

## IX. Intensification of Meaning in Propertius and Others

MARK W. EDWARDS

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Ten years after publishing his *Homage to Sextus Propertius* Ezra Pound wrote:

There are three "kinds of poetry"; MELOPŌEIA, wherein the words are charged, over and above their plain meaning, with some musical property, which directs the bearing or trend of that meaning. PHANOPŌEIA, which is a casting of images upon the visual imagination. LOGOPŌEIA, "the dance of the intellect among words," that is to say, it employs words not only for their direct meaning, but it takes count in a special way of habits of usage, of the context we *expect* to find with the word, its usual concomitants, of its known acceptances, and of ironical play. It holds the aesthetic content which is peculiarly the domain of verbal manifestation, and cannot possibly be contained in plastic or music . . . Unless I am right in discovering *logopŏia* in Propertius (which means unless the academic teaching of Latin displays crass insensitivity, as it probably does), we must almost say that Laforgue invented *logopŏia*. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Actually more work had been done than Pound was aware of in the academic world, both on the poetic technique of Propertius and on the phenomena which Pound groups under the quite unacceptable term *logopŏia*. If he had consulted the introduction of Postgate's edition he would have found many of the qualities he admires in Propertius identified and described as "these contrasts, these extravagancies, these fluctuations and incoherencies, these half-formed or misshapen thoughts . . . this chaos,"<sup>2</sup> and Postgate himself was standing on the shoulders of Hertzberg's brilliant edition of 1843-45. Since Pound wrote scholars have

<sup>1</sup> In his essay "How to Read"; most accessible in *Polite Essays* (Norfolk [Conn.] 1939; these passages pages 171 and 181) or *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound* (London 1954; these passages pages 25 and 33).

<sup>2</sup> J. P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius*<sup>2</sup> (London 1884) page lxxii. Actually Pound used the 1898 reprint of L. Müller's Teubner text of 1870; see *Letters of Ezra Pound*, ed. D. D. Paige (New York 1950) 149, and Pound's renderings of his text at 2.10.2, 3.2.2., 3.3.7, 3.3.32. The suggestion that he used Paley's text is untenable.

done further detailed analysis of usages and connotations of Latin words, and of word-play and ambiguities.<sup>3</sup>

Here I shall collect and try to consolidate what I think is the main work done on some of these phenomena, particularly in cases where a poet seems to be attempting to increase the significance of words by making use of alternative or subordinate meanings, or by positioning words so as to augment their effect by juxtaposition or unusual stress. I add the examples from Propertius which seem to me acceptable.<sup>3a</sup> In many cases it must be a matter of individual judgment whether in fact anything more than the obvious sense is intended or desirable; and very often it is difficult to determine how much the great scholarly commentators have perceived of such techniques, unless a note makes it clear that the poet's efforts have not been appreciated.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps this treatment may

<sup>3</sup> The following, together with D. R. **Shackleton Bailey**, *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1956) and H. E. **Butler** and E. A. **Barber**, *Propertius* (Oxford 1933), are subsequently referred to by author's name only. A bibliography of studies of word-usage is given by H. **Tränkle**, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz* (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 15, Wiesbaden 1960) 184-85. On ambiguity and word-play see in particular A. J. **Bell**, *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* (London 1923) 264-329 etc., and the review of this confused but sometimes perceptive work by A. **Klotz** in *PhW* 46 (1926) 167-82; W. B. **Stanford**, *Ambiguity in Greek Literature* (Oxford 1939); E. **Wölfflin**, "Das Wortspiel im Lateinischen," *Sitzungsber. d. bayer. Akad. Wissenschaften* 2 (1887) 187-208; J. P. **Postgate** (above, note 2) page lvii f. *passim*; D. N. **Levin**, "Ambiguities of Expression in Catullus 66 and 67," *CPh* 54 (1959) 109-110; F. W. **Locke**, "Propertius' Elegia I, iii, 1-10," *The Explicator* 18, No. 5 (Feb. 1960); K. **Quinn**, "Syntactical Ambiguity in Horace and Virgil," *Journ. Australasian Univ. Lang. Lit. Assn.* 14 (Nov. 1960) 36-46; L. Richardson, *Yale Poetry Review* 6 (1947) 21-29, esp. 28 f. On plays on proper names see E. S. McCartney in *CJ* 14 (1919) 343-58, R. D. Williams, *Virgil Aeneid v* (Oxford 1960) 34, and (for Propertius) Shackleton Bailey on 4.1.103 and 4.9.38 (1.1.11 and 3.3.38 can be added).

<sup>3a</sup> An *index locorum* is given at the end of the article.

<sup>4</sup> Few scholars have known the Latin language as Housman did or have won a reputation like his as a poet, but there is no evidence in his lecture *The Name and Nature of Poetry* (Cambridge 1933) of much interest in the way poetry produces its effects; the lecture (*not* Housman's poetry) was attacked by Pound with unusual bitterness. An excellent example of the way Pound's own mind worked is quoted in his own words by H. G. Porteous in *An Examination of Ezra Pound*, ed. P. Russell (Norfolk [Conn.] 1950) 211-12; from the first section of his *Homage* one might illustrate by the puns in "Martian generalities," the paronomasia in "distentions of Empire," his transference of religious association in "from the clear font" (*puro de fonte sacerdos*) and the difference in elevation (cf. Tränkle 172-83) between "But for something to read in normal circumstances?" and "Achilles withstaying waters." Though critics now consider the *Homage* amongst the best of Pound's early work, the misunderstanding and mockery it induced in the Latinist William Gardiner Hale (*Poetry* 14 [1919] 52-55) infected even the editor who first published it (Harriet Monroe in *The English Journal* 20 [1931] 86-87; Pound's illuminating riposte, *ib.* 340-41).

help to focus more clearly some of the points which should always be borne in mind in reading Latin poetry.

