

ing like a stony ridge through description of the sea, answers to the stress on *gravitas* in the firm, settling verdicts given amid the fluid, shifting details of the three legal cases. This is especially true in the third case where *gravitas* (*summa gravitate*, 11) appears centered in the account of the most complex issues of the series. In the description of the port, the account of the sinking of the island's rocks, which settle and remain firmly placed by their own weight (*ipso pondere*, 16), is central. The word for the rocks' weight, *pondus*, commonly used in its metaphorical sense of "constancy," "firmness," or "weight of character," corresponds to the emperor's *gravitas* emphasized in the legal narrative.

Along with *gravitas*, Trajan's other major virtue, the quality displayed in the second member of the essay describing the emperor's entertainment, is *comitas*, or his naturalness and humanity. This virtue finds its correspondence in the second major characteristic of the port already mentioned: its naturalness of construction in which there is nothing superfluous, imposed, or discordant, but simple intensification of native features. Yet here we come to the greater function and significance of the metaphor in the total structure of the essay. For Pliny presents in the preface as program for the essay the triad, *iustitia, gravitas, comitas . . . per plures species . . .*, where *iustitia* must appear redundant at first glance because it is not overtly stated in the essay. That is, although we have assumed provisionally in the preliminary survey of the essay that *iustitia* is focused upon along with *gravitas* in the legal narrative, it is impossible to document it formally. Pliny does not once mention *iustitia* in the narrative, while

gravitas and *comitas* are conspicuously mentioned and often emphasized by synonyms. On the other hand, there is the unevenness, not typical of Pliny, if *iustitia* were in fact omitted. There is also the tripartite division of the essay suggesting that, since *gravitas* and *comitas* are displayed in the first and second parts respectively, *iustitia* should be illustrated in the third part. Here the answer is evident from the character of the metaphor itself, in which *gravitas* and *comitas* are not merely independent of one another, but integrated so as to display *iustitia*. That is, the island in form and function, with firmness and naturalness, provides an image that unites both Trajans, the Trajan firm in law and the Trajan natural at dinner. As the island orders nature in a firm but natural manner, so too, the metaphor suggests, Trajan with combined firmness and humanity gives order to human nature through law. In this way the metaphor, while describing Trajan as a whole individual, serves primarily to define his justice. It emerges as similar to the justice of Plato's *Republic*, which, as that dialogue urges, is human and natural rather than imposed on nature from without. And then too, the definitions of justice given by Justinian and Cicero taken together contain firmness and humanity as cardinal ingredients.¹¹

In summary then, the description of the port's construction, so far from being an appendage, is the climax that integrates the whole in accordance with Pliny's techniques in essay. He employs the special feature of metaphor, the emperor as *insula*, in order to achieve this unity.

CHARLES F. SAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

11. Cic. *Fin.* 5. 23. 65, "...societatem coniunctionis humanae munifice et aequae tuens, iustitia dicitur, cui sunt

adiunctae...comitas"; Just. *Inst.* 1. 1. 1, "iustitia est constans et perpetua voluntas ius suum cuique tribuendi."

SAEVITIA AMORIS: PROPERTIUS 1. 1

Those who read the poetry of Propertius cannot fail to be struck by the prominent role played by words like *durus*, *duritia*, *saevus*, *saevitia*, *crudelis*, *dolor*, etc.,¹ and to multiply

instances of scholars who have referred to it would be otiose.

Two studies concerned with the first poem of the first book can be given particular

1. For usage, cf. R. Pichon, *De sermone amatorio apud latinos elegiarum scriptores* (Paris, 1902), s.vv.

attention.² Twenty years ago, in an extremely valuable article, A. W. Allen examined "the elegy in its relation to the context of ideas amid which it was written" and interpreted "particulars in the light of the conventions of ancient poetry" (p. 258). In the course of his discussion, he showed that *miser* "has a particular significance and a programmatic value. It serves to announce the theme of his poetry: Propertius declares that he is subject to that passionate love which makes the lover its helpless victim" (p. 260). Allen goes on to show (pp. 264 ff.) how the meaning of Meleager's epigram had been extended: "Propertius tells also of the suffering which the overthrow of wisdom has caused in his own experience . . . the pain of love is for Propertius its chief quality" (p. 268).

My aim is to demonstrate how completely the harsh and the cruel inform the very heart of this poem, how all-pervading is the atmosphere of chill and emptiness as the aftermath of *saevitia*, giving the poem finally a stark, monumental quality almost divorced from an individual's experience, even though, as Allen (pp. 270 and 276) has shown, Propertius claims it as a very personal reaction.

It will be seen that Propertius is not only drawing on the established complex of motif surrounding *saevitia*, *miser*, *durus*, but is also injecting new life into this (by now) commonplace idea. To relate this poem to its tradition is essential and helpful but only begins to explain its artistry.

