Achilles at Jove’s feet implies another story, that of the love affair between Jove and Thetis which only ended because of the oracle which said that Thetis’ offspring would be greater than the father.

As we saw earlier, Paetus’ link with Ulysses as hero through epic vocabulary and allusions has certainly added to our understanding of Paetus as a traveler in search of wealth. Yet there is another level to the comparison. What was implied in regard to Ulysses’ amorous adventures becomes explicit in Paetus’ case and informs our picture of Ulysses. In 47-66, he is depicted in the elegiac vocabulary of a lover. His youthfulness is more than a reason to pity him, it turns out. It is a sign that he is a juvenis, one whose hands are slender (teneras ... manus, 48), who utters lover’s complaints (querelis, 55) and weeps (flens, 55), whose characteristic epithet is miser (52, 59, 61). His plush accommodations recall Propertius’ description of Cynthia enjoying the fruits of others’ labors on the banks of the Tiber in the opening of 1.14. His prayer to the wind, using the word which describes Aquilo’s abduction of Orithyia (quo rapitis? 59; raptae timor Orithyiae, 13), indicates that he is praying to a god who will be less than helpful. In short, his prayer to the gods of the sea, the winds, and the waves is to the wrong divinities. His patron divinity as lover should be the aequoreae Nereo genitore puellae (67). Instead, it takes the narrator, the only true lover in the poem, to know to whom to address in prayer.
In short, the speaker in the final couplet has not only contrasted his elegiac lifestyle with Paetus' search for wealth, but he has contrasted his pursuit of the vita iners with Paetus' pursuit of a sollicita vita, the kind of lifestyle which Propertius as poet and lover in the first two books has followed. Paetus' pursuit of wealth on the high seas coupled with the elegiac vocabulary which infuses the poem encourages us to evaluate Paetus in terms of the iter amoris. Described as an elegiac lover, Paetus can only be ultimately in pursuit of one thing, love.

Why does Paetus, according to the speaker (the "true" elegiac lover), fail as a lover? The images of line 72—the lover buried at the door of his mistress—epitomize the vita iners of the true lover. The true lover's life ordains a two-fold commitment—to remain with his mistress until death and to put love for her before all else, including family and country. For example, in 1.6, spurred by the possibility of Tullus dying for his country, Propertius counters it with his own faithful love until death (1.6.27f.). In 2.1.43-46, Propertius identifies his death for love's sake with death for country: laus in amore mori (47). In another poem to Tullus in Book 1, he asks that the joys of being with Cynthia last until the fates decree his death: Quae maneant, dum me fata perire volent (1.14.14). And again, in 2.15.36, he says, "hers will I be in life and hers in death" (huius ero vivus, mortuus huius ero).
In addition to the elegiac lover's promise of fidelity till death, the reference to *domina* in the final line points to another contrast between the speaker and Paetus. For the elegiac lover insists on replacing familial ties with love for his mistress. For example, Propertius says that he will act as a brother and a son to Cynthia: *frater ego et tibi sim filius unus ego* (2.18.34).

Similarly, he rhetorically asks Cynthia, "would I guard more anxiously my own dear mother [than you]?": *an mihi nunc maior carae custodia matris?* (1.11.21). And later in the same poem, he equates his love for Cynthia with his love for home and parents: *tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes* (1.11.23). Paetus has failed in both aspects of the *vita iners*. He has not stayed with his mistress until death. Instead, his tomb is the entire Carpathian sea, far from his mistress. His call for help to his mother (17-18), shows that despite the elegiac vocabulary that is used of him, he has not learned to live the elegiac life and to give up family for his mistress. And the exempla from the Trojan War show that Paetus' search for wealth, gifts for his mistress—perhaps well-intentioned—lead to his death. Yet elsewhere in Propertius, Love is said to shun riches (1.14.8, 15) and Cynthia is praised for preferring the poet-lover to the riches offered by rival lovers (1.8.31-40; 2.26.23-25). It is this lust for wealth, the chance to win the favor of women through things other than love, that ultimately destroys love affairs. Paetus, instead of being satisfied with his mistress' love, strained for new ports, new wealth, new women (5).
The narrator has decided that the journey which Propertius started back in 1.1 will no longer work. Pursuit only leads to trouble, and it rarely leads to love. Flight, if that is the case, is no better. Moreover, the narrator shows that he is correcting his view of the *iter amoris* through his allusions to other poems that deal with the *iter amoris*. At the end of 1.17, Propertius, wandering out at sea, after praying to Cynthia in the first half of the poem, addresses the Nereids as a substitute for Cynthia to help him sail back to safe shores. The speaker's address to the Nereids at the end of 3.7 is no prayer, but an admonishment: "You should have supported his limbs and kept him from drowning" (69). In retrospect, we realize that the Nereids are a part of the all-engulfing, greedy sea, that love-crazed (*insano*, 6) and jealous lover. It will not allow a lover to flee or pursue new love. In 2.26 Propertius indicates that he is willing to endure the trials of Greeks returning from Troy and of Ulysses for his beloved Cynthia. Moreover, he is sure that the gods of the sea will be favorable to the two lovers because they too were lovers once. The examples suggested, Neptune and Boreas, are the same divinities who were most responsible for *miser* Paetus' death. The *iter amoris* will not work, the speaker says in 71-72. Only the life without trouble close to one's mistress will work.
Chapter II: Notes

1 Only after he has denied its possibility in 3.7 does Propertius use the actual term *iter amoris* (3.15.4), and then only to refer to his affair with Lycinna.


3 Leach (1966) 220, n. 14, differentiates two types of journeys in Propertius: the desire to escape from love (represented by 1.1.29-30 and 1.6) and the journey of regeneration (represented by Milanion in 1.1.9-16). Yet as we have seen, the issue is not so clearly defined. Each of the poems which we will discuss will exhibit both aspects of the imagery of journey, flight and pursuit. Although Leach's observation about the two aspects of travel imagery is perceptive, she does not take her idea far enough, primarily because she does not take into account the writer's comments on and criticisms of the poet-lover.


138
6 See Cairns (1972) 1-16 on how Propertius inserts a scholiastic propempticon (1.6.5-18) within the general framework of the whole poem, an encomiastic propempticon.

7 On 1.8a as propempticon, see Kenneth Quinn, Latin Explorations (London 1963) 242-253 and Cairns (1972) 148-152; for a survey of the literature on 1.8, see John T. Davis, Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid, Noctes Romanae, 15 (Berne 1977) 27-38.

8 See Richardson 151-152 for a brief summary of the myths.


10 On the gradual dissolution of the affair, see King (1975-76) and Davis (1977) 40, n. 6.

11 Davis (1977) 40-42.


13 Solmsen (1962) 75-79 criticizes editors' biographical slant in trying to determine Propertius' intended destination and ultimate location in the poem. Yet Solmsen places Propertius stranded on a deserted shore. I would have to agree with Richardson 193-194 and Leach (1966) 216-217 that we cannot pin down Propertius' physical location since his topographical details are chosen more for their emotional coloring than their precise physical details.


15 Leach (1966) 219 points out that alcyones are inherently lonely since the origin of the birds is associated with love and separation (cf. Ovid, Her. 18.81; Met. 11.410-748); that the birds parallel the poet who also grieves for lost love; that they are the only living creatures in the landscape (desertas, 2); that they represent a wish by the poet for a navigable sea; and that the loneliness of the birds express Propertius' loneliness.

16 Enk 1:151 adopts solido in place of the corrupt solito; salvo (Butler and Barber, 179; Shackleton Bailey, 49-50; Camps 1:86; Richardson, 194) might be equally plausible.
Solmsen (1962) 77-80 emphasizes that Propertius’ flight is the result of Cynthia’s anger, while Leach (1966) 222-223 points out that Cynthia’s anger is her reaction to his flight. Neither, yet both are true. Propertius has set out to escape Cynthia (though probably not her wrath) as a cure for his love, yet while on the trip he realizes his mistake and attempts to woo her back by presenting his gradually worsening situation.

On the formal aspects of ancient Roman prayer, see Georgius Appel, De Romanorum Precationibus, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 7.2 (Giessen 1909; repr. Arno 1975); Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede (Berlin 1913; repr. Stuttgart 1956) 143-176.

1.17.11-12 has been the source of endless controversy. P.J. Enk, "De voce 'fatum' sensu minus usitate adhibita," Mnemosyne N.S. 42 (1914) 370-379; 44 (1916) 148, argues that the distich should express one idea with each verse filling out the meaning of the other. He explains that Propertius is probably referring to a cenotaph and that *mea fata* means *meos manes* in this context. Shackleton Bailey 50-51 and Richardson 195 argue against the complexity of Enk’s interpretation. Unfortunately, Shackleton Bailey resorts to emendation (*reposcere* for *reponere*), following Butler and Barber, 180. Solmsen (1962) 86, n. 39, and Richardson 195 offer the best solution, taking *reponere* as meaning "put aside," i.e. put out of one’s mind, or "to store away my death," i.e. file it away in an archive once it is accomplished.

Cf. OLD s.v. an2 l.b.

Leach (1966) 224 says that Propertius shifts the responsibility for his situation from himself to Cynthia. It is true that he is throwing the ball back into her court to see what she will do with it, but it is not primarily because he is blaming her. Moreover, Leach does not explain why Propertius is speaking so vaguely in these lines addressed to her. It is because he is trying to win back her favor without appearing too presumptuous, too censorious.

On *primus auctor*, see Enk 1:154 and F. Leo, Plautinische Forschungen (Berlin 1912) 152-154. On the formulaic nature of *a!*, see Alan Kershaw, "Emendation and Usage: Two readings in Propertius," CP 75 (1980) 71-72 and "A! and the Elegists: More Observations," CP 78 (1983) 232-233. Even though the phrase and idea is 'formulaic', Propertius has nonetheless decided to place it here to shift the blame for his peril onto a third party and to provide a transition from his second person address to Cynthia to his reflections about her in the second half. At the same time, *a! pereat* enhances the already predominant imagery of death in the elegy.
23 On the transition from second person address in 1.8a and 1.11 to more general reflections in 1.8b and 1.12, see Davis (1977) 45.

24 Richardson 195 notes that ignotis (17) implies that "the forest is not simply an unfamiliar one, but one without a sign of human life."

25 Butler and Barber 179.

26 Camps 1:88.

27 mansuetus is used of Amor in 1.9.12 and of the beloved's hands in 3.16.10.

28 Leach (1966) 228-229 sees the burial scene and the return to safer shores as signs of Propertius' acceptance of Rome and the civilized life as well as an acceptance of Cynthia. Yet the poem does not detail Propertius' progress in learning to accept Cynthia. He had already admitted his culpability in the first line (et merito). Instead, he is attempting to win back her devotion.

30 1.2.27-28; 1.3.42.

31 On the poet-lover's promises to die for his beloved, see e.g. 2.7.7-8; 2.13.35-36; 2.15.35-36, 2.20.15-18, 2.24.25-38.

32 On 2.26, see Colin Macleod, "Propertius 2.26," So 51 (1976) 131-136; Nancy Wiggers, "Variations on a Theme: Nightmare and Daydream in Propertius 2.26," Latomus 39 (1980) 121-128; Kenneth Quinn, Latin Explorations (London 1963) 187-197; A.W.F. Holleman, "Notes on Ovid Amores 1.3, Horace 1.14 and Propertius 2.26," CP 65 (1970) 177-180; Howard Jacobson, "Propertius 2.26a: The Poet as Lifesaver," QuCC 45 (1984) 137-140; Theodore D. Papanghelis, Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death (Cambridge 1987) 80-111. Before Macleod wrote, few editors had considered 2.26 as a unity. Macleod argues that lines 1-20, through the use of various devices found in propemptica, succeed in convincing Cynthia not to go abroad while the latter part of the poem is parallel to the poet's exultation in 1.8b. Moreover, 21-58 echo motifs from 1-20, especially Propertius' anxiety and fearfulness in 1-20 but also cushions these feelings through reassuring fantasies in which the gods are kindly and lovers are united. Wiggers also views the poem as a unity, as kind of a poetic triptych on Propertius' ambivalence towards love and his own capacity for personal involvement: 1-20 signifies Propertius' fear of failure, 28-58 his longing for a more complete realization of love while 21-28 acts as a touchstone for the relationship in the present. Unlike Macleod and Wiggers, who deal with the entire poem, Quinn examines only 1-20, emphasizing Propertius' irony at Cynthia's expense and how the poet mixes resentment at Cynthia with affection for her. Holleman and Jacobson
offer interpretations of lines 19-20. Holleman sees the couplet as occurring simultaneously with 17-18. Jacobson explains 19-20 by referring to the lovers' leap from the Leucadian rocks, a well-known, ancient cure for love. Papanghelas discusses only 2.26b, criticizing those who unduly spiritualize a poem "which is organized to a fleshly end" (93) and finding similarities between it and the Hero and Leander story.

33 Quinn (1963) 189-190.

34 Wiggers (1980) 123 notes Propertius in his roles as poet and lover, but thinks that they serve only to accentuate the emotional distance between the artist and his subject and that Propertius' aesthetic involvement precludes personal involvement in her suffering. While I think that this gap between art and real life exists, it is clear that the poet and lover are roles within the poem and that it is the writer who portrays this gap.

35 Quinn (1963) 192.

36 Holleman (1970) 179 suggests that Propertius might believe himself to be a Glaucus because of his "voluptuous longings." While this may be true and add to the poet's irony in these lines, Propertius also wants to stress that despite his playfulness, his prayers are sincere. For Glaucus as Scylla's faithful lover, see Ovid, Met. 13.900ff.

37 Holleman (1970) 179-180 notes that iamque (19) indicates a simultaneity of action that expresses a comparison: he is ready to leap into the water just as the dolphin which will rescue Arion. In order to bring out the comparative meaning by stressing the simultaneousness of iamque, he prefers either a comma or no punctuation at the end of 18. I have adopted the latter.


39 Jacobson (1984) 137-140 points out that examples of people rescuing drowning victims are extremely rare in the ancient world. It is better to think that Propertius is ready to make a lover's leap—in order to be with her in death, I might add.

40 For the best account of the mythology alluded to in these lines, see Enk 2:338-339.

41 See Enk 2:341-343.

On the Tarpeian Rock, see 4.4 and Butler and Barber 343-344.

Shackleton Bailey 117-118 interprets, as I do, *tuo corpora* as a simple locative ablative after *ponere*. Richardson 289 appears to understand that both lovers are dead. In this case, there is even less cause for optimism about love existing after death, for though the two lovers are united physically, their bodies retain no signs of life. See also Papanghelis (1987) 88-91.

Wiggers (1980) 123-125 emphasizes the gap between art and life and between poetic commitment and personal involvement in 1-20 but Propertius the poet, one of his roles in the poem, does not detect this dichotomy. Indeed, 21-28 makes clear that both poet and lover consider themselves successful. Only Propertius the writer, who stands outside the poem, pinpoints the dichotomy, and it is not between art and life, but between belief and reality, between his belief that she has repented and that he will die for her and the reality that it is a dream and he will never jump, even in the dream.

48 Macleod (1976) 131-133.


50 On Neptune and Amymone, see Enk 2:341. Wiggers (1980) 127 contrasts sensuality negatively expressed through the grotesque figures of Glaucus and the Nereids with the positive sexuality of Neptune and by implication, all the gods which follow. Yet Neptune is introduced as Jove's equal in love, *fratri par in amore lovi* (46), hardly an indication of positive sensuality since Jove was known for his amorous appetite. Cf. Cat. 7, 70, 72. With this introduction, it is not clear who presses on Amymone at first, Neptune or the satyr, since there is no agent attached to *compressa* (48). Moreover, *deus amplexu votum persolvit* (49) is ambiguous, too, for why is the god fulfilling a vow which was made by Amymone, not to mention, by means of an embrace? If Neptune can use this sort of logic to get his way in the mythological past, why will he not do it again with Cynthia?

51 On the Dioscuri and their abduction of Phoebe and Hilaira, see 1.2.15-16; Theoc. 22.137-212; Ovid, *Fast.* 5.699-720; Apollod. 3.11.2; Hyg. *Fab.* 80.

52 On Ino as Helle's persecutor, see Ovid, *Met.* 4.481-542; Apollod. 1.9.1-2, 3.4.3; Hyg. *Fab.* 4 and 5; Eustathius on *Il.* 7.86, p. 667 and on *Od.* 5.339, p. 1543; Paus. 1.44.7, 9.34.7.
53 On Glaucus as a notorious lady-killer, see Athen.
7.295b-297c; Ovid, Met. 13.900-14.74; Hyg. Fab. 199; Paus. 9.22.

54 On the rape of Orithyia by Boreas/Aquilo, see 1.20.25-31, 3.7.13; Apollod. 3.15.2; Hyg. Fab. 14, 19.

55 On Orion and the Pleiades, see 2.16.51; Hyg. Astr. 2.21. For Orion's other amours, see Parth. Erot. 20; Eratosthenes, Catasterism 32; Schol. on Aratus, Phaen. 322; Hyg. Astr. 2.34; Apollod. 1.4.3-5.

56 On the lasciviousness of goats, see e.g. Varro RR 2.3.9; Columella RR 7.6.3; Cat. 17.15, 69.6; Hor. Ç. 3.13.3-8; 3.15.12. Certainly the repetition of purus (56) is placed there by the writer to create doubt about how pure Orion and haedus are sexually. Cf. OLD s.v. purus 5.

57 The commentators and most critics are agreed in seeing the poem as a lament or epicedium for Paetus drowned at sea. Cf. Rothstein 2:48; Butler and Barber 275; Camps 3:82; Richardson 340. For a more thorough examination of the lament motif, see W. Kese, Untersuchungen zu Epikedeion und Consolatio in der römischen Dichtung (Diss. Göttingen 1950) 56-59. For Propertius' use of epigram, especially from Book 7 of the Greek Anthology, see Elmar Schulz-Vanheyden, Properz und das griechische Epigramm (Münster 1969) 58-65, and Margaret Hubbard, Propertius, Classical Life and Letters (London 1974) 12-24, 83-87. Beginning with Jose Esteve Forriol, Die Trauer- und Trostgedicht in der römischen Literatur untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz (Diss. München 1962) 119-120, and F. Robertson, "Lament for Paetus—Propertius 3.7," TAPA 100 (1969) 377-386 (who is apparently unaware of Esteve Forriol), discussions of 3.7 have shown more awareness of the element of diatribe within the poem. Only Hubbard (1974) 83-87 appears to have come to middle ground between lament and diatribe. The erotic element in the poem goes unnoticed in the poem, except for terse comments on 3.7.71-72 such as Hubbard (1974) 86, "It is this couplet alone that attaches the poem to love elegy." Putnam (1980) 97-113 and Nethercut (1961) 389-407 (above, note 1) put the motif of travel within the context of Book 3, but do not comment on its link with travel in the love poems of Propertius. Finally, 3.7 has had a vexed history of transpositions, alleged interpolations, and emendations. Only J. Vahlen, "Uber die Paetus-Elegie des Propertius," Sitzber. d. königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin 3 (1883) 69-90, has attempted to validate the manuscript tradition of the poem, explaining that Propertius' method is to return again and again to motifs he has introduced, constantly filling out their meaning. Because of the enormous amount of disagreement about the text, the genre, and the shift in addressees, I will discuss 3.7 at more length than most poems in order to show the interaction of the various levels of meaning, and the effect of putting the speaker's criticism of Paetus within the framework of love elegy (i.e. 71-72).
Hubbard (1974) 83-87 has nearly the same four sections which I see, but considers 71-72 as a separate coda. Moreover, she does not examine the similarity within the internal structure of sections two, three, and four.

On epicedia in general, see O. Crusius, "Epikedeion," RE 6 (1909) 112-113; Kese (1950) and Esteve Forriol (1962) 112-161 (above, note 56).

Hubbard (1974) 84 mentions that these lines could be an epigram and compares its theme with an epigram of Julianus (AP 7.586), but does not elaborate on the epigrammatic character of Propertius' lines.

Walther Abel, Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern (Diss. Berlin 1930) 84 mentions that the apostrophe to pecunia here parodies the hymn form.

Kay Morsley, "Propertius 3.7," CQ N.S. 25 (1975) 317-318 rightly reads reddat for reddite because the present subjunctive is consistent with legas (26) and dicas (28), and I might add, more consistent with his despair at this point. More than likely, the imperative from 29 influenced this line and induced a scribal error, yet Propertius' tone and addressee change in 29ff.


Abel (1930) 90-93 believes that in 3.7.1-26 the event is told completely and that all that follows is reflection by the poet. Indeed, he even divides the poem into a lyric-dramatic section followed by an epic-reflective section. While there is some merit to his idea that the second half unfolds what we are introduced to in the first half, he has not explained why the Agamemnon exemplum is in the first half nor why Paetus delivers a quite dramatic speech in 57-64. Furthermore, he points out that Paetus is no longer addressed after the first half of the poem (1-28), but the narrator certainly addresses his words in 43-46, at least in part, to Paetus. See below.

For references to the victim's age as a means to evoke pity, see Esteve Forriol (1962) 134, 138.

For the myth of Argynnus, see Butler and Barber 277.

Propertius has only one other example of the sailor speaking (1.8.23), but there he acts as a rival lover rather than one who utters a warning or an epitaph.

For the use of this type of irony, see Camps 3:85.

For the two words' connotations of wealth and commerce, see OLD s.v. augeō 1, 9; fortuna 2, 6, 12.

Robertson (1969) 380, n. 7 sees a reference here back to vias (32) and cites Shackleton Bailey 152 on the latter. See L & S s.v. sterne I.B.1, II.A.2 for its use as a term referring to the construction of roads.

On the destruction of the Greek fleet at Cape Caphareus, see 4.1.113-116 and Butler and Barber, 278. Clearly Propertius is aware that the disaster at Caphareus was a different event than when Ulysses wept for his drowned crew, but he is linking them together as representative of the nostoi in general (cf. 2.26.37-38) and with the first exemplum as the beginning and end of the archetypal war for greed. See Morsley (1975) 317. Moreover, William R. Nethercut, "Propertius 3.7.21-24," Hermes 99 (1971) 250, n. 1 sees an allusion perhaps even to contemporary Rome and their expeditions to the East.


Robertson (1969) 377-386 is not willing to concede that any of the poem is a lament because of the impersonalness of the poet's references to Paetus. But a glance at the epigrams cited by Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 58-65 or the epitaphs cited in Lattimore (1962) 120-125, 230-237 indicate a high number of "impersonal" or hackneyed attempts at consolation, not because of the writers' lack of education (this certainly is not true in the case of the writers of epigram), but because of the timelessness and constant validity of certain motifs and ideas. Indeed, Esteve Forriol (1962) 112-161 catalogs them in the second half of his dissertation, so recurrent are they.

Pliny NH 16.231 notes that terebinth was a favored wood for furniture. See Russell Meiggs, Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World (Oxford 1982) 296-298 on the exotic nature of these woods.

On vos decuit, see Camps 3:89.

Propertius' shift in addressee from pecunia in 1-8 to Paetus in 11-12 without first mentioning Paetus by name has caused great consternation, but no solutions other than transposition of 11-12 to other places in the poem. For examples of the rationale...
behind the transpositions, see A.E. Housman, "Postgate's Propertius London 1884" CR 9 (1895) 354; and more recently Morsley (1975) 315-318. Yet even Morsley admits that there are at least four certain examples of the omission of the vocative in a sudden change to the second person in Propertius (2.9.15; 2.12.17; 2.34.67; 3.11.37-38). Indeed, in 3.7 Propertius, I would argue, is consciously trying to be ambiguous in his transition from one address to the next throughout the poem in order to associate Paetus with men who sail for gain, with avarus Ulysses, and in this passage with pecunia.

78 Another vexed passage, primarily because editors are not willing to see intentional ambiguity on Propertius' part. Robertson (1969) 381, n. 8 rightly points out that viveret is awkward applied to Ulysses and contentus is meaningless if applied to Ulysses since he did not leave for Troy because of discontent. Yet the lines must obviously apply to Ulysses too since they follow immediately upon the exemplum and because they allude to his plowing to avoid the 'draft'. On the latter, see Camps 3:86.

79 Cf. OLD s.v. velum 5.


81 Richardson 346 also sees condar as meaning "to be buried."

82 On Ulysses' fame for being an amorous adventurer, see Stanford (1963) 44-55, 142-143, 252, n. 5.
Ultimately, Propertius' journey was unsuccessful, whether it was spurred by a desire to flee his mistress or to win her back. Yet travel was only a response to his situation as lover. Already in the first four lines of 1.1 Propertius spoke about his capture by Cynthia (cepit, 1.1.1) and enslavement to Amor (impositis pressit Amor pedibus, 1.1.4). Such was his servitude that he did not even dare to lift his eyes (deiecit lumina, 1.1.3). The next four lines of 1.1 chronicled the effect such slavery had on his psyche. Afflicted by a madness which forced him to live without reason (nullo consilio, 1.1.6), because of which he felt that the gods were against him (adversae deos, 1.1.8), he spoke with dismay of the furor which had plagued him for a whole year (1.1.7). Indeed, the one word which epitomized his dual condition of servitude and madness was miser (1.1.1). In the second half of the poem, the two images were once again juxtaposed when he called on his friends, first asking them for a cure for his insanity (non sani pectoris auxilia, 1.1.26), then for libertas (1.1.28) to speak as his anger dictated. Line 27 (fortiter et ferrum saevos patiemur et ignes) with its images of fire and iron—remedies for insanity as
well as the means of a slave's punishment—neatly illustrated the
interrelationship between slavery, the outward display of the
lover's condition, and madness, its inner manifestation.

The interconnection of servitium amoris and furor amoris is
most apparent in the first group of poems in the Monobiblos (1-5) as
a means to reveal both the public and inner sides of the lover's
condition and to establish the lover's initial unwillingness to
accept this condition. Once his predicament is established and the
lover begins to accept it (1.7-10), however, the writer begins to
explore the two images independently (servitium in 2.20 and 3.15;
furor in 1.15 and 2.28), and it is not until the poet attempts to
rid himself of love at the end of the third book that the two images
again converge. In his prayer to Bacchus (3.17) to release him from
love, the poet utilizes the two images together in the final couplet
of the poem to signify his desire to be completely free from all
aspects of the lover's condition and in 3.24 and 25 he confesses
that Cynthia's shackles have been untied and his insanity cured.

In the meantime, the writer sees fit to explore each of the
two images separately yet in a complementary manner. This chapter
(Chapter III), therefore, will detail Propertius' initial
conjunction of the two images in 1.1-5 and the external
manifestation of Propertius' helplessness in love (servitium
amoris), particularly in Poems 1.10, 2.20, and 3.15. In the case of
the slavery of love, 1.10 acts as the culmination of a series of
poems (1.7-9) in which Propertius comes to accept his slavery to
Cynthia as not only inevitable but desirable, and, in many ways, it
is this acceptance of her slavery that perhaps leads to the deterioration of the relationship in the second half of the Monobiblos. In 2.20 he reaffirms his acceptance of Cynthia’s mild yoke, yet the reaffirmation is placed within the context of her distrust in his faithfulness and of his future enjoyment of freedom in 2.21-2.25. Finally, in 3.15 Propertius asserts that he will be true even after death, yet his references to Lycinna starting him on the iter amoris and his tale about Dirce, Antiope’s enslaver, being punished and put to death suggest that the enslaver, not the slave, should fear death.

The next chapter (Chapter IV) will examine the lover’s inner condition (furor amoris) in three poems—1.15, 2.28, and 3.17—and show how the two images once again coalesce as the love affair comes to a conclusion in 3.24 and 25. In 1.15, Cynthia’s reluctance to come to his bedside and her put-on concern are another stage in the deterioration of the relationship from 1.11 to 1.19. In 2.28, Cynthia contracts an illness which the poet diagnoses as love-sickness and then claims credit for curing it because of his attentive ministrations. Yet in 3.17 Propertius, worn out from sleepless nights due to his love-sickness, finally asks for Bacchus to heal him of love.

With both metaphors, the persona of the narrator changes from book to book. In Book 1, the narrator is deeply involved in his love affair, attempting to define himself as poet and lover and to understand his relationship with Cynthia. In Book 2, the narrator remains a lover-poet, but the poet flexes his poetic and ironic
muscles, consciously teasing and playing with his beloved and their affair, but ultimately confirming his love for her despite his insinuations and badinage. In Book 3, the poet gradually withdraws from his role as lover, until his eventual prayer for release from love in 3.17.

Since scholars have generally not recognized the interrelationship of the two aspects of the lover's condition, bondage and madness, it will be useful briefly to point out its presence in earlier Roman literature. Although both slavery and illness are frequent metaphors in Roman comedy, they are usually not connected as they are in Propertius. Nor are they conjoined in Catullus. In fact, of Republican writers, only Lucretius in his famous passage on love at the end of Book 4 offers Propertius a precedent for presenting the two images as complementary aspects of the lover's condition. Throughout this passage (Lucr. 4.1030ff.), the lover exhibits signs of being out of control, both in the way he lets his sexual drive master him and also lets his beloved dominate him. To begin with, his physical actions appear completely irrational, and he is compared to a wounded person who searches for the one who has wounded him (4.1045-1057). Hence, Lucretius identifies this kind of irrational behavior with words which tend to emphasize the mental and emotional aspects of the disease: furor, cura, dolor, erumna, and rabies (4.1058-1120). At the same time, this malady also finds expression in one's social conduct and behavior: one's duties (officia) and reputation (fama) no longer matter and one's wealth is squandered on all sorts of
Eastern luxuries (4.1121-1140). Why? because the lover is under
the sway of another (alterius sub nutu, 4.1122). Indeed, the lover
is enslaved to such an extent that in his mind he begins to question
every action which his beloved makes:

aut quod in ambiguo verbum iaculata reliquit
quod cupidó adfixum cordi vivescit ut ignis,
aut nímiúm iactare oculos aliúmve tuéri
quod putat in vultuque videt vestigia risus.
(Lucr. 4.1137-1140)

An ambiguous word from his mistress will rankle him, her wandering
eyes are a sign that she is looking for another man, or her laughter
is interpreted as mockery. The lover's enslavement is but the
outward social sign of his private madness. According to Lucretius,
both are linked, in their worst form, to the mind's inability to
think reasonably and sensibly—all because the mind has not learned
to avoid the simulacra of the opposite sex. According to Lucretius,
avoiding these images and focusing one's mind on other things will
lead to a cure (4.1141-1154). But for Propertius, there is no hope
for a cure: even witches and friends can only bring some relief to
his illness, not a cure (1.1.19-30).

It is significant that both writers link madness with slavery
to indicate the lover's ultimate debilitation. One image
corroborates the other and together they are proof that someone is
truly in love. Lucretius makes clear that distrust, jealousy, and
incriminations about the partner's loyalty are all manifestations of
the lover's furor. Other Republican writers emphasize other types
of physical evidence that someone has contracted love-sickness. In
Poems 50 and 51, for example, Catullus details the physical symptoms
of the disease: feeling the fire of love (50.8; 51.9-10),
disinterest in eating (50.9), inability to sleep (50.10-13), the
loss of one’s sensation (51.5-6), a feeling that one is close to
death (50.14-15; 51.11-12). But Catullus is quite aware that the
disease affects the mind as well. In addition to the physical
symptoms just outlined, the opening of Poem 51 offers a locus
classicus on the envious lover. And in Poem 76 Catullus describes
his disease both in emotional and physical terms:

me miserum aspicite et, si vitam puriter egi,
eripite hanc pestem perniciemque mihi, 20
quae mihi subrepens imos ut torpor in artus
expulit ex omni pectore laetitias.
(Cat. 76.19-22)

In the first couplet, his disease is described physically (pestem
perniciemque). At the end of the poem, moreover, he asks for health
and the removal of his disease (ipse valere opto et taetrum hunc
deponere morbum, 76.25). But the second couplet outlines and
emotional affliction which expelled all happiness from his heart.
In short, Propertius borrows from both Lucretius and Catullus,
sometimes emphasizing the feelings of the furiosus, at other times
pointing out the physical symptoms of the disease.

Cynthia exhibits many of the sure signs of being in love in
her speech to Propertius in 1.3.35ff. She is misera (40) and
immediately defensive. She assumes not only that Propertius has
spent the night away from her (consumpti tempora noctis, 37) but
that he came to her only after he was thrown out of another woman’s
house (alterius clausis expulit e foribus, 36). After her
accusations in 35-8, she prays that he will endure the type of
sleepless nights which she has just experienced (39-42). She concludes by emphasizing her own feelings: she felt abandoned (deserta, 43), spent much of the night lamenting her lot (note the durative force of querebar, 43), and was put to sleep by her tears and cura (45-6). Clearly, she presents herself as one who is love-sick—consumpti (37), me miseram (40), querebar (43), ultima cura (46), and lacrimis ... meis (46)—yet also faithful despite her illness, comparing herself to two paradigms of fidelity, Penelope (purpureo fallebam staminé, 41) and Orpheus (Orphea carmine ... lyrae, 42). Moreover, her accusations about Propertius' infidelity remind us of the lover's misinterpretation of the other's actions in Lucretius 4.1137-40.

Although 1.1 is marked by Cynthia's aloofness from the usual effects of love-sickness, in 1.3 she appears to demonstrate the very symptoms of the love-lorn—suspicion, jealousy, anxiety, and the feeling of rejection at the slightest provocation—that Propertius experiences. Certainly she castigates him to some extent in these lines, yet when she exhibits such strong signs of love-sickness, Propertius feels justified that their love is mutual and that her criticisms were made because she too is in love. His confidence in their relationship is evidenced in the next two elegies. In 1.4 he mentions her insanity again (insana puella, 1.4.17) and in turn asserts his fidelity, rejecting Bassus' suggestion that he give up Cynthia for another woman. In the process, he characterizes his own love with each of the two images, asking Bassus first to let him continue in his usual servitude (quodcumque vitae ... assueto ducere
servitio, 1.3.4) and then presenting a list of Cynthia's qualities which drive him to insanity (haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoria, 1.4.11).