Some system of division and terminology is necessary, though of course the usages continually overlap and fuse into one another. The ancient classifications of rhetorical figures are not very suitable<sup>5</sup> because the grammarians were interested in decorations of language and in the exactitudes of legal expression, not in intensifications of meaning, and were by nature opposed to allowing vagueness and imprecision. Here I divide the material into (i) effects of use of more than one meaning of a word or phrase (with several sub-divisions), (ii) effects of juxtaposition of words, and (iii) effects of exceptional stress on single words.

# I. EFFECTS OF USE OF MORE THAN ONE MEANING OF A WORD OR PHRASE

## A. *Syntactical Ambiguity*

The term is Quinn's and is equivalent to Stanford's "phrasal ambiguity." Ancient grammarians quote many standard examples, mostly from legal contexts, under the description *ambibolia* or *ambiguitas*, and Servius comments on many instances in Vergil, most of them of the rather uninteresting subjective/objective genitive type.<sup>6</sup> Quinn's excellent article points out the effects of this kind of expression in some passages of Vergil and Horace, using the divisions construction-ambiguity, case-ambiguity, and ablative-ambiguity; instead of using these grammatical distinctions I think it will be more valuable, for demonstration of the effect produced, to use the following, though they are much more subjective.

1. Ambiguities where a word or phrase, which may be connected syntactically with two (or more) others, should be considered to attach itself to both at once, and no attempt should be made to decide which construction is to be preferred. The meaning of the word or phrase itself is changed little or not at all, and

<sup>5</sup> As Stanford found; he was sternly criticized on these grounds by Farrington, *Hermathena* 54 (1939), 170-74.

<sup>6</sup> Conveniently listed by J. L. Moore in *AJP* 12 (1891) 289. Many are elaborated by Bell, 293-303.

the effect is that it should be understood—and if necessary translated—twice over. In this category one may place Catullus 66.29, *sed tum maesta virum mittens quae verba locuta es* (quoted by Levin); Horace, *Odes* 2.11.11–12, *quid aeternis minorem / consiliis animum fatigas*; Vergil, *Aen.* 4.298, *omnia tuta timens* (both quoted by Quinn, together with others); and some which Servius identifies in Vergil, such as *Aen.* 9.709, *clipeum super intonat ingens*; 10.147, *media Aeneas freta nocte secabat*.

Propertius 2.34.54, *nec si consulto fulmina missa tonent*, was listed by Postgate (page lxiv) among his examples of “two-headed construction,” and it may be matched by 1.22.4, *Italiae duris funera temporibus* (so Postgate, note *ad loc.*); 4.7.43, *nostraque quod Petale tulit ad monumenta coronas*; 3.10.12, *surge et poscentes iusta precare deos* (but see Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*); 1.19.18, *cara tamen lacrimis ossa futura meis* (where the adjective seems to look back to *Cynthia*).

Other cases where the word-order does not decide the issue may be noted, though I would not claim any great poetic merit for the ambiguity: 2.28.22, *haec eadem Persei nobilis uxor erat*; 3.19.4, *nescitis (fem.) captae mentis habere modum*; 4.5.13, *audax cantatae leges imponere lunae* (cf. Ovid, *Met.* 14.369); 3.20.7, *sunt castae Palladis artes*. More complex are 3.4.7–8 (on which see Butler-Barber) and perhaps 3.18.30 (see Harrington<sup>7</sup> *ad loc.*).

I have not admitted (though Quinn does) cases like 3.7.45, *viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penates*; 2.13.10, *nec si qua illustris femina iactat avos*, because the natural quantity of the *i* in the adjective ending would have prevented any ambiguity for the hearer and may quite possibly have been indicated by the poet for the reader.<sup>8</sup>

2. Ambiguities where a word or phrase may be connected syntactically with two (or more) others *alternatively*, so altering the significance of the sentence (whether or not its own meaning changes); neither significance should be emphasized to the obscuring or excluding of the other. The effect is that of a sudden stroke of emphasis, and often of irony or pathos. Two phrases in

<sup>7</sup> K. P. Harrington, *Roman Elegiac Poets* (New York 1914).

<sup>8</sup> See the Excursus at the end of this article. On the difference between the pronunciation of a vowel long “by nature” and one long “by position” see Kühner-Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Gramm.*<sup>2</sup> (Hanover 1912) 1.226–27, C. E. Bennett, *Latin Language* (New York 1907) 36–40.

Horace to which Quinn draws attention (page 38) may be included here: *Odes* 1.3.5–6, *finibus Atticis reddas*, and 1.1.6, *terrarum dominos*.

There are not many instances in Propertius. Postgate counts in his “two-headed construction” 1.11.5, *nostri cura subit memores a ducere noctes*, where the change in construction is combined with that in the meaning of *cura* (an instance of homonymy; “love for me”/“worry that I spend . . .”). In 3.3.3–4, *reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum / tantum operis nervis hiscere posse meis*, Butler’s translation<sup>9</sup> gives “. . . to sing of . . . the deeds of thy kings, a mighty task”; but the word-order inclines one to attach *tantum operis* also to the preceding phrase, producing a sardonic note which delighted Pound (“. . . the realm your folk have constructed with such industry / Shall be yawned out on my lyre—with such industry”) and is not unsuited to Propertius.<sup>10</sup> *Solum* in 1.7.11, *me laudent doctae solum placuisse puellae*, attaches itself first to *laudent*, which suits the previous line, but the stress on fidelity in the next line suggests it should perhaps also be taken with *me*.

