

# SOME OBSERVATIONS ON PROPERTIUS 1. 1<sup>1</sup>

## I. THE MYTH OF MILANION AND ATALANTA

(Lines 9–18)

PROPERTIUS' account of this myth contains two major difficulties of syntax and interpretation:

- (a) *modo* (line 11). When the word *modo* means ἐνίοτε μὲν and stands in the first of two co-ordinate clauses it requires an answering *modo* or its equivalent in the second clause. *Et* and *etiam* are not satisfactory equivalents.<sup>2</sup> So the necessary second *modo*—or equivalent—is here absent.
- (b) *ibat uidere* (line 12) is the sole account of Milanion's activities in connection with the *hirsutae ferae*. As such it appears obscure and abrupt.<sup>3</sup>

The parallel description in Ovid:

quid fuit asperius Nonacrina Atalanta ?	185
subcubuit meritis trux tamen illa uiri.	
saepe suos casus nec mitia facta puellae	
flesse sub arboribus Milaniona ferunt ;	
saepe tulit iusso fallacia retia collo,	
saepe fera toruos cuspide fixit apros.	190
sensit et Hylaei contentum saucius arcum ;	
sed tamen hoc arcu notior alter erat.	
non te Maenalias armatum scandere siluas	
nec iubeo collo retia ferre tuo,	
pectora nec missis iubeo praebere sagittis ;	195
artis erunt cautae mollia iussa meae.	

*Ars Amatoria* 2. 185–96

has been invoked to clarify these difficulties; and Housman,<sup>4</sup> who believed that two lines containing a second *modo* had fallen out after line 11, used this Ovidian passage as the basis for his *exempli gratia* restoration of two lines to fill his lacuna: 'multaque desertis fleuerat arboribus, / et modo submissa casses ceruice ferebat.' This lacuna and supplement Housman offered as a solution of the two difficulties mentioned. Unfortunately, as we shall see, it is not a satisfactory solution.

<sup>1</sup> Older scholarly material on Prop. 1. 1 is usefully collected by A. W. Allen (*T.C.S.* xi [1950], 255 ff.). Most of the more recent significant work is cited or discussed by W. Hering (*Philol.* cxiv [1970], 98 ff.). Unfortunately Hering did not take account of W. Steidle (*W.S.* lv [1962], 100 ff.), an important article which includes treatments of several of the major problems of Prop. 1. 1. This failure vitiates some of Hering's conclusions, particularly concerning *castae puellae* (l. 5) on which see Steidle, 111 ff. I am greatly indebted to Mr. J. R. G. Wright

for his patient advice and encouragement extending over several drafts of the present paper. My thanks are also due to Professor Alan Watson for discussion of the legal problem treated in § II and to Dr. Michael J. B. Almond for textual and bibliographical information and guidance upon the Byzantine text discussed in § IV.

<sup>2</sup> These conclusions are demonstrated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, 2 f.

<sup>3</sup> On the interpretation of *uidere* see id. 3 f.

<sup>4</sup> *J. Phil.* xvi (1888), 19 ff. = *Collected Papers*, i. 40 ff.

Ovid's version has some value for the interpretation of lines 9–14. A comparison of the Ovidian and Propertian accounts shows that both authors considered Milanion's conquest of Atalanta to be due not only to his feats and sufferings in an active role as a huntsman/warrior but also to his expressions of dissatisfaction at his unreciprocated love. Ovid, in the sequence of thought *meritis* (line 186) . . . *flesse* (line 188) . . . *tulit* (line 189) etc., implies that Milanion's tears are part of the *merita* which won over Atalanta. Similarly Propertius, attributing Milanion's success to *labores* (line 9), sums up the *labores* as both *preces* and *bene facta* (line 16). Thus *preces* (line 16), which has caused commentators some concern because at first sight there is nothing corresponding to it in the previous lines, can be understood to refer to line 11. Propertius imagines Milanion not just wandering in the glens but, like the Ovidian figure, complaining while he does so. These complaints are equivalent in Propertius' mind to pleas. The equivalence was present in Propertius' imagination and he was able to assume his audience's understanding of it. This was because the figure of the neglected lover, wandering about in the countryside uttering a mixture of complaints and pleas, was a conventional one.<sup>1</sup> Propertius himself sketches it at length in 1. 18.

Without making too much of this single point, we can readily allow that Ovid may have been imitating/paraphrasing Propertius in a general way. But we must not overstate this. Verbal coincidence between the two passages is confined to the word *saucius*. Only in one couplet (Ovid lines 185–6, Propertius lines 9–10) can anything resembling word for word paraphrase be found. One detail is different: in Propertius Hylaeus is armed with a club, in Ovid with a bow. It might be argued that Ovid, in imitating Propertius, altered only this detail, and only to allow himself the witty antithesis of line 192. But this argument itself gives the game away. If Ovid could make an alteration here, he could just as easily—if he was imitating Propertius—have inserted in characteristic fashion into his imitation an example of erotic *obsequium* (lines 189–90) already established in elegy,<sup>2</sup> but not present in the Propertian account. In any case we must acknowledge that he did this with line 193, the contents of which do not even occur in Housman's supplement! There is then not enough evidence to show that Ovid was imitating Propertius closely. A common source or more likely an imprecise and expansive imitation is all that can be argued for; neither of these hypotheses can justify tampering with the text of Propertius. This can only be done if the syntactical problems it presents are insoluble. I would suggest that a satisfactory solution is possible.

Problem (a) is based on the supposition that *modo* must mean *ἐνίστε μὲν*. This supposition is doubtless based on the following reasoning: within lines 11–14 (with or without a supplement) Milanion must utter *preces* and perform *bene facta*. Now line 11 alludes to the *preces* and lines 12–14 represent *bene facta*. Some distinction in time between the two activities is therefore logically necessary. No one will imagine that Milanion was simultaneously facing Hylaeus' attack and uttering *preces* to Atalanta. *modo* must provide such a temporal distinction between the two activities; so *modo* must mean *ἐνίστε μὲν*; so we are faced with the problem of the lack of a second *modo* or its equivalent.

But this problem can be evaded: the meaning *ἐνίστε μὲν* is not the only

<sup>1</sup> See Enk on Prop. 1. 18.

<sup>2</sup> See Tib. 1. 4. 49 f. and K. F. Smith ad loc.

temporal sense of *modo*. *modo* also commonly means ἄρτι (recently, of late). This meaning too produces a difficulty. It seems *prima facie* to be impossible to understand a distinction in time between line 11 and line 12 of the kind desired, viz.: 'he was of late wandering . . ., and *then* he was going . . .', if *modo* is taken to mean ἄρτι. The only temporal distinction possible seems to be between lines 11–12 on the one hand and lines 13–14 on the other, i.e. 'he was of late wandering and going and *then* he was struck . . . and moaned'. And this distinction is not at the required point, that is between the *preces* and the *bene facta*. In addition if line 11 means 'he was of late wandering etc.' this is a somewhat odd thing for Propertius to say about the remotely distant Milanion.