The poem departs drastically from the general run of love poems which chart rejection (e.g., 1. 8a). There is no relief from the severe blow-upon-blow of the central idea. Each new item is more than simply another link in the chain of narrative; it does not so much add facts as serve to intensify the feeling to an almost unbearable degree. Often enough Propertius includes mythology to illustrate and diversify his theme; not here. Critics have noted the aptness of Milanion, and further the tone is tightly bound by the strait jacket of subjection.

2. A. W. Allen, "Elegy and the Classical Attitude toward Love: Propertius I, 1," *YCS*, XI (1950), 255-77. J. P. Sullivan, "Castas Odise Puellas: A Reconsideration of Propertius I, 1," *WS*, LXXIV (1961), 96-112.

It is the language that is consistently and unmitigatedly crushing. The opening lines burst with brutality:³

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
improbos, et nullo uiuere consilio.
et mihi iam toto furor hic non deficit anno,
cum tamen aduersos cogor habere deos [1. 1-8].

The verbs *cepit* (1), *deiecit* (3), *pressit* (4) are hard and final; their perfect tense represents action that is instantaneous, almost callously so; they indicate the effortless ruthlessness of a superior and coldly remote warrior. The atmosphere is reminiscent of the ethos of the *Iliad*. It is true that Cynthia appears at the head of the poem and that this too strikes a programmatic note for at least the Monobiblos, yet there is no attempt here to create the living girl; there are no human qualities in evidence. True, the diminutive *ocellis* strives to introduce some warmth, if only in the way Propertius tries to feel about her eyes, but the austere *lumina* of line 3 is entirely devoid of personal reference and the struggling warmth is obliterated (*constantis . . . fastus* has the same feeling of independent quality existing almost separate from Propertius himself). Both this remoteness and the unequivocal claim of "constant arrogance" hint at parity between the duelling parties and frankly pose the consequent depth of degradation of the loser.

Other items reinforce the merciless onslaught: the battering repetition of the hard *c*, particularly in lines 1-2, but recurring as an ominous refrain in 3-4; the strong meaning of the prefix in *contactum*; the heavy word *cupidinibus* (2) at the end of the pentameter together with the rhyme set up with *pedibus* (4); the effect of the enjambement of *improbos* (6) serving to reinforce the bitterness and calculated animosity of Amor;⁴ and most of all the thorough cruelty of line 4: "et caput impositis

3. All quotations from OCT Propertius² (1960).

4. Cf. M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* Berlin, (1920), pp. 56-57: "Improbos heisst Amor, weil er seinen Sieg masslos ausnützt; die andere Bedeutung 'übermütig,

pressit Amor pedibus." With a leap from the strongly metaphorical *lumina*, Propertius describes the lover's head trampled under foot. There is no tautology in this line; *impositis* and *pressit* hammer home the physical subjection, now no longer simply a statement, but an immediate, sensible evocation too of the bodily feeling of being trampled. The repetition of the plosive *p* underscores in sound the brutality of the act. The subtle transfer from Cynthia to Amor⁵ heightens the viciousness because it concentrates largely on the act itself, without relating to personalities where it might be somewhat tempered. As a result *nullo uiuere consilio* (6) seems almost like not living; it conjures up complete paralysis. *Furor* too is posed in similar, stark terms. It is more a frenzy imposed on Propertius from the outside than something that is part of his nature: "et mihi iam furor hic toto non deficit anno" (7).

Compulsion continues relentlessly: *adversos, cogor, contudit, percussus, ingemuit, domuisse*, even *potuit* ("he managed"). These words (and, for the verbs, the crunch of the perfect tense) continue the predominant tone of the opening of the poem and serve as a major link between that and these mythological *exempla*. Allen (p. 269) has already shown the appositeness of the Milanion episode, but that was in ways more thematic than tonal. The character of the words I have just mentioned, which furnish the backbone of the poem, as it were, is supported by *nullos fugiendo . . . labores* (9), *saeuitiam durae Iasidos* (10), *amens, antris* (11), *saucius, rupibus* (14); all harshness and hardships.

Previous critical interpretation of the second half of the poem has enabled us to see that it represents what could be called a frantic, illogical cry for help.⁶ Many scholars have been perturbed by the introduction of magic in lines 19–24, but Propertius gets more extravagant and extreme as he progresses down to line 30. He would suffer torture if only he could speak out; and the torture is graphically expressed in "fortiter et ferrum saeuos patie-

mur et ignis" (27), and particularly in lines 29–30, which are naive and almost maudlin: "ferre per extremas gentis et ferre per undas / qua non ulla meum femina norit iter." But this sentiment, and that in lines 31–32 ("uos remanete quibus facili deus annuit aure, / sitis et in tuto semper amore pares"), is checked swiftly by the tough idea and its tougher treatment⁷ in what follows: "in me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras, / et nullo uacuum tempore deficit Amor" (33–34). There is again the merciless thrust of *exercet*, made more poignant by the paradoxical *nostra Venus*⁸ and finally the tormented piling up of "nullo uacuum tempore deficit Amor." Once again the emphatic repetition twists the knife deeper.