3. Transient ambiguity; instances where a word or phrase at first appears to be syntactically connected in a certain way but is subsequently seen to be actually constructed differently. Locke, referring to the phenomenon as “counterpoint,” points out that, in Propertius 1.3.9, *ebria* would at first seem to be applying to Cynthia and is only later correctly attributed to *vestigia*; as he says, “the ambiguity of syntax has produced an image which should be retained along with the correct grammatical meaning.”<sup>11</sup> The same might be said of Catullus 66.30, *Iuppiter, ut tristi lumina saepe manu* (quoted by Levin), and of two instances I have noticed in Vergil, *Aen.* 4.19, *huic uni* forsan potui succumbere cul-pae (where I think the initial words would, in context, first be taken as masculine), and 8.534, *hoc signum cecinit* missuram diva creatrix (which turns out to have nothing to do with *signum canere*<sup>12</sup>).

<sup>9</sup> H. E. Butler, *Propertius* (Loeb Classical Library, London 1924).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. 2.34.59 f., 3.4, 3.5, 4.1.71 f.,

<sup>11</sup> I do not admit his identification of the same effect in lines 1–2 of the same poem, *carinā/languidā*, as any reader would immediately take *carina* as ablative with the preceding *cedente*, and *languidā* obviously cannot attach itself to these; still less could the question arise for the hearer.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Phoenix* 14 (1960) 164.

To Locke's example from Propertius can be added 1.1.3-4, where it appears that the subject of *deicit* and *pressit* is Cynthia (line 1) until *Amor* is reached, and attention is sharply switched from Cynthia's scorn to the irresistible force of the poet's love; the effect is almost repeated in the next line, as far as *improbis*. In 1.19.7-8 the sentence begins *illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros . . .*, and not until *immemor* in the following line are the genitives correctly assigned; and then Protesilaus' predominant characteristic still remains, to the sympathetic reader, his ultra-faithful wife.<sup>13</sup> Less effective instances are 3.13.2, where one first understands *puellae* with *Venere exhaustae*, and 2.22.5-6, where *candida* is taken as "pretty girl" until its sense is narrowed and attached to *bracchia*.<sup>14</sup>

### B. Lexical Ambiguity

This is Stanford's term for a pun-ambiguity, the use of more than one meaning of a single word. The nearest classical equivalent would be *homonymia*, which Stanford uses in his analysis, but it occurs little except in accounts of legal ambiguities; Wölfflin, in his description of some examples (page 205), said, "Hier lässt die alte Theorie eine Lücke." This group does not, of course, include the various figures which the ancients collected under the general heading *paronomasia* (*annominatio*), for these are characteristically dependent upon a *repetition* of the same word (*diaphora*, *antanaclasis*, *tractio*) or on contrast of two words differing slightly in spelling, vowel-quantity, or grammatical form (for which there are various special terms), and hence in these cases there is no ambiguity in the total meaning of the passage.<sup>15</sup> Such

<sup>13</sup> This was pointed out to me some years ago by Mr. Craig A. Manning.

<sup>14</sup> There is nothing unfair in Pound's rendering "Night dogs" for the first impression of 3.3.48, *nocturnaeque canes . . .* on Roman as well as schoolboy; cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.470, *obscaenaeque canes . . .*

<sup>15</sup> For examples see the ancient authorities: Quint. 7.9.1 f. and 9.3.66 f., Cic. *De or.* 2.63.256, and indexes to *Auct. ad Her.* (ed. H. Caplan, Loeb Classical Library, London 1954), Spengel, *Rhett. Graeci*, and Halm, *Rhett. Lat. Min.*; and also R. Volkmann, *Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer* (Munich 1901) 40-49 (G. Dzialis, *Rhett. ant. de figuris doctrina* [Diss. Breslau 1869] I have not seen). Some instances of *paronomasia* in Vergil are given by R. G. Austin, *Aen.* iv (Oxford 1955) 84 (one might add the instances of *figura etymologica* involving quantity-change, such as *Aen.* 8.14 *late Latio* and the many cases of *voce vocat* and the like) and those in Propertius by Shackleton Bailey, note to 1.2.9, and M. Schuster and F. Dornseiff, *Propertius* (Teubner, Leipzig 1958) 186. Housman lists examples of *antanaclasis* in his note to Manilius 2.130 (quoted by

figures add to the decorative effect but not often to much intensification of meaning; in Robert Frost's patriotic poem *The Gift Outright* the *antanaclasis* in "(The deed of gift was many deeds of war)" seems to me to have less emotional effect than the violent lexical ambiguities of Thomas Hood's *Faithless Nelly Gray* ("The love that loves a scarlet coat / Should be more uniform" etc.) which, though almost certainly intended humorously, can be oddly moving when read aloud. Here again three sub-divisions will be used, corresponding roughly to those of syntactical ambiguity.

1. Cases where two or more slightly different senses of a word co-exist and reinforce each other without creating any special doubt or double meaning;<sup>16</sup> the effect is an amplified significance. Because of the difficulty of determining whether there are in fact two different meanings involved, this is probably the most perilous of all types of usage to identify in a foreign language.<sup>17</sup> Two examples from Vergil are *Aen.* 4.338-39, *nec coniugis unquam / praetendi taedas*, where Austin's note<sup>18</sup> is "he never 'held out' the torch of marriage . . . nor 'cloaked his purpose' by pretence of it"; and, I think, 6.847, *excudent alii spirantia mollius aera*, where the adverb seems to take on one significance in contrast to *excudent* and *aera*, another in association with the life implied in *spirantia*, and possibly even a third to express the delicacy of the operation.