The answer to these dilemmas may be this: Propertius intended these lines to bear the meaning demanded by common sense and he wanted his readers to understand this by recognizing in them an imitation of Greek syntax. The closest Greek parallel to Propertius from a syntactical point of view which I have found is:

. . . ἄρτι γάρ οἱ Σικελὰ μὲν Ἐνν[α  
κατελείπετο, Λαμνῖακοὶ δ' ἐπατεύ[ντο βουνοί  
Δηοῦς ἄπο νεισομένα· σέο δ' ἦν ἄπ[υστος  
ὦ δαίμοσιν ἀρπαγίμα, φάτο δ' ἡμιδ[  
Callimachus, *Lyrica*, Fr. 228, lines 43–6 (Pf.)<sup>1</sup>

This passage involves the following clauses:

1. (lines 43–4) ἄρτι γάρ + Imperfect
2. (lines 44–5) δὲ + Imperfect
3. (lines 45–6) δὲ + Imperfect
4. (line 46) δὲ + Aorist

and it is translated as follows by C. A. Trypanis in his Loeb Classical Text: 'For a short time ago she *had* left Sicilian Enna, and *was walking* on the hills of Lemnos returning from her visit to Deo. But she knew not of you (sc. of your death), O stolen by the gods, and said . . .'. As this translation shows, there is a temporal distinction between the first clause (ἄρτι γάρ + Imp.) and the second (δὲ + Imp.). The first clause is prior in time, although there is no temporal adverb in the second clause to help us to understand this. Thus the verb of the first clause is rendered in English by the pluperfect. The Propertian passage displays a structural similarity. Taken in clauses, it breaks down as follows:

1. (line 11) *nam modo* + Imperfect
2. (line 12) *et* + Imperfect
3. (lines 13–14) *etiam* + Aoristic Perfect

There are indeed differences between the two passages: *etiam* in line 13 is stronger than δέ; and the repeated *ille* of lines 12 and 13 has no equivalent in Callimachus. Propertius wants to emphasize that Milanion's action in line 12 is a *labor* but that his experience in lines 13 f. is a greater *labor*. Hence the use of *etiam* in line 13. The vivid deictic *ille* of line 12 is repeated in line 13 to emphasize the same gradation.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. also Callim. *Aet.* Fr. 110. 51–6 (Pf.) where however πρόκατε clarifies the temporal sequence. Cat. 66. 52–4 translates the second clause in this group with *cum* . . .

*obtulit*. Further clause-sequences of varying degrees of comparability occur at: Tryphiodor. 668 ff.; Colluth. 201 ff.; Theocr. *Id.* 24. 63 ff.; *Ap. Rhod.* 1. 1222 ff.; 2. 607 ff.

But in spite of these differences the underlying syntactical structure of the two passages remains analogous; and the Propertian passage, if translated along the lines of the Callimachean quotation, would run: 'For a short time before he had wandered love-crazed in the glens of Mt. Parthenius, and he *was* going off to face the *hirsutae ferae* and in addition wounded . . . he moaned . . .'. This translation of the passage, made on the assumptions that *modo* means ἄρτι and that the temporal distinctions are the same as in the Greek example, gives us the required time difference between line 11 and line 12—*first* he wandered, *then* he went. It also removes the difficulty of 'For lately he *was*' because *modo* now refers not to the interval in time between Milanion and Propertius but to the gap between two activities of Milanion. This translation is recommended not only by the syntactic similarity between the two passages and the employment in both of verbs of motion but also by Propertius' known fondness for employing Greek constructions.<sup>1</sup> It may be further assisted by the fact that the nearest Greek parallel passage is found in Callimachus, an author whom Propertius often professes to admire and emulate. We are not, of course, obliged to think of this Propertian sophistication as necessarily connected with Callimachus or with Hellenistic poetry. Its basis is the fact that the Greek imperfect can often represent a completed action or even stand for the English or Latin pluperfect (K.-G. i. 383 3, 4). The addition of ἄρτι in Callimachus was made simply to give the reader further help in understanding that this was the sense of κατελείπετο.

But before we can accept that this approach is valid, one objection must be surmounted. The *hirsutae ferae* of line 12 are generally understood to be 'wild boars'. The basis for this interpretation is in part two lines of a Latin epitaph for a dog: 'docta per incertas audax discurrere siluas / collibus hirsutas atque agitare feras' (*Carmina Latina Epigraphica* [ed. Buecheler] ii. 1175, 3-4). The interpretation is also partly based on the Ovidian and other accounts of the Milanion legend, which make Milanion go and fight wild boars. If the *hirsutae ferae* are 'wild boars' then my account of the significance of *modo* makes Propertius' narrative somewhat odd. Propertius would be representing Milanion as going to face wild boars and in the course of, or at the end of this enterprise, as suffering a wound from a Centaur. This oddity could no doubt be explained as the result of Propertian compression of thought: but there is a possible way of understanding *hirsutae ferae* which not only eliminates this difficulty, but has positive advantages. It provides more support for the notion suggested by the Hellenized syntax, namely that this passage is a close imitation of a Greek original.<sup>2</sup> At the same time it demonstrates further the disparity of the Propertian and Ovidian accounts by removing boars from the Propertian version. It also solves problem (b)—the abruptness of *ibat uidere*—and provides Milanion with more creditable *bene facta* than boar-hunting.

*hirsutae ferae* means literally 'hairy wild beasts'. It is just as likely that it means this, that is, wild animals in general, in the epigraphic lines quoted above as that it means 'wild boars' there. In Propertius 1. 1. 12, as we have seen, there is nothing in the context which absolutely prohibits us from understanding it as 'wild boars'. But I believe that a more attractive meaning can be found for it; at two places in the *Iliad* the word φήρ, a variant form of θήρ, is used to refer to

<sup>1</sup> See H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Propertius und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, 72 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Already suspected. See e.g. J.-P. Boucher, *Études sur Propertius*, 317.

Centaurs (1. 268; 2. 743). Both contexts concern the killing of Centaurs. In one (2. 743) the adjective *λαχνήεντες* (*hirsutae*, hairy) is attached to *φῆρες*. Pindar and Simonides also used the form *φῆρ*.<sup>1</sup> The present context, in which the Centaur Hylaeus appears in line 13, makes it highly plausible that Propertius also meant 'hairy Centaurs' by *hirsutae ferae* in line 12. The ancient reader might wonder at line 12 what exactly the phrase *hirsutae ferae* meant. Clarification would come in the next line—a common Propertian device. If the *ferae* are Centaurs, we have removed the problem outlined above, since Milanion was wounded by a Centaur, not while going to face wild boars, but while going to face Centaurs. The abruptness of line 12—problem (b)—has now vanished since the *hirsutae ferae* are no longer introduced and abandoned at a stroke: now lines 13–14 amplify and explain the events and personalities of line 12. Moreover the pseudo-etymological translation of a rare Greek phrase in *hirsutae ferae* is a further argument for the new interpretation of *modo* which I have advanced, in that it confirms the Greek—and the learned Alexandrian—character of the lines.<sup>2</sup> Finally, as noted above, Propertius has provided more solid *bene facta* for Milanion: Milanion helped Atalanta against the Centaurs; he did not merely suffer a clubbing from them.

In the light of this discussion the lines may be rendered: 'For Milanion just before had been wandering love-crazed among the glens of Parthenius; and then he went off to face the hairy Centaurs; and struck by Hylaeus' club he moaned among the cliffs of Arcadia.'