Poem 1.5, however, especially lines 3-18, offers the best example in the Monobiblos of the connection between furor amoris and servitium amoris. He now assumes Cynthia's fidelity, mentioning her as his companion on the iter amoris (et sine nos cursu, quo sumus, ire pares, 1.5.2). But in the course of the poem we learn that Gallus is trying to woo Cynthia away from Propertius, and the opening couplets set the scene, beginning with a command to the rival to leave Propertius and Cynthia alone. In the second distich, Gallus is addressed as insane (3) and infelix (4) twice and asked if he wants to experience the same furores, the same ultima mala (4) as Propertius. The third couplet continues the questioning, and recalls further the vocabulary of love-sickness in 1.1. The rival who is miser (5) is asked if he will endure ignes (5) and drink tota toxica Thessalia (6), the latter echoing Propertius' plea for the witches' help in 1.1.19-24. Clearly, Propertius thinks of himself as furiosus and Gallus as equally mad for trying to win her.

Although Gallus is already said to be love-crazed in 1-6, in the next 12 lines (7-18) Propertius explains first the mistress' power (7-12) and then the lover's reaction (13-18). In describing Cynthia's character, she is set apart (non est vagis similis conlata puellis, 7) and treated as a goddess (quodsi forte tuis non est contraria votis, 9). So great is her power, she is responsible for dispensing the curae which cause love-sickness. So great is her
control over men, she does not allow him to look at any other woman, yet he will not be strong enough to look directly at her (11; cf. 1.1.1-4) nor does she allow him to sleep, a familiar symptom of love. Moreover, she binds (alligat, 12) men who are untamed. Indeed, her mastery causes both furor and servitium.

The lover, in turn, exhibits all the signs of slavery and madness. Scorned by Cynthia (contemptus, 13), he will run to Propertius' thresholds instead, perhaps a parody, yet certainly suggesting the exclusus amator. His difficulty in speaking (singulta ... verba cadent, 14; fugient tibi verba queren ti, 17) can mark either his enslavement (cf. 1.1.28) or a symptom of illness (cf. Cat. 51.9). Ultimately, he will be so disoriented by her power and by his madness that he will have lost his senses; he will not know who or where he is (nec poteris, qui sis aut ubi, nosse miser, 18).

Certainly the lover is confused and disoriented, but the writer is very clear that illness and slavery not only coexist, but are two aspects of the same phenomenon. Indeed, he makes this more evident in the next two couplets.

```
tum grave servitium nostrae cogere puellae
discere et exclusum quid sit abire domum;
nec iam pallorem totiens mirabere nostrum,
aut cur sim toto corpore nullus ego.
```

(1.5.19-22)

The first speaks of the result of Cynthia's actions: he will be a slave (servitium, 19) and an excluded lover (exclusum, 20). The second speaks of Propertius' pallor and wasting away because of love-sickness (21-2) while implying that Gallus will experience
these same symptoms as the result of his contact with Cynthia. The parallel nature of these two couplets, each emphasizing either the interpersonal or the personal aspects of a truly debilitating love affair, reinforces in epigrammatic form the intertwining of illness and slavery in 3-18.

Although within the Monobiblos there are other examples of the two metaphors linked together in the same poem,⁷ in the next several poems Propertius begins to become more comfortable with his successes in love. Hence, his focus gradually shifts to something over which he has more control, his outward actions. As we saw in 1.5, Propertius warns Gallus to stay away from Cynthia lest Gallus become enslaved and love-crazed, as he has. Throughout the poem, Propertius' constant implication is that such slavery and madness are not benefits to be desired, but evils to be avoided. Admittedly, his attitude is due as much to his attempt to dissuade Gallus from loving Cynthia as to his actual condition of helplessness. Yet the lover-poet's attitude changes over the next several poems, culminating in his next advice to Gallus (1.10) to accept the slavery of love because of its benefits and not to ponder the concomitant lack of independence.⁸

This change of attitude from bitter, constrained, and begrudging endurance of Cynthia's slavery to willing acceptance, even to the point of singing the virtues of servitium amoris, begins with the first poem to Ponticus (1.7).⁹ At the start of the poem he contrasts Ponticus' writing of epic poems with his own situation. The imagery of warfare (armaque fraternae tristia militiae, 2) in
Ponticus' poems also characterize Propertius' relationship with Cynthia (nostros agitemus amores, 5), but, as it turns out, Propertius more often loses than wins such battles. Indeed, in line 6 the imagery shifts subtly in one line from combat to slavery to signal his defeat: he attempts some action (aliquid ... quae rimus, 6), but now it is against his harsh mistress (duram ... in dominam, 6). The result is that he is a slave to grief (servire dolori, 7), he is under constraint (cogor, 8), and his poetry consists of laments about his own harsh life (aetatis tempora dura queri, 8), rather than of the events of epic warfare.

In line 9 the lover's tone begins to change and becomes more explicitly that of a poet who writes about his love. In the process, he suggests that the poet's fame will consist of the praise of doctae puellae (11-12) and neglecti amatores (13-14)—the former because of his obedience (placuisse, 11) and his endurance of unjust threats (iniustas saepe tulisse minas, 12), the latter because they might benefit from an awareness of his plight (et prosint illi cognita nostra mala, 14). Although the poet does not reveal a complete tolerance of his slavery, he can admit some of its benefits for his poetry. Yet he concludes the poem with a warning to Ponticus of the dangers which await him.

In 1.8 Propertius' poetic propempticon succeeds in keeping Cynthia from leaving him (see Chapter II). He claims success in winning her because of his poetry (sed potui blandi carminis obsequio, 40) and he claims her as his own (Cynthia rara mea est, 42; illa mea est, 44). Now in 1.9 when Ponticus succumbs to the
slavery of love, Propertius claims credit for having predicted his subjugation and attributes his prophetic powers to his own harsh experience:

non me Chaoniae vincant in amore columbae
dicere, quos iuvenes quaeque puella domet.
me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum.

(1.9.5-7)

Although he wishes that he had never had such an experience and could once again be a novice in love (utinam posito dicar amore rudis, 8), the second half of the poem demonstrates that there is no hope of fleeing the enslaving power of love. Indeed, the similarity in language and imagery between Ponticus' subjection here and Propertius' in 1.1 confirms the inescapability of love's power. For Amor and his proxy, Ponticus' puella, act in tandem just as they did in 1.1.1-4. The punishments of Hades (note that vincula rotae [20] are reminiscent of actual servile punishment) are far preferable to Love's bow (21) or a mistress' anger (22). Amor's deceptiveness (23-4) moreover, parallels the girl's (25-6). In fact, Amor's actions here (alterna presserit ille manu, 24) recall his method of subjugation in 1.1 (caput imposita pressit Amor pedibus, 1.1.4). Finally, after the girl's actions in 25-6, Propertius utilizes the same technique as in 1.1.1-4, delaying mention of Amor in the next couplet (27-8) until the end of the pentameter.

quippe ubi non liceat vacuos seducere ocellos,
nec vigilare alio nomine cedat Amor.

(1.9.27-28)

Ponticus does not know whether the girl or Love or love (some abstract force within him)\textsuperscript{11} is responsible for not allowing him to
survey the beckoning eyes of others. In short, although Propertius advises him to escape her allurements (*fuge blanditias, 30*) the only relief in such love is to admit one's error (*errata fatere, 33*) and to talk about his suffering (*dicere quo pereas saepe in amore levât, 34*).

In 1.10 Propertius reaches the peak of his confidence as a poet-lover: his verses to Cynthia in 1.8 dissuaded her from leaving him, and his predictions in 1.7 that Ponticus would succumb to love came true in 1.9. His persuasion in 1.8 and advice in 1.9, moreover, were uttered primarily in terms of *servitium amoris*: his obsequiousness to Cynthia kept her home, and his own endurance of the trials and punishments of slavery made him an expert in the realm of love. In 1.10 he moves on to clarify the connection between his slavery to Cynthia and the power of his poetry.\(^\text{12}\)

The poem can be divided into three parts of ten lines each. In the first (1-10) Propertius witnesses the *ludi* of Gallus and his bed-partner. In the second (11-20), he thanks Gallus for his trust in him and tells of the power of his poetry. At the end of this section (19-20), Propertius makes explicit the source of his poetry's power, Cynthia. Finally, in the last section (21-30) he offers Gallus advice on how to remain in love, namely to remain willingly enslaved to his *puella*. Although much of the poem's fun consists in the realization that Gallus, the paramour of 1.5, is now receiving his come-uppance, at another level Propertius' protestations of unity with and dependence on Cynthia, though exaggerated, reflect a situation in which Propertius the lover at
least feels very close ties with her. The poem, therefore, contains a tension between badgering Gallus that he will have to endure slavery if he intends to keep his girlfriend and Propertius' acknowledgment that such submission, at least to a certain degree, is an essential part of his relationship with Cynthia.

Propertius' irony toward Gallus is present from the opening lines of the poem. He is Gallus' confidant (vestris conscius in lacrimis, 2), and had prayed for his success in love (votis illa vocanda meis, 4). As Lyne has pointed out, since Propertius and Gallus were rivals for Cynthia's love in 1.5, to believe that Gallus would now allow a third party to witness a night of love-making is absurd. But Propertius is taking advantage of Gallus' situation of new-found love (primo amori, 1) and is getting great delight from it. As rival, his prayers that Gallus would find a new love were more for his own benefit than Gallus', and the pleasure and relief he now feels (iocunda voluptas, 3) is as much his own as Gallus'.

Certain details, moreover, add piquancy to Propertius' digs at Gallus. vestris lacrimis (2) can refer either to the two lovers' tears (vestri as plural), which come about from their delight in love-making, or to Gallus' tears (vestri as poetic plural), which are the result of his enslavement. His dying in the embrace of his girlfriend (te complexe morientem, Galle, puella, 5) signals not only the fulfillment of his love with her but also forebodes the effect of her slavery. Perhaps she remains aloof, despite Gallus' passion, since her embrace (complexa ... puella), the symbol of her affection, can be interpreted as either passive or active.
The absurdity of Propertius as an actual accomplice in Gallus' affair becomes more apparent at the end of the first section and the beginning of the second. Propertius was ready to fall asleep, yet he could not pull himself away from their love-making (non tamen a vestro potui secedere lusu, 9). Gallus, according to the poet, yielded to (concedere, 11) Propertius' wishes that he be Gallus' confidant and that they not be rivals for Cynthia's love. Finally, Propertius says that he learned to keep quiet about Gallus' secrets (didici reticere dolores, 13), yet dolores are less Gallus' past griefs about unsuccessful love than the griefs he will experience because of his coming enslavement to his puella. Furthermore, Propertius is anything but silent about Gallus' affair in this poem, but broadcasts Gallus' most intimate affair to anyone willing to hear his poem.

After such irony and retaliation on Propertius' part, it seems difficult to take seriously Propertius' exaggerated claims of power over love (15-18) and advice to Gallus about how to act in love (21-30), and this scepticism is well-founded. Yet the poet offers several details that indicate that his power in love is grounded in a special relationship with one who is more powerful than he is:

Cynthia me docuit, semper quae cuique petenda quaeque cavenda forent: non nihil egit Amor.
(1.10.19-20)

Propertius does not act on his own, but has learned about love through his relationship with Cynthia. The collocation of Cynthia and Amor—who together frame the couplet—recalls their joint power and Cynthia's semi-divine status throughout the Monobiblos.
Propertius had already alluded to Cynthia in his reference in line 8 to Luna, the nocturnal aspect of triform Cynthian Diana. Together both he and the moon (Cynthia) observed Gallus' intimate affairs (cf. Luna ruberet, 8). Their collaboration in 7-8 provides an additional layer of meaning to nobis (11), for Propertius thinks of Gallus yielding not only to his own wishes (nobis as poetic plural for singular), but to both Propertius' and Cynthia's desire that Gallus not interfere with their relationship as he threatened in 1.5. Thus, his association with a woman of divine stature in 7-8 and more explicitly in 19-20 justifies to some extent his appropriation of the functions (15-18) of a mediator between god and man. He can bring lovers together, open the way into a woman's heart, and heal the pangs of unrequited love—all because he had learned it from Cynthia (19-20). His advice to Gallus to submit to his girlfriend is based on his own experience in love: "love has accomplished something in my case" (non nihil egit amor, 20). Although his advice to Gallus to attend to his mistress and to act humbly and submissively in love appears extreme and to a certain degree ironic, the poem's concluding maxim is meant to illustrate not only Gallus' case, but also Propertius'.

is poterit felix una remanere puella,
qui numquam vacuo pectore liber erit.
(1.10.29-30)

Propertius' success in love in 1.8 and now here in warding off a rival is in large part due to his willingness to be faithful to one and only one woman. Although it means losing some of one's freedom to play the field (vacuo pectore, 30), the benefits of union
outweigh those of not having such a relationship. Although Propertius' acceptance of the slavery of love in earlier poems was less than complete, the poet-lover here admits to its benefits, and directs the exaggerated and ironical elements in his tribute to servitium amoris to Callus rather than himself. It is Propertius the writer who lets us apply this irony to the poet-lover, but only after we have read the second half of the Monobiblos and seen Propertius' fortunes in love plummet until he thinks of his relationship with Cynthia as something marked by death (cf. 1.19).

At first, it may appear surprising that the imagery of death, elsewhere so prominent in Propertius, does not occur as the result of the slavery of love in Book 1. And when it does appear in poems 1.7-10 it is used to refer to the type of honors a poet will receive after his death. In the first book, death does occur as the result of warfare, illness, and travel, all likely spheres of activity in which death is likely to occur. servitium seems as if it should also end in death since the Twelve Tables classify servile offenses for which death is the penalty. Perhaps, the fact that death is not associated with slavery in the Monobiblos indicates the rarity of its occurrence as a punishment among Roman slaveowners or the relative indifference of freeborn Romans to the plight of slaves. Yet as we saw in Chapter II, beginning with the program poem of the second book, Propertius' death emerges as the ultimate expression of commitment in love.
In the very first poem of the second book, the link becomes more apparent between slavery and death. Propertius' epitaph will now read: "huic misero fatum dura puella fuit" (2.1.78). The dura puella, a synonym for domina, is credited as the cause of the lover's death. In the lines which immediately precede the last section (55-70), Propertius makes clear that there is no cure for love, that death is inevitable. The juxtaposition of the two sections suggests the interrelationship of madness and slavery, of love and death. Naming first illness, then the dura puella, as the cause of the lover's death permits the writer to invest the puella with the power of life and death, a natural extension of her divine auctoritas both in Book 1 and in 2.1 and to make death an accompaniment of servitium.

It is in Propertius' epitaph in 2.13, however, that the connection becomes most evident: "qui nunc iacet horrida pulvis, unius hic quondam servus amoris erat" (2.13.35-36). Now there is no mention of illness precipitating the lover's death. Instead, Propertius places slavery and death at two different points on the same continuum of time: the lover, who was a slave in life, is now horrida pulvis. For the poet-lover this is a statement that death is the logical extension of being a faithful servus amoris. But the writer suggests through the emphatically-placed quondam that love does not continue after death, that the slave of love will be no more than dust after he dies.
2.20 offers Propertius' most effective statement about slavery and death in the second book. Cynthia's weeping, the result of her distrust of Propertius (3-4, 33-34), is more funereal than the nightingale's plaint or Niobe's lament (5-8). In response, Propertius promises faithfulness and praises the mildness of Cynthia's yoke (20). If not, he prays that he suffer the same servile punishments in the underworld as Tityus and Sisyphus (29-32). In short, he not only promises faithful service to his mistress until death (17-18), he also suggests that he will remain in her service even after death, in imitation of the slavery of Tityus and Sisyphus (29-32).

Yet the poet's tone is far different from poems of the Monobiblos and his rhetoric and use of mythological paradigms bring the role of the poet to the fore. His opening questions to Cynthia indicate not only that he thinks her actions are overdone but that he is teasing her. Questions and statements to Cynthia compare her to Briseis, Andromache, Philomela and Procne, and Niobe, but it is clear that he thinks her grief is overstated (1-8). His response to her contains a similar hyperbole, comparing himself to an imprisoned Danae and then swearing on the bones of his parents that he will be true till death (9-18). In the second half, his rhetoric cools and takes a milder tack. He praises the mildness of the slavery she imposes as well as her love for him when no one else would love him (19-28). In the last section (29-36) he returns to bombast, depicting his destruction at the hands of the Furies and his subsequent punishment in Hades (29-32) in the unlikely event that he
forgets her beneficences. Then, in order to keep her from supplicating him as if he were a god (33), he concludes that his love will never change (34-36). Thus, the poet is constantly on the offensive, moving from an attack on Cynthia's tears (1-8) to an affirmation of his faithfulness (9-18) to fulsome praise of Cynthia's love and judgment (19-28) to a final expression of fidelity. The tone meanwhile shifts from mock-epic to self-exaggeration to gentle flattery and back to hyperbole. In many ways the teasing and the complicity with which he co-opts Cynthia is reminiscent of 1.10 with one important exception: in Book 1 he would never address Cynthia in this way, while in Book 2 it becomes more and more frequent that Propertius relishes having the upper hand in such situations.21

In the opening section, the poet-lover puts Cynthia on the defensive, castigating her for excessive tears.

Quid fles abducta gravius Briseide? quid fles anxia captiva tristius Andromacha? quidve mea de fraude deos, insana, fatigas? quid quereris nostram sic cecidiæs fidem? non tam nocturna volucris funesta querela Attica Cecropiiis obstrepet in foliis, nec tantum Niobe bis sex ad busta superbe sollicito lacrimans defluit a Sipylo.22

In the first eight lines, he harps on Cynthia's querulousness through the abundance and repetition of words associated with tears, crying, and lament: fles 2 (1), anxia (2), tristius (2), quereris (4), funesta (5), querela (5), obstrepet (6), sollicito (8), lacrimas (8), defluit (8). The anaphora of quid four times in the first four lines and the repetitiveness implied in fatigas give us
some idea of how Propertius feels about Cynthia's persistent tears and questions. He is not about to let her get the upper hand.

Yet the poet softens his attack through his use of these mythological heroines and gradually builds a picture so extreme that it becomes laughable rather than only incriminating. He introduces the mock-heroic style immediately, substituting the high-style flere for ploro, and terming her grief gravis, a word of solemn import. Briseis is an appropriate beginning in the list of heroines since even though later art and literature portray her crying as she is taken from Achilles, Homer mentions no tears at all, only her unwillingness to be transferred to Agamemnon. Andromache's grief comes next, certainly well-known from Euripides' plays. The poet also playfully suggests the reason for Cynthia's grief: their commitment has died (cecidisse, 4). But then Propertius shows her what real grief is, reminding her of the tragedies of Procne (funesta, 5), caused by Tereus' rape of Philomela and his subsequent dinner of their son Itys, and the death of Niobe's children (his sex ad busta, 7). Yet the transformations in each story—Philomela and Procne into a nightingale and a swallow and Niobe into a rock—transfer their grief into fantasy. Indeed, Propertius' expression of Niobe's metamorphosis (Niobe ... lacrimans defluit a Sipylo, 7-8) and the abundance of sibilants in the two lines puncture any vestige of seriousness, and it becomes clear that Propertius has taken Cynthia's grief to comic extremes. And though the comparison becomes overstated, the fact that it was made at all should flatter Cynthia.
Yet Propertius' imagination does not stop here, and though Cynthia may have complained that their fides has died, Propertius makes it clear that he is still very much alive.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mi licet aeratis astringant bracchia nodis,} \\
\text{sint tua vel Danaes condita membra domo,} \\
in te ego et aeratas rumpam, mea vita, catenas, \\
ferratam Danaes transiliamque domum. \\
de te quodcumque ad surdas mihi dicitur aures:} \\
\text{tu modo ne dubita de gravitate mea!} \\
\text{ossa tibi iuro per matris et ossa parentis} \\
\text{(si fallo, cinis heu sit mihi uterque gravis!} \\
\text{me tibi ad extremas mansurum, vita, tenebras:} \\
\text{ambos una fides auferet, una dies.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(2.20.9-18)

Propertius now draws a parallel between his situation and a heroine's, the imprisoned Danae, and continues the funereal imagery in the first section of the poem. Though he is shackled (nodis, 9; catenas, 11) and metaphorically buried in Danae's prison (condita membra domo, 10), those chains will not hold him, that house of death will not keep him from Cynthia (in te, 11). The hyperbole of the Danae example is followed by equally exaggerated claims: he will not hear anything bad about Cynthia (13). He now realizes that his remarks may be unbelievable and asks Cynthia not to doubt his seriousness (14). But at the same time, he reminds Cynthia of her own extravagance, echoing the word by which he first characterized the extent of her weeping (gravius, 1; gravitate, 14). He backs his claim to seriousness, however, with an oath (more overstatement) on Cynthia's parents' bones (more death) and another pun on gravis: he swears by the bones of his parents that he will be faithful, and if he is lying, he hopes that their ashes lie heavy upon him (si fallo, cinis heu sit mihi uterque gravis, 16). Not only does he pray for
something serious (\textit{gravis}) to happen to him, he also reverses the frequent sepulchral epitaph, \textit{sit tibi terra levis}, asking that their ash (\textit{cinis}) rest heavy (\textit{gravis}) on him.\textsuperscript{27} In spite of his metaphorical death in Danae's tower, he will stay with Cynthia to the darkest hour of her life (\textit{ad extremas ... tenebras}, 17). At the same time, he acknowledges her as his source of life by addressing her twice as "my life" (\textit{vita}, 11, 17). And just as her parents were addressed in death as a unit (15), Propertius hopes that he and Cynthia will die together, twice repeating \textit{una} to emphasize their bond. Though the second section begins and ends with death, Propertius has transformed the image from the individual death that Cynthia perhaps envisions to their death together (\textit{una}) in shared faithfulness (\textit{ambos una fides auferet}, 18). Their death together here recalls similar hopes in 2.8 and looks forward to 2.26,\textsuperscript{28} and though his exempla and expressions seem extreme, the poet-lover employs them to tease away Cynthia's tears while allowing his love for her to begin to emerge.

In the next section the poet-lover shifts from promises of his future commitment to gratitude for Cynthia's past and present \textit{beneficia}.

\begin{verbatim}
quodsi nec nomen nec me tua forma teneret, posset servitium mite tenere tuum. septima iam plenae deductur orbita lunae, cum de me et de te compita nulla tacent: interea nobis non numquam ianua mollis, non numquam lecti copia facta tui; nec mihi munerebus nox ulla est empta beatis: quicquid eram, hoc animi gratia magna tui. cum te tam multi peterent, tu me una petisti: possum ego naturae non meminisse tuae?
\end{verbatim}
Although Propertius has accepted slavery to Cynthia not simply as a necessary but unpleasant task in Book 2, applying the epithet "mild" (mitis, 19) to his slavery appears to fall into the pattern of hyperbole of the first two sections. Yet the rest of the section reveals what his slavery is like. Propertius makes it clear that she is in control: she does not always acquiesce to his demands (non numquam, 23, 24), but she does not keep him outside her door (23) nor out of her bed (24) nor force him to 'buy' her love with precious gifts (25).

The section, moreover, paints a picture of their evening trysts, and augments the tenderness of Propertius' remarks. It begins with the moon (21) and the streetcorner (compita, 22). From there, the lovers pass through the mistress' door (ianua mollis, 23) and into the bedroom (lecti copia, 24). Their exchange requires no presents (nec ... muneribus, 25), only his gratitude (hoc animi gratia magna tui, 26) and kind words (27-28). Indeed, the section closes with Propertius' expression of dependence on Cynthia for the turn his life has taken: whatever I was (quicquid eram, 26), I owe what I am now to your generosity. Indeed, cum te tam multi peterent, tu me una petisti (27) reinforces and summarizes the contrast between his dependence and her choice, her authority. And yet the juxtaposition of tu me followed by una (though no longer the adverb) implicitly affirms their unity. Thus, the third section concludes with una (27) just as the second had.
The final section returns to his bombastic tone of the first two sections, but now with the knowledge that Cynthia can laugh with him.

Although the tone shifts from 28 to 29, marking a new section, we must continue the pattern of thought at the end of section 3. Because Propertius is dependent on Cynthia (27), how could he ever forget her (28)? But if he did (tum, 29), he hopes that the Furies would torture him (vexetis, 29) and Aeacus condemn him (damnes ... iudicio, 30) to punishment (mea poena, 31) among the vultures which daily devour Tityus' liver and with the rock that Sisyphus alternately pushes and pursues (31-32). Through the servile language in these lines, Propertius wants Cynthia to believe that he will continue in slavery to her even in the underworld. The punishment (mea poena, 31) which he will accept is reinforced by the Furies' torture (vexetis, 29) and the forced labor of moving Sisyphus' rock (saxa labore geram, 32). Within this context, then, Aeacus' judgment (damnes ... iudicio, 30) evokes a slave's condemnation in a court of law or even by his master.

The next two couplets explain why Propertius must so graphically affirm his servile status: Cynthia has not been treating him in accordance with his proper station in life, but as a god...
(supplicibus me ... venerat tabellis, 33). Venerari, a regular word for beseeching the gods, brings out the double entendre in tabellis—not only Cynthia's letters to him but also the votive tablets posted in shrines. In Book 1, Cynthia seemed a goddess and he the slave. Now he can tease Cynthia that she in her agitation has been trying to reverse their 'proper' roles. Propertius admits his characterizations of himself and Cynthia were exaggerated in Book 1, and the redefinition of his slavery (or now he might say 'dependence') in 21-28 reveals his love in a more realistic fashion. And just as the language of 21-28 echoes images familiar from Book 1 (e.g. exclusus amator) but presents them less boldly, more realistically and more tenderly, the language of the final three lines places his extravagant expression of commitment in 1.12 within a more moderated and perhaps more mature framework. In 1.12 responding to Cynthia's trip to Baiae and his suspicions about her motives, at the end of the poem he proclaims his love dramatically:

\[ \text{aut si despectus potuit mutare calores:} \]
\[ \text{— sunt quoque translato gaudia servitio—} \]
\[ \text{mi neque amare aliam neque ab hac desistere fas est:} \]
\[ \text{Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit.} \] 20

(1.12.17-20)

The final two pentameters in 2.20 pick up his earlier language—the contrast between beginning and end, the use of the future tense of sum, and the parallels between fas and ius—but now it is less epigrammatic, more qualified. For example, the use of subordination in 33 (quae) diminishes the paratactic contrast of Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit (1.12 20), but it does not necessarily point to a diminution of ardor on Propertius' part. Words such as
talis (34), cito (36), and temere (36) also qualify and lower the intensity of his bold declaration in 1.12.19-20. To a large extent, Propertius' moderation in tone springs from the different situations portrayed in 1.12 and 2.20. In the earlier poem, Propertius is reacting to Cynthia's departure to Baiae in 1.11, while in 2.20 Cynthia is claiming that Propertius has broken faith (mea de fraude, 3). Even more importantly, this moderation in tone at the end of 2.20 is meant to contrast with his overstated proclamations and lend a degree of sincerity to them. Without such a modest but heartfelt statement after such embroidery, Cynthia would have no reason to be reassured.

While the poet-lover tries to modulate his tone between bombast and simplicity in order to allay Cynthia's doubts and to reaffirm his trustfulness, Propertius the writer allows us to perceive another version of the poet-lover's faithfulness. Indeed, he has peppered the poet-lover's argument and myths with a number of inconsistencies which suggest that he is not so faithful. Although the poet-lover emphasizes the intensity, the grief which Briseis, Andromache, Procne and Niobe experienced, just as important, the writer would add, is the reason for their mourning, for all four heroines were forcefully separated from someone whom they deeply loved: Briseis was taken from Achilles, Andromache from Hector, Procne from her sister Philomela, and Niobe from her twelve children. The writer has initiated a doubt in our minds that perhaps Cynthia will be forcefully separated from Propertius. The Danae example increases the doubt. Though Propertius' imprisonment
with chains of servitude (nodi, 9; catenae, 11) suggests the punishment of a slave of love, he soon breaks them (rumpam, 11) and escapes his punishment (transiliumque domum, 12). Further, why should he be within Danae's tower in the first place? His enchainment there suggests that perhaps he has become her slave and hence her lover, and hence Danae may be Cynthia's rival. 30

At the end of the poem, he expresses his willingness to undergo slavery—now on Cynthia's behalf—even after death, suffering the same torments as Tityus and Sisyphus. Both of these mythological "slaves," however, were punished, according to at least some tales, in return for acts against love. 31 Tityus had attempted to rape Leto at the behest of a jealous Juno. Sisyphus' punishment resulted either from his betrayal of Jupiter's love for Aegina or from his attempt to outwit Death—by gaining permission to punish his wife for not tending to his funeral rites. Though both were punished, their sins against love do not prognosticate faithfulness on Propertius' part, despite his willingness to endure Cynthia's torments. Propertius' promise to endure the punishments of a Tityus and a Sisyphus, moreover, are part of an implied condition: only if he fails to remember Cynthia's natura would he allow himself to experience underworld servitude.

In addition to the doubts which the poet-lover's mythology raises, his references to death pose more difficulties about his credibility. Not one of his promises to love up to and through death can, upon examination, offer Cynthia any real assurances. His references to the grief of Procne and Niobe are made in fun and
create some doubt whether he takes anyone's death or grief seriously. He is buried in Danae's tower, but he immediately springs back to life. When Cynthia seems to doubt his words, he swears by her parents' bones. Though the collocation of mother and father in the oath may suggest their union in death (ossa tibi iuro per matris et osse parentis, 15; cf. 4.7.94), the emphasis upon their material remains, ossa (twice in 15) and cinis (16), forbodes a less than happy union in the afterlife. His promise to remain with Cynthia, moreover, is ambiguous. He will physically remain with her (tibi ... mansurum, 17), but there is no sign that his heart will remain faithful. After his mockery of death in the three previous examples—the heroines, being buried with Danae, and his pun on gravis (16)—should Cynthia trust him now? When he finally does descend to the Underworld, the examples of Tityus and Sisyphus suggest that he is a slave of love, but not the slave of her love. In short, although he tempers his humor with seemingly heartfelt statements of loyalty, it would be difficult for Cynthia to sift out his true feelings from his hyperbole and sarcasm.

Finally, even within his more unaffected declarations, there are variations which create more doubt. On the one hand, he asserts that he does not believe whatever is said about Cynthia (13); on the other hand, he boasts that street corners resonate with news of their love affair (22). The similarity in language in each of the two lines (de te, 13; de me et de te, 22) points to the discrepancy in ideas. The repetition of una at the climax of the second and third sections should enhance his first statement of commitment.
Instead, it underscores the fact that they do not act as a unit, for in the second statement, it emphasizes that Cynthia acted on her own in choosing Propertius for her lover (cum te tam multi petermin, tu me una petisti, 27). The couple's ultimate independence from each other emerges even more strongly at the end of the poem, for Propertius now acts on his own.

hoc mihi perpetuo ius est, quod solus amator nec cito desisto nec temere incipio.

(2.20.35-36)

solus (35) asserts that Propertius, not Cynthia, will decide when he will begin and end his love. And a second meaning of ius (35) confirms his independence: "This is my right" (as opposed to "this is the law Cynthia sets down for me").

Although the poet appears to have won Cynthia's heart back through wit, humor, hyperbole, and flattery mixed with genuine love, the writer shows that the poet-lover has defects in his arguments which ultimately expose him and his statements of lifelong fidelity as a charade. And certainly the poems which follow (21-25) confirm his rebellion from Cynthia's servitium. Yet as we saw in Chapter II, in 2.26 the poet-lover finally attempts a reconciliation. Although the writer points out the improbability that their solution will work, it is not until Book 3 and in particular 3.15 that Propertius is able finally to renounce, at least in part, his slavery to Cynthia.
In 2.20, then, Propertius has begun to distance himself from Cynthia through his flippant remarks and self-assertiveness—despite his protestations to be her slave even after death. In 3.15 he further intensifies the distancing process. Although he begins and ends the poem with protestations of faithfulness and a dismissal of his affair with Lycinna from over two years earlier as insignificant, the majority of the poem, the Dirce exemplum (11-42), acts as a warning to Cynthia not to be vengeful lest she suffer a fate similar to that of Dirce. Propertius used a similar technique in 3.7 where he disguised his disavowal of Paetus' type of love within a diatribe ostensibly against the pursuit of money, but which included an attack on Paetus as lover. Thus, 3.15 represents another instance of poetic distancing and sophistication as he ostensibly allays Cynthia's fears about an old rival while at the same time warning her against jealousy.

This much we learn from the framing narrative (1-10, 43-46). But the myth opens up the possibility of further parallels between the characters in the narrative—Propertius, Cynthia and Lycinna—and the characters in the myth within the frame. For example, the sympathy and affection with which Propertius portrays the enslaved Antiope in the myth prompts similar feelings for the slave girl Lycinna. In effect, the poet not only warns Cynthia against jealousy, but also threatens her with a potential reinstatement of his affair with Lycinna.
The myth is open to still other possibilities, primarily because of the writer's emphasis in the tale. Though there are parallels between Propertius-Cynthia-Lycinna and Lycus-Dirce-Antiope, the tale, as the writer has molded it, is essentially a contest between Dirce and every other character within the myth. Lycus, after a brief mention (12), quickly escapes from view and the story can be divided between Dirce's enslavement of Antiope and her punishment at the hands of Antiope's two sons, Zethus and Amphion. Jupiter, meanwhile, is viewed as the ultimate avenger since it was he who had lain with Antiope and begot her two sons. Within this context, then, the only constant between the framing narrative and the myth is Cynthia and Dirce, while it is Propertius who variously takes on the roles of slave, rescuer, and punisher. Thus, the writer presents an even stronger warning to Cynthia than the lover-poet: Cynthia should not concern herself over Lycinna, but over Propertius' slavery to her. Soon, according to the myth, her control over Propertius will cease. She, the enslaver, will become the enslaved (vinxerunt Dirce, 38) and she, the one who buries Propertius' former affairs (cuncta tuus sepelivit amor, 9), will be a corpse (mortem, 40).

The opening ten lines present all the information needed in order to understand the multiple correspondences between the frame and the myth.