In his note on Propertius 3.7.32, *fortunae miseras auximus arte*

Shackleton Bailey in his note to another example, 4.8.16). Pound liked it too; e.g. "delectations" for *lectule deliciis facte beate meis*: "I have rehearsed the Curian brothers," meaning (I think; a mock-heroic passage) "I have buried them all over again"; and see L. Richardson (above, note 3) 28.

<sup>16</sup> I do not include the use of words in a metaphorical or symbolical sense in addition to the concrete, and am rather doubtful about Quinn's use of the term "pun-ambiguities" for Hor. *Odes* 3.30.1, *monumentum* and 2.3.27, *sors*. It has been pointed out to me that the term "homonymy" should properly be restricted to cases like *multa*, "fine," and *multa*, "many things", and I have refrained from using it in this section; the usage I am discussing here is basically that described by W. Empson in the third chapter of his *Seven Types of Ambiguity*.

<sup>17</sup> For instance, in 3.25.17, *has tibi fatalis cecinit mea pagina diras*, the verb means both "sang of" and "foretold" in English, but the meanings might not be distinct to a Roman. I would reject Postgate's discovery of double sense in 2.27.5, *sequimur* (note *ad loc.* "pursue" and "make for"), and doubtless others will reject some that I have accepted.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 15) *ad loc.*

*vias*, Shackleton Bailey writes "primarily metaphorical, but with a glance at the literal meaning *aquae vias*"; he refers to Postgate's list (page lxxi) of examples of "non-differentiation of ideas" (most of which I have mentioned elsewhere) and adds the following, which I would place here: 3.7.72, *condar*; <sup>19</sup> 2.26.57, *ponenda*; <sup>20</sup> 3.20.25, *ruperit*. Similar cases occur in the following: 1.2.26, *uni si qua placet, culta puella sat est*, where to the prime meaning "adorned" (cf. the general context) should be added "cherished" (required by the immediate context) and also "cultured," as this last significance suggests the thought of the next couplet; and thus in the single word are united the themes of Cynthia's excessive love of adornment, her disquieting desire to attract other men, and the value of her intellectual charms; 1.2.4, *teque peregrinis vendere muneribus*, where Butler-Barber suggest the two meanings "sell yourself for gifts" and "enhance your value with gifts" and perhaps (since the idea of rivalry is not introduced until the simile in line 15 f.) "sell yourself to these foreign tributes" could be added, anticipating lines 5-6; 4.11.42, *labe mea vestros erubuisse focos*, cf. Postgate (page lxxvi) "the fire's red light appears to the poet as the blush of shame"; 3.3.24, *medio maxima turba mari est*, where the commentators accept the meaning "turmoil," but in context the more usual significance "crowd," i.e. of competitors, should be allowed, <sup>21</sup> as it is by Pound ("mid-crowd is as bad as mid-sea"); 3.23.7, *caras* has to mean both "costly" and "treasured" to suit the context (so Postgate *ad loc.*).

Twice at least *cura* has distinguishable senses as "trouble" and "love"; 1.11.5, *nostri cura subit memores a ducere noctes*, and 1.8.1, *nec te mea cura moratur*, where the meanings "my grief," "my love for you" and perhaps "your love for me" (cf. 1.15.31, *tua . . . cura* "my love for you") all seem to be picked up in the next line.

From Postgate's list of "words used in an archaic or etymological sense" (page xc) can be included 1.3.32, *sedula*; 1.8.12, *elevet*; 1.15.6, *desidia*; 1.12.4, *dissidet*; 3.9.28, *insinuentur*; Shackleton

<sup>19</sup> W. R. Smyth, *Hermathena* 87 (1956) 76, suggests that *condar* here also continues the nautical metaphor of the hexameter.

<sup>20</sup> I suspect that "lay down my life upon your body" has two (discordant) senses only in English; see note 17 above.

<sup>21</sup> I am not sure if Shackleton Bailey intends to accept this meaning in his last sentence *ad loc.*



Bailey (*ad* 4.1.4) approves the last of these and adds 1.10.23, *ingrata*.<sup>22</sup>

2. Cases where two (or more) different senses of a word are used *alternatively*, resulting in a word-play or pun; this is distinguished from the previous type by the fact that here the two different ideas introduced by the word do not reinforce each other but act independently, and the effect is usually one of irony or pathos. Quinn mentions several examples, the clearest being Horace, *Odes* 1.1.3, *Olympicum*, and 1.4.8, *Vulcanus ardens*; in Vergil, Palmer<sup>23</sup> drew attention to *Aen.* 2.574, *aris invisā sedebat* (a brilliant example), and Austin's note<sup>24</sup> suggests this type of ambiguity in 4.41, *Numidae infreni*.

Simple examples from Propertius are 3.1.6, quove *pēde* ingressi, and 3.3.4, *nervis* for "lyre-strings" or "muscles" (cf. the preceding phrase *tantum operis*, above, section A 2). There may be added 4.5.54 with its play on *verba dare* (cf. 2.24.8, and Postgate page lxxii), the double sense of the pronoun in 2.28.62, *votivas noctes et mihi solve decem* ("to me" or "for me" in English), and perhaps also 2.10.1, *sed tempus lustrare aliis Heliconā choreis*, where Pound's "Now if ever it is time to cleanse Helicon" may not be unwarranted.<sup>25</sup> 2.23.23–24 is a vexed passage, but I think Smyth is correct in finding there "a pun on the natural and legal senses of *liber*."<sup>26</sup>

Cases occur where one of the senses is that found in the specialized usage of the *sermo amatorius*; 1.9.15, *quid si non esset facilis tibi copia*, where the first meaning *copia* (*oratoria*) is accompanied by the more usual (in Propertius) *copia* (*puellae*) "access" (so Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*, and cf. 2.33.44); 2.29.7, *sed nudi fuerant*, where the first meaning suggested by the context is "unarmed,"<sup>27</sup> which changes over to "naked" when realization comes that the figures are Erotes. Several times *pereo* seems to retain its

<sup>22</sup> In 4.11.74, *inusta* there may be two senses, "branded on" and "unburned," but use of an identical expression in Cic. *Verr.* 1.44.113 (quoted by Butler-Barber) diminishes the likelihood of intentional poetic effect.