The relation between the myth and the reality is clearly that Milanion stands for Propertius and Atalanta for Cynthia. This is well understood and for Cynthia it has been worked out in detail: both Cynthia and Atalanta are portrayed as *durae puellae* who initially reject the love of their admirer; on the other hand, Atalanta eventually yields to Milanion, while Cynthia as yet remains obdurate to Propertius' suit.

But one aspect of the correspondence between Propertius and Milanion does not appear to have been emphasized sufficiently: Propertius, before falling in love with Cynthia, was an anti-love figure—untouched by desire (line 2) and displaying *fastus* of love (line 3). So too was Milanion before he fell in love with Atalanta. This tradition appears in Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 785–95 where Milanion is said to have been a misogynist who went and lived in the wilderness to avoid marriage.

This factor provides greater tension and interest within myth and reality in separation. In each a young man formerly hostile to love becomes enamoured of a young woman who rejects his love. Both are therefore to some extent conflicts between an anti-love hero and an anti-love heroine.

In other respects too the Propertian Milanion resembles Propertius. Whereas the Ovidian Milanion's *merita* are tears, net-carrying, killing wild boars, being wounded by Hylaeus—a mixture of activity and endurance—Propertius' Milanion is a relatively passive individual. His *labores* and *bene facta* are described in terms chosen for their colourless neutrality (*errabat, ibat*). So they are consonant with the typical *inertia* of the elegiac lover as he is portrayed by

<sup>1</sup> Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 4; 4. 119; Simon. Fr. 58 D. Cp. also Soph. *Trach.* 556, 568 for *θήρ* = Centaur.

<sup>2</sup> On Alexandrian etymological and

glossographical interests see R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, indexes s.vv. etymology, γλωσσαι.

Propertius. It is only the successful erotic effect of Milanion's behaviour (*contudit, domuisse*) which is emphasized in positive language. Ovid's hero is able to perform at least one action—boar-hunting—which is inconsistent with Propertius' own *persona*. Cf.

incipiam captare feras et reddere pinu  
cornua et audaces ipse monere canis;  
non tamen ut uastos ausim temptare leones  
aut celer agrestis comminus ire sues.  
haec igitur mihi sit lepores audacia mollis  
excipere et structo figere auem calamo.

Propertius 2. 19. 19–24

But in Propertius Milanion's *labores* are ones Propertius might have performed himself. Hence, as Propertius sees it, the injustice of a situation in which Milanion was successful, while he is not; and hence his attribution of the blame to *Amor* (line 17).

If Milanion and Propertius are almost totally similar in character, the same cannot be said of Atalanta and Cynthia. The chaste virgin of the myth corresponds to the *meretrix* of the reality only in the rejection of one lover. There is no implication that Cynthia has always or does always reject lovers. In fact the reader, being familiar with the conventions of ancient love literature, would know the elegiac mistress's character only too well. This difference of course makes Propertius' plight even more poignant and pathetic. Rejection by a chaste girl is much easier to bear than rejection by a *meretrix*. We cannot fail to notice in this context the violence of the language used to describe Atalanta (*saevitiam, durae*), the wounding of Milanion (*percussus*) and the outcome of Milanion's wooing (*contudit, domuisse*) which contrasts strikingly with the neutral words used of Milanion's specific actions. This we should probably see as another expression of Propertius' annoyance at the success, not of a more active or better-equipped lover or one with an easier suit, but of a mythological character who is an *alter ego* in every detail and who has a harder task.

A final point of difference between Propertius and Milanion may be mentioned. In Propertius Milanion's *labores* (like the *merita* of Ovid's Milanion) consist both of *bene facta* and *preces*. Propertius tells us that in his case Love devises no ways and means (l. 17). Thus Propertius is incapable of both *bene facta* and *preces*; and this in turn implies that Propertius 1. 1 is not *preces*—because Propertius is incapable of them. The point is significant, because if 1. 1 were *preces* it could not also be, as it is, erotodidaxis (see below).

## II. THE APPEAL TO THE WITCHES

(Lines 19–24)

Two stylistic features of Propertius' appeal to the witches may clarify his thought. First, the appeal is couched in terms of a prayer formula: it begins with the *at precantis* (line 19) and is divided into three typical clauses of such a formula:<sup>1</sup>

1. (lines 19–20) the functions or powers of the being to whom the prayer is addressed;

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos, frühgriechische Dichtung*, Diss. Würzburg, 163 ff.; Virg. *Aen.* 6. 56 ff. and Norden ad 1924, 12 n. 8. loc.; H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der*

2. (lines 21–2) the request;
3. (lines 23–4) the reward promised if the request is fulfilled.

Secondly, the thought-structure of the passage is chiasmic, a feature which can be illustrated by the following paraphrase:

- A<sub>1</sub> (line 19) You whose *fallacia* is to draw down the moon;  
 B<sub>1</sub> (line 20) And whose *labor* is in *magicis sacra piare focis*;  
 B<sub>2</sub> (lines 21–2) Turn my mistress's mind and make her more in love with me than I am with her;  
 A<sub>2</sub> (lines 23–4) Then I shall believe that you can control stars and rivers.

There is a contrast between *fallacia* (line 19) and *labor* (line 20); and the activities of lines 23–4 clearly belong to the same category as that of line 19. As will emerge from subsequent discussion, the activities of line 20 are of the same type as those of lines 21–2.

I now attempt to interpret the details of lines 19–20. Of the three possible senses of *fallacia deductae lunae* (line 19) delineated by Housman,<sup>1</sup> Shackleton Bailey<sup>2</sup> has convincingly defended and expounded the first—'false pretence of bringing down the moon'. He admits the objection that Propertius is being slightly illogical in appealing to witches whose power he doubts—although only partially (see below)—but rightly comments on the psychological validity of this process. Shackleton Bailey again rightly raises the possibility that in antiquity some kind of actual conjuring trick was involved in the feat of bringing down the moon and that it was not merely a false claim to be responsible for naturally occurring eclipses. This idea he rejects for lack of evidence. Evidence however exists:

Σελήνην δὲ ἐν ὁρόφῳ φαίνεσθαι δεικνύουσι [i.e. magicians] καὶ ἀστέρας τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ὁροφῆς μέρει προσαρμοσὰς κάτοπτρον, τιθεὶς λεκάνην ὕδατος μεστήν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῆς γῆς κατ' ἴσον, λύχνον δὲ μέσον φαίνοντα ἁμαυρὸν μετεωρότερον τῆς λεκάνης θείς, οὕτως ἐκ τῆς ἀντανakλάσεως ἀποτελεῖ σελήνην φαίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ κατόπτρου. ἀλλὰ καὶ τύμπανον πολλάκις ἐφ' ὕψηλου πόρρωθεν ὄρθιον περιβαλὼν ἐσθῆτί τι, σκεπόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ συμπαίκτη, ἵνα μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ φανῇ, κατόπιν θείς λύχνον, ἐπ' αὐτὸ σύνθημα παράσχη τῷ συμπαίκτη, τοσοῦτον ἀφαιρεῖ τοῦ σκεπασματος, ὅσον ἂν συνεργῆσαι τὸ προσμίμημα κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς σελήνης τὸ σχῆμα. χρίει δὲ τὰ διαφαίνοντα τοῦ τυμπάνου μέρη κινναβάρι καὶ κόμμι . . . καὶ τῆς† ἐτυμολογικῆς† δὲ λαγήνου περικόψας τὸν τράχηλον καὶ τὸν πυθμένα, ἐνθεὶς λύχνον καὶ περιθεὶς τι τῶν ἐπιτηδείων πρὸς τὸ διαυγεῖν σχῆμα, στὰς ἐφ' ὕψηλου κρύβδην ὑπὸ τινα σκέπην τις τῶν συμπαικτῶν, μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὸ σύνθημα ἐκ μετεώρου καταχεῖ τὰ μηχανήματα ὥστε δοκεῖν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιέναι τὴν σελήνην. τὸ δὲ ὅμοιον καὶ διὰ χύτρας γίνεται ἐν ὑλώδεσι τόποις. διὰ δὲ τῆς χύτρας καὶ τὰ κατ' οἶκον παίζεται. βωμοῦ γὰρ κειμένου κατόπιν κείται ἡ χύτρα ἔχουσα λύχνον φαίνοντα· ὄντων δὲ πλείονων λύχνων οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον δεικνύται. ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπικαλέσθαι ὁ ἐπαοιδὸς τὴν σελήνην, πάντας κελεύει τοὺς λύχνους σβέννυσθαι, ἕνα δὲ ἁμαυρὸν καταλιπεῖν, καὶ τότε ἀντανakλᾷ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐκ τῆς χύτρας εἰς τὸν ὁροφον καὶ παρέχει φαντασίαν σελήνης τοῖς παροῦσιν, ἐπισκεπασθέντος τοῦ στόματος τῆς χύτρας πρὸς ὃ ἀπαιτεῖν ὁ καιρὸς δοκεῖ, ὡς μνηοειδῇ δεικνυσθαι ἐν τῷ ὁρόφῳ τὴν φαντασίαν.

Hippolytus, *Refutatio Haeresium* 4. 37

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. 25 ff.

<sup>2</sup> C.Q. xliii (1949), 22 f. and *Propertiana*, 4.

Cp. for stars :

Ἀστέρας δὲ εἶναι δοκεῖν ποιούσι θρισσῶν ἵππούρου φολίδες ὕδατι μετὰ κόμμειωσ δεδευμένοι καὶ προσπεπλασμένοι τῷ ὀρόφῳ κατὰ διαλείμματα.

Hippolytus, *Refutatio Haeresium* 4. 38

Although this Christian writer has good reason for wanting to prove the powers of magicians fraudulent, he is unlikely to have chosen to do so by explaining the mechanics of an illusion, unless this trick was or was thought in antiquity to be practised in some fashion. With this passage in mind moreover we can now more confidently regard Sosiphanes Fr. 1. (*T.G.F.* ed. Nauck, p. 819)

μάγοις ἐπωδαῖς πᾶσα Θεσσαλὶς κόρη  
ψευδῆς σελήνης αἰθέρος καταβάτις

cited by Shackleton Bailey, as further evidence for ancient knowledge of this illusion.

The witches' *fallacia* then is a trick; their *labor* (line 20) is what Propertius is really interested in. It is the occupation which Propertius hopes will be more effective and more helpful to him than the witches' more spectacular activities. What exactly is the *labor*, described as *in magicis sacra piare focis*? This question can best be answered by reference to the parallel account in Tibullus (1. 2. 42-64) of dealings with a witch. She has guaranteed to Tibullus that Delia's *coniunx* will not discover the affair between Delia and the poet. This guarantee is backed up by an impressive list of the feats Tibullus has seen her perform :

hanc ego de caelo ducentem sidera uidi,  
fluminis haec rapidi carmine uertit iter (43-4)

plus raising and controlling the dead, and changing the weather (45-50). A résumé of the witch's resources—the potions of Medea, the dogs of Hecate, and magical incantations—leads on to :

quid credam? nempe haec eadem se dixit amores  
cantibus aut herbis soluere posse meos,  
et me lustrauit taedis, et nocte serena  
concidit ad magicos hostia pulla deos.  
non ego totus abesset amor, sed mutuus esset,  
orabam, nec te posse carere uelim. (59-64)

Thus the *magici foci* of Propertius' witches are the altars of the *dei magici* to whom the witch is sacrificing a black victim in Tibullus. It is likely therefore that *sacra piare* refers to a purification and sacrifice resembling that made by Tibullus' witch. We must not be side-tracked by any question of the witches' *pietas*. Both Propertius' and Tibullus' witches are benevolent white witches who could be *pieae*; but their *pietas* is quite irrelevant to this discussion. Nor are interpretations of *sacra* as 'offences against religion' or as 'accursed things' satisfactory.<sup>1</sup> The first has been refuted by Enk and Shackleton Bailey; the second is over-obscure.

The words *piare* and *sacra* do occur once in Roman elegy in a context of purification: 'Nec minus hesternae confundor imagine noctis, / quamuis est

<sup>1</sup> For the first of these see F. H. Sandbach (*C.R.* lii [1938], 211 f.). As for the second, Stat. *Theb.* 10. 804, speaks of *sacra insania*

'accursed madness'—(see § III); but a Roman reader would have been hard put to take *sacra* in a pejorative sense here.



sacris illa piata meis' (Ovid, *Heroides* 19. 193-4). But the verb is transitive and a dream is 'purified'—that is its evil effects are countered—by means of a sacrifice or some other ritual activity (*sacra*). As a result this couplet is unhelpful with Propertius 1. 1. 20.

I believe that in Propertius 1. 1. 20 *sacra piare* means nothing more than 'hold purificatory ceremonies' and that *sacra* is functioning here as an internal accusative. This grammatical usage is characteristic not only of poetic but also of religious Latin.<sup>1</sup> In this context a parallel passage cited by P. J. Enk in his *Commentarius Criticus* merits re-emphasis: 'Cum capita viridi lauro velare imperant / prophetae, sancta ita caste qui purant sacra' (C. Iulius Caesar Strabo, *Sc. Rom. Fr.* ed. Klotz i. p. 304). I suggest that Propertius with *sacra piare* and C. Julius Caesar Strabo with the even rarer *sacra purare* are both employing a characteristic type of religious idiom to dignify their diction and that their meaning is the same.

Whether or not this interpretation of *sacra piare* is persuasive, the distinction between *fallacia* and *labor* together with the parallel of Tibullus 1. 2. 59-64 make it clear that *sacra piare* is conceived by Propertius as an effective and, from his point of view, a protective function. Propertius' confidence in it replaces his scepticism about the witches' more spectacular claims and emboldens him to ask for practical assistance in his love-life.