What must be said of the second half of the poem is that, because the poet is so ineluctably crushed, there is very little feeling in his thoughts. Thus, "in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artis, / nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire uias" (17–18) is said quite flatly, without spirit of any kind. In the same way, the calls for help do not ring with hope: even in the terms of the poem, Propertius does not believe that "Medea's" magic will have any effect. Similarly the couplet, "uos remanete, quibus facili deus annuit aure / sitis et in tuto semper amore pares" (31–32), has no liveliness of thought or language, no positive meaning.

When it comes to expressing things other than the harsh, the poet is almost less than coherent. The vibrant personality is all the time suppressed.

We have seen that Propertius has stressed the dominant atmosphere of subjection until there is nothing but this; idea, language, and tone are monolithic. There is no important side-glance anywhere, not even to convince us of Cynthia's humanity. We expect the women in elegy to be shadowy figures; but here Cynthia is both an inscrutable and a menacing presence, and this presence affects the whole of the poem. So Propertius does not explore any single detail of pain or the rending rapture

schalkhaft" passt wohl auch zu Amors Wesen, aber nicht in die Stimmung dieses Gedichtes."

5. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

6. See, e.g., K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations* (London, 1963),

pp. 131–32.

7. Cf. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

8. *Ibid.*

of being smitten by love, even if the love is unrequited and the lover adamantly rejected. It is only at the conclusion of the poem that we catch a glimpse of the great pain that lies dully in the core of the poet's own being. Even here Propertius has turned to another lover, in his role as *praeceptor amoris*, and insists on the great pain he will have if the lesson goes unheeded: "quod si quis monitis tardas aduerterit auris, / heu referet quanto uerba dolore mea!" (37-38). This warning relaxes for a moment the austere and monumental atmosphere and gives us briefly a glimpse of Propertius' own pain, existing on a poignantly human level. This glimpse comes as a result of an indirectness that does not begin to destroy the fabric of the poem as previously woven; it is the barest hint tantalizing us with an overture of something with which we can humanly identify. It is this touch which spreads our receptivity to the overwhelming starkness of the rest. It convinces us too of the poet's strong humanity, which he nowhere else allows to appear.

Although Freudian psychology may help in

determining the meaning of *castas odisse puellas* (5), we can now see that it is not appropriate to say, with Sullivan,⁹ that Propertius gives a valid psychological account of love, as a judgment of the whole poem. Nor is the poem, as Allen would suggest (p. 265), "direct self analysis." Propertius is not interested here in psychology, he is hardly interested in the people involved; he is totally concerned in creating a state and in creating in the reader, through complete immersion, an experience of this state. There is nothing clinical in Propertius' description; there is the expression of total emptiness. So great is the reader's absorption in the experience that there is no possibility of objectivity.

The total is utterly consistent within itself. It rings true as an imaginative capturing of a state of empty degradation, and it is the imagination here that is more important than clinical information.

P. J. CONNOR

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

9. *Op. cit.* (n. 2).

ON THEOGONY 118 AND 119

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόντος Ὀλύμπου,
Τάρταρά τ' ἡερδέντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρυδείης

[116-119].

M. L. West in his commentary on the *Theogony* (Oxford 1966), pp. 193-94, argues for the retention of 118 even though both 118 and 119 are ignored by Plato *Symposium* 178B. Aristotle *Metaphysics* 984a27, and other ancients. His method of proof entails taking both lines separately. Although I agree with West that the line should be retained, I find that his argument lacks force. He turns to "the sense" of the line, attributing the appearance of Olympus to "Hesiod's tendency . . . to see the elements in his cosmogony as homes for the gods." From an examination of all lines including the regions in which gods dwell, West

concludes that a god may have homes both on earth and in heaven, thereby answering any objection advanced on the grounds that the gods should be placed in one particular location alone. "The line 118 is best retained."

Earlier in the argument, West noted, however, that 118 recurs at 794 and is, therefore, in some sense formulaic. The question he should have asked at this point was: "Does this 'formulaic' line have any essential relationship with any other?" If it has, certainly the best line of attack would be to consider these lines together and not, as he does, separately. The problem is simplified greatly if one sees 118 and 119 in what I should like to call "structural terms," making specific use of the well-known oppositional nature of the poem as a whole (cf. especially P. Philippson "Genealogie als mythische Form," *Symb. Osl.*,