Sic ego non ullos iam norim in amore tumultus,
   nec veniat sine te nox vigilanda mihi:
   ut mihi praetexti pudor est velatus amictus
   et data libertas noscere amoris iter,
illa rudes animos per noctes conscia primas
imbuirt, heu nullis capta Lycinna datis!
tertius (haut multo minus est) cum ducitur annus,
vix memini nobis verba coisse decem.
cuncta tuus sepelivit amor, nec femina post te
ulla dedit collo dulcia vincla meo.
(3.15.1-10)

The imagery within the opening couplet describing Propertius' relationship with Cynthia acts as a foil to the imagery in the following couplets which express Propertius' affair with Lycinna. Propertius' hopes in the first couplet are expressed in terms of battles (tumultus, 1) and sleepless nights (nox vigilanda mihi, 2), both military images of Cynthia's control over her beloved. Propertius, on the other hand, describes Lycinna's effect on him with positive images. Although Propertius was still a young man (praetexti ... amictus, 3), Lycinna did not expose his inexperience (pudor est velatus, 3), but offered him freedom (libertas, 4), and the possibility of a successful relationship (amoris iter, 4). As we saw in Chapter II, the imagery of the journey of love, enhanced by the allusion to ship's sails (velatus, 3),\(^\text{36}\) acts in a two-fold way. Just as it had with Milanion, here in 3.15 it signals the pursuit of a successful relationship, but from Cynthia's point of view, it also marks Propertius' escape from her into an old but still threatening affair. Lycinna, aware of Propertius' inexperience in love and herself already well-versed in love (both are meanings of conscia [5]), acted as Propertius' psychopomp, initiating him (imbuit, 6) into the mysteries of love.\(^\text{37}\)
As he tries to allay Cynthia's fear in the next couplet (7-8) assuring her that not even ten words passed between himself and Lycinna in the past three years, he uses a word (coisse, 8) which is frequently used of sexual intercourse. Although the two had not spoken much in the past three years, the poet implies that they might have slept together. In the end, he returns to the imagery of constraint in order to reassure Cynthia that she is his one true love (collo dulcia vincla meo, 10) and adds the imagery of burial (cuncta tuus sepelivit amor, 9). These images evince her control—her love buried past affairs—as well as her alleged tenderness—she will bury him and tend to his grave. Hence, the couplet synthesizes the contrast in the two types of love represented by the two women. Lycinna's love was part of a youthful exuberance (praetexti pudor ... amictus, 3; rudes animos per noctas ... primas, 5) and primarily physical (vix memini nobis verba coisse decem, 8). Cynthia's affection, on the other hand, is to be preferred because of its safeness (non ullos ... tumultus, 1; nec ... nox vigilanda, 2), the security in familiar limitations (dulcia vincla, 10), and the promise of fidelity until death (sepelivit, 9). Despite Propertius' affirmation of their relationship in 9-10, however, the imagery and appeals in the first eight lines favor Lycinna. Propertius no longer wants arguments and sleepless nights (1-2), but he does prefer, it seems, the promise of success in love and escape from Cynthia. Lycinna, though ostensibly part of an earlier relationship, is not mentioned until Book 3 because Propertius intends her as a more positive alternative to Cynthia and a way of
expressing his desire to escape from his relationship with Cynthia. And the final couplet of the frame narrative confirms the poet’s attitude: Cynthia (tuus amor, 9) buried all things, not Propertius. And although no woman has enslaved Propertius since Cynthia (nec femina post te, 9), it is possible that Lycinna did before. Thus, in spite of, or perhaps because of, his protestations of loyalty to Cynthia, the poet makes it clear that he is distancing himself from Cynthia.

The myth confirms and unfolds the poet’s desire to separate himself from Cynthia. It can be divided into three sections of eight lines, each time followed by a pair of couplets in which the narrator to a greater or lesser extent intrudes upon the story. The first section (11-18) establishes the basic correspondences between the frame and the exemplum.

-testis erit Dirce tam sero crimine saeva
Nycteos Antiopen accubuisse Lyco.
ah quotiens pulchros ussit regina capillos
molliaque inmites fixit in ora manus!
ah quotiens famulam pensis oneravit iniquis
et caput in dura ponere iussit humo!
saepe illam inmundis passa est habitare tenebris,
vilem ieiunae saepe negavit aquam.

With the words testis (11) and crimine (11) Propertius immediately places the myth within the context of the courtroom. It is clear that Dirce, who is given the epithet saeva, a word regularly employed by Propertius to designate the domina and Cynthia in particular, is the plaintiff, accusing Antiope of sleeping with Lycus, Dirce’s husband. In the next three distichs, Dirce is already meting out Antiope’s punishment and she now treats her as a
slave and common criminal: she tortures Antiope with fire (iussit, 13), scratches her face (fixit in ora manus, 14), loads her with unjust tasks (15) and commands her to place her head on the hard ground (16), forces her to live in darkness (17), and even denies her water (18), a cruelty reserved only for banished criminals.\textsuperscript{40} Words such as saeva (11), regina (13),\textsuperscript{41} inmitis (14), oneravit (15), iussit (16), and negavit (18) characterize Dirce while mollia (14), famulam (15), and passa est (17) portray Antiope's fragility and complete subjection to her mistress.

The parallels between Dirce's pose as domina and Antiope's as famula fit neatly with the relationship between Cynthia and Lycinna, whose Greek name points to her servile status. Yet the mistress' accusation of sleeping with her vir is given a twist by the introduction of Jupiter in the next section:

\begin{quote}
Iuppiter, Antiopae musquam succurris habenti tot mala? corrumpit dura catena manus.
si deus es, tibi turpe tuam servire puellam:
invocet Antiope quem nisi vincita Iovem?
\end{quote}

(3.15.19-22)

The narrator's invocation to Jupiter reminds the audience that it was the king of the gods who was responsible for Antiope's children, not Lycus. Jupiter is implicated with responsibility for Antiope's servitude, by the narrator (Cynthia's lover) and the blame for Antiope's (and Lycinna's) condition is consequently deflected from Dirce's (and hence Cynthia's) shoulders. The narrator's insertion of Jupiter at this point, however, is a reminder that Lycus was not responsible for sleeping with Antiope and begetting her children (cf. 11-12), but Jupiter. The king of the gods has, therefore, more
than some vague responsibility for Antiope’s misfortune and the narrator justifiably complains to him on Antiope’s behalf.

In the next section, as Antiope escapes the imagery modulates between slavery and travel.

sola tamen, quaecumque aderant in corpore vires, regales manicas rupit utraque manu.  
inde Cithaeronis timido pede currit in arces.  25  
nox erat, et sparsa triste cubile gelu.  
saepe vaga Asopi sonitu permota fluentis credebita dominae pone venire pedes.  
et durum Zethum et lacrimis Amphiona mollem experta est stabulis mater abacta suis.  30  
ac veluti magnum cum ponunt aequora motus, Eurus ubi adverso desinit ire Noto,  
litore sollicito sonitus rarescit harenae: sic cadit inflexo lapsa puella genu.  
(3.15.23-34)

Despite the narrator’s appeal to Jupiter, Antiope escapes Dirce’s slavery (regales manicas rupit, 24) completely on her own (sola, 23). She journeys in fear (timido pede, 25; vaga, 27), searching for safety (arces, 25; cubile, 26; stabulis, 30), dreading the sound of her mistress’ footsteps (dominae pone venire pedes, 27). Images of the sea calming down after a violent storm not only mimic the quarrel between Zethus and Amphion whether to rescue Antiope but also add to the travel imagery of Antiope’s escape: the sound of the surf (sonitus, 33) echoes the sound of the river Asopus (Asopi sonitu, 27), whose motion caused Antiope to hear the footsteps of the pursuing Dirce (28). Antiope still tries to escape (inflexo genu, 34), but eventually collapses, worn out by the emotional and physical rigors of the trip. Indeed, in other versions of the myth Antiope is nearly put to death by her mistress, and the vocabulary here (cadit ... lapsa, 34) suggests death’s imminence.
In the last section, Antiope's deliverance and Dirce's ignoble end are related in the imagery of enslavement.

Antiope's sons not only acknowledge their own mistake in not recognizing their mother but also understand the reason for Antiope's wandering (matris est cognitus error, 35). And through the juxtaposition digne lovis natos (36), the poet reiterates the divine parentage of Zethus and Amphion. In the process, not only is Lycus absolved of Dirce's allegations, but implicitly so is Propertius from Cynthia's accusations. Jupiter, meanwhile, is given responsibility both for the old man's rescue of Antiope's sons from exposure (digne lovis ... senex, 36) and for Antiope's ultimate deliverance (Antiope, cognosce Iovem, 39), while the sons take credit for Dirce's punishment (puerique trahendam/vinxerunt Dircen, 37-38), even exult in it (41-42). Antiope's bondage (catena, 20; vincula, 22; manicas, 24) and nearness to death (caput in duro ... humo, 16; inmundis ... tenebris, 17; cadit ... lapsa, 34) have now been transferred to Dirce (vinxerunt, 38; mortem, 40) and the circle is complete.

The poem concludes with the narrator's remarks to Cynthia.

at tu non meritam parcas vexare Lycinnam:
nescit vestra ruens ira referre pedem.
He warns Cynthia not to punish Lycinna (vexare, 43). And he links his warning explicitly with the myth by using the plural vestra (44) to refer to both Cynthia's and Dirce's ira—and perhaps women in general—and by alluding to Dirce's pursuit of Antiope (dominae pedes, 28; referre pedem, 44). His assertion that nulla fabula (45) will disturb Cynthia's ears, however, belies such a one-sided conclusion in which Dirce is the only parallel in the myth with the framing narrative. Perhaps, Cynthia will hear no more tales of Propertius' liaisons with Lycinna, but the myth has already done just that. Indeed, the poet has left planted several suggestions within the myth which could imply a continuing bond between Propertius and Lycinna. Not only is Antiope mistreated as a famula (15), she is also named a puella (34)—despite being the mother of two grown boys—a word which is odd in the context unless Propertius intends it to also refer to an amatory context. Such a framework unfolds in the allusions to Jupiter. Just as Propertius has not seen Lycinna for a long time and has done little to protect her, ultimately Jupiter, after a long wait (cf. 19-22), comes to Antiope's rescue just as Propertius comes to Lycinna's defense. Moreover, the sympathy with which the poet describes Antiope's enslavement and escape hints at a similar affection for Lycinna. Hence, to some extent the poet suggests that a similar bond of affection exists between himself and Lycinna just as between Jupiter and Antiope. Although Jupiter comes to Antiope's rescue, however, there is no
indication that their liaison is renewed. Similarly, Cynthia should not fear such a threat. Although the affection remains between them, Propertius will be faithful to Cynthia alone (solum, 46) until death (lignis funeris istus, 46).

The final four lines of the poem, however, contain a number of troublesome phrases which Propertius the writer uses to encourage us to re-examine the poem in another light. Lycinna is said not to deserve (non meritam, 43) Cynthia's wrath, and Propertius proclaims his faithfulness in language reminiscent of Dirce's punishments (ussit, 13; ustus, 46). Moreover, the promise of loyalty even after death (te solum et lignis funeris ustus amem, 46) is phrased in such a way that the writer invites disbelief: the perfect participle referring to an already completed action (ustus) and the graphic reference to wood of the funeral pyre make it difficult to accept how such remains can possibly love Cynthia. Yet, if Lycinna does not merit Cynthia's ire and Propertius depicts himself with the same language with which he characterizes Antiope and if his final statement of commitment lacks credibility, then we must re-examine the elegy to see if perhaps Antiope's fate is a parallel to Propertius'. Admittedly, the links between Antiope and Lycinna are present, but the correspondences between Antiope and Propertius, the writer makes clear, are equally pervasive.

As we saw above, the images which characterized Antiope were slavery, travel and death. And in the first ten lines of the poem, Propertius depicts himself with similar imagery. Although Lycinna gave Propertius the freedom to learn the amoris iter (4), it was
primarily Propertius' journey, not Lycinna's. And while Lycinna's Greek name indicates that she is quite probably a slave girl, Propertius specifically mentions that she was not the slave of love (heu nullis capta Lycinna datis, 6).

Propertius, however, is the slave of Cynthia's love and wears her chains around his neck (dedit collo dulcia vincla meo, 10). Propertius, moreover, has been on the journey of love throughout the first three books, and though he appeared to reject traveling as too treacherous in 3.7, Propertius the writer made clear that the lover's solution—burial outside the doors of his mistress (3.7.71-72)—was no solution either. Hence, his slavery begins to parallel Antiope's, his journey begins to correspond to Antiope's. For Antiope, both situations have the potential to end in death. Her mistress forces her to place her head, a metonymy for her whole being, on the earth (caput in dura ponere ... humo, 16) and to live in the shadows of the other world (inmundis ... habitare tenebris, 17), and even denies her water (18) the means of life. Antiope's escape is just as perilous and brings her near death (sparso triste cubile gelu, 26; cadit ... lapsa puella, 34). In the same way, Cynthia brings death and burial upon Propertius (cuncta tuus sepelivit amor, 9). Propertius prays for love after death at the end of the poem—a death which Cynthia has brought about—but it is only a wish (amem, 46), not a fact, and the ability of his cremated remains to keep loving is suspect.
At the end of the poem, Propertius says that Lycinna does not merit punishment (43), and in the myth we learn that Lycus was wrongly implicated in the crime (11-12)—that Antiope has slept with Jupiter, not Lycus (19-22, 36). The writer does not want the similarity of the two situations to escape our notice and purposely repeats the root lyk- ‘wolf’ in both names to draw attention to their innocence. In asserting that Lycinna should not be punished, he suggests that the guilty party is himself. Cynthia’s options are then one of two possibilities: either she will forgive him or else punish him. Although Cynthia’s options theoretically include forgiveness, nowhere does the writer lead us to believe this will come true. Instead, the vivid picture of her counterpart in the myth torturing her slave seems all too true against the backdrop of the lover’s feeble protestations about dulcia vincla (10) and impossible promises to love after death (46). Rather than simply a warning by the poet, the story of the enslaver becoming the enslaved, of receiving death instead of inflicting it, seems much closer to self-fulfilling prophecy. The exultant strains of Amphion’s paean (41-42) parallel the writer’s mood as the relationship begins to come to a close in the last ten poems of the third book.
Chapter III: Notes


3 Catullus' use of the servitium theme is rather limited, found primarily in Poem 68. See Menefee (1981) 64-68 and Murgatroyd (1981) 595-596. Much more frequent is his use of the metaphor of
love as a disease, e.g. Poems 50 and 51. See J. Svennung, *Catulla Bildersprache*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 3 (Uppsala 1945) 122-127. In addition, there is some indication that he used the furor motif to reflect the language of partisan politics and thereby set his relationship with Lesbia against a larger social background. See Marilyn B. Skinner, "Disease Imagery in Catullus 76.17-26," *CP* 82 (1987) 230-233.

4 No one, to my knowledge has commented on the inner and outer aspect of the lover's furor and servitium in Lucr. 4.1030ff. For a general appreciation of the passage and its Hellenistic and neoteric background, see E.J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne* Ser. 4, 23 (1970) 366-392, esp. 380-388.


6 Critics tend to downplay the references to love as a disease in 1.5. See, for example, R.O.A.M. Lyne, "Propertius 1.5," *Mnemosyne* Ser. 4, 27 (1974) 262-269.

7 E.g. 1.9.5-8, 15-24; 1.18.7-8, 17-18, 23-26.

8 Lyne (1979) 117-130, in particular, stresses that one of the primary differences between Propertius' and Tibullus' use of servitium amoris is that Tibullus invites punishment while Propertius resists his servitude. In general, Lyne is correct, but Propertius' statements in 1.10, though exaggerated, reveal a partial acceptance of his slavery.


10 Richardson 165.


12 To a great extent I follow the interpretation of R.O.A.M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980) 110-114, but I differ from him in seeing beneath the poem's surface
a recognition, almost an acceptance, of the advantages of slavery to one's domina.

13 Richardson 173.


15 Camps 1:68.


17 Richardson 174 suggests that line 20 should be read with lowercase amor, but will not allow for the possibility of understanding both Amor and amor in the line.

18 In 1.7.15-20 the poet-lover speaks of receiving death from a type of warfare, i.e. Cupid's arrows.


21 For example, Propertius is quite willing to tease Ponticus in 1.7 and 9 and Gallus in 1.10. At times, he even uses hyperbole in his addresses to Cynthia in Book 1, e.g. 1.2. But in 1.2, his exaggeration derives from the joy which they share at this point in their relationship. Later in the book, e.g. 1.15, it is Cynthia's actions which are exaggerated as she dallies to come in Propertius' periclum and then puts on false concern. In Book 2 there are several examples of Propertius taking the dominant position, even if his words sometimes do not support this. For example, in 2.14.23ff. Propertius applies the imagery of triumph to his victory over Cynthia in their battles of love. Cf. also 2.15.25, 2.26, and 2.28.

22 In 2.20.7-8, I follow the major manuscripts, reading Niobe, superbe, and lacrimans. Rothstein 1:338-339, Enk 2:272-273, Camps 2:146, and Richardson 269-270 follow the first and third, but read superba. On superba, see Shackleton Bailey 102-103.


24 For the myth of Procne and Philomela, see Apollodorus 3.14; Hyginus, Fab. 45; Ovid, Met. 6.412-674. For Niobe, see Hom.
In addition to Ovid who incorporates both myths within the same book, Sophocles Electra 147-152 mentions them together as types of mourning.

Most scholars have not allowed the myth to function as humor, chiding, and flattery. See e.g. Godo Lieberg, "Die Mythologie des Properz in der Forschung und die Idealisierung Cynthias," RHM 112 (1969) 331-332.

Richardson 270 takes in te as accusative of motion, but Tränkle 91 understands it as in with the ablative, translating "in your case."

Richardson 270 is hesitant to see an allusion to the common epitaph sit tibi terra levis, in part because he believes that Propertius is only serious in this line. For examples of the epitaph, see Richmond Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (Urbana 1962) 65-74.


Out of the first four exempla, Williams (1980) 68 mentions only that Briseis lost a lover and Andromache a husband. More important to thematic unity of the exempla is that all four lost a loved one.

Additionally, Williams (1980) 68 points out that the story of Jupiter's golden shower supports the idea that Propertius is somehow being unfaithful by being in Danae's tower. Indeed, the reader would expect Propertius not to be taking the female, but the male, role.

On Tityus' attempted rape of Leto, see Hyginus, Fab. 55; and RE s.v. Tityos, pp. 1595ff. On Sisyphus' betrayal of Jupiter's love for Aegina, see Paus. 2.5.1; for gaining permission to return and punish his wife for her (obedient) neglect of his funeral services, see Pherecydes, frg. 119. Contra Francis Cairns, Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome (Cambridge 1979) 55.

Cf. OLD s.v. ius 9, 10.

34 I do not see any necessary reason for placing lines 45-46 after the first couplet as Richardson does nor for using 43-44 to create a bridge between the framing narrative and the myth after line 10 as Hanslik does. And I do not see any reason for a lacuna after line 10 even though some manuscripts (FLPDV) begin a new poem here. As both Macleod and Williams have pointed out, Propertius, as Catullus in Poem 68 had done with the Protesilaus-Laodamia myth, presents a paradeigma as a substitute for a statement in primary language. It is a conscious technique by the poet to create a more ambiguous and, consequently, a richer and more complex poem. In this case, the purpose for Propertius' indirect statement is due in part to the strong warning which the myth contains.

35 This easy correspondence is the usual view of the poem. See e.g. Shackleton Bailey 186-187 and Yardley (1974) 429-434. Williams (1980) presents a minimalist view of the standard treatment, saying that there are only correspondences between Cynthia and Dirce and between Lycinna and Antiope. But neither of these views allow for the multiple correspondences which the poet has created. The only parallel which must remain fixed is that between Cynthia and Dirce while either Lycinna or Propertius can alternately take the role of Antiope.

36 While every editor from Rothstein to the present has viewed velatus as an incomprehensible reading, it is an obvious choice for a poet who likes to open language up to new possible meanings. Not only does Propertius' choice reinforce the theme of iter amoris, it also plays with the usual sense of velo. Instead of describing a person covered with clothes, an emotion (pudor) associated with clothes is concealed because of Lycinna has initiated Propertius into the journey of love. See OLD s.v. velo 5.

37 Richardson 381 remarks on the double sense of conscia and alludes to the potential for imagery of initiation.


39 Propertius' change in attitude can be seen in the way in which he quotes himself. In 1.17.19 (illisc [Roma] si quae meum sepelissent fata dolorem) Propertius had deflected the blame for the end of love from Cynthia to fata. In 3.15.9 Cynthia (tuus amor) is made directly responsible (cuncta tuus sepelivit amor).

40 Richardson 382-383.

41 saeva and regina fit not only Dirce and Cynthia, but also remind one of the vengeful queen of the gods, Juno, in Vergil's Aeneid.
Cf. 3.9.6 where inflexo genu is also used in a context of flight.

Cf. Hyginus, Fab. 8. In 3.15, Dirce is not given direct responsibility for Antiope’s brush with death because at one level of the poem the lover is still trying to allay Cynthia’s doubts about Lycinna rather than accuse her of such ultimate harshness. But sepelivit amor (9) allows the writer to suggest otherwise.

On vexare used in the context of servile punishments, see 2.20.29.

CHAPTER IV

The Lover's Condition, Part II: Furor Amoris

As Propertius' ineffectual rebellion against his slavery gradually gave way to at least a poetic mastery over Cynthia through the Dirce exemplum, one side of the lover's condition was made evident. Just as servitium characterized his relations with Cynthia and acted as the external manifestation of his helplessness in love, the imagery of illness, as we shall see, illuminates his inner condition, his inner weakness. After a relatively independent use of furor amoris throughout most of the second and third books, at the end of 3.17 Propertius once again allows the images to merge as he closes out his affair with Cynthia in 3.24 and 25.

Three poems in particular focus on the illness of the lover and allow us to trace the course of the disease, at least for Propertius. In 1.15 Propertius, exhibiting all the signs of love-sickness, complains of Cynthia's slowness to respond to the danger he is experiencing. In 2.28 Cynthia appears to come down with a similar malady, and Propertius, unlike Cynthia in 1.15, actively solicits the gods for her recovery. Although we never learn if he recovers in 1.15, his prayers for Cynthia's recovery in 2.28 appear to be answered, which encourages him in 3.17 to pray to
the gods, Bacchus this time, to remove his illness. Although he seems to have escaped it in 3.24 where he dedicates himself to Mens-Bona, significantly in 3.17 there is no sign that Bacchus has or ever will heal him.

Of these three poems, only one, 2.28, has generally been recognized to deal with illness and only recently has that illness been diagnosed as love-sickness. In 1.15 there has not been any consensus on what Propertius' periclum is. Although Shackleton Bailey attempted to settle the problem, asserting that periclum could mean "illness," all of his examples have words qualifying periclum. Hence the problem is far from settled. Critics have spoken of 3.17 as "an evocation of the progress of inebriation" or as a "prayer to the wine-god to bring rest to the love-tormented poet," but no one has specifically connected the poem with the continuing illness of love which Propertius has experienced since he introduced himself and his situation in 1.1 and of which these three poems are only the most prominent, full-length discussions of the theme.

The repetition and prominence of the symptoms of love-sickness in the poems immediately preceding 1.15 are meant to provide a framework within which we can distill the meaning of Propertius' periclum in 1.15. In 1.13 he sees Gallus exhibiting most of the symptoms of demens ... furor (1.13.20): he is languishing, bound to his girlfriend's neck (toto vinctum ... collo, 1.13.15) weeping and unable to speak (1.13.16-7). But the image which follows (1.13.21-24), Hercules' fire for Hebe, casts a long shadow upon the
positive value of the lover's condition since it is also the same fire which ignites his death. Propertius' encomium on the power of Love in 1.14 should be tempered by his own situation and by statements within the poem itself. In a sense, the poem is a momentary interlude between Cynthia's refusal to return from Baiae in 1.11 and 12 and the new danger he feels in 1.15, followed by his own voyage, desolation, and death in 1.17-19. Although he asserts Love's power to overcome the power of wealth and the strength of heroes, he also reminds us of his own situation: Venus brings dolor (1.14.18) to the hardest hearts and she makes a miser iuvenis (1.14.21) toss upon his bed in anguish. She is not afraid to cross the threshold, but excluded lovers have no such power. And perhaps mottled textiles and richly dyed garments mean nothing to her (ostrino toro, 1.14.20; variis serica textilibus, 1.14.22), but their use as presents (munera, 1.14.24) to one's beloved are visible symbols of the lover's enslavement and madness (cf. Lucretius 4.1123-32).

Coming after such images of the lover's enfeeblement in 1.13 and 14, the language of 1.15 makes clear that the sentiments of the entire poem from beginning to end are uttered by a love-sick lover. His accusations about Cynthia's levitas (1-4) and suspicions about her interest in a potential rival (5-8) are the same symptoms which we saw the love-sick Cynthia demonstrate in 1.3.35ff., and of which Lucretius speaks in 4.11.37-40. The mythological heroines are not only examples of fidelity, but also supreme examples of love-sickness (9-22). And Propertius ends the poem with the
ultimate charge that even Cynthia’s love-sickness was a part of her dissembling (37-40). The poem, in short, unfolds gradually a tension between how one should act in love (i.e. be love-sick) and how one should not act if one is truly in love (to dally in coming to aid one’s lover and to feign love-sickness). Propertius' argument, which centers on the contrast between Cynthia and the mythological paradigms in the first half of the poem (1-24), is expanded in the second half of the poem (25-42) to include himself in contrast to Cynthia.7

Propertius begins the poem with an expression of disappointment and a concern:

Saepe ego multa tuae levitatis dura timebam hac tamen excepta, Cynthia, perfidia. aspice me quanto rapiat fortuna periculo! tu tamen in nostro lenta timore venis.

(1.15.1-4)

In the first couplet the cause of Propertius' complaint is not made clear, but a series of suggestive words—saepe, multa, the plural dura, and the durative force of timebam—depict Propertius' frequent disappointments while the dramatic pause after excepta, the postponement of its noun perfidia until the final position, and the interjection of Cynthia's name between the two words reveal an increase in Propertius' aggravation at Cynthia's current behavior. His exasperation continues in the third line with an exclamation heightened by the disjunction of quanto ... periculo, but still no specific grievance has emerged. Only in the fourth line do we hear that Cynthia, by not coming quickly in Propertius' distress (lenta ... venis, 4), has not been acting as a true friend should.8
In the next two couplets Propertius elaborates further on Cynthia's conduct and concludes with a second, more serious charge:

\[
\begin{align*}
et \text{ potes hestemos manibus componere crines} \\
et \text{ longa faciem quaerere desidia} \\
\text{nec minus Eois pectus variare lapillis,} \\
\text{ut formosa novo quae parat ire viro.}
\end{align*}
\]

(1.15.5-8)

The hexameter lines point to her meticulousness about her appearance (hesternos ... componere crines; Eois pectus variare lapillis) while the pentameters emphasize Propertius' interpretation of her actions: longa desidia must be a sign that she no longer cares for him and is preparing for a date with another man. And the reference to yesterday's coiffure (hesternos ... crines) hints that she is duplicating the hairdressing efforts, which only yesterday she had exerted for Propertius' benefit, for another man. Indeed, Propertius' conclusion at the end of the first pair of couplets was extravagant enough—she no longer acted as a friend should—but the second pair of couplets indicates that Propertius believes she is preparing to transfer her affection and no longer acting as a lover should. His periclum, we begin to realize, is not something extraneous to their love affair; it is the result of Cynthia's demonstrated, or so Propertius thinks, lack of affection for Propertius.

Propertius is not acting the part of a sane, calm man in these lines. He fabricates an extravagant conclusion which cannot be supported from the evidence presented. Her current conduct, dressing up and not coming immediately at her lover's summons, can be interpreted in many ways. Her past instances of levitas (1) need
not have any bearing on her current behavior. But Propertius extrapolates from past instances of Cynthia's levitas (1) and her present lack of celerity in coming to him to the quite unnecessary conclusion that she is dressing to go visit another lover. Moreover, a calm man, secure in his love, would not launch into a tirade and a series of accusations to begin his remarks to his beloved, but would be understanding and forgiving. Of course, none of this is unusual for a man who is in love (cf. Lucr. 4.1137-40). In fact, it might be perfectly justified after Cynthia's extended stay in Baiae. Yet this is exactly the point. Propertius' irrationality, misinterpretation, and anger are the symptoms of the love-sick, a man who has contracted furor amoris.

In the next section, he takes on the role of the magister amoris, utilizing as examples four women who are in love:

at non sic Ithaci digressu mota Calypso desertis olim fleverat aequoribus:
multos illa dies incomptis maesta capillis sederat, iniusto multa locuta salo,
et quamvis numquam post haec visura dolebat illa tamen, longae conscia laetitiae.
Alphesiboea suas ulta est pro coniuge fratres, sanguinis et cari vincula rupit amor.
nec sic Aesoniden rapientibus anxia ventis Hypsipyle vacuo constitit in thalamo:
Hypsipyle nullos post illos sensit amores,
ut semel Haemonio tabuit hospitio.
coniugis Euadne miseros elata per ignes occidit, Argivae fama pudicitiae.
quarum nulla tuos potuit convertere mores,
tu quoque uti fieres nobilis historia.

The opening phrases at non sic (9), followed by nec sic (17), declare his purpose: he is contrasting Cynthia with these mythological heroines. And his one couplet conclusion (23-24) makes
clear that he had hoped to persuade Cynthia into changing her habits. There has been little agreement concerning what all four of these heroines represent. Certainly, the reference to Calypso's unkempt hair (incomptis capillis, 11) is meant to contrast with Cynthia's elaborate care of her own hair (componere crines, 5), yet this poem is not about Cynthia's coiffure and dressing routine. And in fact none of the other exempla refers explicitly to appearance. It has been posited that all four represent instances of fidelity. Yet Calypso uttering threats to the sea— the usual interpretation of iniusto multa locuta salo (12)— and Hypsipyle wasting away in her bridal chamber all alone (vacuo ... in thalamo, 18) seem to be examples of disdain and rejection rather than fidelity.

Clearly Bennett is correct in seeing that the poem hinges on Cynthia's perfidia, her dissembling and lying, not her fidelity. Yet, he has not taken the exempla far enough: he says that the heroinae are credible paradigms for Cynthia because they are genuine protestations of love in contrast to her dissembling. He says that Calypso exhibits the signs of a woman truly in love: she is mota (9), tearful (10), maesta (11), disheveled and dejected (12), and querulous (12). These are moreover all the signs of a woman who is love-sick. Bennett, in rejecting the idea that Propertius' periculum is not physical illness, eliminates the idea that the poem could be about love-sickness. But the other women are characterized by words, familiar by now, that connote love-sickness. Alphesiboea's amor breaks the bonds (vincula, 16) of blood kinship, presumably because of her own enslavement in the vincula amoris. Hypsipyle is
anxia (17), pining and wasting away (tabuit, 20) in an empty bridal chamber (vacuo in thalamo, 18). And Evadne, through the use of a transferred epithet, is miser (Evadne miseros lata per ignes, 21). While there are more words typical of love-sickness in the two longer exempla (Calypso and Hypsipyle), the actions of the women in the two shorter ones suggest those of the two most famous furiosae in ancient literature. Like Medea, Alphesiboea kills her brothers to prove her love for her husband, and like Dido, Evadne commits suicide, ultimately to be with her husband in the next world.11 Clearly, Propertius is indicating to Cynthia how she should act if she is truly in love with him, if she is truly love-sick.

The order of the exempla has also been a source of controversy. Nearly all recent editors assume that Propertius is attempting to create a progression from least to greatest, but many object that at non sic (9) must be followed by nec sic (17), thereby displacing 15–16 (Alphesiboea) after either line 20 (Markland) or line 22 (Lachmann).12 The result is a progression based not on the effect of all four exempla, but on the editor’s personal preferences concerning the greatest model of fidelity, which I have shown not to be of primary importance in the passage. None of these changes is necessary if one considers that Propertius has two ideas here, exemplified by two exempla each, each introduced by either at non sic or nec sic, and the first and longer example in each instance followed by one which is but a single couplet. The first group is that of Calypso and Alphesiboea, whose love-sickness is of a lesser sort since they do not accept their suffering willingly, but instead
go on the attack. Calypso utters insults to the sea (as a surrogate for Ulysses) and Alphesiboea takes vengeance upon her own flesh and blood. The second group, Hypsipyle and Evadne, represent the more serious case of furor amoris; both of them react more passively and pathetically and do not take physical vengeance upon men. The picture of Hypsipyle, abandoned and standing in her now empty bed chamber (vacuo constitit in thalamo, 18), reminds us much more of Propertius' own abandonment at the beginning of the elegy, and the simple expression employed to describe Evadne after she had performed obsequies for her spouse—occidit, 'she died'—foreshadows Propertius' own ultimate act of love-sickness in 1.19. Thus, while these heroines are offered as exemplars for Cynthia to follow, in many ways they do more to suggest parallels for Propertius' love-sickness. Cynthia should act as if she were love-sick, too, just as Propertius is.