### III. THE FUROR METAPHOR

There can be no doubt that a metaphor equating Propertius' love with madness is present in 1. 1. The plain words *furor* (line 6) and *non sani pectoris* (line 26) are proof enough. What I hope to show in this section is that these are not isolated outcroppings of the metaphor. Rather it is present throughout the whole poem. This helps to give the poem that conceptual unity which commentators have denied to it.<sup>2</sup>

The principle of the discussion that follows is this: since metaphor is clearly attested in 1. 1, it is only common justice to Propertius to allow that where his vocabulary can bear a sense consonant with the metaphor, it was his intention that it should bear this sense and form part of his metaphor. The fact that his vocabulary can and does bear other senses in other contexts is no counter-argument. The logic of metaphorization demands that the language of a metaphor should be able to bear other senses in other contexts. In addition the fact that Propertius' words often fit the erotic as well as the metaphorical context is not a sign that the metaphorical sense was unintended, but a proof of Propertius' skill as a poet. In employing a sustained metaphor Propertius was adhering to a poetic tradition commonly exemplified in Latin poetry.<sup>3</sup> The love/madness equivalence is one of the commoner notions of erotic poetry. It was reinforced in the Hellenistic period by philosophical definitions of any strong emotion as a disease.<sup>4</sup> The point of both the erotic and the philosophical comparisons was to stress the seriousness of what was in fact a non-pathological state of mind by equating it with mental conditions actually requiring medical attention. Propertius enlivens this stock metaphor with many detailed medical allusions. At the same time the philosophical background to the

<sup>1</sup> See K.-S. i. 275; L.-H.-S. ii. 38 f.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Boucher, *op. cit.* 350 f.

<sup>3</sup> See D. West, *Reading Horace; The*

*Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius; J.R.S.* lix (1969), 40 ff.; *Philol.* cxiv (1970), 262 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum*

image is present throughout. When illustrating the metaphor, I shall draw material from medical accounts of *insania* in general, since it is clear that, although *furor* and *insania* were sometimes distinguished, *insania* could include *furor*.<sup>1</sup> Moreover the ancients were not always precise in defining different kinds of mental illness and their treatment.<sup>2</sup>

The *furor* metaphor is first introduced specifically in line 7. But it is already anticipated in the second line of the poem. A Roman reader told that Propertius is *contactum cupidinibus* would already recognize him as a *furiosus* especially in view of the frequent use of *contingere* to denote infection with disease (*T.L.L.*, s.v. 1 B 5). The 'wise man' was notoriously untroubled by desires. And anyone not in his happy state was a madman. Such ideas had been particularly associated with Stoic thinking. But by this time they had passed into popular currency.<sup>3</sup> *nullo uiuere consilio* (line 6) also anticipates this specific introduction of *furor* in line 7. That lovers lack *consilium* is a commonplace. Cp. e.g. (of love): '... quae res in se neque consilium neque modum / habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes' (Terence, *Eunuchus* 57–8). But, in addition, the lack of *consilium* of some *furiosi* is mentioned by a medical writer who is a near contemporary of Propertius, in words which suggest, if not a technical term, at least a medical way of talking about madness: 'si uero consilium insanientem fallit, tormentis quibusdam optime curatur' (Celsus 3. 18. 21). Propertius could thus reasonably expect his audience, on meeting *furor* in line 7, to remember the occurrence of *nullo uiuere consilio* in line 6 and to link it with a medical aspect of *furor* as well as understanding it as something connected with love.

In line 7 Propertius protests that his own love-madness has not decreased in a whole year. The significance of the protest is that madness was not generally a long-lasting affliction.<sup>4</sup> *deficit* (line 7) is the only use in Latin known to me of the verb *deficere* to denote a decrease in intensity of *furor* or of any other disease.<sup>5</sup> Its precise meaning and something of Propertius' reasons for using it in preference to the many other words available in Latin for expressing similar notions is shown by the use of the derived adjective *defectiuus* by a Latin medical writer: 'Diocles ait defectiuas febres tutas atque innoxias esse frequentius quam sunt continuae' (Caelius Aurelianus, *Acutae Passiones* 2. 10. 60). Caelius, in describing intermittent fevers as *defectiuas*, was undoubtedly translating Diocles' use of the standard Greek medical term for intermittent fevers—*διαλείποντες πυρετοί*.<sup>6</sup>

Propertius was, I believe, using *deficio* in the same sense and was, like Caelius, using it to translate *διαλείπω*. This may be deduced from various factors: the word *deficio* and its cognates are, at least, very rare in contexts of this kind; *furor* was commonly distinguished in antiquity from *insania*—when such a

*Fragmenta*, iii. 102 ff. On literary and philosophic love-madness in relation to Prop. 1. 1 see A. W. Allen, op. cit. 258–64. The fullest Latin exposition of the analogy between strong emotions and illness is Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 4, where 68 ff. deal with love. Much useful material on literary madness is collected in A. O'Brien-Moore, *Madness in Ancient Literature*, Diss. Princeton, 1924.

<sup>1</sup> See *T.L.L.*, s.vv. *furor*, *insania*.

<sup>2</sup> Epilepsy was for example regarded as a form of madness. See O'Brien-Moore, op. cit. 20 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See Allen, op. cit.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. the three kinds of madness distinguished by Celsus 3. 18, where only the most acute is of any long duration.

<sup>5</sup> See *T.L.L.*, s.v.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. Arist. *Pr.* 866A, 23; Hippocr. *Aph.* 4. 43.

distinction was made—by this very feature, namely that *furor* was intermittent whereas *insania* was constant;<sup>1</sup> madness sometimes arose from fever or was combined with it.<sup>2</sup> Finally, if we translate line 7 into Greek, we find that the Greek version contains an extra nuance of meaning which is not present in Latin. *διαλείπω* is frequently used with words denoting length of time in the meaning ‘to leave an interval of’.<sup>3</sup> So in Greek, as well as having its primary sense—‘intermit’, *διαλείπω* would also, being combined with the Greek equivalent of *toto anno*, hint at the other sense of the verb. This is not true of the Latin *deficio*. Thus there is a possibility that Propertius had a Greek model here, that the Greek model employed the verb *διαλείπω* and that Propertius (and his model) intended *deficio* (*διαλείπω*) to form part of the madness metaphor.

In line 8 the *furor* metaphor continues. *Tamen* at the beginning of line 8 shows that Propertius considers it odd and worthy of remark that he should at one and the same time be possessed by the madness of love (line 7) and not be favoured by the gods of love (line 8). The significance of this paradox lies in the metaphor. The notion of a lunatic as the recipient of divine favour is old and well-documented in antiquity.<sup>4</sup> The application of this traditional idea to love and the description of love as one of the beneficial and divine-linked sorts of madness is Platonic in origin.<sup>5</sup> It is because erotic madness and divine favour are so connected that Propertius can feel his own situation to be abnormal.

The first metaphorical passage (lines 6–8) is followed by the Milanion myth, which is linked to it by the *amentia* of Milanion (line 11). After the myth and Propertius’ reflections on it, the metaphor returns at line 19 with the appeal to the witches. On the erotic side the appeal is well understood;<sup>6</sup> but the connection between the witches and madness has been neglected. The *furor* metaphor continues in lines 19 ff. and Propertius’ appeal to the witches is an appeal made not just by a lover but by a lover–madman. This is clear from two lines of a later Propertian elegy (3. 24) which alludes back to 1. 1 in many particulars. In that poem Propertius refers with deliberate inaccuracy to the vain efforts he had made to escape from love in 1. 1: ‘quod mihi non patrii poterant auertere amici, / eluere aut uasto Thessala saga mari’ (9–10).