<sup>23</sup> L. R. Palmer, "Aris Invisa Sedebat", *Mnemosyne* 6, ser. 3 (1938), esp. page 375, note 2.

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 15) *ad loc.*

<sup>25</sup> On the religious significance of *lustrare* see Austin, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) page 27.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 19) 74.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Shackleton Bailey on 4.1.28. I think the contrast *vincula*—*nudi* explains the *sed* here, which has caused some difficulty.

usual sense of "perish" in addition to the common one "be in love" (e.g. 2.15.13, 2.24.41); 1.6.12, 1.6.27 (cf. next line), 2.21.5, *tot noctes periere* ("so many nights spent in lovemaking" or "wasted"); 2.16.16, *indigna merce puella perit* ("loves" or "is ruined"). Possibly the erotic sense of *iter* and *via* is strong enough to warrant including a few apparently punning instances here: for example, 3.10.32 and 2.33.8.<sup>28</sup>

3. Cases where the straightforward effect of a word is enhanced by consciousness of another meaning or a common association; this is true "logopœia"—use "of habits of usage, of the context we *expect* to find with the word, its usual concomitants, of its known acceptances"—and I think some fairly certain instances can be found in Propertius, though I am not sure that they justify Pound's lavish praise of him.

Locke has pointed out that in 1.3.3 the usual erotic connotations of *accumbere* are not irrelevant or inappropriate, and I think the example belongs in this category. Even clearer perhaps are 2.30.29, *ut Semela est combustus*, the verb being unique in this sense in classical Latin (cf. *ThLL*) and chosen here for its irreverent aptness for Semele's own fate (Pound, "combusted Semeles"); 4.8.8, [serpens] *ex imo sibila torquet humo*, on which Tränkle comments (page 96), "Die Gleichzeitigkeit des mehrseitigen Geschehens kommt damit in ungeahnter Weise zum Ausdruck." Even more effective is 1.19.11, *semper tua dicar imago*, the usual meaning "shade" given enormous pathetic power by the underlying association with the "image" of the Protesilaus-Laodamia legend, mentioned immediately before.<sup>29</sup>

Lighter in touch are 2.29.3, *turba minuta* (cf. Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*); 2.1.9, *lyrae carmen digitis percussit eburnis* (*eburnus* often of the plectrum, e.g. 3.3.25, Tib. 3.4.39); 2.22.25, *Iuppiter Alcmenae geminas requieverat Arctos*, where the verb is oddly used transitively to mean "stopped them moving"<sup>30</sup> for the sake of its bedroom flavor. In 4.7.61, *numerosa fides* the meaning is obviously "lyre," but *sine fraude maritae* in the next couplet suggests the more usual meaning remained in the poet's mind; similarly in 4.8.45, *per talos Venerem quaerente secundos*, the reference is obviously to dice,

<sup>28</sup> See Shackleton Bailey on 4.8.88, Schuster-Dornseiff, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 198, s.v. "Iter."

<sup>29</sup> I have not seen this pointed out in print; it was first remarked on to me by Mr. Craig A. Manning.

<sup>30</sup> So taken by Shackleton Bailey, *CQ* 43 (1949) 25.

but the next couplet seems to pick up the idea "trying to enjoy the love-making"; and in 1.9.13, *i quaeso et tristis istos compone libellos*, the verb has to mean "put on the shelf," but Shackleton Bailey comments on "the peculiar awkwardness with which *compose* is here made to mean, in effect, 'do not compose'," and it may not be accidental or careless.<sup>31</sup> Possibly 4.7.11 might be added, as here *increpuere* could well include something of the sense of *increpitare*, "accuse."

Again ordinary and erotic connotations are sometimes interwoven; in 2.26.43, *isdem nudi . . . iactabimur oris*, in 2.13.31, *ardor*, and in 3.13.21, *ardent*; and in 1.4.12 and 1.14.14 *perire* seems to mean predominantly "perish" with only a glancing allusion to "love." Underlying improper but not unsuitable allusions may be detected; 3.15.8, *vix memini nobis verba coisse decem*; 2.34.57, *mixtas inter conviva puellas* (cf. 1.13.21, and so *miscere* often); 3.2.2, *gaudeat in solito tacta puella sono*, where Pound's famous "devirginated young ladies" is far from impossible.<sup>32</sup> In 3.11.30 *trita* is used straightforwardly *sensu obsceno*,<sup>33</sup> and perhaps something of that flavor clings in 3.13.10 and 3.20.6; and this and other similar erotic colorings underlie many of Cynthia's last words in 4.7.93-94. *Arma* is very often used by Propertius, like other poets, to mean something like "lists of love," but only once, I think, i.e. in 4.8.88, is there a sly allusion from the equipment of war to that of love.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Harrington, *op. cit.* (above, note 7) *ad loc.*, thinks *tristis* has erotic flavor as well and takes the alternative meaning to be something like "compose songs of unrequited love" (following some earlier editors), but Shackleton Bailey is strongly critical of this.

<sup>32</sup> *Tango* is often used in this sense, e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.28; see W. Goldberger, "Kraftausdrücke im Vulgärlatein", *Glotta* 20 (1931-32) 107.

<sup>33</sup> See Tränkle (above, note 3) 138; Goldberger (above, note 32).