But more to the point, the heroines' responses to the men act as a warning to Cynthia, each with ever more serious results. Calypso utters threats to the unjust sea (iniusto ... salo, 12), unjust because that is her judgment of Ulysses' departure. Alphesiboea kills her brothers. Hypsipyle knows that she will never love again (nullos post illos aestit amores, 19), a more terrible fate for a lover than death. And by her choice of death, Evadne takes away any hope from men who wish to love her. Not only will she not respond to their advances, as was the case with Hypsipyle, she will not exist for them even to hope to love her. Thus, these heroines are not only models of how Cynthia should act if she were
love-sick for Propertius, but inasmuch as they reflect Propertius' status as love-lorn, they also serve as a warning of what Propertius in his furor might do.13

Despite the heroic exemplars of women madly in love just presented (nobilis historia, 24), Propertius concludes that Cynthia will not change (quarum nulla tuos potuit convertere mores, 23). Her actions, however, have undergone a transformation from her previous slowness in responding to his danger to more extravagant expressions, expressions which suggest the character of one who is love-sick. She now makes a list of perjuria (25) and hopes to move the gods to forgiveness (movere deos, 26). She now is ready to grieve at Propertius' danger (nostro dolitura periculo, 27). She speaks obscurely of the possibility that she might die (si quid forte tibi durius inciderit, 28).14 She threatens to injure her eyes somehow or pray that they fall out of their sockets (ut tibi suppositis exciderent manibus, 36), since Propertius prays that they not seem worthless to her (viles, 33). Finally, she too becomes pale (multos pallere colores, 39) and weeps (fletum ... ducere, 40). Her weeping and her threats recall Calypso (fleverat, 10; injusto multa locuta sale, 12). Her vows to do herself bodily harm (e.g. pluck out her eyes) remind us of Evadne's self-destruction (21-2). And her grieving, promising, changing colors and exaggerated defense are all signs of her love-sickness. Evidently, she seems to have taken the example of Propertius' heroines to heart. Yet we learn of Cynthia's changes in manner only through Propertius' response to them. He begins emphatically with a command
desine (25) which continues his tone from the first eight lines. He recognizes her change of manner as another instance of her perfidia (2, 34). He is not concerned with past offenses (periuria, 25) or about extravagant grief over his periculum in the future (audax ah nimum nostro dolitura periculo, 27). But suddenly his tone changes when Cynthia suggests that something terrible might happen to her. The euphemism si quid forte tibi durius inciderit (28) suggests the fate of Hypsipyle or even Evadne. Evidently, Cynthia has learned from Propertius’ lesson. Propertius’ castigation turns into a pledge of commitment—nature will become topsy-turvy (29-30) before his love for her changes (31)—and to his initial concern: sis quodcumque voles, non aliena tamen, "Be whatever you will, just do not be another's" (32).15

He had told her strongly to quit reminding the gods of her periuria and not to be deceitful by grieving overly much at his danger. Now Propertius seems to have backed down from the rather emphatic desine which opened the second half. The answer is twofold. Cura in the previous line (31) reminds us of his love-sickness. It is a sign of his furor that he is so much in love that it does not matter how she acts, as long as his greatest fear is not fulfilled, that she belong to another man (aliena). Cynthia has taken his advice to heart and is acting love-sick, but Propertius will not believe her because she is still dissembling (audax ah nimum, 27; quis te cogebatur multos pallere colores/ et fletum invitis ducere luminibus?, 39-40). Yet at the least he wants her with him, despite her lies and deceitfulness.
The second reason Propertius retreats from his initial forcefulness occurs in the next three couplets:

\begin{quote}
tam tibi ne viles isti videantur ocelli,  
per quos saepe mihi credita perfidia est!  
hos tu iurabas, si quid mentita fuisses,  
ut tibi suppositis exciderent manibus:  
et contra magnum potes hos attollere Solem  
nec tremis admissae conscia nequitiae?  
\end{quote}

(1.15.33-38)

Previously her eyes were signs of her fidelity. She swore that if she deceived Propertius, they would fall out of their sockets (35-36). Yet they were also the reason Propertius kept believing her even when she was dissembling (per quos saepe mihi credita perfidia est, 34). He has been willing to look past her perfidia, but if she does snatch them out, if the Sun, who sees all things, learns of her lies and her obvious nequitia, then Propertius' own light will be gone. Cynthia's eyes captured him in 1.1 and were responsible for wounding him with love-sickness. Yet they are also responsible for giving him life, since his life now depends on Cynthia. Thus, if Cynthia's eyes, the symbol of her own life as well as Propertius', are found guilty of dissembling, Propertius will die.

The last half of the poem, therefore, exhibits a progression. First, Propertius tells Cynthia what to do (desine), namely to stop being deceitful (25-26). Propertius realizes, however, that if something happens to her, he will still love her (27-32). In line 32, he has backed down from his order that she stop being a dissembler and now requests (note the subjunctive sis [32]) simply that she not give herself to other men. The ultimate reason that he
backs down, in case something more serious happens to her (durius), is explained in 33-38: her lies may incur the wrath of the gods, especially Sol who sees all. In 39-40, Propertius says that she does not need to be deceitful since no one forced her (cogebat, 39) to show her pallor or to cry. Evidently her pallor and false tears have persuaded Propertius to shift from his initial rebuke to her and to deliver it to other lovers:

\[ \text{quis ego nunc pereo similis moniturus amantes:} \\
\text{\'o nullis tutum credere blanditiis!'} \]

(1.15.41-42)

Thus, his accusation about dissembling has been diminished first into a plea simply that she not leave him, and finally deflected into a warning to other lovers like him. His complete and total love-sickness is proven once and for all by his ultimate capitulation to the eyes which first captured him.

Typically, his warning to other lovers is useless, for Propertius cannot even extricate himself from his own condition. And the warning which Propertius should take to heart recalls his warning to Cynthia in the mythological exempla. If Propertius parallels the condition of those women, he should take note of what the men in each case do to the women. Ulysses abandons Calypso; Alcmaeon is banished from Alphesiboea and marries a second wife in her stead; Jason leaves Hypsipyle in her bridal chamber; and worst of all, Evadne's husband, Capaneus, perishes prematurely because of his boast that Jupiter himself could not stop his assault on Thebes. Propertius' own warnings have now come full circle. The warner should take heed of his own warnings. He may perish from
unrequited love (pereo, 41), but his relationship is also dying because of the mendacity of Cynthia's actions and Propertius' refusal or inadequacy to deal with them.

At the end of 1.15 Propertius says that he is dying (pereo, 1.15.41) because of Cynthia's perfidia. Of course, he may be referring only to the common erotic metaphor of dying because of unrequited love, but as some have pointed out, the use of pereo in this context has a more literal meaning. Bennett suggests that the futurity of moniturus in the same line implies that pereo is literal,\(^\text{17}\) that Propertius will actually die because of her treatment of him, because of his incurable illness. But within the context of the Monobiblos death is a metaphor of emotional distance, a fate which Propertius will approach in the following poems, especially in 17-19.\(^\text{18}\) The examples of Alphesiboea and Evadne, as parallels for Propertius, may imply a very positive notion, namely that Propertius is willing to kill to defend his beloved's honor or to die in order to be with his beloved. But the pereo joined at the end of the poem with a very strong warning to other lovers not to follow his example marks an overall negative connotation of death in the poem, one that has been borne out in our reading of 1.19.

The conjunction of illness with death becomes much more pronounced in the concluding section of the programatic poem of the second book:\(^\text{19}\)

\begin{verbatim}
omnes humanos sanat medicina dolores:
solus Amor morbi non habet artificem.
tarda Philoctetae sanavit crura Machaon,
Phoenicis Chiron lumina Phillyrides,
\end{verbatim}
et deus extinctum Cressis Epidaurius herbis
restituit patriis Androgeona focis,
Mysus et Haemonia iuvenis qua cuspidem vulnus
senserat, hac ipsa cuspidem sensit opem.
hoc si quis vitium poterit mihi demere, solus
Tantaleae poterit tradere poma manu;
dolia virgineis idem ille repleverit urnis,
ne tenera assidua colla graventur aqua;
idem Caucasia solvet de rupe Promethei
brachia et a medio pectore pellet avem.

(2.1.57-70)

He opens these lines with the proposition that there is a remedy for all things—except for love (57-58). In the next three couplets (59-64), he notes that Machaon, Chiron, Asclepius, and Telephus all effected cures for various afflictions. Asclepius even brings the dead Androgeon back to life. Yet the last three examples (65-70) are parallels of the lover whose dolor never ceases and whose affliction is never healed: Tantalus, who raped Ganymede, never reaches the apples; the Danaids carry jugs which can never be full; and Prometheus, because of his lust for Athena, is tortured by a bird which pecks at his breast/heart. Ultimately, the impossibility of a cure leads Propertius to think of death, for in the first line to follow this section, he speaks of his own death: quandocumque igitur vitam mea fata reposcent (2.1.71). As he made clear at the beginning of this passage, love does not desire a cure (58). Indeed, as Propertius said earlier in the poem, the only praiseworthy deed is to die in love (laus in amore mori, 2.1.47).

This attitude of fearlessness in the face of death, encountered in 1.19 and 2.1, receives its most eloquent statement in 2.27.20 Mortals know neither the hour nor the manner of death (2.27.1-10), only the lover knows (solus amans novit, 2.27.11), and
needs not fear death because his puella can call him back from the Underworld with a whisper.

si modo clamantis revocaverit aura puellae, concessum nulla lege redibit iter.  
(2.27.15-16)

Poem 2.27, as a sort of generalized epigram on 2.26 and a prelude to 2.28, the next illness poem, appears to confirm the lover’s statements of a joint iter amoris, and even to go a step further. For in saying that the lover can be called back from death by his puella, he need no longer fear the harsh waves and winds of the iter amoris. He is in control of his death as well as his life to the point that any fear of death is rendered meaningless: his puella will call him back, even though no law admits passage back from the underworld (concessum nulla lege ... iter, 2.27.16). The iter amoris of the unified lover and beloved in 2.26 has become real merely by Propertius’ stating and affirming it: the puella calls the lover on the iter.

Yet this new-won fearlessness in the face of death provides a foil to 2.28,21 for love-sickness has overtaken Cynthia (affectae, 2.28.1), and Propertius asks Jupiter to take pity on his puella:22

Iuppiter, affectae tandem miserere puellae:  
tam formosa tuum mortua crimen erit.  
(2.28.1-2)

Cynthia is near death (mortua, 2), yet Propertius is worried about her. He prays to Jupiter (41), Persephone and Hades (47-48); he invokes the powers of magic (35-38), and when Cynthia recovers at the end, even tells her to pray in thanksgiving to Diana and Isis (59-62). His prayers appear to work, for by the end of the poem the
danger seems to have passed (dimissa periclo, 59). Yet 2.28, following so closely upon his flaunting of death in 2.27, should not show this concern with Cynthia's death, even in fun. Such an immediate reversal can only serve to diminish his generalizations in 2.27 from death in general to "perishing" in happy love-making or can only make 2.28 a parody of those who are too concerned with those they love. We will return to 2.27, but let us first look at 2.28 more carefully.

If one compares the opening and closing lines of 2.28, it is easy to see a progression from Cynthia near death (mortua, 2) to once again being in the bloom of life (mea lux, 59). Every critic agrees that Cynthia at the end of the poem has, if she is not recovered, at least been promised the hope of being restored to life. Yet what danger is she in? A recent article by Paul Alessi has pointed out that Cynthia is not necessarily physically ill, as all previous critics have assumed. affectae (1) does not refer to physical illness unless the context shows that this is the meaning. In fact, affectus usually refers to mental or emotional conditions. And Propertius the lover makes it clear in the opening lines that it is not the hot weather which is bothering Cynthia, but her refusal to hold the gods sacred (totiens sanctos non habuisse deos, 6). In fact, she seems to have put herself on equal footing with Venus, Juno and Minerva (9-12).

From Propertius' reference to swearing and not respecting the gods in 6-8, the lover reminds us of Cynthia's oaths in 1.15, the oaths that Propertius hoped that she would not make again lest she
remind the gods of the ones she had already broken. Now, we are left to infer, the gods have caught up with her, in particular Venus, Juno and Minerva. Cynthia’s comparison with the triad of goddesses assembled here implies a revised version of the judgment of Paris in which none of the goddesses is judged most beautiful, but Cynthia is so judged instead. Propertius suggests that Cynthia claimed to be more beautiful than Venus (prae se formosis, 10), scorned Juno’s foot (11) and denied the beauty of Pallas’ eyes (12). In addition, references to beauty pepper the poem: 2, 10, 13, 14, 27, 49, 53, 57. Thus, Propertius, in a ring composition of sorts, introduces Cynthia’s disrespect for the gods in 6-8, gives specific instances in 9-12 and recapitulates in 13-14, only to add the specific way in which she offended the gods by her beauty: hoc tibi lingua nocens, hoc tibi forma dedit (14).

Once her offense has been explained, Propertius tries to reassure her that although she is in danger of death (extremo die, 16), she will receive honors similar to those of the heroines Io, Ino, Andromeda, and Callisto. All of them were known to have offended a goddess in some way, Io for having attracted Jove, Ino for harboring the mother of Dionysus, her sister Semele; Andromeda for having a mother Cassiopeia who claimed to be more beautiful than the Nereids, and Callisto for also attracting Jupiter. In the first two examples, Propertius stresses that Io and Ino were in the bloom of youth (primos ... annos, 17; prima ... aetate, 19), and hence we can assume that the other two were also, especially since Andromeda becomes Perseus’ bride and Callisto was comely enough to
attract Jupiter's attention. Just as he did in the earlier section (5-14), Propertius rounds off this catalog with a couplet promising good fortune.28

\[
\text{quodsi forte tibi properarint fata quietem,}
\]
\[
\text{illa sepulturae fata beata tuae}
\]
\[(2.28.25-26)\]

The couplet also introduces a coda to this list of heroines and hints at a less exalted end for Cynthia. Perhaps you will die, but your burial will be blessed. Semele will commiserate with you since she too experienced the hardships of beauty, and Maeonian women, immortalized by Homer's song, will yield the place of honor to you.

At the beginning of the catalog of heroines, Propertius had sought to assure Cynthia of his confidence; in 2.27 the aura which transports the beloved's voice in 2.27.15 will also be the harbinger of Cynthia's good fortune in death (2.28.16). Yet the examples of deification which began the catalog have given way to existence, albeit an honored one, in the underworld. Moreover, Propertius' sentiment at the end of the catalog is not as optimistic as at the beginning. In 31-32, he bids Cynthia to obey her destiny (fato), hence suggesting death, and his assurance has become a rather vague and flat statement:

\[
\text{nunc, utcumque potes, fato gere saucia morem:}
\]
\[
\text{et deus et durus vertitur ipse dies.—}
\]
\[(2.28.31-32)\]

Although he still asserts Cynthia's continued good fortune, he has also come closer to admitting that this continued good fortune will perhaps occur in the underworld and that she is closer to death.
The next section, framed by Juno (33-34) and Jupiter (41-42), also portrays Propertius' ambiguity about Cynthia's fate. In the hexameter opening the section (33) he is confident that Juno will forgive her. Yet the pentameter admits that Cynthia's condition is not improving and implies that she is still near death: frangitur et Juno, si qua puella perit (34). In 35-38, he then explains that magic has failed (deficiunt, 35) and returns to the theme of iter amoris (39-40). Unlike 2.26, their destination is now specified: ad infernos lacus (40). Death seems closer than ever, and not just for Cynthia, but for himself as well:

\[
\begin{align*}
  &\text{si non unius, quaeso, miserere duorum!} \\
  &\text{vivam, si vivet; si cadet illa, cadam.}
\end{align*}
\]

(2.28.41-42)

Because his life depends upon Cynthia, Propertius hopes to convince Jupiter to pity both of them, partly because of his commitment to Juno, mentioned as coniunx at the start of this section (33), and partly because he is the god of oaths. And Propertius takes advantage of this latter role, first making his own promise to him on Cynthia's behalf (43-44), and then promising that Cynthia will duly worship him (operata, 45)\textsuperscript{29} in the next couplet (45-46). Indeed, Cynthia, by sitting at Jupiter's feet, is taking on the role of obedience and submission which Propertius advocated at the end of the previous section (31-32).

Cynthia's nearness to death prompts him to pray to another couple, Persephone and Hades, in the next section (47-58). The collocation of husband and wife and the recurrence of coniunx recall Juno and Jupiter in the previous section and most of all, Propertius'
and Cynthia's interdependence (42). Perhaps the fact that both men and gods swear upon the Styx reminds Propertius to pray to the gods closest to that river to spare Cynthia, who has broken her oaths. Although Cynthia is no closer to death than she was before, neither is she any better. He is asking them to be merciful on the assumption that one more beautiful woman would not make any difference when there are so many beautiful women there already (49-56). The couplet which concludes the section (57-58), a general reflection on the inevitability of death, appears to be an attempt to reassure Persephone and Hades that Cynthia will join them sooner or later. At the same time, it seems to be Propertius' final and most feeble attempt to assure Cynthia that her death will not be so bad. But instead of affirming that it will be glorious or at least honorable as he did earlier, he only says that now she, like everyone else, will have to die. No word on her existence after she dies.

This final, bland statement about death is far from the optimism expressed in 2.27 and generated in the early part of 2.28. Thus, Propertius seems to have reached a new low-point. But the last two couplets throw new light on Cynthia's condition. She is no longer mortua (2), but mea lux (59). And the danger of dying has been removed (magno dimissa periculo, 59). She is to render proper thanks to Diana and Isis, and most of all to pay Propertius ten nights (votivas noctes, 62) owed him for his prayers and efforts on her behalf. The fact that some temples of Diana and Isis were not just centers of chastity, but noted centers of prostitution,
suggests that Propertius hopes to spend his ten nights with Cynthia in love-making. With this closing twist we recognize that there have been signs of Propertius' light tone throughout and that his ever more fervent, extravagant and seemingly pessimistic prayers were really a part of his rhetorical game-plan. Cynthia's situation seems to worsen, in part at least, because Propertius, as a true friend who performs the proper offices for a friend who is in danger, invokes heaven, provides reassurances, tries any means possible (perhaps magic) to diminish the threats to his friend's well-being. For rhetorical effect, at least, the danger must seem to worsen, the darkness and gloom must appear to deepen, and the gods invoked must seem to be that much more dire. It is the twist at the end that forces us as readers to place Propertius the poet into the poem. The fact that Propertius asks Cynthia to treat him as one of the gods implies a playfulness on his part that allows us to see most clearly his poetical and rhetorical game. Yet he had entered the poem earlier in his guise as poet when he promised Jupiter a sacrum carmen (43) as well as a titulus which would read "per magnum est salva puella Iovem" (44). Of course neither the sacrum carmen nor the titulus need refer to poetry. They could simply recall another form of the magic which had not succeeded in 35-38 and to a votive plaque given by the petitioner upon the felicitous outcome of his prayers. But the following couplet (45-46) with its reference to the poetic world of Thetis kneeling at Jupiter's feet (II. 1.500ff) or to Artemis on her father's knee in Callimachus Hymn 3, or to the posture of Iris by Hera's throne in
Callimachus Hymn 4 makes it clear that it is the poet speaking here and throughout the poem.  

Even as Cynthia’s situation appeared to have deteriorated and his prayers became more fervent, there were signs that the poet was at play. For example, to personify the moon and make her deny that she has come down from heaven so many times (totiens, 37) defeats the seriousness of the failure of magic. To compare his girlfriend to a goddess sitting at her father’s feet undercuts his own statement of life-and-death dependence upon his puella in 42. To suggest to Persephone and Hades that there are already too many beautiful women in the underworld punctures the gravity of his appeal to the di inferi. Cynthia must not be in such great danger if the poet is willing to play at the points in the poem where her condition seems to be approaching its nadir.

The poet makes his presence felt most by transforming the nature of Cynthia’s danger. Although he specifically denies that Cynthia’s perilous condition is Jupiter’s fault or due to the heat of the weather in 5-6, he has already introduced another reason for Cynthia’s predicament which we as readers can no longer avoid. A collocation of ambiguous vocabulary and imagery reveals that Cynthia’s peril is not simply the result of not honoring the gods, but of being love-sick. As I mentioned above, affectus (1) refers to those affected primarily mentally or emotionally. The use of miserere (1) calls to mind the word par excellence for describing a lover, miser: have pity on one who is miser. The double meaning of ardo (5), referring both to the high temperature and to the heat of
passion, reinforces this same ambiguity in torridus and fervere (4). Although Propertius generalizes his accusation of Cynthia to all women in 7-8, significantly they are miseras ... puellas. Moreover, the pentameter alludes to Catullus’ famous epigram upon the unreliability of women’s oaths:

Nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle
quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat.
dicit: sed mulier cupidus quod dicit amanti,
in uento et rapida scribere oportet aqua.
(Catullus 70)

Though Propertius only specifically mentions the second distich within the context of Cynthia’s love-sickness in lines 1-6, he no doubt has the first couplet in mind, too. For Lesbia had promised to love no man more than Catullus, not even the divine Jupiter.34 Through the reference to Jupiter in 2.28.1, coupled with Cynthia’s love-sickness, the poet encourages us to place Cynthia’s oaths within a context similar to Catullus 70. Moreover, in 1.15 we had already seen Propertius complain about Cynthia swearing falsely and dressing up as if to visit another lover. Although he had not explicitly linked her swearing with infidelity in 1.15, it is clear that he has taken that step here. Evidently, the gods, having found her out, have put her in this perilous condition. This couplet, furthermore, suggests that her swearing, implicitly her swearing about being faithful to Propertius more than anyone else, is the cause of her peril, which is love-sickness. Moreover, her love-sickness suggests that she is in love with someone other than Propertius, perhaps even Jupiter, considering the opening invocation and the Catullan reference.
The poet makes the connection between her love-sickness and her love for Jupiter explicit only gradually. For the next thing he mentions is her rivalry with the beauty of Venus, Juno and Minerva and her intemperate words. The poet wants us to think of her as another goddess perhaps, or more likely, a Helen who has abandoned her proper husband for the renegade rival lover, Paris. When he lists heroines as parallels to her own situation, the emphasis remains on their similarity with Cynthia and only by implication suggests that Propertius' rival may be Jupiter. Out of Io, Ino, Andromache, Callisto and Semele, all but Andromeda were persecuted by Juno. And some indeed are given descriptions which suggest their love-sickness. As I mentioned earlier, the youthful beauty of Io and Ino is mentioned. The wandering of Ino (\textit{vagata est}, 19) and Callisto (\textit{erraverat}, 23) recalls Milanion's crazed wandering in 1.1 (\textit{amens errabat}, 1.1.11) as well as the \textit{iter amoris} as a cure for love-sickness. Semele, coming as the last individually named heroine, shows the closest similarities to Cynthia. Like Cynthia, she was beautiful (\textit{formosa}, 27), in danger (\textit{periclo}, 27), learned (\textit{docta puella}, 28), and had experienced \textit{malum} (28), the same word Propertius uses in 1.1.35 to describe his own love-sickness. Certainly Jupiter is responsible for seducing three of the five, Io, Callisto, and Semele, but not all of them. More to the point is the propensity for each woman to have more than one lover. This is brought out most clearly by Propertius' concluding reference to the Maeonian heroines of Homer. In the most famous catalog of women, \textit{Odyssey} 11.225-332, the women were known not just for sleeping with
other men, but with gods in addition to their husbands. A similar statement could be made about the Hesiodic catalog of women. The Roman poet's remark just after his own catalog is completed plays on this possibility. He tells her to be submissive to her fate, presumably because even if she dies from her illness, she will experience at least the honor accorded to the heroines just mentioned (and the claim of 2.27 that lovers can be called back from the dead should also reassure her). More important are the words used to describe her submissiveness: fato gere saucia morem (31). The dative combined with morem gerere was the standard expression used in Roman wedding ceremonies by the new wife in expressing her obedience to her new husband. By implication the poet-lover wants Cynthia to be obedient as a "wife" who will be faithful to him alone. Saucia, we have observed earlier, is the word used to describe the love-sick Milanion in 1.1.14 and was used in Lucretius 4.1048 with the same connotation. Cynthia, it is clear, has finally become love-sick, just as Propertius has been ever since 1.1. Yet as the catalog of heroines shows, she is perhaps love-sick not for Propertius, but for another, perhaps divine, lover.

In 33-46 he shifts from reassurances to prayers. Lines 33-34 offer a neat transition. Ostensibly his appeal to coniuncto Juno (33), who presides over marriage, is to allay Cynthia's final doubts about her lot after her illness is over. Yet the poet takes the opportunity to remind Juno and indirectly Jupiter that they are married and should therefore remain faithful to each other rather than trouble themselves with a puella. Further, Propertius mentions
that Cynthia is perishing, presumably to stir their pity for her. Yet at the same time, he undercuts his assurance to Cynthia by reminding her that she may very well perish. Thus, the couplet is a warning to Cynthia not to "fool around" with Jupiter lest his coniunct may be irritated further. Finally, perit (34) acts as an admission by the poet that Cynthia truly is love-sick and may "perish" from unrequited love, not on the part of Propertius, who is willing, but on the part of her new boyfriend.

In 35-38 he explains why he must turn to the heavenly king and queen for help. His antaphrodisiacs have failed (deficiunt, 35). And after playing on Juno's pity for a girl who is dying, he indicates to Jupiter that he and Cynthia are a couple who will journey on one boat, even to the caerulean waters of the Underworld. Jupiter, as a husband himself, should recognize such love and take pity on it. In return, Propertius the poet-lover will offer him poetry and Cynthia will offer sacrifices (operata, 45). And if such vows will not convince the god to take pity, then the poet's allusion (45-46) to Thetis at the feet of Jupiter will surely convince him since Thetis was destined to bear a child greater than the father. Cynthia, by implication, could cause him as much trouble if he does not take pity.

In the next to last section (47-58), the poet shifts his attentions to Persephone and Hades. It is only natural that the threat of Cynthia's fatal illness moves the poet to invoke the help of the gods of death. Once again, he calls first upon the queen, this time Persephone—the paradigm not only of one who is experienced
with life and death, but also being abducted by her 'husband'—and
then the husband king. This time, however, he applies the epithet.
\textit{coniunx} to the male partner in order to remind him of his
responsibilities to his wife. At the same time, he cleverly reminds
the married king of the Underworld that he has in his possession all
sorts of exotic women ranging from the swarthy Iope from Ethiopia to
the fair (\textit{candida}, 51) Tyro, and Europa and Pasiphae, examples of
unnatural love, women from every part of the known world (53-54),
and finally even Roman beauties (55-56). The jingling effect of the
lines, the repetition of \textit{vobiscum} (51-52), the careful balance of
regions (53) with cities representative of those regions (54), and
the ghastly image of the \textit{ignis avarus} (56) which has devoured so
many Roman girls show the hand of the poet employing his craft to
persuade Persephone and Hades to be merciful to his beloved.
Indeed, as we saw earlier, the double meaning of 57-58 either as a
final reassurance to Hades that he will eventually possess Cynthia
too or as a final remonstrance to Cynthia not to use her beauty for
the wrong purposes neatly rounds off his prayer to Hades while
reintroducing Cynthia's peril to prepare us for the unexpected
reversal of her fortune.

Evidently Propertius' prayers to the divine rulers both above
and below the earth have worked. The poet then tells Cynthia to
render thanks to two goddesses linked in his mind because of their
connection with chastity, Diana and Isis. One the one hand, Diana
was the goddess of chastity \textit{par excellence} while Isis' temples
demanded a ten-day incubation period during which the devotee
remained celibate while awaiting the goddess' response. On the other hand, both were mentioned earlier in the poem in the first catalog of heroines, though in chiastic order. divae nunc, ante iuvencae (61) echoes nunc dea, quae tibi flumina vacca bibit (18), reminding us that Io was forced to remain chaste when she was a cow and in Juno's possession.

The mention of Diana recalls the Callisto exemplum (23-24), for it was she who ultimately killed and punished Callisto for not staying in her band of chaste nymphs. Thus, Propertius can be confident that if Cynthia renders these two goddesses thanks, she will not run off with some rival lover, either human or divine. Moreover, Propertius insures her fidelity by wittily transforming the ten days of incubation in the rites of Isis into ten nights spent with him alone. Not only will Cynthia be celibate while with Diana and Isis, she will owe Propertius her fidelity (and nights in bed) in return for his prayers and ministrations for her recovery.

While 1.15 and 2.28 portrayed first Propertius' love-sickness and then Cynthia's, 3.17 returns to Propertius, but now to ask for a release from furor amoris. Indeed, 3.17 fits into a pattern that exists throughout the third book, a sequence of poems in which the poet gradually distances himself from love until his final rejection of Cynthia in 3.24 and 25. As we saw in Chapter III, in 3.15 he employs the myth of Dirce's death as a warning to his mistress that she might suffer the same terrible fate as Dirce if she refuses to stop being jealous. The first two-thirds of the following poem, 3.16, parallels and comments on 2.27 but now within a particular
occasion. Asked by his beloved to travel to her at night (3.16.1-10), he remembers that despite the dangers of the journey, he would be safe since lovers are sacrosanct (3.16.11-20). As in 2.27 he concludes (3.16.21-30) with the possibility of death, but instead of assurances that his mistress' aura will call him back from the underworld, he imagines that she will tend his tomb. Yet the doubts about his mistress' commitment to tend his tomb in 1.19 have been given new force by her demonstrated jealousy in 3.15. Within the context of the entire collection, then, the journey in 3.16 will not only lead to his death—even though lovers are theoretically sacrosanct—but also it seems unlikely that she will tend his tomb as he hopes despite the lover's confidence that she will in 3.16.23-24.

When he turns to Bacchus in 3.17, it is only natural then that he pleads for relief from the love-sickness which causes him to be dependent on his mistress. Unlike 3.7 where the speaker-poet disassociates himself from a certain type of lover (Paetus), yet still considers himself a lover (3.7.71-2), in 3.17 he asks for relief from love completely and attempts to disavow his role as lover. In distancing himself from furor amoris, he attempts to replace his role as lover-poet by his role as a poet of another genre, specifically as a Pindaric poet who sings of gods and heroes (3.17.39-40). Unlike many of the poetic forms which he employed in Books 1 and 2, which emphasized the lover in relation to his beloved, in 3.17 he chooses the poetic form of the hymn to signal his attempt to divorce his poetry from love. The Callimachean allusions in
3.16.21-30 to be far from the crowd and from the bustle of a busy road pave the way for his renunciation of love-poetry and the joyful embrace of Pindaric (and Callimachean) hymnody. Bacchus as the god of love and poetry, of cures and slavery, of life and death, is an appropriate god to hymn and thereby bring about this transition.39

Propertius presents two possible cures for his disease, death or wine: funera sanabunt aut tua vina malum (10). The two cures are interrelated, Propertius thinks, and both are manifestations of Bacchus' regenerative power. Death, he hopes, will result in immortality such as Ariadne's (7-8). Wine, though a more mundane cure, will lead to sleep, a final sort of symbolic death, and hence a relief from his cares (11-12). As we shall see, the writer indicates that neither remedy is quite as foolproof as the poet imagines, that they lead neither to immortality nor to a removal of love.

In his attempt to persuade Bacchus to put an end to his furor, he writes a poetic prayer structured around four requests for aid. The first is couched in the most general terms, a plea for favorable sailing on the iter amoris, picking up the imagery of journey from 3.15 and 16.40 He becomes more specific in the lines that follow, making clear that he desires not just a fair journey, but relief from the illness of love. In the lines preceding the second request (3-5), he utilizes the language of furor amoris to detail the god's influence in the realm of love-sickness. And in the lines succeeding this request (7-12) he recounts both the god's and his experience in love. The majority of the poem then is framed by the
last two appeals and reveals his promise to tend to the god's vineyard (15-18) and hymn his praises (21-40). Thus wine and poetry, the means to the cure and the payment for it, appear to divide the poem in half, yet both images permeate both halves, and wine not only becomes a source of repayment, but poetry appears to be a potential cure.

The first couplet not only includes the first request, but also presents the dramatic situation in miniature:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nunc, o Bacche, tuis humiles advolvimur aris:} \\
\text{da mihi pacato vela secunda, pater!} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.17.1-2)

In following the traditional, ancient Roman prayer form, he addresses the god (o Bacche) and depicts his supplicant pose before the god's altars (1). His request in the second line also parallels the common prayer formula da pacem, da veniam. Yet more importantly, his first request utilizes imagery employed throughout the first two books as the image of regeneration, of a cure for the lover's condition. His request for favorable winds indicates a desire for an easy voyage on the ship of Love. Pacato (2), moreover, contrasts with sollicitum (42) in the last couplet and hints at the nature of Propertius' plea. It is for relief from love.

The nature of his request becomes more clear in the next four lines, which end with his second petition for the god's aid:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tu potes insanae Veneris compescere fastus,} \\
\text{curarumque tuo fit medicina mero.} \\
\text{per te iunguntur, per te solvuntur amantes:} \\
\text{tu vitium ex animo dilue, Bacche, meo!} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.17.3-6)
Now he recounts the god's power in the realm of love, his ability to temper insana Venus (3), and by means of wine (mero, 4) to offer a cure for the anxieties of love (curarum medicina, 4). For Bacchus can unite and release lovers (5). More importantly, insanae (3), curarum (4), medicina (4), and vitium (6) all illustrate the lover's condition as that of furor amoris.

His second appeal to the god not only provides a closure to his catalog of Bacchus' ability to control love, it also suggests another way in which to understand the opening lines. On the surface, the request in line 6 mimics the plea for ritual purification where diluere means 'wash away' and vitium a 'fault' or 'blemish.' Yet the poet has transformed the image, for his vitium will not be cleansed with water, but with wine (mero, 4). Further, vitium is also Lucretius' and Propertius' word for love-sickness. It resides within the victim (ex animo, 6) rather than as an external manifestation of the victim's impurity. Thus, by placing this request within the framework of furor amoris, the poet effects a transformation of the thing to be purified—from the traditional external ritual cleansing to the removal of interior manifestations of the lover's condition. In the same way, humiles (1) refers not just to his pose as supplicator, but to his pose as lover; insana Venus refers not just to the goddess, but to his disease. As poet, therefore, Propertius begins to show, through the application of poetic vocabulary, his ability to transform his subject matter just as Bacchus can transform men and women into devotees.
In the next section, he persuasively augments the reasons why Bacchus should come to his aid:

```
teqoque enim non esse rudem testatur in astra
lyncibus ad caelum vecta Ariadna tuis.
hoc mihi, quod veteres custodit in ossibus ignes,
funera sanabunt aut tua vina malum.
semper enim vacuos nox sobria torquet amantes,
spesque timorque animos versat utroque modo.
```

(3.17.7-12)

By now the amatory images have merged with those of traditional prayer and purification so that the lover may make his appeal to the god more specific and hence more likely to bring favorable results. Bacchus is not inexperienced (non esse rudem, 7) in love, for he rescued Ariadne from the shores of Naxos and transported her into immortality among the stars (7-8). In Propertius’ case, however, so great are the fires of love (in ossibus ignes, 9) that only death or wine will bring him relief. Indeed, malum (10) is the same word that Propertius utilized in 1.1.35 and elsewhere to refer to his disease, and sanabunt (10) brings out its latent medical connotation. The sure signs of Propertius’ furor include tortured nights alone (vacuos nox ... torquet amantes, 11), the poet racked both by the hope that his girlfriend will come to him and by the fear that she is actually with another lover (12). Indeed, animos versat (12) graphically describes his internal incoherence with an external picture of tossing and turning on a vacuus lectus. In the lover’s eyes, therefore, Bacchus and Ariadne are the picture of success while his condition is so bleak that death appears likely if the god’s other remedy, wine, does not heal him.
The poet, however, hints at a much more optimistic solution. *vecta Ariadna* (8) perhaps recalls a familiar part of the Roman wedding ceremony, in which the image of a young bride is carried in a wagon to her new home. Yet now the wagon is drawn by a team of panthers rather than by common domesticated animals. The poet has transformed an image of hope, namely Bacchus and Ariadne as bride and groom, into an even greater promise, the promise of immortality. Through the metamorphosis of the image, death is no longer a dismal end for the lover, but an expectation of immortality. Moreover, Propertius has taken for his own the promises which he had formerly made to Cynthia. He, instead of Cynthia, will become *nobilis historia* (cf. 1.15.24) and become immortalized (cf. 2.28.17-24).