Later in 3. 24 when Propertius has declared himself free of love, it is to *Mens bona* (line 19) that he dedicates himself. Thus also he shows that he now considers his former state, which he claims a *Thessala saga* was employed to cure, was mental disorder.

The ease with which Propertius was able to think of applying to witches in a case of *furor* was due to the resort sometimes made to magic in antiquity in case of madness and kindred disorders.<sup>7</sup> The reason for this resort was, of course, the popular belief that madness was caused by gods or spirits inside or outside the madman.<sup>8</sup>

Two further allusions to the metaphor occur within the appeal to the witches: first, activities describable as *piare* (line 20) were sometimes a mode of treating madness;<sup>9</sup> secondly, the word *palleat* appears in line 22. This naturally refers

<sup>1</sup> Notably for example in legal provisions for the *cura* of *furiosi* and *insani*. See W. W. Buckland, *A Textbook of Roman Law*, 169 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Celsus. 3. 18. 1 f.

<sup>3</sup> See L.–S.–J. s.v.

<sup>4</sup> See E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 64 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Phaedr.* 245B, 249D.

<sup>6</sup> See A. W. Allen, op. cit. 272 ff.; K. F. Smith on Tib. 1. 2. 43.

<sup>7</sup> See below, n. 9, and e.g. R. Poerner, *De Curetibus et Corybantibus*, Diss. Halle, 1913, 347 ff.

<sup>8</sup> See O’Brien-Moore, op. cit. 11 ff.

<sup>9</sup> e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 291, 517; Hor. *Sat.* 2. 3. 164 f.; Fest. p. 234L.

primarily to *amor* of which *pallor* is almost a synonym.<sup>1</sup> Propertius is therefore asking the witches to bring it about that Cynthia becomes even more enamoured of him than he is of her. But *pallor* can be a symptom of some *furiosi*. Compare 'item pallore quodam (sc. nonnulli furiosi) suffunduntur' (Aretaeus, *De causis et signis morborum* 1. 6), where *pallor* is a symptom of medical *furor*.<sup>2</sup> There are also many passages where *pallor* is a sign of mantic *furor*.<sup>3</sup> The metaphor is therefore sustained within the prayer. Propertius is asking that Cynthia become even more in the power of his *furor* than he himself is.

Propertius follows his appeal to the witches with an appeal to his *amici* (lines 25–30). This second appeal specifically reiterates the *furor* metaphor in *non sani pectoris* (line 25). In it there are also other allusions to the metaphor. The first concerns the *amici* themselves. *Amici* seem to have had a specific social relevance to *furor* in Propertius' day. It is not possible to be certain exactly what their role *vis-à-vis* the madman was, nor indeed, in the absence of satisfactory legal evidence, to say whether or not their role had any legal basis. But one possibility which accords well with lines 24–5 is that they functioned as curators of madmen when closer relatives were not available. Under the XII Tables *furiosi* were placed in the *cura* of their *agnati* and failing these their *gentiles*; and it is generally thought that the praetor, beginning with a right to appoint non-agnate curators for persons outside the scope of the XII Tables legislation, extended the right to cases within the XII Tables.<sup>3</sup> Some non-technical evidence could suggest that it was to *amici* that this *cura* was often given, an element of the *cura* being the care of the madman's person. Cp. 'si familiam tuam dimisisses, quod ad neminem nisi ad ipsum te pertineret, amici te constringendum putarent' (Cicero, *In Pisonem* 48, in a context [46 ff.] in which Piso's *furor* is discussed); 'adde manus in uincla meas (meruere catenas), / dum furor omnis abit, si quis amicus ades' (Ovid, *Amores* 1. 7. 1–2). Another passage: 'propinqui quibus est puella curae, / amicos medicosque conuocate: / non est sana puella . . .' (Catullus 41. 5–7) suggests a different interpretation of the role of the *amici vis-à-vis furiosi*, that is that they were called *in consilium* by the relatives.

None of this evidence has of course any strict legal force. At the most its import is social; and although the notion that *cura* of a *furiosus* would in some circumstances normally fall to *amici* is attractive, it cannot be assumed that the references in the passages quoted are necessarily to *cura*, or even if they are to *cura*, that this is *cura* in the legal sense rather than a more informal arrangement. But the ease with which *amici* make their appearance in this sort of context does show that there was a social presumption—beyond the mere notion that friends will help a man in trouble—that the *amici* of a *furiosus* would play some part in caring for him. In this sense then, it may be said that the mention of *amici* in lines 25–6 functions as an integral part of the metaphor.

The special relevance of *amici* to *furor* is confirmed by the language of the appeal to them. They are said to be curing—or trying to cure—Propertius: they *reuocare a lapsus*. Both these terms are used of illness. Cp. 'nam et uiris et corpus amisi; sed, si morbum depulero, facile, ut spero, illa reuocabo' (Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares* 7. 26. 2); 'et cetera, quibus exulceratae mentes ad sanitatem reuocantur' (Petronius, *Satyricon* 111); 'quaedam mente labuntur'

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Prop. 1. 9. 17; Ov. *A.A.* 1. 729 ff.; *Am.* 3. 6. 25.

<sup>2</sup> See O'Brien-Moore, op. cit. 218 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See Buckland, loc. cit.; W. A. J. Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic*, 155.

(Celsus 5. 26. 13); 'Argolicus morbis fatisque rapacibus Idmon / labitur . . .' (Valerius Flaccus 5. 2-3). Moreover *auxilia* (line 26) is the technical medical term for remedies.<sup>1</sup>

Every aspect of lines 25-6 therefore plays its full part in the metaphor. The same is also true in the case of lines 27-30. This has been questioned, on the ground that fire, steel, and foreign travel can be remedies for other diseases as well as madness.<sup>2</sup> They are indeed; but this is not a valid objection since the logic of metaphorization, discussed at the beginning of this section, makes it irrelevant. Moreover the thought pattern of lines 25-30 reinforces the notion that the metaphor is continued. In lines 25-6 Propertius asks his *amici* to seek *auxilia* for him. It would be odd if the *auxilia* which Propertius goes on to mention in lines 27-30 were anything other than the same *auxilia* he asks his *amici* to seek, namely *auxilia* for *furor*.

The three remedies mentioned by Propertius can all be illustrated from Celsus as remedies for madness. *Ferrum* and *ignes* are mentioned together in line 27. The iron may be fetters. These figure along with starvation and flogging as a remedy for madness at Celsus 3. 18. 21. But Propertius is probably alluding to the procedures of Celsus 3. 18. 16: 'Neque alienum est, si neque sanguis ante missus est, neque mens constat, neque somnus accedit, occipitio inciso cucurbitulam admouere.' These fit the bill better since they combine *ferrum* and *ignes*. Cutting and application of a *cucurbitula* (a vessel for cupping) is involved. The *ferrum* is the scalpel and the fire the *cucurbita* which contained burning lint (see Celsus 2. 11. 1).<sup>3</sup> Foreign travel is also referred to by Celsus as a remedy for madness<sup>4</sup> as well as being a standard remedy for love.<sup>5</sup>

Lines 28 and 30 raise further questions which can be properly elucidated through an understanding of the metaphor. Propertius expresses his willingness to suffer *ferrum et ignes* with one qualification: 'sit modo libertas quae uelit ira loqui' (28). *Ira* and *furor* are so intimately connected in classical thought as to be almost synonymous.<sup>6</sup> Propertius' insistence on freedom of speech, that is, on being allowed to say what his *ira* (*furor*) wishes to say, can now be explained in medical terms. Madmen were prevented from uttering their lunatic fantasies: 'ubi perperam aliquid dixit aut fecit, fame, uinculis, plagis coercendus est' (Celsus 3. 18. 21). Propertius wishes to retain the right to speak. This paradox is a contribution to the programmatic function of 1. 1. Propertius' lunatic utterances are the poems of the Monobiblos in which his love-madness is expressed. His insistence on thus expressing his madness may be contrasted with: 'ure ferum et torque, libeat ne dicere quicquam / magnificum post haec: horrida uerba doma' (Tibullus 1. 5. 5-6). Here, although *furor* is absent from the context, the connection between harsh treatment and silence is specifically illustrated.