<sup>34</sup> The occasional use of *arma*=*pruriginis arma* (Enk's term) may have been rather over-emphasized, e.g. by A. Spies, *Militat omnis amans* (Tübingen 1930) 69 f., P. J. Enk, *Prop. Monobiblos* (Leiden 1946) 2.37 (on 1.3.16), approved by A. La Penna, *Athenaeum* 27 (1949) 151; the connotation always seems to arise in the context and not in the word itself. In two instances (2.8.29-30 and 4.4.62) Propertius uses the word in contexts where any inherent obscene sense, traditional or colloquial, would fit only too well and cause sniggers from Ausonius; and the poet can hardly have been aware of the possibility of such misinterpretation, which is surely not intended. I have therefore disallowed this sense in other instances where it is not quite impossible and not unsuitable, viz. 3.11.29 and 3.13.9 (in both of which the adjacent use of *terere* (see previous note) makes decision harder), and 3.8.29-30 (reading *grata*). In other cases the sense "lists of love" or "sweet conflict" seems to me sufficient (3.20.20, 2.34.6, 4.1.137, and the *locus conclamatus* 1.3.16). If Horace were the author, I should have suspected 3.6.3; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.116.

## II. EFFECTS OF JUXTAPOSITION OF WORDS

It sometimes appears that a poet has placed a word in juxtaposition to another with which it has no syntactical connection in order that the force of one or both may be thus increased, or in order that one may be influenced by the significance or color of the other. This can be obscured by the not uncommon habit of modern readers, when they have passed the stage of consciously coupling subject and verb, noun and adjective, of storing up the meaning of a word and only bringing it into action when it slips into its syntactical position; and thus much of the flavor can be lost in the best Latin poetry. Locke remarks "... by the very nature of a synthetic language such as Latin and Greek metaphors may arise by the mere juxtaposition of words which are in no way related by syntax. By reading juxtaposed words which are in different cases *as though* they were related syntactically imagistic elements which otherwise escape detection may be seen to emerge." Sometimes the juxtaposed words are also connected by the variation of logical grammar known as *hypallagé*, most often (to use the more precise term) by *enallagé*, the transference of an adjective between two nouns of which one is dependent on the other. Good comments have been made on the effects of this. Postgate wrote (page cii),

An attribute which should properly only qualify a single noun is allowed a wider influence, so that it still qualifies that noun, but qualifies it indirectly while directly qualifying the word on which that noun depends . . . This liberty . . . is restricted by a rule which is already indicated in what I have said . . . *The range of an epithet may be extended, but it must not be confined.*

An excellent article by O. Hey<sup>35</sup> sums up the poetic effect thus:

Sicherlich aber wäre die Figur nicht so weitverbreitet, wenn sie nicht ihren besondern poetischen Wert hätte. Und zwar nach zwei Seiten hin: erstens koppelt sie zwei noch unverbundene Begriffe zu einer engern Einheit zusammen und weckt dadurch ein neues Phantasiebild oder regt zum Suchen eines solchen an: zweitens

<sup>35</sup> O. Hey, "Zur enallage adiectivi", *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* 14 (1904-6) 105-112; this quotation from page 110. See also E. Adelaide Hahn, "A Study of Vergilian Hypallage," *TAPA* 87 (1956) 147-89, esp. 147, note 1a; J. B. Hofmann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*<sup>5</sup> (Munich 1928) 459-60. The *apo koinou* construction proper (Hofmann, *op. cit.* 848-49; F. Fletcher, *Virg. Aen.* vi [Oxford 1948] on lines 122-23; many of Bell's examples of "Ellipsis with *-que*" are of this type) seems to have little emphatic value.

bindet sie durch Rückwirkung auf den Begriff, zu welchem das auffallend gestellte Attribut eigentlich gehören sollte, diesen selbst enge an die neue Einheit, so dass eine Art unlöslichen Gebildes entsteht, ein *apo koinou*.

Here Bell's idea of "the reduction of a fourfold union to three" is more convincing than usual; and his comment (page 317) on *Aen.* 6.268, *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram*, that it is "reduced from *ibant soli sub sola nocte*, and *ibant obscuri sub obscura nocte*, in each of which the more obvious term of the like pairs is omitted as sure to be suggested by the expression of the less obvious term" is not unhappy and may be compared to Fletcher's<sup>36</sup> "The darkness of the night has passed into the hearts of the travellers, and the loneliness of their feelings seems to be part of the night itself." I do not know of any work yet done on the relationship of hypallage to word-order.<sup>37</sup>

There are instances of the importance of this kind of juxtaposition on every page of Vergil. To choose almost at random, *Aen.* 6.127, *patet atri ianua Ditis* should, I think, be roughly translated not "There opens the door of black Dis," nor (by hypallage) "There opens the black door of Dis," but primarily "There opens black the door of Dis," the juxtaposition *atri ianua* being further strengthened by the long *a*'s bearing the ictus. Notice the interwoven order of *Aen.* 4.95, *una dolo divum si femina victa duorum est*, or 6.355–57, and compare with the utter lack of such effect in Marouzeau's example<sup>38</sup> of bad disjunction, *Culex* 146–47, *At volucres patulis residentes dulcia ramis / carmina per varios edunt resonantia cantus*.