In a similar way, the poet shifts the meaning of other traditional images, demonstrates his control over them, and offers them as signs of hope, if not of an actual cure. The fires of love (*in ossibus ignes*, 9) are no longer blocked by hovering and defiant custodes, but are instead preserved (*custodit*, 9) inside the person afflicted by love-sickness (*in ossibus*, 9). In other words, the poet need not rely on external remedies—which were shown to be ineffective in 1.1 and 2.1—but can instead administer his own cure—with Bacchus' help. Hence, significantly, the poet adds that sober nights (*nox sobria*, 11) torment lovers whose partners are absent, a situation which can easily be remedied through the poet's hand. Thus the poet through his transformation of the images of love-sickness suggests that poetry—through its ability to shape and
change what the reader perceives—can act as a type of control and cure for the lover's predicament.

The poet's control over his own cure becomes explicit in the next section:

\begin{verbatim}
quodsi, Bacche, tuis per fervida tempora donis
accersitus erit somnus in ossa mea,
ipse seram vites pangamque ex ordine colles,
quos carpant nullae me vigilante ferae.
dum modo purpureo spument mihi dolia musto
et nova pressantis inquinet uva pedes,
\end{verbatim}
(3.17.13-18)

By now it should come as no surprise that he transforms the lover's heat (*fervida*, 13) into a gift of the god and allows the two cures, death and wine, to coalesce into *somnus*, a type of temporary death and hence relief from love within the here and now. It is also clear that he is echoing lines 9-10 while transforming them. The fire of love which was formerly in his bones (*in ossibus ignes*, 9) emerges as the warmth which Bacchus' wine provides as the god lulls his devotee to sleep (*somnus in ossa mea*, 14). Indeed, the transfer of *in ossibus/*in ossa—both phrases in the penultimate position of their lines—from the fire of love to the god's gift of sleep—indicates the change most clearly. The poet, moreover, by planting and guarding the god's vineyard, crushing the grape and tending to his wine will not only be honoring the god, but will always have a ready supply of the remedy which will remove any recurring bouts of love-sickness.

The vocabulary of tending Bacchus' vineyards, moreover, looks ahead to his second promise, to sing Bacchus' praises as poet. *pangam* (15) refers to hammering one's verse into shape, *carpant* (16)
as the means for choosing subject matter, numerem (17) to putting one's words to rhythm, specifically into metrical feet (pedes, 18). Propertius' viticultural husbandry is therefore paradigmatic for the writing of poetry in honor of the god of wine. Lines 19-20 provide the transition from vintner to hymnist:

\[
\text{quod superest vitae, per te et tua cornua vivam, vi\text{r}utis\text{que tuae, Bacche, poeta ferar!}}
\]

In the time which is left after the nurturing of Bacchus' vineyard (\textit{quod superest vitae}, 19), the poet will devote himself to two activities, evenly split between the two lines. The hexameter summarizes and extends what has just come before: the poet who has renounced love will live his life through and for the god (\textit{per te, 19}) through drinking his wine ([\textit{per}] \textit{tua cornua, 19}). The emphatic placement of \textit{vivam} (19) at the end of the line—in essence an echo of \textit{vitae} (19), which occurs just before the caesura in the same line—accents the poet's belief in and hope for the immortality granted Ariadne. The double allusion of \textit{tua cornua}—either drinking cups or the horns of a goat or bull, symbols of Bacchus' fecundity—reinforces the \textit{élan vitale} in \textit{vivam} and \textit{vitae} and indicates the manner in which Bacchus' devotee will spend his life—honoring the god by drinking his wine. The wine, by implication, becomes the source of inspiration for the poet's promise in the pentameter to sing an aretalogy of the god's greatest deeds (\textit{virtutis tuae ... poeta, 20}).
In the next section (21-40), the poet not only presents a panorama of the gods' greatest deeds, but also sings in poetic strains worthy of Pindar. The section is structured around stories of the god in ever-increasing length: 4 episodes in the first two couplets—his birth, the rout of Indic arms, Lycurgus, and Pentheus; two in the next two couplets—the Tyrrhenian sailors and Ariadne; and one expansive portrait of Bacchus and his train in the next five couplets. Just as he had in the line introducing the section (poeta ferar, 20), the poet in the last couplet again speaks in the first person (ego ... referam, 39). His assertion that he will intone the god's aretalogy in Pindaric style indicates that he has accepted Pindar's famous mania. With a single word, spiritus (40), Propertius alludes to the Theban poet's famous statement about inspiration. Yet he also makes clear what he believes is the source of Pindar's inspiration. The tragic boot (coturno, 39) recalls the manic dancing of Bacchus and his attendants (32-36), and the repetition of the verb—in compound form this time—with which he promised to sing Bacchus' praises (referam, 39) links his inspiration to the god of wine. The twin allusions to Thebes, Pindar's birthplace, implicitly in the story of Pentheus (24) but explicitly in the Bacchus panel (mollia Dircaeae pulaabunt tympana Thebae, 33)—reveals that Propertius thinks that Pindar's source of poetic inspiration is also Dionysian. Thus, Propertius' acceptance of Bacchus' inspiration for his poetry in 39-40 encourages us to view the priest in lines 37-38 as none other than Propertius. In 19-20 he had summarized his two promises to tend the god's vineyard
and through wine's influence to sing his exploits; he now closes the section with two interrelated roles, priest and poet. Indeed, antistes (37) makes the link between these two roles clear, for it refers not only to the god's priest, but also his prophet and spokesperson, not only to a religious function, but also to a secular one as the master or leader of any skill or art, in this case that of poetry. In short, as a result of the god's power Propertius will become both his priest and poet.

The last couplet of the poem brings us back to the poet's initial appeal, asking the god one last time to help him:

\[
\text{tu modo servitio vacuum me siste superbo,} \\
\text{atque hoc sollicitum vince sopore caput!} \\
\text{(3.17.41-42)} \\
\]

The poet continues the lofty tone of the aretalogy, altering an archaic construction (siste + double accusative) in the hexameter. The usual construction is siste tutum/salvum + an accusative of the person saved. Instead of tutum/salvum, Propertius employs vacuum, a word frequently used in amatory elegy to refer to lovers who do not presently enjoy the company of their beloved, but who desire it in the future. Such was the word's connotation earlier in the poem when Propertius asserted the torturous effect of spending the night alone both without a woman and without a bottle:

\[
\text{semper enim vacuos nox sobria torquet amantes} \quad (11). \\
\]

But Propertius has no such desire any longer. Instead of being "available," he wishes to be permanently unavailable or "free from love," (servitio vacuum, 41). By introducing the imagery of slavery here, he widens the scope of his final prayer to Bacchus. Earlier pleas had been
expressed primarily in terms of a cure from love's illness, and the final line, to be sure, adds a plea for sleep (sopore, 42) to assuage his sollicitum caput (42), words we now know refer to the inner anxieties of a love-sick lover. Yet now in his final appeal to the god he seems to make his broadest request, that the god may aid him in his slavery and his illness, for together these two images articulate the lover's condition as he interacts with (or more appropriately, reacts to) his beloved and remembers and responds to his own feelings about their relationship. In retrospect, we realize that the poet linked the two images, slavery and mental illness, in a similar manner in the couplet preceding his third request:

semper enim vacuos nox sobria torquet amantes,
spesque timorque animos versat utroque modo.
(3.17.11-12)

Once again, an image of slavery, torture (torquet, 11), occurs in the hexameter—linked with the word vacuus as in the final couplet—and words depicting emotion and inner feelings occur in the second line of the distich. Yet we were less apt to notice the slavery image early in the poem because unlike the final couplet, where it appears as an image parallel to furor amoris, here it helps define not as much the lover's interaction with his girlfriend but his feelings as he spends another night without Bacchus' medicina and without his puella.

Besides enlarging Propertius' prayer to Bacchus to include both the inner and outer aspects of the lover's condition, the final couplet hides several details which cause us to question whether or
not Propertius’ prayer will achieve success. Admittedly, he pleads for the removal of his servitium, but the pentameter actually undercuts the request in the hexameter, for he merely asks for a temporary solution, sleep. Furthermore, sleep is no longer specifically linked with death (sommus in ossa mea, 14) and the immortality which Bacchus grants in death. Instead, its ephemeral nature signals a lack of confidence on Propertius’ part concerning Bacchus’ ability or desire to release him permanently from bondage. Indeed if we re-examine the entire elegy, we will find a tendency of Propertius the lover which was so frequent in the first two books, namely to back down gradually when confronted by someone more powerful than he.

His initial prayers were broad and inclusive: favor my journey (a solution to his lover’s condition) and release me from my love-sickness (vitium, 6). In line 10, he proclaims the most extreme form of a desire for a cure: only death or wine will heal me. Coming just after the reference to Ariadne’s catasterism, the former would appear to be the preferred solution, yet the following pair of couplets reduce Propertius’ situation to that of a lover who cannot fall asleep (11-12) and who then prays for a wine-induced sleep (13-14). Given the less inclusive, more specific situation and request in 11-14, the reference to death seems to be included primarily for the sake of self consolation (yes, you will become immortal like Ariadne, if you die) or to play on Bacchus’ sympathy. But 11-14 indicate that the situation is not a life and death matter, but one of loneliness and love, jealousy and fear. In the
past, such emotions, such a situation, were described by the lover in terms of death. Even here the poet had tried to link death with sleep through the repetition in ossibus (9)/ in ossa (14). Yet it is clear that death is no longer what the poet desires. He wishes to be free from love, to be released from commitment until death, even love as death, and to be free to act as Bacchus' priest and to chant his praises as poet.

Yet Propertius the writer will not let go of the theme of death, and indeed he uses the theme to show that the poet, far from being free from love, is actually becoming enslaved to a new master, the god of wine. The first prayer, for favorable winds on his journey, hints at what is to come, for journeys in Propertius involve flight just as frequently as pursuit, failure just as often as success. The dual nature of the god himself becomes clear in line 5, for he not only releases lovers (solvuntur) but also yokes them together (iunguntur). The god can check insana Venus (3) but he has also married and deified Ariadne (7-8). Even though Propertius hopes to be freed from the fires of love (in ossibus ignes, 9), he soon permits the warmth of Bacchus' wine to enter his head (tuia per fervida tempora donis, 13) so that sleep may enter his body (note the repetition of in ossa mea [14]). In short, the god encourages and discourages love, removes the pangs of love but also enjoys love himself, not only diminishes the fires of love, but also replaces them with his own fire.
Ironically, the negative side of the god's nature becomes more apparent at exactly the moment when the poet is singing his praises, when he believes or at least hopes that he will be cured. And even though he has to some extent downplayed funera as he promises to tend the god's vineyard, they return with vengeance in the aretalogy. Bacchus' birth is the result of his mother's death by fire (maternos Aetnaeo fulmine partus, 21). His triumphal march to the West is marred by a military rout (Indica ... arma fugata, 22). Far from curing Lycurgus, he drives him insane (vesanum, 23), causing him to think that his own legs are vines worthy to be cut down. Pentheus, another opponent of Bacchus', meets his death (funera, 24) at the hands of women. Although the Tyrrhenian sailors do not suffer the same fate as Semele, the Indic hordes, Lycurgus, and Pentheus, the writer signifies their transformation into dolphins through the word corpora (25), whose meaning is often "corpses." Although the poet might be exhibiting his artistic virtuosity through his references to little known tales and his poignant sketches of Bacchus' power, he is actually cataloging a grim reminder of the god's destructive tendencies.

In and of itself, such a catalog would have little effect on how we view the poet seeking refuge from love were it not for the scenes which follow. The absence of violence and the emphasis on prosperity in the next episode (27-28) seem out of place after the unmitigated bloodshed in 21-26. Given the repetition of Naxos and the earlier reference to Ariadne (7-8), the lines probably allude to the marriage of Bacchus and Ariadne and therefore to Bacchus' power.
over death. But here death’s destructive potential is not noted, but its regenerative power. Indeed, we are meant to recall the aftermath of the holy marriage, Ariadne’s apotheosis. Yet there is a significant difference between this optimistic scene and the previous tales of destruction. In all the earlier episodes in which Dionysus overwhelmed those who would not accept his worship, the recipients of the god’s destructive forces were male: Indic armies, Lycurgus, Pentheus, the sailors. The recipient of the god’s favor, however, is female. And the details in the god’s description in 29-32 reinforce his preference for the feminine, for his appearance is decidedly feminine. The bassara was a fox-skin worn by Bacchants and the mitra was a cloth worn around the head by women to confine the hair. The Romans regularly depicted him as nude except for a token mantle and the boots of a traveler, but his depiction here—nudos veste fluente pedes (32)—is closer to that of a maenad. As for the attendants who flank him in the scene, half are devotees of Cybele, the Dea Magna, eunuchs who are noted for their self-inflicted castration in the service of the goddess. In addition, the drums are given the epithet mollia (33), whose connotations include ‘effeminate,’ and are further qualified by Dirceae Thebae, representing a woman who was punished for trying to punish and enslave another woman, Antiope. The portrait of Dionysus, therefore, is that of a god who despises, punishes, enslaves, and even kills men, but who is dressed as, associates with, and immortalizes women. The poet, who has willingly taken on the enthused spirit of Pindar, who is willing to take on tasks in
order to honor and praise the god, has committed himself to a new form of madness and slavery. And the writer makes clear that his new master is just as harsh to men as his former mistress was. Although he prays for a cure and freedom from love, he has only shifted his slavery from Cynthia to Bacchus, and his illness from one form of possession to another.

Although Propertius in 3.17 seems to be exchanging one form of slavery for another, at least he has taken one more step on the road to separating himself from Cynthia. Unlike 3.15 in which he spoke to Cynthia only through indirection, he has actually asked for relief from his predicament. And to signal his desire for a solution, once again he utilizes both metaphors, slavery and madness, to express the public and inner sides of his situation with Cynthia. When he declares the end of the relationship in 3.24 and 25, the two metaphors together represent the past while a third metaphor, journey, points to the future. In addition, self-conscious references to 1.1 and 2 in both poems indicate a poetic closure for the affair.

3.24 begins with sharp words for Cynthia. In each of the first four couplets, the hexameter begins with a statement to Cynthia while the pentameter reveals Propertius' personal response to that statement. Just as he lauded her beauty in 1.2, in each of the hexameters Propertius speaks about her forma. But now he admits that his praise only made her haughty (superba, 2) and himself ashamed (pudet, 4). His love made her into something she was not (quod non esses, esse putaret amor, 6). His inability to see his
beloved’s true nature clearly recalls the insane and enslaved lover in Lucretius 4.1149ff., who overlooks his girlfriend’s every fault. None of the cures he proposed in 1.1.19-28 had worked, neither friends (9), nor witchcraft (10), nor surgery (non ferro, non igne, 11). Indeed, he was in a state of shipwreck on the ship of love (12), and the slave of love (vincus eram, 14). Interestingly enough, the journey he had proposed in 1.1.29-30 as a solution to his love affair had come true. But instead of winning his beloved, he succeeded in freeing himself from love. Now his ship has crossed safely to port (portum tetigere carinae, 15) and was firmly anchored (ancora iacta ... est, 16). He had recovered from the heat of love (aestu, 17) and had come to his senses (resipiscimus, 17). In thanksgiving, he dedicates himself to the goddess Mens Bona (19).

While in 3.24 he focused on his blindness as lover and placed stress on the recovery of his sanity, in 3.25 he focuses on the public reaction to his relations with Cynthia and his final maledicta. He was a laughingstock (risus, 1) because of his faithful slavery (servire fideliter, 3). Although he was once captured (sum captus, 5), it was by artifice (ab arte, 5). He now recognizes Cynthia’s deceits: no longer do her tears move him (5, 7) and his yoke no longer fits (conveniens, 8). He will no longer demonstrate signs of his love-sickness (lacrimantia, 9; irata, 10) or of his servitude (limina, 9; ianua, 10). Even the curses which end the poem are public rather than private: he hopes that Cynthia’s beauty will vanish and she will become a locked-out lover (exclusa, 15). In short, Cynthia ends the poem outside while Propertius ends
3.24 inside the sanctuary of Mens Bona and in port. Even Cynthia's mirror will cavil out loud at her wrinkles (speculo rugas increpitante, 3.25.14) while Propertius' recovery is internal (resipiacimus, 3.24.17; in sacraria, 3.24.19). Finally, 3.25 ends with hints of death (fatalis, diras, 17; eventum, 18) while 3.24 ends with health (sanum, 18). Thus, the true nature of death is clarified: it is not a sign of love or commitment, but of departure (discedens, 3.25.7), separation, and the end.

Although the two poems clarify the inner and outer functions of the metaphors furor and servitium and strip away any signs of faithfulness from the imagery of death, they also illuminate the two main characters of the collection, Cynthia and Propertius. As usual, Cynthia has no chance to speak for herself. We hear only Propertius’ voice, chiding, mocking, retracting. He admits to having made mistakes only indirectly, never taking full credit for them: his eyes were responsible for making her too proud (3.24.2) or amor (3.24.6) made him think wrongly about her. When he is ashamed about her role in his poetry, he leaves the first person pronoun out (3.24.4). Cynthia, on the other hand, is characterized by falsae (3.24.1) and insidiae (3.25.6). She receives all the abuse. Yet it is significant that both are shown to have made mistakes, both to have dissembled, both to have lied. Of course, Propertius blamed his dissembling on sources outside himself such as amor or oculi while Cynthia dissembled because of her natural, inherent perfidia. Hers was malicious, but Propertius delivered his lies because he was in love. Each character is so clear-cut that the result could
easily be interpreted as caricature. And in Book 4 Propertius will build on the presentation here and take it one step farther, to a intense mixture of comedy, satire, and pathos not yet seen in the first three books.
Chapter IV: Notes

1 Margaret Hubbard, Propertius, Classical Life and Letters (London 1974) 47-58 believes that Jupiter is love-sick for Cynthia while Paul T. Alessi, "Propertius 2.28: Unity without Illness," CJ 81 (1985-86) 39-48 claims that it is Cynthia who is really afflicted with furor amoris. For the standard view that Cynthia is physically sick, but not love-sick, see John T. Davis, Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid, Noctes Romanae, 15 (Berne 1977) 51-64 and the bibliography cited there.

2 Shackleton Bailey 42. Alessi (1985-86) correctly points out the limitation to Shackleton Bailey's examples.

3 Richardson 386.

4 Camps 1:132.

5 Jasper Griffin, Latin Poets and Roman Life, Classical Life and Letters (London 1985) 145 makes this connection, but sees the image of Hercules' pyre as positive, a harbinger of immortality. I would argue that Propertius' choice of image here, fiery death rather than a portrait of Elysium, bodes negatively for Gallus' love affair.

6 On 1.14


8 J.C. Yardley, "Sick-Visiting in Roman Elegy," Phoenix 27 (1973) 283-288 points out that tending to a sick friend was a recognized and expected Freundschaftsdienst in the ancient world.
9 Allen (1973) 383-384, Gaisser (1977) 385-391, and Richard Whitaker, Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy, Hypomnemata, 76 (Gottingen 1983) 107-109, view the heroines as paradigms of fidelity and devotion, noting a movement in thought from bodily adornment and possible infidelity to ultimate fidelity and bodily death. Allen, moreover, sees the deaths of Alcmaeon and Capaneus as pointing to Propertius' danger and fear of imminent death. Davis (1972-73) 136 and Gaisser 390, however, observe that if the heroines are a model of devotion for Cynthia, their lovers provide a picture of desertion that reflects on Propertius' intentions (i.e. he intends to leave as the other men did). Bennett (1972) 36-39 makes the right point, recognizing that the four women "represent the type of a woman really in love" (37) because of their genuine (and not dissembling) protestations of love.


11 Although Dido commits suicide in Book 4 not out of love for Sychaeus (though Dido regrets her broken promise to Sychaeus at Aen. 4.552), but to spite Aeneas, in Book 6 she is seen happily with Sychaeus. Moreover, in Book 1 she is hesitant to enter into an affair with a stranger out of respect for Sychaeus and her oath to him. Thus, Vergil presents different motives at different times, but outside of Book 4 Dido holds her former husband in esteem.


14 Although "duirius" can refer to the rigors of unrequited love (Davis [1972-73] 137), the entire expression "si... tibi durius inciderit" also has undertones of death, a point generally overlooked by the commentators.

15 Although Rothstein 1:156, Butler and Barber 176, and Enk 1:134 understand "non aliena (eria), Shackleton Bailey 45-46, followed by Camps 1:81 (provisionally) and Richardson 188, correctly observes that "non aliena (sia) is more natural after the first half of the line (sis quocumque voles) and complements the meaning of the hexameter rather than simply repeats it.

16 On the myths, especially those of Alcmaeon-Alphesiboea and Capaneus-Evadne, see Richardson 187 and the references there.
17 Bennett (1972) 39 follows Rothstein 1:157-158 and Enk 1:135 in reading pereo in a more literal sense: "the poet in his death will constitute a monumentum for others, like him, in love."

18 Davis (1972-73) 134-137 views the poem within its emotional context and does not allow for the more literal interpretation. Allen (1973) 384-385 allows for both the literal and the emotional interpretations, but either way sees pereo only as Propertius' "witty seal" on the poem.


20 See Kenneth Quinn, Latin Explorations (London 1963) 182-187 for an appreciation of the irony in 2.27.

21 Herbert Juhnke, "Zum Aufbau des zweiten und dritten Buches des Properz," Hermes 99 (1971) 101, 106 sees none of the ironical interplay with 2.26 and 2.28 which I do. Indeed, he groups 2.26 with 2.24b and 2.25 while pairing 2.27 with 2.28. In both the latter two poems, he observes a parallel development from uncertainty to the return of the lover/beloved to life.


23 See e.g. Hubbard (1974) 51.


25 Cf. OLD s.v. affectual 1, 5, 6, 7, 8.

26 Perhaps templo is corrupt, as Butler and Barber 239 suggest, and hides some reference to Juno's beauty, e.g. planta (Alton, Goold). See George P. Goold, "Noctes Propertianae," HSCP 71 (1966) 59-106. J.P. Postgate, "On Propertius 2.28.11," CR 14 (1900) 449-450 defends templo by seeing an allusion to the myth of the Proetades. Even in following the manuscripts, there still might be a reference to Cynthia judging herself more beautiful than Juno's cult statue in the temple.
27 On the myths of Io, Ino, Andromède, and Callisto, see Enk 2:354-356 and the references there.

28 Whitaker (1983) 102 points out Propertius' use of ring composition in framing the exempla.

29 Camps 2:192 points out that operatus describes a condition of a person, meaning here "as your worshipper."

30 Some temples of Isis and Diana were centers of prostitution at Rome. On Isis, see 2.33 and John F. Miller, "Propertius' Tirade against Isis (2.33a)," CJ 77 (1981-82) 104-111. On Diana, see 4.8.29-30 where Propertius makes clear that part of his evening's entertainment includes the courtesan Phyllis who lives in the vicinity of the Aventine temple of Diana. On the temple, see Richardson 466. On the humor of the last line of the poem if et mihi is retained, see Enk 2:367, Camps 2:194, and Richardson 294.

31 See Yardley (1973) 283-288 on the obsequium expected by those who were sick in bed from their friends.

32 Yardley (1977) 400.

33 I owe the references to Homer and Callimachus to Hubbard (1974) 56.


41 On the formal aspects of ancient Roman prayer, see Georgius Appel, De Romanorum Precationibus, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 7.2 (Giessen 1909; repr. Arno 1975) and Norden (1913) 143-176. On their appearance in 3.17 in particular, see Littlewood (1975) 664-668.

42 2.22.47-50 and 1.14.20-21 offer excellent parallels for lines 9-12.

43 On traditional Roman wedding ceremony, see Williams (1958) 16-29.

44 For examples of custodes blocking lovers, see e.g. J.C. Yardley, Phoenix 34 (1980) 255–256.

45 On pango, "to hammer one's poetry into shape", see OLD s.v. pango 6. On carpo as the type of word used to describe a writer or poet at work, see Ter. Ad. 591, Cic. Sest. 119, Mart. 11.24.8, Gell. 9.4.5, Aus. 322.72, and perhaps even Hor. Ç. 1.11. On numerem (the reading in L), see OLD s.v. numerus 13-15. On pedes, see OLD s.v. pes 11.

46 On the double allusion in cornua, see e.g. Richardson 388.

47 Penelope Wilson, "Pindar and his Reputation in Antiquity," PCPhS N.S. 26 (1980) 97-114 notes that even though Pindar's own view of the creative process was far from the idea of the poet as irrationally possessed, "he was to become the standard example of such a poet for many later admirers [in antiquity]" (100). On poetic madness in general, see E.R. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, Sather Classical Lectures 25 (Berkeley 1951) 80-82 and D.A. Russell, Criticism in Antiquity, Classical Life and Letters (London 1981) 69-83. Pindar frg. 137 (Bowra) associates his craft with prophecy: "Give your oracle (μαντήσω), Muse, and I will interpret (μαντεύω)." Horace associates poetic madness with Pindar in particular in Ç. 4.2. See Richard Freis, "The Catalogue of Pindaric Genres in Horace Ode 4.2," CA 2 (1983) 27-36.

48 In Pythian 11.36-42 (Bowra), Pindar speaks of "being blown off course."
Cf. OLD s.v. *antistes* 2.

On *siste* + double accusative, see Tränkle 45.

E.g. 2.33.22.

On the myths, see Camps 3:134-135.

Semele is excepted from this group since Jupiter, not Bacchus, is responsible for her death.

On *bassara* and *mitra* as feminine apparel, see Richardson 389.

Richardson 389 notes the unusual depiction, but does not draw any conclusions from it.

Cf. Cat. 63.

CHAPTER V

Militia Amoris in Propertius

While images of slavery and madness pointedly capture the essence of the lover's condition—his submission and willingness to do anything for his mistress coupled with an almost neurotic insecurity about her faithfulness to him—the poet has seemingly frozen their meanings. By definition, the lover is the slave and his beloved is his mistress. The lover is insane with love while his beloved remains aloof, unwilling to tend to his bedside. The images acquire their very force because of the emerging perception of the fixed nature of the participants' roles. Propertius cannot escape his slavery or his illness except through divine intervention. The lover and beloved can exchange their roles, as when Cynthia contracts furor amoris in 2.28, but they cannot modify their roles within the scope of the image. Cynthia can never be only partially sick. Propertius can never be a slave only sometimes. Given the fixed definitions of the two images, the poet's only recourse to demonstrate changes in the lover-poet's understanding of his affair, therefore, is through techniques such as double entendre (e.g. 3.15), hyperbole (e.g. 2.20), and divine intervention (e.g. 3.17), but not through an ever-changing and
developing portrait of lover and mistress gradually coming to a reconciliation and mutual understanding that they are no longer slave and mistress but compatriots in love.

Images of warfare in Propertius, however, are far more fluid. Even if the lover is always the miles, hostes and socii constantly change. At times, lover fights alternately against Amor (e.g. 1.1, 2.9), against his mistress (e.g. 2.15), or against rival suitors (e.g. 2.8, 2.9, 2.16). The image of the soldier's lot in life can also be used to characterize the lover's condition—without references to specific opponents (e.g. 1.6). Running throughout the metaphor, however, is one constant: conflict, ultimately resulting in power for the victor and submission for the vanquished. So it was, for example, in 1.1 when Propertius was captured by Cynthia (Cynthia cepit) and subjugated by Amor, whose gesture of triumph (1.1.1-4) marked Propertius' downfall.

Since the image is painted with a more varied palette, at first glance it seems more difficult to follow a consistent pattern within the poet's use of militia amoris. In addition to his customary use of double entendre, hyperbole, reversal, and sarcasm, Propertius employs several other markers which illustrate the image's development from book to book. Not only does Propertius' adversary change from Amor to a rival to Cynthia, but he moves from a position within Cynthia's castra to establishing his own camp. And his attentions turn from dueling with his rival to fighting against Cynthia. His engagements with Cynthia, moreover, shift from bedroom to barroom and from friendly scuffles to more intense
warfare. In short, the poet-lover’s death as the result of combat begins as a necessary, even desirable, test of one’s fidelity to one’s commander, but becomes unnecessary, and ultimately not mentioned in Propertius’ final battles.

Certain poems, in particular, illustrate Propertius’ transformation of the image especially well. As we observed in 1.1.1-4, Propertius utilizes military imagery to explain the means by which he became enslaved. Later in the poem (1.1.25ff.), however, the image becomes a metaphor for the hopelessness of his condition and even adumbrates the possibility of death. While his opponent in 1-4 is ostensibly Amor, the poet’s intentional confusion of Cynthia with Amor foreshadows her eventual battles with Propertius in later books. In 1.6 the poet defines his life in contrast to Tullus’ by appropriating Tullus’ language of civic and military aspirations to describe his own life. While 1.6 remains on a personal level and fails to explicitly name an adversary, in 2.7 Propertius offers to suffer decapitation while fighting in his mistress’ castra. By naming Cynthia as his imperator, Augustus Caesar, named earlier in the poem, becomes the implied hostis. In 3.8, a lover’s quarrel provides a test case for the hypothesis that a passionate quarrel is the best proof of a passionate relationship. Despite the clever argument, however, the poet reveals more than a little animosity to Cynthia and his rival. While a certain ambiguity existed in 3.8 concerning into whose camp Cynthia fell—Propertius’ or his rival’s, in 4.8 the sides are clearly drawn (Propertius against Cynthia). And though the
mock-heroic language elevates the personal to the level of epic warfare, the conflict dissolves into love-making instead of death. In spite of the humor in the poem and the 'happy ending,' the focus on the conflict between Propertius and Cynthia, the virtual elimination of the rival, signals the writer's transformation of militia amoris. Mock-heroic conflict replaces the lover who fights for his mistress to the point of death. In effect, mockery replaces promises to die and true feeling, and love-making is restored to its proper place.

In 1.1 Propertius had used the imagery of triumph and warfare to explain how he had been captured and subsequently enslaved by Amor (1.1.1-4). Later in the poem, he returns to the image to illustrate his helplessness and depict his closeness to death (1.1.25ff.). In 1.6 Propertius embraces the image again in order to define the relationship between himself, the man of love, and Tullus, the man-at-arms. Although he refuses Tullus' invitation to accompany him to Asia, he does so in language which Tullus will understand. Hence, from the beginning of the poem, Propertius asserts his own bravery and justifies his stay at Rome by pointing out that the rigors and hardships of staying behind equal, if not surpass, those of journeying to the East. By the end of the poem, Propertius' appropriation of Tullus' macho language results in a reversal of value terms so that Tullus is associated with softness (mollis, 31) and Propertius with toughness (duro, 36).
In appropriating Tullus' language, he also takes on Tullus' definition of militia. Significantly Tullus' tour of duty does not entail enemies in combat. Rather imperium (3.4) involves political alliances and reconciliations. If Propertius therefore defines himself by means of Tullus' language, then this language will redefine Propertius' relationship with Cynthia. Just as Tullus' tour of duty will involve more political (cf. iura refer sociis, 20) than military actions, so Propertius' militia will involve reconciling his ally, Cynthia.

As in many of Propertius' elegies, the poem opens in medias res with Propertius vigorously, though politely, defending his courage and affirming his friendship with Tullus:

Non ego nunc Hadriae vereor mare noscere tecum, Tulle, neque Aegaeo ducere vela salo, cum quo Ripaeos possim conscendere montes ulteriusque domos vadere Memnonias; sed me complexae remorantur verba puellae mutatoque graves saepe colore preces. illa mihi totis argutat noctibus ignes et queritur nihil esse relicta deos; illa meam mihi se iam denegat, illa minatur, quae solet ingrato tristis amica viro. his ego non horam possum durare querelis: ah pereat, si quis lentus amare potest! an mihi sit tanti doctas cognoscere Athenas atque Asiae veteres cernere divitas, ut mihi deducta faciat convicia puppi Cynthia et insanis ora notet manibus, osculaque opposito dicat sibi debita vento et nihil infido durius esse viro?

(1.6.1-18)

Evidently, Propertius and Tullus have been engaged in a conversation about Tullus' journey to Asia, and Tullus, we are to believe, has accused Propertius of being afraid to sail on the high seas with him. nunc (1) signals the beginning of Propertius' rejoinder.
ego (1) and tecum (1) coupled with cum quo (3), stress their ties of friendship. His response demonstrates his courage: he is not afraid (non ego nunc ... vereor, 1) to experience (noscere, 1) the perils of two seas, the Adriatic and the Aegean, which were noted for their storms and squalls. The opening line establishes his courage and introduces an aspect of militia, fearlessness: he is not afraid (non ego nunc ... vereor, 1). The verbs which characterize his actions, noscere (to get to know well, experience fully), ducere (2), conscendere (3), and vadere (4) suggest a man of action and daring. The places to which Propertius is willing to travel, the Adriatic (1) and the Aegean (2), both known as turbulent and perilous seas, the northerly Rhipaean Mountains, located in Scythia, and the deserts of Ethiopia, emphasize that he is literally willing to go to extremes (ulterius, 4) with Tullus, to the ends of the known world. There should be no doubt about his courage.

But a third party restraints him. The introduction of illa three times in the next three lines (7, 9a, 9b), allows this 'other' to intrude upon the relationship between Propertius and Tullus, which was marked by first and second person pronouns in lines 1-6. While Propertius' use of pronouns is intended to stress his friendship with Tullus, his description of Cynthia, who restrains him with feminine allurements—words (verba, 5), embraces (complexae, 5), prayers (preces, 6), and the changing colors of emotion (mutato colore, 6)—reveals his affection for her as well. Indeed, she demonstrates all the signs of being in love. In his response to her actions he remains the man of action and curses
anyone who is slow (lentus, 12) to respond to love. At the same
time, he is already beginning to modify what it means to be
courageous. For even though he can brave the perils of sea, snow,
and sand with Tullus, he cannot endure (non ... possum durare, 11)
his girlfriend's complaints (querelis, 11).