Line 30 can also be elucidated in terms of the metaphor. Foreign travel is a remedy for madness but in accepting the remedy Propertius—again paradoxically—links it with a symptom of madness, when he emphasizes its con-

<sup>1</sup> See *T.L.L.*, s.v. II 3 a, b.

<sup>2</sup> See Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Of some interest also is Celsus 3. 23. 7, a description of the ultimate remedies for *morbis comitialis*, viz. blood-letting by cutting the legs, blood-letting by cutting and cupping at the back of the head, and burning with a hot iron. *M.c.* could also be com-

pared with love, e.g. Aul. Gell. 19. 2; Plut. *Mor.* 755 D, E.

<sup>4</sup> 3. 18. 23.  
<sup>5</sup> See Enk on Prop. 1. 1. 29; Theocr. *Id.* 14. 53 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See *T.L.L.*, s.v. *furor* IIb; H. Ringeltaube, *Quaestiones ad veterum philosophorum de affectibus doctrinam pertinentes*, Diss. Göttingen, 1913, 85.

nection with escaping from women. Shunning one's fellow human beings was regarded as a sign of madness in antiquity. Cp. *ΔΙ. Γεωργός ει;* *ΣΥ. Μελαγχολῶν μ' οὕτως οἶει;* (Aristophanes, *Plutus* 903), upon which the scholia comment: *Ὡςπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι, τὴν ἐν τοῖς πλήθεσι διατριβὴν ἀπαναινόμενοι, ἐν ἐρημίαις φέρονται, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν τῶν γεωργῶν διατριβὴν μελαγχολίαν ὠνόμασεν, ὡς ἐν ἀγροῖς γενομένην, or the equivalent.<sup>1</sup>*

Finally the metaphor re-emerges at lines 33–4. First of all Propertius alludes back to line 6 by using in line 34 the passive form of *deficit*, i.e. *defit*, to echo the same sentiment and by substituting *Amor* for *furor*. The meaning of this couplet as a whole has not yet in my view been explained although Shackleton Bailey's<sup>2</sup> rendering is, I believe, correct in literal terms: 'in my case (or 'against me') our goddess Venus works zealously through nights of bitterness, and Love is never idle or faint.' I suggest that Propertius here is describing himself as suffering from the sleeplessness characteristic of the unsuccessful lover. Tibullus offers some assistance:

Adde merum uinoque nouos compesce dolores,  
occupet ut fessi lumina uicta sopor:  
neu quisquam multo percussum tempora baccho  
excitet, infelix dum requiescit amor. (I. 2. 1–4)

Tibullus wants to get drunk and fall asleep so that *infelix amor* can *requiescere*. This will be the direct consequence of—if not the equivalent of—line 2, Tibullus' own falling asleep. This kind of expression is traditional. Compare *ἐμοὶ δ' ἔρος / οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὥραν* (Ibycus Fr. 6 D. lines 6–7).

So in Propertius the nocturnal assaults of Venus and Amor amount to sleeplessness on Propertius' part. Sleeplessness as well as being a love-symptom is also one of madness. Among the results of madness Celsus includes: 'omnibus uero sic adfectis somnus et difficilis et praecipue necessarius' (3. 18. 12). At an earlier point he treats insomnia as a diagnostic symptom of madness: 'uel nullo dolore substate somnus ereptus continuataque nocte et die uigilia' (2. 7. 25). In this way the whole poem is unified by the recurrent love/madness metaphor.

#### IV. GENRE AND UNITY

It is well known that lines 31–8 are erotodidaxis of a kind common in ancient poetry and that they constitute a programmatic claim by Propertius to be a *magister amoris*.<sup>3</sup> No difficulty need be felt about *Cynthia prima* (line 1) in this connection. Although Cynthia was the first woman to attract Propertius and although she has not yet yielded to him, Propertius nevertheless has the right to claim to be a *magister amoris*. In Tibullus 1. 4 the poet is an unsuccessful lover; but he functions as a *magister amoris* in transmitting the god Priapus' *praecepta* to other lovers.<sup>4</sup>

In Propertius 1. 1 the source of the poet's *praecepta* is experience. The erotic teaching is derived from the poet's own sufferings. In this way the situation is analogous to that found in yet another Tibullan erotodidactic elegy: 'ipsa Venus magico religatum brachchia nodo / perdociuit multis non sine verberibus'

<sup>1</sup> Cp. O'Brien-Moore, op. cit. 63 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Propertiana*, 8.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Boucher, op. cit. 350.

<sup>4</sup> It may also be relevant that in general—although not here—erotic teaching can

address itself to unsuccessful lovers who are to learn from the teacher's lack of success. e.g. 'me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator / et prosint illi cognita nostra mala' (Prop. 1. 7. 13 f.).

(Tibullus 1. 8. 5-6). But in 1. 1 Propertius does not convey to us in statement form that the gods of love have taught him by harsh experience. Rather he narrates at length his harsh experience and then displays his own reactions to it. When the erotic precepts finally come at the end of the elegy their validity has already been guaranteed by the previously related sufferings of the poet. This view of the relationship between lines 1-30 and lines 31-8 of Propertius 1. 1 further stresses the conceptual unity of the elegy: it is not only the final lines but the whole poem which is erotodidaxis. The generic identity of the elegy is withheld from the reader up to line 31. There the revelation, when it comes, causes him to revise and enlarge his view of lines 1-30. This type of generic device is paralleled.<sup>1</sup>

We can further appreciate the unity of Propertius 1. 1 by setting down its main divisions in such a way that its conceptual symmetry can be observed:

- A<sub>1</sub> (lines 1-18) The hopeless love of Propertius contrasted (lines 9-16) with the happier love of Milanion.
- B (lines 19-30) Appeals (in the divine-human order) first for the supernatural help of witches (lines 19-24) and then for the natural assistance of friends (lines 25-30).
- A<sub>2</sub> (lines 31-8) Propertius, the hopeless lover, gives advice to more successful lovers.

The final section thus repeats that combination of themes—unhappy and happy love—found in the initial section.