In Propertius 1.3.2, *languida desertis Cnosia litoribus*, more is involved than hypallage; Locke makes the important point that

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, note 35) *ad loc.*

<sup>37</sup> P. Moje, *De adjectivorum . . . collocatione* (Diss. Rostock 1920) I have not seen. J. Marouzeau gives bibliographies of studies of word-order in his *L'Ordre des mots dans la phrase latine* 1 (1922) ix–xvi and 4 (1953) 129–46. In particular see L. Havet, "La mise en relief par disjonction," *Mélanges Nicole* (1905) 225–32; J. Marouzeau, "Sur l'ordre des mots," *Rev. de Philol.* 35 (1911) 205–15; H. W. Prescott, "Position of 'Deferred' Nouns and Adjectives . . .," *CPh.* 7 (1912) 35–58. R. S. Conway's articles on interweaving of words (*CR* 14 [1900] 357–60, *Virg. Aen.* 1 [Cambridge 1935] on line 1.13) are concerned only with the *apo koinou* construction. G. Murray, *Classical Tradition* (London 1927) 170 f., has good remarks on Hor. *Odes* 1.9.21–22, and E. Norden, *Verg. Aen. Buch vi*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1927) 391–404 gives a detailed analysis of symmetrical arrangement of words in Vergil without discussing the effects on the sense.

<sup>38</sup> *Rev. de Philol.* 35 (1911) 207.

“what we should notice is the root *desert-* in its relationship to Ariadne (Cnosia): she is actually deserted by Theseus. The desolation of the shores is reinforced by the desolation of Ariadne through the image provided by the non-syntactical elements *desertis* / *Cnosia*”; and one might add that the sandwiching of *desertis* between *languida*, with its heavy erotic overtones,<sup>39</sup> and the suggestion of exile that lies behind the conventional metonymy *Cnosia*, embraces pathetically the loneliness of the shore and the heartless seduction and betrayal of the foreign princess. Almost as effective are 1.15.11, *multos illa dies incomptis maesta capillis / sederat*; 1.15.17–18, *nec sic Aesoniden rapientibus anxia ventis / Hypsipyle vacuo constitit in thalamo*; 2.9.11, *et dominum lavit maerens captiva cruentum*—in all of which almost every word is reacting upon its neighbors. 3.19.17–18 is similar but perhaps unhappily tortuous.

Some of the hypallages listed by editors<sup>40</sup> are effective in much the same way; in 2.23.22, *furta pudica tori*, the adjective does duty, in different senses, with both nouns; and the same can be said for 1.20.10, *vago fluminis hospitio*, and for 3.11.11, *feros clausit serpentis hiatus*. In its context of the taming of wild things Pound's probably inaccurate translation<sup>41</sup> of 3.2.7, *ferâ Galatea sub Aetnâ*, “harsh Galatea . . . under Aetna,” may have hit the mark.

### III. EFFECTS OF EXCEPTIONAL STRESS ON SINGLE WORDS

Often in Latin poetry a word is emphasized by removing it from its normal syntactical position and placing it late in the sentence at the beginning of a line or before a pause.<sup>42</sup> In translation it may often be necessary to resort to periphrasis to retain something of the effect. As Postgate saw, after Hertzberg,<sup>43</sup> Propertius sometimes contrives to throw a similar amount of weight on a

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *languidus* in line 38 of this poem (not by chance); *languidulos . . . somnos*, Cat. 64.331 (“sc. post coetum,” Schuster-Eisenhut *Cat.* [Leipzig 1958] page 126); *languere* and *languescere*, Prop. 2.34.59, 1.13.15.

<sup>40</sup> Hertzberg, *Prop.* (Halle 1843) 1.143, Postgate, *op. cit.* (above, note 3) cii f., Schuster-Dornseiff, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 192, s.v. “Enallage.”

<sup>41</sup> In spite of his admiration for Greek and Latin rhythms there is some doubt whether Pound's scansion was impeccable. Twice over (*Literary Essays* [London 1954] 103 and 151) he misquotes Prop. 2.1.4 as *ingenium nobis ipsa puella fecit*.

<sup>42</sup> Williams, *op. cit.* (above, note 3) 72, quotes some of the many instances in Vergil.

<sup>43</sup> Postgate, *op. cit.* (above, note 3) lxii and cxxi; Hertzberg, *op. cit.* (above, note 40) 142–43.

word even when it is not in an emphatic position, simply because only thus will the sentence make sense; as in 2.34.72, *huic licet ingratae* Tityrus ipse canat. Here I merely add the following to Postgate's list of examples; 2.32.36, *inter pecudes accubuisse deam*; 2.14.6, *falsa tenens flevit ossa soror*; 1.8.38, *non tamen illa meos fugit avara sinus*; 1.2.8, *nudos Amor formae non amat artificem*.

## INDEX LOCORUM

<i>Book 1</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Book 2</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Book 3</i>	<i>Page</i>
1.3-4	133	13.10	131	8.29-30	138, n. 34
2.4	135	13.31	138	9.28	135
2.8	142	14.6	142	10.12	131
2.26	135	16.16	137	10.32	137
3.1-2	132, n.11	21.5	137	11.11	141
3.2	140	22.5-6	133	11.29	138, n. 34
3.3	137	22.25	137	11.30	138
3.9	132	23.22	141	13.2	133
3.16	138, n. 34	23.23-24	136	13.9	138, n. 34
3.32	135	26.43	138	13.10	138
4.12	138	26.57	135	13.21	138
6.12	137	27.5	134, n. 17	15.8	138
6.27	137	28.22	131	18.30	131
7.11	132	28.62	136	19.4	131
8.1	135	29.3	137	19.17-18	141
8.12	135	29.7	136	20.6	138
8.38	142	30.29	137	20.7	131
9.13	138	32.36	142	20.20	138, n. 34
9.15	136	33.8	137	20.25	135
10.23	136	34.6	138, n. 34	23.7	135
11.5	132, 135	34.54	131	25.17	134, n. 17
12.4	135	34.57	138		
14.14	138	34.72	142		
15.6	135			<i>Book 4</i>	
15.11	141	<i>Book 3</i>		1.137	138, n. 34
15.17-18	141	1.6	136	4.62	138, n. 34
19.7-8	133	2.2	138	5.13	131
19.11	137	2.7	141	5.54	136
19.18	131	3.3-4	132	7.11	138
20.10	141	3.4	136	7.43	131
22.4	131	3.24	135	7.61	137
		3.48	133, n. 14	7.93-94	138
<i>Book 2</i>		4.7-8	131	8.8	137
1.9	137	6.3	138, n. 34	8.45	137
8.29-30	138, n. 34	7.32	134	8.88	138
9.11	141	7.45	131	11.42	135
10.1	136	7.72	135	11.74	136, n. 22

EXCURSUS ON THE DISTINGUISHING OF THE ACCUSATIVE  
PLURAL OF I-STEMS IN AUGUSTAN MSS.