In the next three couplets (13–18) he begins to turn the
tables on Tullus by proposing a hypothetical situation if he should
go with Tullus. For now Propertius suggests that Tullus' trip
includes more sightseeing than peril. Indeed, cognoscere (13)
recalls noscere (1), but now it is in the context of sightseeing
(cernere, 14) rather than adventure (ducere vela, 2; conscendere
montes, 3; domos vadere Memnonios, 4). Tullus' destinations,
moreover, no longer include the dangerous seas, the wintry north or
the parched south, but learned Athens (13) and the riches of Asia
(14). In turn, Cynthia's complaints and threats have become more
insistent and more specific. She hurls insults (convicia, 15) at
his departing ship, tears at her face with her hands (16), offers
her kisses to the winds which will keep Propertius ashore longer
(opposito vento, 17), and calls him unfaithful. Although earlier
Propertius could not endure her complaints (non durare, 11), now
Cynthia calls him harsh (durius, 18). Thus, the last three couplets
of the first half of the poem, with their contrast between Tullus'
(revised) destinations and Cynthia's laments, adumbrate the last
three couplets of the second half of the poem where Propertius
contrasts Tullus' journey as mollis and his stay at Rome as durus.
Propertius, moreover, while asserting his courage and fortitude from
the opening lines of the poem, has begun to alter Tullus' definition of bravery and of what is durus.

In the second half of the poem Propertius makes more explicit his evaluation of the difficulty of Tullus' militia and Propertius' affair with Cynthia:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{tu patrui méritas conare anteire secures,} \\
&\text{et vetera oblitis iura refer sociis:} \quad 20 \\
&\text{nam tua non aetas umquam cessavit amor,} \\
&\text{semper at armatae cura fuit patriae;} \\
&\text{et tibi non umquam nostros puer iste labores} \\
&\text{aderat et lacrimis omnia nota meis!} \\
&\text{me sine, quem semper voluit fortuna iacere,} \quad 25 \\
&\text{hanc animam extremae reddere nequitiae.} \\
&\text{multi longinquo periere in amore libenter,} \\
&\text{in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat.} \\
&\text{non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis:} \quad 30 \\
&\text{hanc me militiam fata subire volunt.} \\
&\text{at tu seu mollis qua tendit Ionia seu qua} \\
&\text{Lydia Pactoli tingit arata liquor,} \\
&\text{seu pedibus terras seu pontum remige carpes,} \\
&\text{ibis, et accepti pars eris imperii:} \\
&\text{tum tibi si qua mei veniet non inmemor hora,} \quad 35 \\
&\text{vivere me duro sidere certus eris.}
\end{align*}
\]

With \textit{tu} (19) and \textit{me} (25) marking off the next two sections, it is clear that Propertius intends to continue his remarks within the framework of the friendship with which he opened the poem.

Significantly, the 'other' who interposed himself in their friendship has disappeared and in her place comes an insistence on Propertius' part to distinguish himself from Tullus. The repetition of the second person form at the beginning of each of the next three couplets (19, 21, 23) is countered by an even more frequent use of the first person (23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30). Clearly, he associates Tullus with military (and civic) accomplishments (\textit{secures}, 19; \textit{iura refer sociis}, 20; \textit{armatae ... patriae}, 22), but he also defines him
in his own lover's terms: Tullus' youth (aetas, 21) never took time for love (amor, 21), his cura (22) was for his arming his fatherland. In the next couplet (23-24), while Propertius indicates another sign of friendship by not wishing his ills on Tullus, the distinction between Propertius' erotic world and Tullus' soldierly world begins to blur. labores are not Tullus', but Propertius' inflicted by Amor (puer iste, 23), and signs of hardship (lacrimis ... nota meis, 24) are both things Propertius has learned as marks of his enslavement.

While Tullus' duties have become progressively less demanding, Propertius has described his own life, its labors and hardships, in gradually more graphic terms. In the next three couplets (25-30), Propertius completes the exchange of valuation of each other's life by a total abrogation of Tullus' language of civic and military duties. Moreover, he specifically contrasts the fulfillment of his life in 25-30 with Tullus' in 19-24. While Tullus will be advancing (anteire, 19), either physically in front of his uncle's retinue or even outstripping him in honors (meritas secures, 19), Propertius will be lying (iacere, 25), fallen on a battlefield (using Tullus' military frame of reference) or laid out in his tomb. Tullus will be restoring (refer, 20) political rites to allies, whereas Propertius asks for permission (me sine, 26) to return his spirit (animam reddere, 26, another euphemism for death) to total licentiousness. Tullus has never tasted love (amori, 21), but many others have freely perished in love (in amore, 27). Though Propertius is not fit for bearing arms (armis, 29), his soldierly
willingness to die contrasts with the soldier Tullus, who is armed (armatae cura, 22), but inexperienced in love's labores (23). Thus, Propertius reasons, his service in love is closer to militia (30) than Tullus' travels to learned Athens or rich Asia.

Propertius' reevaluation of his way of life in comparison with Tullus' is not without the humor which good friends would share. Starting with Propertius' exaggeration of the distances he would go to accompany Tullus, followed by his diminishment of the hardship of his friend's trip (13-14) and his application of lover's terms to describe his official military duties (21-24), Propertius has incorporated a substratum of good humor in his refusal to travel with Tullus. In 25-30, moreover, his willingness to die involved puns on erotic situations, for iacere can allude to lying with one's girlfriend in bed, and perishing in love, in particular long-lasting love (longinquo, 27), is a well-known euphemism for sexual climax. Perhaps even subire (30) contains a reference to a position for intercourse.

The last three distichs complete the transfer of erotic terms to Tullus and military terms to Propertius. Tullus' journey is described in terms which overtly suggest the extent of Rome's imperium. He will travel on land and sea (33-34) to Ionia and Lydia. In fact, he will be associated with imperium which has been handed down, presumably, from Octavian (accepti pars eris imperii, 34). Yet the poet undercuts Tullus' part in his uncle's entourage by hinting at the luxury and ease which he will experience. References to mollis Ionia, the great expanse of Lydian fields,
enjoying the journey (carpere, 33) and being welcome (accepti, 34) not only increase the picture of Tullus' otium, but also have secondary erotic connotations. A lover and girlfriend is often described as mollis (physically soft) and when she is willing to sleep with her lover, the term is accepta. carpere can refer to sexual as well as emotional pleasure. Given this context of erotic connotation, the distinctive phrase "touching fields" (tingit arata, 32) could allude to caressing the beloved's cunnus. Thus, Tullus, though traveling to the East to establish Octavian's ties to Antony's former provinces under a grant of imperium, becomes the lover by the end of the poem.

Propertius, meanwhile, though depicted as an unlucky lover, has taken on what should have been Tullus the soldier's traits, i.e. a willingness to become the soldier and to die (25-30). And at the end of the poem it is he who has become ultimately associated with a hard life (vivere me duro sidere certus eris, 36). A form of duro/durus had occurred at two earlier, crucial points when he had spoken of his relationship with Cynthia. The first came when he said that he could brave a journey with Tullus but he could not endure Cynthia's complaints (11). But the next time comes at the end of the third section when Cynthia characterizes him by durius if he is unfaithful. The third time, therefore, alters the meaning again since theoretically he has no control if he is under the influence of a hostile star (36). Though employed in a slightly different sense each time, together the usages suggest an unwillingness on Propertius' part to be durus or to experience something durus.
His reluctance to take part in a hard life clarifies his statements in 25-30 which seem to reveal a willingness on his part to take part in the militia amoris. Yet the section begins and ends with statements that fortuna (25) or fata (30) desires for him to lie prostrate or to undergo this type of service. Although he suggests that he is willing to perish in love's service, explicitly he says only that many other people (multi, 27) perish willingly. As for himself, he only asks to be buried with them (28)—no mention of willingness. Given Propertius' purpose in the poem—to demonstrate his friendship for Tullus—coupled with his fondness for reversing the meanings of words and the roles of people and his allusions to sexual enjoyment, it is clear that the poet-lover's reluctance is more coyness and indirection. Of course, he wants to sleep with Cynthia and die in her arms. And despite Tullus' association with arms, metaphoric (secures, 19) or real (armatae, 22), his mission is to restore forgotten allies back to the Roman empire (20), not to fight new ones. Furthermore, given his decision not to go with Tullus but to stay with Cynthia, it should be clear that Cynthia is the poet-lover's ally in love, not his enemy. Thus, the poet-lover hopes to retain the friendship of both Cynthia and Tullus, but his tone of regret and reluctance to be with Cynthia springs from the situation in which he finds himself—the need to persuade Tullus of his friendship.

The writer, however, does not want us to ignore the ambiguities in the poem. Although Tullus' current mission is peaceful, the references to arms—especially the unnecessary mention
of the lictors' secures rather than their fasces—and to forgotten allies (obliti ... sociis, 20) recall that Rome was recently at war with her allies and even her own citizens. The lack of clarity which civil war brings—which Roman is friend and which is foe, which ally is truly an ally and which is not—affects our understanding of Propertius' relationship with Cynthia. His decision to stay at Rome with her should be unequivocal, but the frequent mention of his hard lot in life, perhaps points to an underlying tension in their relationship. The graphic reference to burial (28) certainly colors his more erotic allusion to death in the previous lines. Finally, his description of Cynthia's protestations include images which do not fit well with a picture of a good ally: the sad entreaties (6), nightly fires (7), threats (9, 17), ugly moods (10, 11, 15). As far as the lover is concerned, Cynthia is on his side, though perhaps in need of some reconciliation. The writer, however, points out how present allies were once enemies and foreshadows perhaps another, less friendly role for Cynthia.

In 1.6, Propertius successfully defends his way of life in terms which mirror Tullus' own commitment to militia. Although the lover does not desire literal death, he does hope for a chance to perish in the act of love. In Book 2 he expands upon the idea of death in the service of love, namely that what is laus is not dying for one's country, but for one's beloved. 2.711 is significant because it shows for the first time Propertius' reaction at the intrusion of the public sphere into his and Cynthia's relationship.
By the end of the poem, Propertius not only has denied Caesar's power over lovers and the role of civic authority altogether, but also has appropriated the language of real militia, specifically that of the imperator, to depict his own world. Significantly, he ultimately rejects Caesar's authority by transferring Caesar's power over life and death to Cynthia and makes her his master. In so doing, Propertius enlarges his own world to encompass this public outer world of imperium and ultimately replaces Caesar's world with his own.

Poem 2.7 begins (1-6) with the opposition between Caesar's world and Propertius': the language of public authority intrudes into Propertius' world (e.g., legem, 1; edicta, 2; magnus Caesar, 5), but the poet counters with his own language (e.g., gavisa es, 1; flemus, 2; amantes ... invitos, 3-4). While the first section delineates the dilemma between the two outlooks and emphasizes the threat of Caesar's world, the central section (7-14) focuses on Propertius' perspective of commitment: he is willing to be faithful to Cynthia to the point of death (7). He continues to deny not only the outlook of the socially acceptable, but the language of that world, too. He reinterprets for his reader what it means to be nupta and maritus, the sounds of the marriage flute, tibia (11-12), the expectation of raising a family (13-14). Moreover, he ends the section with a statement to Cynthia (11-12) and a retort to Caesar (13-14). In the last section (15-20), the poet repudiates real militia by appropriating its language: he now accompanies castra puellae (15) while riding a charger greater than Castor's (16). His
gloria is carried to the Borysthenides (17-18). And he asks for the official approval of his mistress (places; placeam, 19). Thus, while the tone of the poem reveals a stronger and stronger scorn for the world of politics and legality, the language used modulates from public to private to public. In the third section the poet appropriates this vocabulary not just to explain his world in language understandable to his readers nor to elevate his world to Caesar's, but to control Caesar's world by using Caesar's language to depict his own world, to show his transformation of the princeps' world.

In the opening section, it is the intrusion of the public world into the world of the lovers that prepares us for and dictates the dichotomy between the two worlds:

Gavisa es certe sublatam, Cynthia, legem,
qua quondam edicta flemus uterque diu,
ni nos divideret; quamvis diducere amantes
non queat invitōs Iuppiter ipse duos.
"at magnus Caesar." sed magnus Caesar in armis: 5
devictae gentes nil in amore valent.
(2.7.1-6)

A law that was destined to separate (ni nos divideret, 3) Propertius and Cynthia has been removed (sublatam, 1). The language involved (sublatam ... legem, 1; edicta, 2) has provoked commentators into endless debate about the specifics of a law that is entirely unattested elsewhere in the ancient sources. Hertzberg in 1843 first proposed that Propertius was referring to a marriage law that was the precursor of the leges Juliae of 18/17 B.C. and the lex Papia Poppaea of A.D. 9. Mommsen in a footnote suggested that the lex in question was never actually a law, but only a proposed law
that was never enacted because of the opposition to it.\textsuperscript{14} Badian has recently argued that it was not a law passed by the assembly, but one of the triumvir's edicts that was finally repealed and that induced Propertius to write these lines.\textsuperscript{15} Yet more important for our understanding of the poem is the situation delineated by the poet and the language used to describe it. Commentators have generally noted the official, legal quality of \textit{sublatam \ldots legem} (1) and \textit{edicta} (2),\textsuperscript{16} but they have not noted the other official public language in the opening section. For example, \textit{ni nos divideret} (3), while it could not possibly be even a paraphrase of Caesar's edict, has the ring of authority, for the archaic form \textit{ni} suggests the word that introduces prohibitions in law, especially in the XII Tables,\textsuperscript{17} and \textit{dividere} is a technical term for dissolving a partnership or an alliance.\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Iuppiter ipse} (4) is of course the king of the gods, the divinity ultimately responsible for enforcing law. In the last distich of the section, \textit{arma} and \textit{devictae gentes} introduces an avenue to authority in addition to law. While Jupiter is considered responsible for law, it is Caesar who holds direct sway over the military. Indeed, the phrase \textit{magnus Caesar} (5) recalls the epithets given to past leaders of the republic (cf. Pompeius Magnus) and suggests the \textit{auctoritas} that allows one to lead in both the civil and military spheres.

The impingement of the legal, political and military language in the first section provokes a response from those the law affects most, lovers. First, long weeping (\textit{quondam \ldots flemus \ldots diu}, 2), then joy (\textit{gavisa es}, 1). Yet there is joy only because the law has
already been removed (sublatam, 1). The interlocking word order of
the first line (gavisa es ... Cynthia=A; sublatam ... legem=B) and
the juxtaposition of edicta flemus on either side of the caesura of
the pentameter indicate the contrast between the two languages, the
two points of view. Yet the interlocking effect of the first line
and the ambivalent quality of the adverbs of the second line
(quondam refers to the time when either the edict was in effect or
the lovers were weeping; diu refers to the extent of time that the
law was in effect or that the lovers cried) show the dependence the
lovers have upon public authority: they cry when the law is in
effect, they rejoice when it is removed. Thus, the first distich
not only presents the contrast between the world of law and that of
lovers, but also lovers' dependence upon the removal of external law
for their happiness.

Yet it is only in the second couplet that we learn why the law
posed such a threat to their happiness: Ni nos divideret (3). The
law, symbol of public authority, might separate the two lovers.
Although we have seen that the clause ni nos divideret has the ring
of public authority since it hints at legal terminology, the clause
is not a proper prohibition at all, but a fearing clause dependent
on flemus (2).

Now the first obstacle to the union of lovers has already been
removed before the poem has begun (sublatam ... legem, 1), but the
thought of the law and its enforcement has led Propertius to dwell
upon a second threat that may separate himself and Cynthia: Iuppiter
ipse (4). Certainly Jupiter, as the divine lawgiver/law-enforcer,
is a potential obstacle, but Propertius limits his power through the context of his presentation of the god in the poem. The danger he poses is hypothetical (quamvis, 3) and more generalized (nosdivideret has become diducere amantes). By explaining his power in a conditional, more abstract way, the poet distances himself and Cynthia from that power. Moreover, the forceful placement of non queat at the beginning of line 4 and the threefold repetition of words connected with lovers (amantes ... invit ... duos, 3-4) just before key pauses in the two lines underscore the lovers' strength of will. Furthermore, Iuppiter ipse is framed and limited by words for lovers, invit ... duos. Finally, the placement of amantes at the end of line 5 and the emphasis upon the lovers in the couplet suggest another role for the king of the gods: Iuppiter ipse amans. For Jupiter can only separate lovers as a lover/ravisher himself, but when he takes on the role as divine lover, he relinquishes his political and legal power and becomes subject to Amor. Thus, the second threat is removed not just by Propertius' insistence that Jupiter has no power, but by transforming him into a distant, hypothetical rival lover instead of the king of the gods. Jupiter is perhaps still a threat, but no longer an external, judicial one. He is now part of the lovers' world.

Unlike the second couplet, which postpones the naming of the threat until second hemistich of the pentameter, at the beginning of the third couplet the third threat to Propertius and Cynthia is introduced immediately: 'at magnus Caesar' (5). Caesar synthesizes the first two threats in that he is responsible for the law and he
is Jupiter's representative on earth, and his power over men is manifest: he has conquered nations (devictae gentes, 6) and has great political prestige (magnus, 5). How then does Propertius minimize the threat Caesar poses? Once again through language. By adding two simple words to the repeated phrase magnus Caesar (5) Propertius limits the scope of his influence to the military: sed magnus Caesar in armis (5). While Propertius hinted at the dichotomy between the realm of public life and of love in the first two couplets, he comes to a climax of directness in the final line of this section. Caesar's distinction is through war, and to have conquered nations gives him no influence in matters of love. In addition, Caesar's power is limited also by the word devincere (6). Rather than choose some form of vincere, a common lovers' word, Propertius wrote a compound that seems not to be used in love's contexts, but in public contexts instead. Hence, Caesar is allowed no power in love, not even in the vocabulary of love.

In the next section, Propertius outlines his alternative to the world of military and political authority and focuses on the language of commitment:

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

ah, mea tum qualis caneret tibi tibia somnos,
tibia, funesta tristior illa tuba!
unde mihi patriis gnatos praebere triumphis?
nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit.

(2.7.7-14)

Before we go on to examine this section, however, it is important to take notice of various verbal and syntactic clues that help explain
the argument of this section. According to Propertius' logic, he would rather die (7) than (quam, 8) be unfaithful to Cynthia. Since aut (9) indicates alternatives, quam (8) therefore governs two clauses (8; 9-10), each of which deals with betrayal by marriage (cf. nuptae, 8; maritus, 9). Tum (11) provides the conclusion to the conditional statement in 7-10 and introduces two questions, one to Cynthia (11-12) and one to Caesar (13-14). To paraphrase, I would rather die than (quam, 8) betray you, Cynthia. But if I did betray you and therefore did die, then (tum, 11) what sort of (qualis, 11) sleep would my tibia provide for you and how (unde, 13) would I produce sons for the fatherland's triumphs? This explanation of the key conjunctions and adverbs not only provides a framework for the parallel questions of 11-14 and consequently eliminates the need to posit a lacuna after line 12 or the beginning of a new poem with line 13, but also provides a transition (13-14) that links the opening section and its language of military triumphs with the final section in which Propertius applies the language of public life to his relationship with Cynthia.

Despite the apparently simple structure I have just outlined, the interlocking layers of imagery add a great richness and complexity to the poem. Line 7 links the first section with the second and sets the tone. In line 6, devictae gentes had introduced the concept of slavery, since defeat in war means slavery for those who have not died in battle. Collo (7) continues the thought by recalling the Roman army's method of subjugating their opponents into slavery: captives would bend their necks as they walked under
the yoke of slavery. The connection suggests that Propertius would have to submit to slavery if he had followed the dictates of the edict of lines 1-3. Yet Propertius asserts that he would rather die: nam citius poterer caput hoc discedere collo (?). The language of the line is unusual. Rather than simply say he wants to die, he is quite graphic about the manner of death, because he wants his readers to recall the death penalty ad ferrum, the only type of death with which a free-born citizen might be inflicted. Why? Of the Augustan marriage laws that we know in more detail, only the lex Julia de adulteriis specified the death penalty, and then only if the husband or the father of the bride caught the offender in the act and only if the social status of the adulterer was that of an actor, slave or former slave. Even if, as Stahl suggests, the penalties associated with the edict of lines 1-3 were harsher, it is highly unlikely that it would have recommended the death penalty for free-born citizens since (1) the laws were designed to protect and foster legitimate marriage and to increase the birth rate and (2) the death penalty, even for maiestas, was so rare in Rome that Clodius' emphasis on Cicero's hand in executing the Catilinarian conspirators—all Roman citizens—eventually forced Cicero into exile for a year and out of politics altogether for a number of years. Thus, Propertius is both challenging the princeps and taking control of his own affairs. The princeps cannot simply 'eliminate' lovers if he wants to repopulate Italy nor can he make Propertius a slave like the victims of his wars and triumphs.
Yet the line clearly suggests the language of a slave to a master. For example, Tyndarus, the slave of Philocrates, says in Captivi 687-88:

meumque potius me caput periculo praecoptavisse, quam is periret, ponere.

Propertius' line is even more strongly worded: rather than simply risk his life (caput periculo ... ponere) as Tyndarus declaims, Propertius is willing to die. Tyndarus' greatest desire is that his master not die at the hands of Hegio while Propertius' greatest hope is that his love for Cynthia not die, that he not betray her trust. The substitution of a slave to die in place of his master is frequent in comedy. Propertius builds on the theme to show his servitium amoris, his slavery to Cynthia. Thus, to repopulate Caesar's troops, Propertius rejects Caesar's slavery and enters the service of another master, Cynthia.

But Propertius is not simply saying that he is willing to undergo slavery (the slavery of love) rather than betray Cynthia. He carries the idea of slavery to an extreme—to the point of death. By using the language of slaves, at least in Roman comedy, Propertius extends the concept of servitium amoris. To be a true slave of love, the lover must be willing to undergo death for his beloved. As we have seen, both servitium amoris and the idea of being willing to die in love are present in the Monobiblos. Yet here Propertius decisively links them together, by capitalizing on the slavery implicit in Caesar's control of devictae gentes and by using the comic language of slaves who suffer 'death' either at
their master's hands or in place of their masters. If we recall the means by which Propertius was enslaved in 1.1—through the imagery of military capture—the collocation of *militia* and *servitium* within 2.7 makes more sense.

To be a slave, then, means to be willing to die rather than be unfaithful to Cynthia. The alternatives presented build on and resonate with each other. In both instances, it is important to remind ourselves of how Propertius defined his relationship with Cynthia at the end of the previous poem:

\[
\text{non uxor numquam, numquam seducet amica:}
\text{semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.}
\]  

(2.5.41-42)

As Stahl rightly comments, Propertius' relationship does not admit the traditional relations between husband and wife or lover and girlfriend. To say that Cynthia is only an *uxor* or only an *amica* is too limiting. Propertius' relationship with her transcends the limits of marriage and the limits of concubinage. The first way he might be unfaithful involves a highly disputed line: *quam possem, nuptae perderet more faces* (8). The crux of the line focuses on the two short syllables preceding *faces*. Three readings are advocated in current texts: *more* Barber, Fedeli [<e> more Williams (1958) 28]; *amore* Schuster-Dornsieff, Enk (so also Stahl [1985] 145); and *in ore* Hanslik (so also Shackleton Bailey [1956] 74). All three readings commend themselves, and all three yield what has become the communis opinio: never, if I am forced to marry, would I love a wife and forget you.30 The reading that is best attested and also the lectio difficilior is *more*.31 As Shackleton Bailey and Scheidweiler point
out, more cannot mean "at the whim of" a bride, as Butler and Barber translated. However, if we translate in a sense similar to morem gerere, it will mean "according to the wishes" of a wife, expressing the fact the Propertius will have lost his freedom. For him to obey a wife, to become subservient to her, is hardly an alternative to serving Caesar. And according to Propertius, neither one is true slavery, that is, slavery to Cynthia.

Although much of the controversy has centered on the two syllables preceding faces, it is the several connotations of faces that have often provided the basis upon which editors have chosen one reading over another. But to choose one definition of faces limits the meaning of the passage far too much. Perhaps the way that readers first interpret faces is ignes amoris. Propertius would rather suffer death than lose the flames of true passion (presumably for Cynthia) at a bride's behest. Since Propertius' true love is for Cynthia, he should comply with her wishes. Moreover, nuptae more implies that Propertius has married according to the dictates of Caesar's edict, an implication that is borne out in the following distich. Yet faces, especially with nuptae in the same sentence, can also suggest marriage torches. Then we would translate: "I would rather suffer death than waste marriage torches, (especially) at a bride's behest." The line, as Camps points out, contains a certain degree of petulance on Propertius' part, since the torches are provided by the bridegroom and a bride should not be telling her new husband how to run things. This interpretation, moreover, suggests even more strongly that Propertius has succumbed
to Caesar’s wishes and has married. He also appears to regret the marriage, not just because he has lost Cynthia, but because his bride—who does not understand him and who is not Cynthia—tells him what to do.

Propertius experiences additional remorse because faces can also symbolize the torches of the komast, the torches that lit his way during his nocturnal revels or as he waited outside Cynthia’s door. To lose these torches was indeed a great loss since he could no longer claim fidelity to his mistress, no longer wait at her doorstep, guarding her from others and thereby saving her for himself. In short, he could not longer be her elegiac lover, her servus amoris.

The alternative way that Propertius could betray Cynthia (lines 9-10) develops the contrast between the two types of relationship, marriage and komast, more explicitly. The limina clausa suggest the lover’s paraclausithyon as he waits outside the closed door of his mistress, singing her love songs, and believing in her love for him, in short, the symbol of Propertius’ whole relationship with Cynthia. But the juxtaposition of limina clausa with maritus underscores Propertius’ betrayal (prodita, 10). By crossing the threshold as a maritus, not as an amator, he would be rejecting his true relationship with Cynthia, which is not limited by terms such as maritus, uxor, or amica (cf. 2.6.41-41). Moreover, crossing the threshold was a sacred part of the Roman marriage ceremony. But it emphasized the crossing of the bride over the threshold, just the opposite of what Propertius depicts here.
Propertius, therefore, also parodies the Roman ceremony that Caesar's edict was so eager to strengthen.

To sum up, the first way in which Propertius might betray Cynthia is by acting as the *servus* of a master other than Cynthia, namely, the bride. The second way builds on the first, since he not only obeys a new master, but takes the role of husband, the logical extension of his obeying the *nupta*. In each case, the symbol of his fidelity to Cynthia is given up: he is no longer a *servus amoris* nor an *amator* who stands outside her closed doors. And finally, each example parodies the Roman marriage ceremony. A wife, not the husband, should be *morigerus* to her husband, and a wife, not a husband, should be the first to cross the threshold of the house after marriage.

These alternatives were prefaced by Propertius' desire to suffer death rather than betray Cynthia. Each way suggested the contrast between two types of relationships: komastic and marital. Lines 11-12 pick up the idea of Propertius' failure in komastic relationships. The *tibia* of the komast will no longer serenade Cynthia to sleep, because it has been replaced by the *tibia* of the marriage procession.41 On the one hand, *funesta* and *tristior* of the next line suggest the mournful intonations of the lover's serenade as he is locked outside his mistress' doors.42 Yet the two words also force us to recall line 7 and what betrayal really means for Propertius: death. In fact, the entire central section plays upon images of death. The torches of passion, marriage, and the komast can also be the torches of the funeral procession.43 In fact,
Propertius more than once equates marriage torches with funeral torches. And the comparison between the sadness of the funeral trumpet and the *tibia* in line 12 helps us recall that the *tibia* was also played at funerals. The conjunction of marriages and funerals points to the result of Propertius' betrayal of Cynthia by obeying a wife and acting as a husband: a marriage that follows the dictates of Caesar's edict and denies the special amatory relationship that he has had with Cynthia leads to death. Within the same context we should understand Propertius' tearful eyes (*udis luminibus*, 10), eyes that are wet because of betrayal (*prodita*, 10) that leads to death. Indeed, even the sleep that the *tibia* induces suggests death since the mournful tones create a sleep without lovers together, a sleep that symbolizes the end of Propertius' relationship with Cynthia if he were to be unfaithful.

The two questions introduced by *tum*, therefore, in lines 11-14 are predicated not just on the idea that Propertius has been unfaithful, that he will no longer be able to serenade Cynthia outside her doorstep, but also on the idea that betrayal means death—to the lover who betrays his girlfriend and consequently to the relationship as a whole. *Tum* (11) means "then when our relationship is over." But the funereal imagery of the passage shows that separation is the equivalent of death. Lines 13-14 therefore continue the hypothetical situation of betrayal, separation and death and re-introduce the language of *militia*. *Unde* ("from what source?") makes sense if we understand that Propertius' separation from Cynthia is like death. His relationship with her is
the only one that truly is life-giving. If his relationship is over with the one he truly loves, if he is really dead, then how can he produce children for his country's triumphs (patriis ... triumphis, 14)?

The couplet becomes more clear when we realize that Propertius is making explicit the intertwining of private and public, that Caesar's effect upon private affairs is similar to his impact upon public life. The juxtaposition of patriis gnatos (13) suggests a pun on patria/pater. Sanguine (its primary meaning here is 'family, lineage') in the next line clinches the pun and makes clear the parallelism between patria and pater. Fatherland and fatherhood are both distasteful to Propertius since they are symbols of the mos majorum. Fatherland as a symbol may mean triumphs, but sanguine (14) reveals the bitter truth behind those victories. Nor will Propertius act as a father (here sanguine = 'family, lineage') since that means that he is no longer faithful to Cynthia, but to Caesar and his edict on marriage. He does not want to marry and have legitimate children as Caesar desires if they are only to be used for patrii triumphi, triumphs that will cause the death of many other gnati. Moreover, sanguine (14) recalls Propertius' own death in line 7 and underscores the difference between Propertius' death and the soldier's death. Propertius chooses death in the service of his mistress (citius paterer ..., 7) while the miles (14) more than likely does not opt for death.
Thus ends the central 'hypothetical' section of the poem. It begins with Propertius electing death in slavery to Cynthia in preference to following Caesar's edict and becoming Caesar's slave. In the process, this view of death changes to suggest that in betraying Cynthia, the literal death Propertius is willing to suffer also symbolizes the metaphorical death of the relationship. Propertius' graphic description of the type of death he will endure (caput hoc discedere collo) echoes the words that signify the separation that the edict and Jupiter pose for the two lovers (divideret; diducere, 3). Although Propertius seems effectively to take control out of Caesar's hands by proposing a solution that would be unusual for a free-born Roman and politically damaging for the Restorer of the Republic, he nevertheless chooses death. Although it is done in the service of his mistress, it will lead to their ultimate separation and the end of their relationship. Thus, in countering Augustus' measures, Propertius creates problems for himself. Only life beyond death, immortality, will solve their problem. Propertius has said in 1.19 that he can love even after he has died. But as we saw in Chapter I, this promise of fidelity is ambiguous.

With patriis ... triumphis (13) Propertius returns once again to the language of public authority—only to reject it once again. But the final section of the poem (15-20) illustrates Propertius' transformation of the language of militia into his own elegiac language:
Quodsi vera meae comitarem castra puellae,  
non mihi sat magnus Castoris iret equus.  
hinc etenim tantum meruit mea gloria nomen,  
gloria ad hibernos lata Borysthenidas.  
tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus:  
hic erit et patrio nomine pluris amor.

(2.7.15-20)

Quodsi (15) signifies a shift in thought from the hypothetical situation of dying—if he were to betray Cynthia—to another, better way of acting in her service. Propertius will accompany the castra puellae, not the castra Caesaris. Indeed, her camp is the only true (vera, 15) one. Moreover, with Cynthia as his leader, he would need a horse greater than Castor's steed. Magnus ... equus (16) recalls Propertius' rejection of magnus Caesar in line 5. Castor was associated with Roman victories at Lake Regillus in 496, at Pydna in 168, against the Cimbri in 101 and at Pharsalus in 48. Significantly, in the two most recent victories, Augustus' great uncle Marius and Caesar were blessed by the aid of the Dioscuri. Further, the "great horse of Castor" recalls the annual transvectio Equitum, a ceremony designed to honor their patron Castor, but in the time of Augustus also to demonstrate the Equites' subservience to Caesar. Thus, Propertius' denial that Castor's horse would be great enough for him is not just a rejection of a lifestyle that prefers war to peace, but also a rejection of Caesar, too.

Propertius is also applying the language of real militia to his own world and presenting an alternative to the status quo. As he comments on the relationships drawn here, he reveals the proper relationship between the great horse of Castor and the one whose camp he follows. The one who rides the horse of Castor may be an
important person within the hierarchy of the *vera castra*, but he
should still serve the leader of the camp, even if it is a *puella*.
In this analogy, Propertius the horseman acts at the bidding of the
leader of his camp, i.e. Cynthia, who earlier in the collection has
been described in divine terms. Serving the leader of the camp,
Propertius suggests, is the proper way to act. This idea gains more
force when we realize that Caesar was using a ceremony in honor of
Castor (the *transvectio Equitum*) in order to control, or—as he
would say—to 'recognize' who was or was not a legitimate *eques*.
Yet Castor, as son of Jupiter, recalls Jupiter's role as model and
leader for Caesar in lines 3-6. Accordingly, Caesar should also act
at the behest of divinity, in this case Jupiter or Castor, rather
than try to abuse his connections with the gods in order to control
his subjects with marriage legislation.

In 17-18, Propertius continues this double-edged note of
rejection and appropriation. On the one hand, by using
*Borysthenides* (18), a learned and obscure place name, indeed a *hapax
legomenon*, Propertius parodies Caesar's claims, later so proudly
presented in his *Res Gestae* in similar language, that his
reputation will extend to the ends of the earth. Yet he also
appropriates for himself and his poetry this claim to glory. The
reason for his fame is indicated by *hinc* (17): it is not because of
any great conquests accomplished at the cost of great bloodshed, but
because of his subservience to the *castra puellae* in the preceding
distich.
The poem concludes with a final act of deference on Propertius' part to his mistress. By using the legal term *placere*, he recalls the beginning of the poem which posed a legal obstacle to his union with Cynthia. While the edict of the opening lines threatened subservience to Caesar, *placere* (19) demonstrates his willingness to serve Cynthia—a metamorphosis of masters from Caesar to Cynthia. Moreover, *patrio sanguine* also recalls 13-14, where Propertius as *pater* refused to produce children for the fatherland's triumphs (*patriis ... triumphis*, 14). Now, however, Propertius' refusal of Caesar is linked more explicitly with Cynthia. Indeed the final line specifies the reason for his servitude: *amor*, which is more valuable than the fatherland's blood (*patrio sanguine*, 20). His love for Cynthia is worth even more than repopulating the fatherland or than his own need for children (*sanguine* = 'stock'). Moreover, his love is also more important than the shedding of blood for the fatherland (*sanguine* = 'blood'). If Propertius is going to spill his blood, it will be for his *domina castrorum*, not for Caesar. His appropriation of the language of the *mos maiorum* is therefore complete.