Lastly the order of the themes of Propertius 1. 1 and the conceptual connections between them are not only natural but have probably been influenced by a traditional pattern of thought. The evidence for this suggestion is the appearance of similar themes in almost the same order in a Greek analogue of Propertius 1. 1. This is a ninth-century-A.D. anacreontic poem of Constantine the Sicilian.<sup>2</sup> It is a long work of which only the last section concerns us in detail. Its first 60 lines relate how the speaker saw the love-god and attempted to catch him. Then the speaker says of the love-god:

μανίης πέφυκε δῆγμα (line 61)

Thirteen lines later, following a final statement of the speaker's failure to catch the love-god (71-4), the god strikes at the speaker by shooting him with his arrow:

πύματον βέλος <δὲ> πέμψας  
βάλεν ἡπάτων τά κοῖλα. (lines 75-6)

So far, in the equation of love with madness and in the account of the speaker's falling in love, the Greek text corresponds thematically with Propertius 1. 1. 1-18.

<sup>1</sup> See my *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, 194 ff., 202 ff., 210.

<sup>2</sup> Published in Cramer, *Anecd. Paris.* iv. 380 ff.; Matranga, *Anecd. Gr.* ii. 693 ff.; Bergk, *Lyr. Gr. Fr.* iii. 351 ff. Some brief

later remarks on this poem may be found in T. Nissen, 'Die byzantinischen Anacreonten', *Sitzungsberichte der Beyer. Akad. der Wiss.*, Ph.-hist. Abt. 3. 1940, 66 f., and R. Anastasi, *Siculorum Gymnasium*, xvi (1963), 193.

The next Greek lines read :

συνομηλίκων χορεία,  
 συναρρήξατε προθύμως,  
 κατακαίομαι, κλονοῦμαι,  
 ἀφανῶς τε πυρπολοῦμαι.  
 ἀνθοκόμους λιβάδας πεζοπονήσας  
 παῖδα πανοῦργον ἐλεῖν οὐκ ἡδυνήθην.  
 δότε μοι λόγον, τί ῥέξω,  
 τί πάθω, τί δ' αὖ προσοίσω,  
 τί δὲ φάρμακον πόθ' εὔρω,  
 κραδίην ἐμήν δροσίζον.  
 φάρμακον ἐξ Ἑλένης εἴ τις ἐφεύροι  
 ἡμετέραις φιάλαις ἐγκαταμίξαι. (lines 77–88)

Here we have first an appeal to the speaker's contemporaries for help and advice. Then the speaker wishes for a *φάρμακον*. This word in itself can refer equally to magic or to orthodox medicine. But the phrase ἐξ Ἑλένης which qualifies *φάρμακον* favours a religious/magical interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Thus in these lines we have appeals resembling those of Propertius to the witches and to his friends (1. 1. 19–30). The appeals in the Greek text are in reverse order but the logic of the situation is the same: the lover's pain and misery cause him to seek help from the most likely sources, the more impressive source in each case being placed first.

Immediately following these lines the Greek text proceeds :

ἄκος εἰς ἔρωτ' ἀκούω  
 ἀποδημίαν γενέσθαι. (lines 89–90)

The notion of foreign travel as a cure for love found here corresponds to the same notion in the next two lines of Propertius 1. 1—29–30. Then the Greek text continues :

σὺ μένειν θέλων δὲ μᾶλλον,  
 ἕτερον τρόπον μετέρχου·  
 αὐπνους ἵαυε νύκτας  
 μετ' Ἀχιλλέως, ἑταῖρε,<sup>2</sup>  
 σὺν ἀηδόσι λιγείαις  
 μελιθεά προσάδων. (lines 91–6)

The concept of the lover's foreign travel is followed, first by the idea of telling someone else to stay behind (91–2) and second by the notion of sleeplessness (94–6). Just so Propertius 1. 1. 31–2 tells happy lovers to stay behind while 33–4 deal with sleeplessness (see above). The details and the treatment of the concepts differ in each case. In the Greek text the poet addresses a *ἑταῖρος* who is to stay behind and continue to pursue the love-god (i.e. unsuccessfully); successful lovers are to stay behind in Propertius. In Propertius sleeplessness is the lot of the unhappy lover–poet. In the Greek the speaker is by implication himself

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Hom. *Od.* 4. 220 ff. Professor A. J. Beattie points out to me that Constantine's poem seems to refer to worship of Helen as a love-goddess. Cp. 11. 67 ff. (on the plaiting of wreaths to be hung on plane-trees) with

Theocr. *Id.* 18. 43 f. This is a further hint at the learned Hellenistic source from which this lyric may ultimately derive.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Hom. *Il.* 9. 325.



sleepless but he also wishes sleeplessness on his friend, another unhappy lover. Then the Greek text continues on a different tack from Propertius:

ἐδάην πόθου τὸ φίλτρον,  
ὁδὸν δ' οὐδαμῶς ἐπέγνων.  
δότε μοι συνοιμοδίτην  
τὸν Ἔρωτα συλλαλοῦντα. (lines 97-100)

Here the situation is resolved in what appears to be a reconciliation between the lover and love-god, who are now companions on the journey. Constantine the Sicilian's poem ends with a repetition of the sort of warning found several times at earlier points in it:

τῆς Παφίης τὸ βρέφος φεύγετε κούροι,  
λαμπάδα καιομένην χερσὶ κομίζει. (lines 101-2)

This is reminiscent of Propertius 1. 1. 35-6 with its similar warnings to others to avoid the lover's fate.

There are, as has been noted, marked differences between the treatment of some of the themes in the two texts. But at the same time it is impossible to dismiss the thematic correspondences between them as coincidence. Nor can we believe that a Greek poem of the ninth century A.D. was influenced by Propertius. Rather it is a late representative of a learned tradition of erotic poetry which probably began in the Hellenistic period and which also influenced Propertius. This view may derive some slight confirmation from part of the Byzantine poem's superscription in the index to Cod. Barberiniani 310: ἔλαβε δὲ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκ μελωδίας τινὸς ἀδομένης ἐν γάμῳ. Whether or not an actual epithalamium is meant here this remark does hint at a possible avenue of transmission from antiquity to Constantine's period.

The sudden transitions both in Propertius and in the Greek text are expressions of emotional reactions to difficult human predicaments, and ancient readers would have been conditioned by the literary tradition to understand them in this way. Thus falling in love causes desperation in the lover; this makes the lover appeal for and suggest remedies, each of which in turn except the last is abruptly abandoned as unsatisfactory. The last remedy—foreign travel—turns the lover's thoughts to those who remain behind. The last two lines of Propertius 1. 1, in which he warns his hearers of the consequences of neglecting his advice, are not paralleled in the Greek text. But it seems to be a conventional way of ending *praecepta amoris*. Cp. 'tu caue nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu: / saepe uenit magno faenore tardus Amor' (Propertius 1. 7. 25-6).<sup>1</sup> Propertius 1. 1 is therefore an attempt to simulate the discourse of a lover-madman, out of his wits with hopeless passion, turning here and there for assistance he knows will be ineffectual and warning others in pathetic earnestness when he cannot help himself. Propertius has rendered the disordered behaviour of such an individual with admirable persuasiveness. But we must not be so persuaded as to think that Propertius has written anything other than a unified and well-ordered prologue to his Monobiblos, carefully designed to impress on his reader the elegiac *persona* which unfolds throughout the book.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. also e.g. Tib. 1. 8. 77-8.