Quintilian approved (1.7.2 f.) the practice of marking long syllables with the apex when this was necessary to determine the sense, and Pliny (according to Charisius, Keil, *Gramm. Lat.* 1.129.9) wanted to distinguish the accusative plural of i-stems by the spelling *-eis*; Terentius Scaurus in a corrupt and inconsistent passage (Keil 7.32.21 f. and 18.12 f.; see Wessner, *RE* 9<sup>2</sup> [1934] 674) seems to accept this, and goes on to point out that internal long *i* should be indicated not by the apex, as is the case with other vowels, but by the i-longa. In inscriptions the spelling *-eis* for this accusative plural was used as early as 132 B.C. (Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*<sup>5</sup> [1928] 278, § 194(d); E. Lommatzsch, "Zur lateinischen Orthographie," *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* 14 (1906-8) 129-37; more recent bibliography in E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* [London 1938] 3.114), and the i-longa, which became common in Sulla's time, is found (for example) in the accusative plural *omnIs* on the Monumentum Ancyranum (J. S. and A. E. Gordon, *Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions* [Berkeley 1957] 186-201; J. Christiansen, *De apicibus et i longis* [Husum 1889] 26-40; R. P. Oliver in *AJP* 81 [1960] 195-96). The proportion of long vowels indicated by the apex or i-longa was always fairly low. J. C. Rolfe found 34 per cent so marked on the Mon. Anc. and 26 per cent in Claudius' speech at Lugdunum (*Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 61 [1922] 87 and 93). The Gordons found, on their selected inscriptions, 40 per cent of the long *i*'s written with i-longa in the period Augustus-Nerva and the apex rarely on a majority of the long vowels (*op. cit.* 188 and 148). The grammarians' rejection of the long *i* with apex is on the whole upheld, though exceptions occur (the Gordons, 148; Christiansen, 12-17).

The same principles are followed in the papyrus of the *Carmen de bello Actiaco*, dated between 31 B.C. and 79 A.D. (*PHerc.* 817; E. A. Lowe, *Codd. Lat. Ant.* 3, no. 385; transcriptions printed in W. Scott, *Frr. Herc.* [Oxford 1885] (by Hayter) and N. Ciampitti, *Herc. Vol. . . . Collectio Prior* 2 [Naples 1809]; text in E. Baehrens, *Poetae Lat. Min.* [Leipzig 1879] 1.212 f. and J. Ferrara, *Poem. Lat. Frr. Herc.* [Pavia 1908]). No accusative plurals in *-eis* occur, but some long vowels (not *i*) are marked with an apex (sometimes, but not always, where the quantity is hidden or *anceps*), and a few



long *i*'s are represented by a letter made taller than usual by an extension above the usual leftward hook at the top; this seems to be the i-longa, perhaps formed originally, as Christiansen suggests (page 26), by writing one *i* above another. In two cases this i-longa occurs in the accusative plural of i-stems: line 34, hic igi[tu]r [p]artIs [ani]mu[m] didu[ctu]s in om[n]is (where the restoration *partIs* is virtually certain), and line 38, qualis ad InstantIs aciés cum tela pa[ra]ntur (so Hayter's transcription and Baehrens; Ciampitti's transcription, where the i-longa is apparent in only these two lines, gives *instantIs*; Ferrara prints *Instantis* (with J for i-longa) but I cannot see why). In some other cases where such accusative plurals occur (e.g. lines 65–66, hos inter coetus [t]alisque ad bella paratús / utraque sollemnis iterum revocaverat orbes . . .) the *i* is taller than usual but does not have this double-hooked form; and though some of these are printed as i-longa by Ferrara, it is not really clear whether this is intended as an indication of quantity or not. There is a strong similarity between the form of this letter and the i-longa used in the Augustan papyrus of Cicero, *Verr.* 2.2 (*PIandanae* v, ed. J. Sprey [Leipzig 1931] No. 90), but its occurrence in the *Carmen* is quite erratic; besides its use for (for instance) the first *i* of *mllite* (line 59) and for the consonant-*i*'s of *conIunx* and *subIungere* (lines 31 and 32: for this use of the i-longa see the Gordons, 199–200) there are found a number of instances of short *i*'s written likewise, e.g. both *i*'s in *tImorIs* (gen. sing., line 43). One can only adopt the caution used by the Gordons in dealing with early representations of the i-longa (*op. cit.* 186–87) and by Baehrens, who remarked of the *Carmen* papyrus (*op. cit.* 213), “aliis nonnullis locis num ‘i’ longam voluerit scribere librarius, identidem disquirenti ambiguum est visum.”

But in spite of these difficulties and inconsistencies, at least it clearly emerges that, if an Augustan poet had cared to put beyond doubt the case of (for example) the participle in *iam tandem Italiae fugientis preddimus oras*, he had the means of doing so on his MS., intelligibly and with the approval of the learned; and therefore even instances where a certain decision is not now possible cannot safely be considered ambiguous.