Yet the final couplet yields another aspect: the idea of unfaithfulness. Propertius rejected his own unfaithfulness in the central section of the poem, and the indicative *places* (19) underscores his own promise of fidelity. But the subjunctive *placeam* (19) allows us to question the faithfulness of his *domina*. Naturally, a *domina* is whimsical and hard to please, yet perhaps she is not tied to him by the same bonds of commitment as he is to her.
The doubt created in the final couplet, therefore, suggests that we re-examine the poem to see if we can corroborate the hints of Cynthia’s infidelity elsewhere in the poem.

If we return to the opening lines, we can already perceive some doubts about Cynthia’s fidelity. *Certe* (1) framed by *gavisa es* and *sublatam*, can be taken with either idea, yet in each case implies doubt about Cynthia’s sincerity. If coupled with *gavisa es*, it is ironic and the phrase suggests “You were happy, to be sure, when the law was repealed, but your mood before was ....”52 If we understand it with *sublatam*, we would translate, "when the law was definitely repealed." In either case, it is suggested that Cynthia was not responding to Propertius as he hoped she would or as he was to her. She does not, it is implied, have the same indomitable commitment as Propertius has in the face of laws, or Caesar, or even death.

The next couplet continues the doubt. Jupiter cannot separate lovers unwilling to be parted (*invitos*, 4), but what about lovers who are not as firm as Propertius. Propertius makes it clear that he is willing to suffer decapitation rather than be unfaithful. Yet *invitos* builds in the possibility that one or the other lovers might not be willing—or capable—of remaining faithful, that one of the two might not be unwilling to be separated. Propertius confirms what we have seen earlier in 1.15, 17 and 19: for love to be successful each partner must be committed, unwilling to be parted. And certainly Jupiter, in his role as *amator*, recalls the threats
that other lovers have posed to Propertius' and Cynthia's relationship in the preceding poems.

Even as Propertius makes his expression of commitment in the central section and eliminates questions about his own fidelity, there is still doubt about Cynthia's. Propertius would not cross her closed doors (limina clausa, 9), yet they are closed nonetheless. And Propertius' tears (udis ... luminibus, 10) are just as likely to be from grief at her not receiving him as from regret for his betraying her. Indeed, the imagery in the lines (faces, limina clausa, tibia, caneret) suggests a komastic situation that illustrates both the fickleness of the woman and the possibility that she harbors another lover behind the limina clausa. Usually the lover's serenade is mournful because he is unable to gain access to his beloved. Yet the imagery of death in 7-14 colors our view of his serenade, linking it with a funeral dirge.

Indeed it is the imagery of death in these lines that confirms our suspicions most. As we have seen, at one level Propertius' commitment is stronger than death. He is willing to die (7) rather than be unfaithful. And the mournful sounds of the serenading tibia revealed Propertius' fidelity to Cynthia even though being outside her door would be like death to him. Conversely, betraying her by marrying someone else would be, he thinks, like death to her. Her sleep would then become the sleep of death (11-12). At another level, public and private are linked by death. Caesar's intrusion
into their affair is shown to be parallel to the death signaled by
the funesta tuba, to the results of patriis triumphis.

Yet death is also linked with Cynthia's fickleness and
unfaithfulness. The funereal tones of the tibia color our view of
Propertius' faithful waiting outside Cynthia's limina clausa. It
signals a more painful truth beneath the tuneful notes of a komastic
serenade. Indeed it sings (caneret, 11) not a serenade, but a dirge
(funesta, 12). The torches (faces, 8) used to beat open the doors
of his mistress are also the torches that lead a funeral
procession. The threshold crossed is no longer the one that the
lover hopes to cross in order to be united with his puella, but the
one that a corpse crosses to leave the house. Because Cynthia is a
domina, because she is behind the limina clausa and consequently
inaccessible to her lover, the betrayal (prodita, 10) becomes part
of her character. Cynthia does not demonstrate the same commitment
as Propertius and hence the funereal torches, thresholds, and pipes
indicate the true nature of the relationship of the exclusus amator
and his beloved, just as the death wish of line 7 reveals the
ultimate fate of a lover enslaved to his mistress. Hence the tibia
funesta sounds a dirge for Propertius inasmuch as their relationship
will not continue, despite his resistance to Caesar's law and the
attitudes manifested by those who uphold the mos maiorum.

Poem 2.7 therefore extends the ideas of love and death in the
first book. As the enslaved and maddened lover, Propertius took on
most of the blame for the growing separation in the relationship, a
blame that resulted in Propertius' voyage in 1.17 and death in
1.19. At the same time an increased use of death in a literal sense pointed to some sort of 'death' in the relationship. 1.19, as the culmination of this development, suggested that Propertius' commitment would last beyond death. Yet, it did not indicate how that death would take place. In 2.7 we have seen that Propertius speaks more of a literal death, motivated primarily by his interaction with the attitudes of public life. Finally in 2.7 when Propertius speaks of the method of death (decapitation) in response to the threats of Caesar, he uses this literal death to deny the authority of Caesar's militia and to establish once again his faithfulness to Cynthia. Indeed, in rejecting Caesar's authority, he appropriates Caesar's language and applies it to Cynthia, making her his domina castrorum. Yet just as in 1.19, the imagery of death, especially the connection between komast and funeral and between slavery of love and death, hints even more strongly at the impossibility of his continuing faithfulness in the face of Cynthia's fickleness and lack of commitment.

2.7, therefore, is representative of Propertius' militia in Book 2. Firmly in Cynthia's camp, his only enemies are Amor (e.g. 2.8.39-40, 2.12.13-18) and other rivals. Indeed, 2.9 reveals the extent to which he belongs in Cynthia's castra. Even though he rails at her infidelity throughout most of the poem, in the end he asserts his fidelity to Cynthia (2.9.41-46) and hopes to take his anger out on Cynthia's new lover, Propertius' rival (2.9.47-52). 2.15 adds an additional nuance to his militia amoris and looks forward to Book 3. Propertius and Cynthia engage in battles, but
they are the struggles of the bed (2.15.1-36), nights destined to make Propertius immortal (2.15.37-40). In contrast, their "warfare" is "peaceful", not real as at the battle of Actium (2.15.41-48). Propertius and Cynthia lie (iacere, 2.15.42), to be sure, but as the result of wine and love, while soldiers' bones are given no such rest, but instead are churned up by the sea (verteret ossa mare, 2.15.44). Although the poem ends with an ambiguous image, withered leaves floating in wine cups (2.15.51-52), the poet-lover at least hopes for more love (magnum speramus, 2.15.53), concluding with an injunction similar to the close of 1.19 to make merry while there is still time since forsitam includet crastina fata dies (2.15.54).

2.15, therefore, points to the poet-lover's further refinement of militia in Book 3. For in this book Amor is a god of peace (3.5.1) and lovers do not participate in military triumphs, except to lie in each other's arms while the triumphal procession passes by (3.4.15-18). Indeed, nearly every example of militia in Book 3 records only real warfare. Even when two lovers are involved, such as Galla and Postumus in 3.12, their love is not represented through militia amoris. Instead, it is Postumus' service in Rome's legions which separates him from his beloved.

Within this framework, 3.8 seems to be an anomaly. The poem sketches what appears to be Propertius' rationalization of a lover's quarrel. The poem can be divided into four main sections. In the first (1-10), Propertius says how sweet was his quarrel (dulcis ... rixa, 1) with Cynthia the previous night and asks that she continue to wage war against him. His reason for the request (11-20) is that
women show their true affection through angry outbursts. In fact, such warfare adds to the lover's interest and delight (21-32). In the final section (33-40) the poet surprisingly shifts the argument from fighting with one's mistress to fighting off the attention of rival suitors and reveals that another man was the cause of his quarrel with Cynthia.

The poem marks a transition in Propertius' use of militia amoris in a number of ways. First, in the course of the poem the poet blurs the distinctions concerning whom he is fighting (Cynthia or the rival). Moreover, the reason behind the quarrel is ambiguous. Is it to reveal a certain amorous enjoyment in having a lover's quarrel? Does it show that Propertius takes his love with Cynthia seriously and only intends to twit her new lover and his rival? Or does it reveal a deeper gulf between Propertius and Cynthia in regard to the love they share for one another? Finally, why is there no suggestion of death, Propertius' most frequent image, amidst all this fighting?

The poem begins by asserting a familiar theme: a woman shows true love only through her anger:

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 nostros audax invade capillos et mea formosis unguibus ora nota, tu minitare oculos subiecta exurere flamma, fac mea rescisso pectora nuda sinu! nimirum veri dantur mihi signa caloris: nam sine amore gravi femina nulla dolet. (3.8.1-10)
Others had dealt with the idea, e.g. Catullus 83 and 92, but none so extensively as Propertius does here. To open with a word such as *dulcis,* and to parody epic in 5 (*vero,* 7, and later in 14, would normally suggest a light tone and a thalamial atmosphere: that Propertius intends to talk only of erotic skirmishes. But the details of the battle soon demolish such an assumption. Pushing tables (3) and throwing cups (4), the lovers appear to start out harmlessly enough, but soon the poet asks for her nails to mar his face (6) and flames to scorch his eyes (7). A pun linking the heat of the flames and the heat of her passion (*signa caloris,* 9) brings back the light tone, but not before some doubt has been created about the nature and intensity of the lovers’ *rixā.*

The poet also offers a hint about the motivation for the fight. Three times within three lines Cynthia or her actions are described as mad or insane (*insanae,* 2; *furibunda,* 3; *insana,* 4), all terms which characterize a lover’s *furor amōris.* Other signs of love-sickness—threats (*minitare,* 7), signs of ardor (*signa caloris,* 9), deepfelt love (*amore gravi,* 10) and grief (*dolet,* 10)—are other sure indications that Cynthia is in love. Whenever we saw such signs of *furor amōris* in the past (e.g. 1.3 or 1.15), they were often accompanied by jealousy. In 1.3 Cynthia accused Propertius of spending the night with another woman. In 1.15 Propertius was sure that the purpose of Cynthia’s dalliance at the dressing table was preparation to see another man. This assumption here is further confirmed by the most recent poem in the third book (3.6) focusing on Propertius and Cynthia. There Propertius relished Cynthia’s
indignation against him—reported through his slave, Lygdamus—as an indication of her love for him. Perhaps his pledge of fidelity and condemnation of Faetus in 3.7 were meant to act as a means of reconciliation, but now evidently the issue has not been resolved. Now that Cynthia and Propertius have had a fight (rixa, l) and Propertius describes Cynthia as mad with love, it is natural to conclude that the fight was motivated by Cynthia's anger at Propertius' infidelity.59

The next section adds further evidence that Cynthia is truly in love.

\[
\text{quae mulier rabida iactat convicia lingua,} \\
\text{haec Veneris magnae volvitur ante pedes;} \\
\text{custodum gregibus circa seu stipat euntem,} \\
\text{seu sequitur medias, Maenas ut icta, vias,} \\
\text{seu timidam crebro dementia somnia terrent,} \\
\text{seu miseram in tabula picta puella movet:} \\
\text{his ego tormentis animi sum verus haruspex,} \\
\text{has didici certo saepe in amore notas.} \\
\text{non est certa fides, quam non in iurgia vertas.} \\
\text{hostibus eveniat lenta puella meis!}
\]

Whether a woman takes the offensive, hurling insults (11), using custodes to spy on her lover, or following the lover down the middle of the street as a crazed maenad (14) or acts more passively, dreaming of her lover's infidelities or seeing pictures in which she does not seem so beautiful, she is reduced to groveling at the feet of the goddess of love. These are not "types" of women, such as the prude or the wanton or the sentimentalist, but women who show different symptoms of passionate, and often jealous, love.60

Propertius, the verus haruspex (17) of love, uses a series of words which point to the symptoms of love: gravida (11), Maenas ut icta
(14), dementia (15), and miseram (16). Indeed, when a woman hurled insults, her wrath has often been motivated by jealousy (11). Sending out spies to observe her lover or, in a fit of rage (Maenas ut icta), following after him down the middle of the street reveal her insecurities about her lover’s faithfulness. Dreams in elegiac poetry are often associated with jealousy while paintings often arouse feelings of inferiority on the part of the viewer, who then needs to be reassured of a lover’s affection. Although Propertius generalizes from her actions to those of other women, he shows his knowledge and hence superiority over love-lorn women.

Battle imagery also continues in this section as well, especially in the first and last couplet, and continues the apparent playfulness of the poet. After hearing mulier gravida iactat (11), the listener expects something such as tela manu, but instead the woman’s adversary receives an onslaught of verbiage launched from her tongue (convicia lingua. 11). The use of high style vocabulary in 13, e.g. stipat, and the epic parody of 14 tend to deflate the seriousness of their quarrel. And lines 19-20 conclude the exempla and readjust the scope of the battle, for a hostis (20) is introduced who is outside of the quarrel between Propertius and Cynthia. Though iurgia imply lovers’ battles, they are signs of certa fides (19). The lovers now seem to be allies, though perhaps somewhat tendentious, in comparison to the true enemy, rival lovers (20).

From this point on, the poet-lover attempts to interpret his battles with Cynthia as signs of her commitment to him. He no longer wants her to be suspicious of him and all the examples which
follow demonstrate their unity against a background filled with their enemies:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{in morso aequales videant mea vulnera collo:} \\
\text{me doceat livor mecum habuisse meam!} \\
\text{aut in amore dolere volo aut audire dolentem,} \\
\text{sive meas lacrimas sive videre tuas,} \\
\text{tecta superciliis si quando verba remittis,} \\
\text{aut tua cum digitis scripta silenda notas.} \\
\text{odi ego, quos numquam pungunt suspiria somnos:} \\
\text{semper in irata pallidus esse velim.} \\
\text{dulcior ignis erat Paridi, cum grata per arma} \\
\text{Tyndaridi poterat gaudia ferre suae:} \\
\text{dum vincunt Danai, dum restat barbarus Hector,} \\
\text{ille Helenae in gremio maxima bella gerit.}
\end{align*}
\]

(3.8.21-32)

aequales (21) sets the tone of the new section and marks Propertius and Cynthia apart from them. Propertius’ rivals would like to interpret a bite on his neck (in morso collo, 21) or a bruise (liver, 22) as true wounds, but Propertius says these ‘wounds’ (mea vulnera, 21) indicate his unity with Cynthia (22). Indeed, the repetition of me/meus three times within line 22 seems to support Propertius’ new interpretation. Despite the hopes of the aequales, Cynthia is not available. Indeed, the next two couplets reinforce the importance of their togetherness. Propertius wants them to experience both the good and the bad together: the torments of love (dolere ... dolentem, 23) and each other’s tears (meas lacrimas sive ... tuas, 24) as well as secret messages encoded in the movement of eyebrows (25) and the sketches of fingers in wine (26). In the next couplet, he makes explicit his desire for reconciliation and asserts his own furor amoris (pallidus esse velim, 28).
In his eagerness to distinguish his battles with Cynthia from actual warfare, he introduces the exemplum of Paris and Helen. *dulcior* (29) clearly recalls the *dulcis rixa* (1) which opened the poem and compares Propertius and Cynthia with Paris and Helen. Yet, Propertius implies, Paris' and Helen's battles are sweeter because their warfare is erotic (*in gremio*, 32), pleasing (*grata*, 29) and full of joy (*gaudia*, 30). Any hint of real war takes place in the distance, far from their bedroom (31). The myth should act as a paradigm for true love: lovers' battles should be confined to those which are sweet and erotic, not to those which involve serious threats and even blows. Thus, the section reveals a gradually improving picture of how Propertius views or would like to view his affair with Cynthia. He begins with Cynthia's actions—reinterpreted to show Propertius' acceptance, even forgiveness of what has happened (21-22)—followed by images of the couple sharing bad times and good (23-26). Then Propertius' pledge of love (27-28) is followed by a mythological paradigm which promotes a distinction between bedroom battles and actual warfare.

The next four couplets, however, reveal a surprising turn of events, culminating in Propertius' remarks to a specific rival in 37-40:

```
aut tecum aut pro te mihi cum rivalibus arma
   semper erunt: in te pax mihi nulla placet.
gauce, quod nulla est aequa formosa; doleres,
   si qua foret: nunc sis iure superba licet.
at tibi, qui nostro tendisti retia lecto,
    sit socer aeternum nec sine matre domus!
cui nunc si qua data est furandae copia noctis,
   offensa illa mihi, non tibi amica, dedit.
```

(3.8.33-40)
He concludes the myth with another promise of fidelity, but now framed as a pledge to fight his rivals for Cynthia’s love. Propertius’ change in attitude in 21 ff. was meant as an attempt to win Cynthia back from another. Earlier references to enemies (hostibus, 20; aequales, 21) quickly begin to make more sense. Further, it is Propertius’ wish (volo, 23) that he be the recipient of secret messages (25-26), but the intended recipient is not explicitly stated. Perhaps they were not for Propertius, but for his rival. Finally, the prominent juxtaposition of the Trojan War with the maxima bella of Paris and Helen is meant to remind that their love affair initiated the war fought by Menelaus and the Greeks to win back his bride. Propertius has reversed roles with Cynthia. It was not Cynthia who was abandoned for another, but Propertius. Certainly Propertius’ characterization of Cynthia in 1-20 as a woman truly in love was accurate. But she was not in love with Propertius, hoping to get him back, but in love with Propertius’ rival.

His statement in 33-34 maintains his hope that he and Cynthia are a pair. Either they will fight side by side (tecum, 33) or Propertius will fight on her behalf (pro te, 33). The next couplet (35-36) indicates his final attempt to win her back, complimenting her for her beauty. Indeed, the reference to her unparalleled beauty (nulla est aeque formosa, 35) and the deserved epithet superba (36), coming just after the double mention of Helen (30, 32) in the myth, add to Propertius’ compliment, and perhaps even allude to Venus,
acknowledged as the most beautiful because of the judgment of Paris.63

The mention of Paris and Helen had suggested, only implicitly, that Propertius' rival must be similar to Menelaus, a married man. When Propertius turns to address his rival in 37 (at tibi), he confirms this characterization by alluding to still another Homeric story, the capture of Ares and Aphrodite by Hephaestus (qui nostro nexisti retia lecto. 37).64 But just as Propertius had revised the Paris-Helen myth (love's warfare in preference to real war), he alters the emphasis of the Hephaestus story, using the rival's married status as an impediment to having a decent relationship with Cynthia, first because of her lack of commitment and second because of the absence of her affection. By wishing him an ever-present father-in-law (sit socer aeternum, 38), he reminds him that if he cannot maintain her as a committed wife, the socer could, under Augustus' marriage legislation, withdraw her dowry and bring her back home. In addition, even if her affairs have not been detected, and he does manage to get her into bed, her loyalty still belongs to Propertius: the husband will have stolen (furandae, 39) what is in fact, though not legally, Propertius', and she will lie with him not out of affection for the husband (non tibi amica, 40) but out of anger at Propertius (offensa illa mihi, 40). In short, the rival, Cynthia's legal husband, has no means of keeping Cynthia as his own, either through the law or through his affection.
In the course of the poem Propertius has, therefore, altered our expectations not once, but twice. He began by implying that it was Cynthia who was upset at him because of his infidelities, but by suggesting a willingness to fight hostes, shifts to the offensive. It is Cynthia who is unfaithful and Propertius spends the rest of the poem trying to convince her to fight only battles in bed (as Paris and Helen did). Yet if other battles must be fought, the poet-lover makes it clear that he will fight on Cynthia's side against his rivals for her love. And in this case, the love triangle turns out to be lover, beloved, and husband, a familiar theme in comedy. In the end, Propertius manages to twit his rival by asserting his own power over Cynthia and using one of the poem's earlier arguments against him: even if Cynthia is angry with Propertius, her ire reveals a stronger emotional tie to Propertius than to her husband (40).

In short, the physical battle with which the poem opened should be replaced, Propertius argues, with amorous battles between the lovers and true conflict only with one's rivals. Yet Propertius' return to the suggestion that Cynthia may be truly mad at him (offensa, 40) jumbles Propertius' argument. And on second reading, we realize that it was Propertius who was provoking Cynthia to fight (5-8) and that he is upset that there are flocks of custodes (13), or at least a husband, presenting an obstacle to their affair. In turn, he would like to interpret the bite on the neck and a bruise as tokens of Cynthia's love, but they quite likely are not. And even when he pledges his desire that they share their
grief and tears (23-24), his language is ambiguous. For *dolor* and *lacrimae* need not refer only to the anguish of love, but to actual pain and sorrow. Indeed, he wants (*volo*, 23) her to grieve and to cry in proportion to his own grief and tears. His willingness to fight need not be only with rivals (*cum rivalibus*, 33), but could also include battles with her (*tecum*, 33). Finally, even his admission of her beauty may contain a veiled threat that, if she were not so beautiful, he would find another woman. Thus, although the lover-poet appears to end by presenting a picture which distinguishes erotic and actual battles, the writer suggests that the two are often indistinguishable and that perhaps the *dulcis rixa* which initiated the poem hides a more serious conflict between the two.

If 3.8 is somewhat ambiguous about the manner and reason for lovers’ battles, 4.8 makes clear that the battles for which lovers are best suited are no longer those which occur in lovemaking, but in anger. Indeed, 4.8 carries to an extreme one half of Propertius’ argument in 3.8—that fights lead to lovemaking—by portraying a mock-epic version of Odysseus’ vengeance on the suitors. In the process, Propertius overturns most previously established conventions concerned with *militia amoris*. No longer do Propertius and Cynthia resort to playful struggles in bed, but instead Cynthia goes on the attack by physically disrupting Propertius’ evening with two courtesans, Phyllis and Teia. Just as Propertius promised to attack his rivals in so many poems in Book 2, Cynthia now takes vengeance upon her *hostes*, Phyllis and Teia. But unlike earlier
examples in which Propertius promised to fight to the death for the privilege of being Cynthia's one and only, Cynthia now actually enacts the terrible deed—seemingly with no risk and for the purpose of imposing imperium over Propertius. In short, lover becomes beloved, beloved becomes avenger, and warfare is excluded from the bedroom, yet the participants do not risk their lives, but live—though not happily ever after.

The first couplet of the poem introduces the language of the military:

Disce, quid Esquilias hac nocte fugarit aquosas,
cum vicina novis turba cucurrit agris,
(4.8.1-2)

A rout (fugarit, 1) will lead to confusion (turba, 2) and retreat (novis ... cucurrit agris, 2). Although this battle is clearly meant to be comic—e.g. note the contrast between high-style of Esquilias ... aquosas and the humble vicina turba and the intentional vagueness of quid (1)—disce (1) suggests that despite the comedy, there will be a lesson from which others may learn.

A description of the fertility rites at Lanuvium (3-14) makes way for a portrait of Cynthia which mimics the statue type of Juno Sospita, the patron deity of Lanuvium. Juno Sospita was regularly portrayed as a warrior goddess who wore the clipped pelt of a goat with the scalp pulled over her own head as a sort of helmet. Also frequent in her depictions was the guardian of her cult, a snake. When Cynthia is first introduced in 15 ff., she is carried (avecta est, 15) to Lanuvium by signs of wealth and luxury, Gallic ponies with closely cropped manes (detonsis ... mannis, 15). The next
couplet clarifies the impressive picture of 15-16: she rides as a victorious general in triumphal procession. Though the ensuing description allows the procession to evolve almost into a race (e.g. effusis rotis (18) for effusis habenis or citatis rotis) \(^69\), the spectaculum is only increased. And just as her military victory recalls Juno Sospita as a warrior goddess, perhaps the horses' manes, which are clipped (detonsis, 15), or the boyfriend's plucked (vulsi, 23) beard are substitutes for the goddess' helmet of goatskin. And certainly the chariot on which she and her boyfriend ride offers as much wealth and ostentation to view as an entire triumphal parade (serica carpenta, 23; vulsi nepotis, 23; armillatos colla Molossa canes, 24). The mention of a triumph, moreover, just after stating that love-making was the journey's purpose (mage causa Venus, 16) suggests that the boyfriend is part of the booty as much as the silk-covered chariot or thebraceleted Molossian hounds were. Already conquered by love, he will advance to another form of warfare (the gladiator school) after his beard grows too thick and Cynthia finds another boyfriend:

\[
\text{qui dabit inmundae venalia fata saginae,} \\
\text{vincet ubi erasas barba pudenda genas.} \\
\text{(4.8.25-26)}
\]

Propertius signals the transition to the next section with another military image:

\[
\text{cum fieret nostro totiens iniuria lecto,} \\
\text{mutato volui castra movere toro.} \\
\text{(4.8.27-28)}
\]

The lover, whose bed had been wronged once too often, will now no longer engage in erotic struggles in his mistress' camp. His
preference in 2.7 and elsewhere has been abandoned. The only warfare which remains, either for Propertius or Cynthia, is bloody and violent. Indeed, Propertius cannot even keep his mind on the festivities generated by Phyllis and Teia (47). Instead, he imagines himself the offering to the serpent at Lanuvium (Lanuvii ad portas, ei mihi, totus eram, 48). When Cynthia finally returns, she has become Lanuvium's tutela, the serpent that decides which maid is chaste and which is not. Her disheveled hair (non operosa comis, 52) is the result not only of the ride but having become a snaky incarnation of a Fury. Like a Fury, she is furibunda (52). Her entrance begins with a murmur but soon erupts as she flattens the doors (totas resupinat Cynthia valvas, 51). She vents her rage (saevit, 55) through thunder (fulminat, 55) and fingernails (iratos ungues, 57). Returning to military imagery, her destructive power is likened to a captured town (spectaculum capta nec minus urbe fuit, 56) and Teia's cry for water (58), the confusion of sleeping citizens (59), the ensuing commotion on every street (60), and the escape of battered soldiers (direptisque comis tunicisque solutis, 61) recall the fires, destruction and chaos created by the enemy in a conquered city. Cynthia, in turn, rejoices in the spoils (exuviiis, 63) left by the courtesans and approaches Propertius already as conqueror (victrix, 63).

If ever there was any doubt about the nature of the dulcis rixa in 3.8, the ensuing rixa in 4.8 removes it. Instead of the wounds of love's battles, the wounds which she inflicts now are intended to hurt (perversa sauciat ora manu, 64). Blows replace
kisses (64), and bites are meant to draw blood (morsuque cruentat, 65). She stops only because she is weary from giving so many blows (lassavit bracchia plagias, 67), not from a lack of desire.

Interestingly enough, Propertius does not parry her blows, let alone fight back. He does not even attempt to ask her for mercy by pleading to be faithful in the future, even to die for her as he had in the past. Instead, he sues for peace (ad foedera veni, 71) in a suppliant pose (supplicibus palmis, 71). She, in turn, imposes the conditions of forgiveness (accipe, quae nostrae formula legis erit, 74), scarcely recognizing his supplications (72). As imperator (imperio data, 82), she proclaims her edict (indixit legem, 81). Propertius can only accept (legibus utar, 81). It appears that Cynthia is ready for a second triumph.

Although Propertius' tone is light throughout and Cynthia's conditions for surrender (75-80) are amusing enough that Ovid after Propertius borrows the idea as well as some of the images, the poet reevaluates militia amoris and his capture by Cynthia in 1.1. Propertius is captured (captus eram, 70) as before but now there is no affection either on Propertius' part or Cynthia's. Although the poem ends in lovemaking, the repetition of respondi (81, 88) only serves to reinforce the idea that sleeping together is one of the conditions imposed to obtain peace, not a voluntary act. Moreover, their warfare is not renewed in bed as it was so often in the past. Indeed, solvimus arma (88) rather emphatically signals that there will be no more battles of love between the two lovers. Lygdamus' situation confirms the end of real affection. Like Propertius, he
too is captured. He even becomes a slave (pedibus vincula bina trahat! 80). Despite the vincula, familiar as the bonds of love, there is no question that he will become the slave of love. The language, as elsewhere in the poem, is too graphic for that hypothesis to be realized.

Militia amoris, in the course of four books, has been transformed. In 1.1 the military metaphor explained the means of Propertius' enslavement but in suggesting the helplessness of his situation (1.1.25 ff.) also looked forward to 4.8. The metaphor began as a means to distinguish and also to credit Propertius' experience with Cynthia from the source of prestige and authority it was for Tullus in 1.6. Indeed, so powerful was the love between Propertius and Cynthia that in 2.7 Propertius would fight on her behalf. Propertius never intended to fight her except on the battleground of the bed (e.g. 2.1.13; 2.15). When a rival finally does come, as in 3.8, Propertius' only response is an ambiguous rixa with Cynthia and taunting words to the rival, her husband. Now when confronted with a rival, he no longer promises to love until death. In 4.8, as he clearly moves away from Cynthia's camp into a new one (4.8.28), vengeance and dominion rather than love motivate the battle while sex, not love, becomes one of the terms for peace.
Chapter V: Notes


3 Richardson 161.

4 Cairns (1974b) 150-151.

5 Stahl (1985) 81-82 stresses the atmosphere of friendship engendered by the first and second person pronouns in the opening lines which is then countered by the repetition of the third person illa, but he does not allow enough for Propertius' affection for Cynthia in these lines.
6. Camps 1:59-60 is aware that animam reddere is a euphemism for death, but takes it too literally. He paraphrases "bring myself through profligacy to an early death."


8. On acceptum imperium, i.e. imperium which has been received as a part of an official grant from Augustus, not which has been or will be well received by the provincials, see Rothstein, followed by K.M.T. Atkinson, "The Governors of the Province Asia in the Reign of Augustus," Historia 7 (1958) 300-330; Cairns (1974b) 160; Stahl (1985) 86-87.


11. On 2.7, William R. Nethercut, "De Propertii Elegia 2.7.19-20," Mnemosyne, ser. 4, 24 (1971) 380-384 (= Nethercut 1971b), comments on the unity of the elegy, especially through verbal repetition, and summarizes why earlier critics failed to see the unity of the poem. Francis Cairns, "Propertius on Augustus' Marriage Law (2.7)," GB 8 (1979) 185-204 (= Cairns 1979b), tries to show that the image which Propertius presents of himself in the poem is so negative that Roman readers with any sense of social responsibility could only say that the poem's attack on Augustus' marriage law was so without basis that the poem was actually an oblique encomium of Augustus. Stahl (1985) 140-155 attacks Cairns' generic approach and pro-Augustan stance and attempts to elucidate its true anti-Augustan flavor. Finally, I must mention Gordon Williams, who on three separate occasions wrote concerning 2.7. First, in "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals," JRS 48 (1958) 16-29, he argues persuasively that the correct reading for 2.7.8 is more based on the ideal that a Roman wife is morigerus to her husband; in "Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome," JRS 52 (1962) 28-46, he explains the dichotomy in Augustan poetry between the poet who exhorts the emperor to social reform and marriage legislation and the love poet who is content to be a bachelor and never marry as primarily the result of trying to fuse Augustan idealism and Alexandrian poetic material, yet fails to view 2.7 within his own framework, i.e., as a poem in which Propertius poses as amator. Finally, in Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford 1968) 525-535, he debunks the view that Cynthia must be considered a meretrix on the basis of 2.7, when the evidence, especially in 2.7, makes more sense if she were married already and that she and Propertius were going to be separated in 2.7 on the basis of the lex de adulteriis.
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CHAPTER VI
Conclusion

When Propertius introduced himself as lover in 1.1, he used images familiar both from the poetic tradition and from Roman life. His puella captured him while Amor subdued him, even triumphed over him. Through his defeat in warfare he was reduced to the status of a slave, in this case the slave of love. While servitude characterized the lover's interaction with his mistress, his inner condition was represented through a mental illness, furor amoris. Finally, journey offered an escape from his condition. Together, these four key metaphors—militia, servitium, furor, and iter—established in 1.1, will offer Propertius a means to create the characters of Propertius as poet-lover, Cynthia, and others, and to explicate his poetic love affair.

In Propertius' hands, these metaphors are hardly static, as some scholars imagine, but are instead constantly reshaped to reveal new aspects in his volatile relationship with Cynthia. In the case of the iter amoris, Propertius' journey alone in 1.17 gives way to a trip which he shares with Cynthia in 2.26, but he ultimately abandons the journey in favor of becoming, in 3.7.71-72, a loyal exclusus amator, one aspect of love's slavery.
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While 3.7 presents a willing *servus amoris*, Propertius is anything but a willing slave in 1.1. Only gradually does he begin to see the 'advantages' of slavery, offering Gallus the advice in 1.10 that a successful relationship can only result from becoming a slave to one's mistress. In 2.20 and again in 3.15 the lover appears to have embraced eagerly the idea of his own subjugation to Cynthia, speaking of *servitium mite* (2.20.20) and *dulcia vincla* (3.15.10). Propertius' *furor* appears to move in the opposite direction. In 1.1, 1.15 and 2.1 no cure is available, but in 2.28 through his careful ministrations and prayers he appears to have cured Cynthia of her illness, while Bacchus offers a remedy for his own insanity in 3.17. Military imagery appears to bridge the gap between acceptance of slavery and the end of love's madness. On the one hand, in 1.6 and 2.7 *militia amoris* offers an alternative to the world's *militia* and to lover and beloved serving in the same camp. In 3.8 and 4.8 the lovers' battles have become less loving and more ferocious, thus suggesting the failure of *militia amoris*, at least from Propertius' point of view; but in 4.8 the lover has once again been captured and graphically reduced to the same condition of enslavement as in 1.1.

In short, if one takes the words of the lover literally, there is little indication that he perceives unhappiness in his relationship with Cynthia until the end of Book 3. The lover goes from being an unwilling slave (1.1) to a willing one (2.20, 3.15), from one who tries to escape love (1.17) to one who stays with his beloved (3.7), from one who looks for a cure for his madness (1.1)
to one who tends to his mistress in her illness (2.28), from unwilling subjugation (1.1) to an active service in Cynthia's castra (2.7). Even in 3.8 the lover appears to remain in his mistress' camp, praising her for her beauty in 35-36 while flinging verbal barbs at his rival in 37-40. Indeed, only in 3.17-25 does he make clear that he is attempting and succeeding in freeing himself from Cynthia.

If the preceding accurately portrays the attitude of the character of the lover, Propertius the writer has created a much more dynamic relationship between Cynthia and the lover than most critics have supposed. Indeed, most scholars have not even granted that the lover has undergone a change, as I have just outlined, in the first half of 1.1. Instead, the communis opinio has been that Propertius the writer has created in the Monobiblos a book of poems which maintains the reader's interest through variatio of theme and topos without any attempt at a linear development. The attempt to find patterns in the other three books have generally fallen back upon the same techniques—variatio, pairing, symmetry, and concentric patterns—to explain Propertius' method of book construction. Only in 3.21-25 is there a consensus that Propertius is presenting a linear progression from one poem to the next.

To a large degree, these patterns of symmetry, pairing, and concentric arrangement derive from two parallel paths of research. The first—the attempt to steer away from the pitfalls of biographical criticism—has encouraged scholars to seek static patterns that emphasize variation on theme or topos lest they be
accused of trying to explain Propertius' affair with Cynthia as historically real and accurately portrayed. The second—a deeper appreciation of the Hellenistic poetry book—has pointed research on Augustan poetry books in a similar direction since Augustan poets explicitly recognize and commend their Hellenistic predecessors.6

Although Propertius clearly makes use of static patterns of arrangement, he is also the first extant Roman poet to present dynamic and changing characters within a psychologically satisfying progression from book to book. Indeed, there is evidence that Propertius wants his readers to treat all four books as a unit, representing in part psychological and emotional stages within a love relationship. First, unlike Tibullus, who changes girlfriends from the first to the second book, Propertius' affair always focuses upon one woman, Cynthia. Secondly, although the lover and the poet begin as two aspects of the same character in Book 1, gradually the poet begins to distance himself from the lover in the ensuing books, thus preparing the reader for the eventual 'end' of the affair in 3.24 and 25. Finally, through the ambiguity of language, myths, and metaphors and through contradictions spoken by the character of the poet-lover within the poems, the writer supplies hints, which eventually become explicit in the fourth book, that treat the character of the poet-lover with more and more irony and distance.

The first stage in understanding Propertius' conception of the unity of the four books is his depiction of the two aspects of his character, poet and lover. Indeed, Propertius prepares his readers for the lover's change of attitude at the end of Book 3 much more
gradually than has been generally recognized, for the character of
the poet within the poem shifts from complete sympathetic oneness
with the character of the lover to a greater and greater measure of
aloofness. In the first book, lover and poet act in tandem, trying
to define the relationship with Cynthia in the first half and win
her back in the second. In 1.5 he employs his poetic rhetoric
against Gallus, asking him if he would be willing to suffer the same
furor, the same servitium as he. In 1.6, utilizing the
propempticon, he excuses himself from traveling with Tullus and
asserts a preference for militia with Cynthia. In 1.10 the
poet-lover taunts Gallus, who is now in love, first by expressing
his delight in being a witness (testis, 1.10.1) and confidant
(conscius, 1.10.2) of Gallus' new liaison, then by advising him how
to be a proper servus amoris. In 1.15 the poet-lover utilizes the
mythological heroines Calypso, Alphesiboea, Hypsipyle, and Evadne in
all earnestness to convince her to act as a woman deeply in love.
In 1.17 he associates Cynthia with the divinities of the sea, hoping
that by praising her, admitting his responsibility for their
separation (et merito, 1.17.1), and playing on her sympathy
(allusions to his death, 1.17.19-24), she might be reunited with
him. Even in 1.19, the myth of Protesilaus and the catalog of women
in Hades are introduced so that the he may demonstrate his loyalty
to Cynthia even beyond death. In the Monobiblos, therefore, the
personae of lover and poet are so fused that lover feels free to
employ poetic devices, topoi, and myths to further his relationship
with Cynthia. Where the poet's irony or teasing humor can be found,
such as in 1.6 or 1.10, they occur not at Cynthia's expense, but at his friends' expense. There is too much at stake, especially in the second half of the book, for the poet-lover to risk the appearance of frivolousness.

In Book 2, although the poet-lover still ultimately expresses his commitment to Cynthia, he begins to take on a pose of superiority. For example, in 2.20 he teases Cynthia about her excessive grief, comparing her to Briseis and Andromache, Procne and Niobe. His expressions of fidelity are equally exaggerated. He will break from his chains and out of Danae's tower to be with her. He terms his servitude as 'mild' (servitium mite, 2.20.20), is glad because sometimes (non numquam, 2.20.23) he is not excluded from her bed. And if he is unfaithful, he says that he will endure the same servile punishments as Tityus and Sisyphus. Although his faithfulness is affirmed, it is couched in the language of hyperbole, designed primarily to make her laugh at herself and not to entertain any questions about his loyalty. At the same time, the same exaggeration reveals a Propertius with much more security in love, with much more ability to look at the relationship from a more objective perspective.

Similar poses are effected in 2.26 and 2.28. Indeed, in 2.26.21-22 the poet becomes more assertive and cites the effectiveness of the dream in lines 1-20 in reconciling Cynthia with him and claims that Cynthia now serves him (pulchra puella/serviat), that he is now potens. At the end of 2.28, he takes credit for Cynthia's recovery from her illness and demands that she not only
thank Isis and Diana for her cure, but also honor him (et mihi, 2.28.62) with ten nights of worship, presumably in bed. His poetry has evidently persuaded Juno and Jove, even Persephone and Hades, to take mercy on her. To a large degree, the reason for his self-confidence and ability to tease Cynthia derives from a reversal of his situation in Book 1. It is Cynthia, not Propertius, who is anxious about his faithfulness in 2.20, who asks for forgiveness in 2.26.1-20, who is in danger and on her deathbed in 2.28.

The poet's voice becomes even stronger in the first two-thirds of Book 3 and proclaims a greater gulf between his role in Book 1 and the current book. In 3.1 although he still professes to be a love poet, he celebrates a triumph and is now accompanied by Amores rather than subject to them (cf. 1.1). In 3.7 he castigates Paetus for his search after wealth and his inability to be a proper lover. In 3.8 he again redefines love, but his assertion that it entails actual battles indicates a further step away from the playful battles in bed in books 1-2. Finally, in 3.15, though he once again professes his faithfulness to Cynthia in preference to Lycinna, the introduction of a former love and the exemplum of Dirce and Antiope offer a warning to Cynthia that she should not press Lycinna too hard lest she suffer the same fate as Dirce. The persona of poet, therefore, is virtually indistinguishable from that of the lover in Book 1, but through humor and exaggeration in the second book the poet begins to establish a distance from the lover. In Book 3 he asserts greater and greater independence from Cynthia and love until he finally asks for relief from love in 3.17 and severs his poetic
relationship with Cynthia in 3.24 and 3.25. Far from exhibiting fixed roles which can only be further refined through variation in theme or topos, both the lover and the poet develop and change through the first three books. And even though I have treated the metaphors separately within this dissertation, when viewed as a whole, each book presents a unified picture of lover and poet.

Propertius the writer presents a third pattern of development within the collection, encouraging the reader often to question and reevaluate the lover's and the poet's statements, a pattern which leads to the writer's ironical characterization of both the poet-lover and Cynthia in 4.7 and 8. His primary tools are the ambiguity created through the reversal of roles and the use of mythology, the inherently equivocal nature of the four metaphors, and the several implications within the imagery of death. For example, when the writer causes Propertius and Cynthia to reverse roles and shows Cynthia confined to her bed in 2.28, it becomes clear that Cynthia's furor amoris does not result from her love for Propertius (as Propertius' madness in 1.15 derives from his passion and jealousy toward Cynthia), but from her passion for another, perhaps divine, lover. Yet within the poem the poet-lover is convinced that Cynthia's recovery is due to his own ministrations and that she will ultimately show her affection for him (votivas noctes et mihi solve decem, 2.28.62). Within 2.26 the mythology of the passionate sea-gods Neptune, Boreas, Orion, and Glaucus, known for seducing and raping women, hardly supports the poet-lover's
claim that these gods will grant Propertius and Cynthia a favorable journey.

The four metaphors themselves present the potential for alternative interpretations. Journey involves flight from as well as pursuit of a beloved. Hence, the journey in 1.17 is not just an opportunity to play on Cynthia's sympathy and to win her back, but also a metaphorical experience of the poet-lover's flight from his beloved. Since neither slavery nor illness is preferred by those who typically experience such conditions, the writer cautions the reader to be wary of Propertius' eagerness for servitude in 2.20 or his willingness to exchange his *furor amoris* for the *furor Bacchi* in 3.17. Finally, when Propertius applies military imagery to his relationship with Cynthia, the distinction between bedroom engagements and actual battles often blurs. Although he contrasts his *militia amoris* with Tullus' *militia* in 1.6, the description of Cynthia's tactics to keep him from going with Tullus—fire, oaths, and threats—resembles aspects of real war, not lovers' battles. Similarly, in 3.8 the lover would like to interpret his bruises and wounds as part of love's games (3.8.21-22), but it becomes clear that Cynthia is indeed mad at him (*offensa*, 3.8.40) and their quarrel (*rixā*, 3.8.1) was far from *dulcis*.

The imagery of death is not unequivocal. On the positive side it can point to the height of sexual passion and to a lover's willingness to die on behalf of his beloved. At the same time, however, the possibility of separation, whether emotional or physical, lurks within the image. Thus, in 1.17 the poet alludes to
death in order to play on Cynthia's sympathy, but the suggestion of
death's possibility merely confirms the situation of the poem: the
poet-lover is sailing away from his beloved and his potential death
suggests the potential for the lovers' separation. And while the
poet-lover glories in his own death in 2.1 and 2.13 (to the close
accompaniment of Cynthia, either named on his tombstone [2.1.78] or
leading his funeral train [2.13.27-36]) or relishes the thought of
death in each other's arms in 2.8 and 2.26, the imagery in such
circumstances often seems closely allied with sexuality (cf. pereo
'to reach sexual climax') and hence cannot be understood as
protestations of deep mutual fidelity. Or the imagery is depicted
in such a literal and graphic fashion that thoughts of actual death
and separation cloud the poet-lover's statements of loyalty.
Further, there is no evidence that Cynthia ever desires death in any
of these poems, bringing the possibility of their mutual fidelity
further into question.

In the third book, death imagery has few associations with
positive aspects of love. Instead, it reinforces the impossibility
of the love affair and undercuts the roles of lover and beloved
familiar from the first two books. Although Propertius still
expresses a willingness to be buried outside his mistress' door in
3.7.71-72, the graphic, even unkind, portrayal of Paetus' death (cf.
est. 3.7.5-12, 51-66) qualifies the 'advantages' of being buried
near one's mistress. Death in 3.15, moreover, is associated only
with the end of love, Dirce's death acting as a warning to Cynthia
not to continue enslaving Propertius. In 3.17, death, along with
wine, once again is a potential remedy for love (3.17.10), yet its function is again ambiguous. The poet seeking release from love views death as a means to gaining immortality, but the myths of Lycurgus and Pentheus suggest a rather unsavory immortality. And the frequent references to sleep act not just as a poetic substitute for death, but as a deeper statement of disavowal. Sleep is the only type of death the poet would endure now.

The substitution of sleep for death and the pejorative aspects of death in the mythological examples corroborate the disappearance of death in other key Cynthia poems in the book. In 3.8 the lovers enact a battle without any threat of dying. When the poet announces his freedom from enslavement and insanity in 3.24 and 3.25, the image is ignored in 3.24. And in 3.25 the only reference to death ends the poem with no positive connotations whatsoever:

has tibi fatalis cecinit mea pagina diras:
 eventum formae disce timere tuae!
(3.25.17-18)

In the previous six lines he has prayed for old age to overtake Cynthia. Thus, his conclusion to the poem and to the book forecasts only literal death with no mention of the possibility of poetic immortality. In short, Book 3 no longer presents a positive valuation of death, but either affirms its destructive capacity or else abandons the image altogether.

Although the first three books seem to present a relationship which begins, develops, and then comes to conclusion—thus encouraging some to view Books 1-3 as a simultaneous publication— the writer's comments on the poet-lover and on death have not yet
reached their poetic completion. Indeed, a dissertation on love and
death in Propertius would be incomplete without a few words on
4.7. For 4.7, along with 4.8, completes the development of
color and of the imagery of death which we have just been
surveying in this affair with Cynthia. In so many earlier poems,
thoughts of death were introduced as hypothetical or in the future.
In 4.7 Cynthia is presented as already dead, returning to speak to a
dreaming Propertius. Granted a rare opportunity to speak in propria
persona, she delivers a rhetorical apologia, not only defending her
good name, but also castigating Propertius for his faithlessness.
The elegy presents the same kind of ambiguity which we have seen in
the first three books. On the one hand, Cynthia's speech is
delivered so effectively that it has persuaded many readers to lend
her sympathy, and even respect. On the other hand, the writer
offers many clues which present a less favorable picture of
Cynthia. The framing narrative (1-12, 95-96) depicts the poet-lover
quite differently from the way in which Cynthia does in her mono­
logue. In addition, topoi formerly associated with the lover's
faithfulness until and even in death are altered so that death
ceases to be a metaphor for love, but becomes an indicator of doom.
And even though the allusions to Homeric and Virgilian epic elevate
Cynthia's stature in the reader's eyes, the writer, I believe, indi­
cates that these references should not be taken at face value. The
result is that the writer seems to strip away any remaining illusion
about the type of love affair which Propertius and Cynthia shared.
The poem opens with an allusion not only to Iliad 23, the return of Patroclus' ghost to Achilles, but also to Propertius 1.19, a double allusion which sets a tone of continuing ambiguity for the remainder of the poem.

\[
\text{Sunt aliquid Manes: letum non omnia finit,}
\]
\[
luridaque evictos effugit umbra rogos. (4.7.1-2)
\]

On the one hand, the reference to Achilles' response to the appearance of Patroclus' ghost elevates the poem to the mythological and the literary and places Cynthia in the role of the heroic Patroclus coming back to claim his due (Ὤ πόποι, ἰ βά τι ἔστι καὶ εἶν ′Αἴδεο δόμοισι/ψυχὴ καὶ ἔμολον, II. 23.103-104). The assertion that existence continues on the other side of life recalls Propertius' colloquial but positive assertion of his fearlessness in the face of death in 1.19 (non ego nunc tristes vereor, mea Cynthia, Manes, 1.19.1). Thus, both Patroclus and the lover of 1.19 present models of fidelity against which the reader may judge the ghost's loyalty.

On the other hand, certain differences among the preceding allusions create another impression. The ψυχὴ καὶ ἔμολον of Homer are replaced by Manes, spirits potentially malevolent if their burial spot is not tended. The pentameter projects an even more menacing image. lurida denotes color, but also has connotations of the underworld and death. Moreover, the repetition of the prefix e- 'out of' in both verbs reveals a ghost insistent on escape from the funeral pyre and from death, not insistent, as Patroclus and Propertius were, on loyalty.
The following couplet continues the tone of gloom and threat and introduces the ghost's name:

Cynthia namque meo visa est incumbere fulcro
murmur ad extremae nuper humata viae.
(4.7.3-4)

Patroclus had approached Achilles to ask for burial, but Cynthia has been deprived of such a motive. Instead, as John Warden notes, "her motives lie in past love and jealous anger. A practical need is replaced by a psychological one." Unlike Patroclus who only stands by Achilles' head, Cynthia leans over (incumbere). Indeed, incumbere suggests both a sense of menace ("to lean towards or against") and of eroticism ("to lie on"). Murmur in the pentameter can also connote lover's talk, but within the context of the line it has less favorable overtones, suggesting both the rumble of the passing traffic and the comments of passersby. Cynthia's burial alongside a busy road, coming just after effugit (2), is a criticism of Propertius' insensitivity and may contain the suggestion of her inability to find a true resting place to conclude her iter amoris. By contrast, the lover hopes to be buried near his mistress' doors (3.7.71-72).

Only in the next couplet (5-6) does Propertius in his own words describe himself.

cum mihi somnus ab exequiis penderet amoris,
et quererer lecti frigida regna mei.
(4.7.5-6)

Propertius' inability to sleep because his bed is empty and hence cold (frigida regna is the underworld here removed from that to function metaphorically as bed) is characteristic of a lover.
afflicted with furor amoris. The sleep promised by Bacchus in 3.17 as a cure for love seems not to have come. But the lines also continue the gloom of the first four and hence suggest an alternative. Love has indeed been given a funeral (ab exequis ... amoris), and there is the suggestion that Propertius' bed is chilly because of Cynthia's return from frigida regna. Perhaps Propertius' reaction results not so much from love as from terror at the apparition.

The next six lines (7-12) continue the tone of ambiguity in the first six. On the one hand, the mention of Cynthia's hair and eyes, reinforced by the repetition of eodem at the beginning of two consecutive lines, recalls the features of which Propertius was so enamored in 1.1 and elsewhere. Yet the writer makes clear that these are not necessarily the same eyes and hair as in 1.1, for these are the same as when she was led to her grave (quibus est elata, 7). Her other features—the clothing burnt to her side, the charred ring, and the lips (or face) worn away by the waters of the underworld—all accentuate the graphic and inescapable power of death. Moreover, habuit secum (7), a regular legal formula—especially common in divorce suits—for 'retaining possession of', gives the effect of Cynthia bringing her physical features along as a group of possessions rather than as details which continue to inform her. Thus, Cynthia's appearance is not so much described as cataloged. Hair, eyes, clothes, ring, and fingers are all duly listed. But now she is left with only air and sound (spirantisque animos et vocem, 11).
The first 12 lines, therefore, present a picture of the two lovers which we do not expect. The lover, though he had said farewell to his affair with Cynthia in 3.24 and 25, now reveals one of the tell-tale signs of furor amoris, complaints (quererer, 6) of sleeplessness. And Cynthia, although she is compared with two models of fidelity, is marked more by menace (Manes, 1; incumbere, 3) and death (letum, 1; lurida, 2; the catalog of physical features ravaged by the pyre) than by commitment. The contrast between high and low language (e.g. humata, a word associated with the language of epic and ritual, is incongruous within a line describing her place of burial near a busy road) and between epic allusion and her present charred form diminishes the seriousness of her mission and questions her claim to epic stature. Finally, the use of the legal language of divorce (habuit secum) and the snapping of her fingers (12) reveals a tone of litigiousness and rebuke which can be seen throughout the rest of the poem.

With the exception of the final couplet, Cynthia's speech comprises the remainder of the poem. Instead of coming to ask for burial, as Patroclus does in Iliad 23, or to express her love for Propertius even after death, as Propertius does in 1.19, she returns to complain about Propertius' disregard for her funeral and to deliver a set of orders concerning the treatment of her slaves and her tomb. Admittedly, she does equate her fidelity with that of Andromeda and Hypermestra, but the juxtaposition of her statement of loyalty in 79-80 with her tone of rebuke and self-pity in the rest of the poem seems to call her motives into question. Beginning with
perfide (13) and ending with teram (94), her speech delivers relentless self-righteousness, whether accusing Propertius of infidelity, justifying her own past, or demanding the fulfillment of future mandates. As she presents a series of tableaux—the Subura at night (13-22), the funeral procession (23-34), the house after her departure (35-48), the two halves of the underworld (55-70), she never escapes the atmosphere of murkiness and menace which characterize her present abode. When she finally comes to present her epitaph in the light of day (85-86), the preceding gloom cannot help but negatively taint her hope for immortality, and she quickly descends once more to the shadowy realms of Hades. In the process, she twists love into sex, faithfulness into duty, promises into threats.

Cynthia begins her speech by calling Propertius perfide (13). Yet the reason for her accusation is not immediately clear, nor is it clear that she is blameless. He has trouble staying awake (14), she claims, even though he had claimed some difficulty in falling asleep (5). In reminding him of their wakeful nights (vigilacis, 15), she concentrates more on her own deceits than Propertius'. She emphasizes her desire for love-making rather than for commitment. furta (15) and dolis (16) suggest both stolen love and sexual 'tricks.' trita (16) and pectore mixto (19) both are explicit in referring to sexual union. Such is their ardor that the two lovers warm the street beneath them (fecerunt tepidas pallia nostra vias, 20) and their location at the crossroads (trivio, 19) keeps Cynthia firmly in a shadowy world of superstition and magic. Indeed,
Cynthia's journey of love (trivio, vias) has descended to the physical (trita, 16; in tua colla, 18; tepidas, 20). And though she complains of fallacia verba (21), it is by no means clear that they are not her own.

The next section (23-34) recounts Cynthia's funeral. Certainly, Cynthia's accusations of Propertius are an indictment of the poet-lover. In 2.13.17-36, he had asked for a simple funeral, marked most of all by Cynthia's grief. Cynthia deserved at least as much at her funeral. Instead, there was no conclamatio (23), no music (25), no grief or tears by Propertius (27-28), no indication that he intended to follow the bier outside the city (29-30), no nard to perfume the pyre (32), no hyacinths (33), and no wine poured upon her grave (34). In short, according to Cynthia, her lover showed not one sign of affection, had not fulfilled for his beloved what he had hoped for himself.

The passage, however, signals the death of love, and incriminates not only Propertius, but also Cynthia. If what Cynthia claims in 23-34 is true, then it is clear that their love affair is over. Yet Cynthia's charges contradict the picture in 5-6 of Propertius unable to fall asleep because of his memories of the funeral. Moreover, she misuses myth. In 23-24, she alludes to the power of love over death (cf. 2.27.15-16), but seems more eager for another day of life than a reunion with her beloved. Instead of acting the part of the eager Protesilaus in 1.19.7-10, she awaits the call (in this case, the conclamatio) of her lover. Rather than woo her lover, she carps. Rather than show her affection, she
wants for it to be shown her. Finally, certain details betray her attitude: the _tegula curta_ whether propping up her head or falling upon it (26), the picture of the funeral procession rushing through the city (30), and the difficulty in getting her pyre to burn (31) are images which border on the comic. Unlike the images of Propertius' funeral in 1.17.19-24 which were designed to win back Cynthia's love, the images within this section can at best evoke only pity, not love, and at worst elicit mirth, not pity.

In the next section (35-48), Cynthia's accusations become so exaggerated and her self-pity so pronounced that her veracity is undermined. On the one hand, she charges Lygdamus and Nomas with poisoning her (35-38) and accuses her rival with melting her image to obtain a dowry to marry Propertius (47-48). By contrast, her own slaves have been punished for placing wreaths on Cynthia's tomb and making a request in her name (41-46). It is clear that Cynthia can see only black and white, either all bad or all good. The writer also points out that Cynthia has altered the metaphors of love. No longer do lovers undergo the slavery and punishments of love. No longer does pallor (_pallida_, 36) signify love-sickness. Instead, real slaves are the only ones who experience punishment. Pallor and potions (_arcanas ... salivas_, 37) are signs of death. The actions of Cynthia's new rival, moreover, noted for her cheap nightly rates (_per viles ... noctes_, 39), not only incriminate the lover, but also parallel Cynthia's nightly _furta_ in the Subura and turn Cynthia's accusations back on herself. Finally, Chloris' burning of Cynthia's _imago_ recalls the Laodamia's suicide when her image of Protesilaus
was destroyed by fire. But now, instead of a sign of fidelity as in 1.19.11, the burning statue connotes only death and the end of Propertius' love for Cynthia.\textsuperscript{18} At the end of the first half of Cynthia's speech, therefore, every image for love has been overturned. Instead of love in death or love as death, love has been replaced by death.

When Cynthia turns to defend her own fidelity, she tries to moderate her previous reproaches (\textit{non tamen insector}, 49), but their number and vehemence in the previous thirty-six lines cannot be so lightly passed over. Indeed, they have taken to extremes her speeches at 1.3.35-48 and 2.29.31-38, which are perhaps more persuasive because of their brevity. Her vow that she is telling the truth (\textit{si fallo, vipera nostris/sibilet in tumulis et super ossa cubet}, 53-54) only serves to recall her threatening pose in line 3 (\textit{incumbere}) and erotic activity in 15-20 and to foreshadow her own viperous qualities in 4.8.51-52. Love, if it exists at all in the grave, is reduced to its purely physical aspect.

In 55-68, Cynthia reaches the climax of her profession of fidelity, placing herself among the \textit{sine fraude maritae} (63). Yet Andromeda's and Hypermestra's complaints do not really parallel Cynthia's. The two heroines' loyalty in love is associated with passivity, while Cynthia's \textit{furta} in the Subura were aggressively pursued. The introduction of Cybele and her choruses (61-62) among the 'good' women interjects the picture familiar from 3.17.28-36 of the frenzy caused by Bacchus and Cybele. Though Bacchus grants immortality to women in 3.17, to men he offers only furor,
servitium, or mors. In 2.28, moreover, Cynthia was associated with members of both groups, Pasiphae and Andromeda. Yet the heroines cataloged in 2.28 were known not just for their beauty, but for their infidelity, whether by choice or not, and one joined either group of heroines only through death. Thus, though Cynthia situates herself among the good heroines, the writer provides evidence that associates her with infidelity and death instead of loyalty and immortality.

Her final requests (71-86), like all that have preceded them, are meant to elicit pity for herself, but she fails to demonstrate any sign of renewing her relationship with Propertius. She continues to chide the lover (si te non totum Chloridos herba tenet, 72) without showing any desire to love Propertius herself. Her pleas on behalf of her two servants, Parthenie and Latris, are meant as a positive reflection on her character (nec tibi avara fuit, 74) and as further cuts at Propertius (ne speculum dominae porrigat illa novae, 76). Although Propertius as poet was responsible for bringing her praise, she now considers the laudes from his poems her exclusive domain, and tells him to stop receiving praise which rightly belongs to her (laudes desine habere meas, 78). Indeed, her epitaph, her last hope for immortality and praise, presents the ultimate irony. After usurping Propertius' fame and his poetry, she asks him to write (scribe, 83) an inscription which speaks only of herself and her praise (85-86), quite a contrast with Propertius' tombstone which asserts his faithfulness in love.
After her bitter, exaggerated, and self-pitying tale has been completed, it is difficult to accept that Propertius' dream is either to be believed or pious (87). And Cynthia's closing words are more threat than promise:

\[\text{nunc te possideant aliae; mox sola tenebo: mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.}\]

(4.7.93-94)

Though she would not allow her bones to be bound with ivy (\textit{contortis alliget ossa comis, 80}), she promises to hold Propertius \textit{(tenebo, 93)} when he finally dies. Indeed, \textit{tenebo} is stronger than \textit{possideant}, signifying both permanence and physicality. \textit{mixtis ossibus} recalls \textit{pictore mixto} (19) and \textit{teram} augments the sordid nature of her final threat, suggesting both the threat of servile punishment and the coarse image of necrophilial bump-and-grind.21 Though Propertius extends his arms to embrace her in the final couplet (95-96), her insubstantiality is confirmed when she slips from his grasp. Moreover, \textit{sub lite peregit} (95) provides the proper context within which to view her \textit{querula}. No longer a lover's word, \textit{querula} now can only suggest litigiousness and threats of punishment, not love and affection. Cynthia has reduced her relationship with Propertius to the purely physical. Death is no longer an expression of fidelity, but of menace, insubstantiality, and incomplete love.

4.7 therefore carries Propertius' earlier pictures of lover and beloved to their logical extreme. The wronged mistress finally has a chance to vent her frustration, but in the process her believability is impugned and her intentions are revealed as selfish.
and sordid. The character of the lover is caricatured also. Though he cannot sleep because of the death of love (5) and he tries to embrace Cynthia's shade as she departs, faithfulness to such a shade becomes both a ludicrous and life-threatening prospect.

In addition, the development of the imagery of death has reached a conclusion. In 1.19 the lover had expressed a willingness to face death to underscore his fidelity to Cynthia and had utilized myth to express their union even in death. The writer, however, had indicated that the physical separation which occurs at death implies both a physical and an emotional separation between the two lovers that cannot be bridged. In 4.7 Cynthia has experienced the death which the lover had promised in 1.19, but there is no evidence that Cynthia died to demonstrate her love for Propertius, only rebuke and self-pity. In 93-94, moreover, she speaks of a reunion for the two lovers in the underworld, but it is purely physical and lustful, without the affection which the lover in 1.19 had desired. Thus, the writer shows that death, despite physical union, still marks the end of genuine love.

Finally 4.7 and 4.8 form a complementary pair. Cynthia's assassination of Propertius' character in 4.7 modulates into a full-scale battle in 4.8. Her complaints of Propertius' infidelity in 4.7 are confirmed when she discovers him cavorting with a pair of courtesans in 4.8, but her own infidelity hinted at in 4.7.15-16 is given vivid portrayal in the depiction of her ride to Lanuvium with her gigolo in 4.8.15-26. Cynthia's desire for control over Propertius' servants, his poetry, his heart, and his genitalia in
4.7 is amplified in her terms for surrender in 4.8.71-82. And just as 4.7 reveals only death's destructive power with no hint of its former use as an expression of loyalty and of love, its absence in 4.8 in a context (war) where it is expected, confirms the writer's hints since as early as 1.19 that dying is not an effective expression of love, for love cannot cross the shores of fate but can only point to the separation which will occur at death. The presence of physical union in death contrasts with Cynthia's emotional detachment in 4.7, Cynthia's control and Propertius' subjugation in life in 4.8 does not hide the fact that their love has passed away. Thus, 4.7 and 8 reveal a psychological, rather than a chronological, development in which caricature and the absence of death in 4.8 carry to a logical extreme Cynthia's desire for mastery and the emotional estrangement depicted in 4.7.

A full appreciation of Propertius' elegies, therefore, involves two complementary perspectives, depth and development. By depth, I refer to the multiple correspondences between a poem and the myths within it; to the interactions among the characters within a poem, between what they say and what they intend, and between these characters and Propertius the writer; and to the ambiguity inherent within the metaphors of journey, slavery, madness, warfare, and death. In 3.15, for example, Antiope provides a parallel to both Lycinna and Propertius; the lover expresses a desire for Cynthia to forget about her past rival, the poet offers Cynthia a warning, but the writer makes clear that the warning involves Propertius as well as Lycinna; and though Lycinna was a slave, she
introduced Propertius to freedom, which was non-existent in his affair with Cynthia. By development, I mean the effect created by the linear progression of a poem, a flow determined not just through reason, but through images as well, which encourages the reader at the end of a poem to reexamine it once again. To look at 3.15 once more, a pattern of images from slavery to journey to slavery reveals a metaphorical logic which insists that Antiope's slavery, once escaped, will ultimately descend upon her enslaver. This pattern encourages the reader to explore again the relationships in the framing situation, which are also defined by the same metaphors. At a broader level, development involves the modulation of myths, images, metaphors, and characters from one poem to the next, from one book to the next. Thus, as the lover demonstrates a greater and greater reliance upon Cynthia, the poet distances himself from the lover's insanity and servitude. Although the poet eventually proclaims his independence from Cynthia in 3.24 and 25, the poet's vehemence and onesidedness suggests that Cynthia should have equal time. Additionally, as the poet distances himself from the lover, he views the lover with greater and greater irony and detachment. 4.7 and 4.8, therefore, represent the logical conclusion of this development, for the writer exposes both the lover and Cynthia and shows their belief in love and death to be extreme and unrealistic.

The four books of Propertius' elegies, therefore, mark a new departure in ancient poetry. Instead of presenting a series of individual portraits of a love affair, Propertius has arranged his
collection to allow his readers to perceive a gradually unfolding picture of a single love-relationship although poems on other (but often related) themes intervene. Moreover, the psychological and emotional development of this affair through all four books lends a unifying effect to the entire collection, which encourages his readers to read the collection in the order in which it was published, always allowing earlier poems to influence their understanding of subsequent poems.
Chapter VI: Notes

1 Works such as Galinsky (1969), Lyne (1979), Murgatroyd (1975) and (1981), Menefee (1981), indeed any study which tries to explore one of these metaphors through Latin literature, tend to define the metaphor by accumulating examples of various features. Indeed, the exploration of the metaphor through one particular author does not fall within the scope of their studies. When authors as Baker (1968) and (1970) or Wenzel (1969) try to explore militia amoris or death through Propertius, they often reveal a preconceived notion about Propertius' literary development which parallels that of other Augustan writers and do not allow for multiple meanings within the metaphor as it develops.


9 For bibliography of those who would defend Cynthia's honor in 4.7, see Warden (1980) 78-79.

10 On Manes and lurida, see Warden (1980) 14-16.


12 Warden (1980) 19-20 notes the effect of Cynthia's disjunction, but then attempts to diminish its impact, saying that Propertius wants Cynthia to be both a half-burned cadaver and flesh-and-blood, both umbra and body. Such a statement on Warden's part only serves to strengthen Cynthia's unreality and artificiality.

13 On the contrast between humata and Cynthia's burial near the side of the road, see Warden (1980) 17.

14 Papanghelis (1987) 150 remarks, "These first six lines submerge us in a twilit [sic] world from which we never really emerge. . . . To and fro between underworld and Underworld, Cynthia the ghost recalls Cynthia the shadowy demi-mondaine and presents Cynthia the Elysian shade."
I owe Papanghelis (1987) 153-154 for his observations on the latent sexuality and superstition within these lines.

Warden (1980) 28 mentions Cynthia's exploitation of the Protesilaus myth in connection with the con clamatio, but then says it should not be overstated.


Yardley (1977b) 85 points out the allusion to the Protesilaus myth, but does not refer to Propertius 1.19.

In 2.28.52 Cynthia is linked with Pasiphae and other lustful beauties in the underworld and in 2.28.21-22 with Andromeda and others who have been immortalized. As in 4.7, Cynthia seems to fit better with the former group than the latter.

For Propertius' epitaph, see 1.7.23-24; 2.1.78; 2.13.35-36.

Although Yardley (1977b) 83 and Allison (1980b) 170-173 point out that the sexual overtones of mixtis ossibus are somewhat common in funerary inscriptions, teram is unique. Moreover, the explicit erotic overtones of teram help overcome the conventional nature of mixtis ossibus, if indeed the latter was conventional by the time of Propertius. Furthermore, although mixtis ossibus frequently suggests faithfulness within sepulchral inscriptions, in the present context the writer is using this association primarily to increase the irony of the lines.

For other views on the pairing of 4.7 and 8, see Warden (1980) 80-81; Papanghelis (1987) 196-197; and Allison (1980a) 332-338.
Note that references to the works listed under "Editions and Commentaries" and "Handbooks and Bibliographies" are cited in the notes by the author's last name only or by the abbreviations listed after their name. References to works listed under "Secondary Literature" are cited in the notes by the author's last name and the year of publication, except for Shackleton Bailey and Tränkle who are listed by last name only. All quotations of Propertius are from Hanslik's edition unless otherwise noted.
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