PROPERTIUS 3.2 AND HORACE

JOHN F. MILLER
University of Minnesota

For Friedrich Solmsen

Of the numerous Horatian echoes which scholars have discovered or alleged in Propertius' third book—his "response" to *Odes* 1–3—the fullest and perhaps the surest are those in Propertius 3.2.[1] What may merely be a parallel with Horace or otherwise seem vaguely Horatian in some elegies[2] has in 3.2 a firm philological basis. Some years ago Friedrich Solmsen convincingly demonstrated how in the concluding part of this elegy Propertius recasts Horace's well known "sphragis" ode (3.30), "Exegi monumentum aere perennius."[3] Since then, Dieter Flach has shown in detail that

---

[1] Even a sceptical reviewer of Dieter Flach's *Das literarische Verhältnis von Horaz und Properz*, R. G. M. Nisbet, finds the Horatian echoes claimed for 3.2 among the most plausible (*CR* n.s. 21 [1971] 57–59). Flach's monograph (Giessen 1967) is the most extensive treatment of the entire topic and the earlier scholarship. To his bibliography add N. Terzaghi, "Orazio e Properzio," *RAL* 14 (1959) 179–201 = *Studia Graeca et Latina* (Turin 1963) 1174–96; R. Lucot, "Propertiana," *Pallas* 2 (1954) 98–102 (on Prop. 3.9); L. Hermann, "Horace adversaire de Properce," *REA* 35 (1933) 281–92; and C. Pascal, "Orazio e Properzio," *Athenaeum* 4 (1916) 150–56. See more recently William R. Nethercut, "The Ironic Priest. Propertius' 'Roman Elegies,' III, 1–5: Imitations of Horace and Vergil," *AJP* 91 (1970) 385–407; B. Józefowicz, "Die literarischen Beziehungen zwischen Properz und Horaz," *Eos* 62 (1974) 79–92; J. P. Sullivan, "Horace and Propertius—Another Literary Feud?" *Studii clasice* 18 (1979) 81–92; and the excellent comparisons of Propertius and Horace in Margaret Hubbard's *Propertius* (New York 1975), see the General Index s.v. "Horace, *Odes* I–III and Book III."

[2] For example, the similarities between the Paetus elegy (3.7) and the Archytas ode (1.28), Propertius' hymn to Bacchus (3.17) and Horace's Bacchus poems (2.19 and 3.25), the treatment of Cleopatra in elegy 3.11 and *Odes* 1.37, and the thematic structure of 3.4 and *Odes* 3.14 (here the question of Horatian influence must be reexamined in the light of the new Gallus papyrus; see below, note 7). For a convenient summary of the parallels see Hubbard (above, note 1) 72.

I do not mean to suggest that these elegies are not part of Propertius' response to Horace's *Odes*; but discussions of such apparent versions of Horatian lyrics should proceed from an accurate interpretation of the close verbal echoes of Horace in the programmatic elegies (3.1, 2, and 9). The whole topic is worthy of further study, even after the work of Flach, Hubbard, Nethercut and others. My intention here is simply to offer a modest contribution to that project.

[3] "Propertius and Horace," *CP* 43 (1948) 105–9 = *Kleine Schriften* (Hildesheim 1968) 2.278–82.

the poem's second section (lines 11–16) is definitely modeled on the opening of *Odes* 2.18, "Non ebur neque aureum."[4] The manner, however, in which Propertius here ingeniously refashions and combines these two Horatian passages has not been fully appreciated. By a close examination of both imitations in terms of the entire poem's structure the present paper seeks to shed some new light on this Propertian ingenuity and to clarify how these imitations function as allusions. It will also be suggested that the extent of one of the imitations may be greater than others have noticed.

Our poem is the second in the programmatic group opening the third book (1–5) in which Propertius reexamines the nature of his poetry and explores his poetic status as an elegist. In all these elegies he is particularly concerned with defining himself as a poet in relation to earlier Greek and Latin poets, especially his more immediate Augustan predecessors and contemporaries. The context of literary history is established, as elsewhere in Roman poetry,[5] through a wide range of allusions which either suggest his allegiance to a tradition or else contrast his own poetry with that of a given predecessor. In the first elegy, for example, he imitates Virgil's *triumphus* from *Georgics* 3 to express his own grand, yet peaceful, literary achievement. In 3.3 his poetic initiation acquires a broad context by means of allusions to Callimachus, Ennius, and Virgil's *Eclogues*.[6] In 3.4, as we learn from a recently discovered papyrus, he seems to distance himself from the panegyrical stance of a fellow elegist, Cornelius Gallus.[7] No less important than these echoes of epic, didactic, pastoral, and other elegy are those of Horatian lyric. Indeed, the entire introductory cycle has often been called Propertius' version of Horace's "Roman Odes." Besides the extensive imitation in 3.2, the second couplet of 3.1 has long been seen as an allusion to both the prologue and the epilogue of Book 3 of the

---

[4] Flach, *Das literarische Verhältnis* (above, note 1) 37–38. See most recently the good discussion of both imitations by J. H. Brouwers, "De macht van het lied. Bouw en betekenis van Propertius, El. 3,2," *Lampas* 10 (1977) 135–38.

[5] On this function of imitation and allusion in Republican and Augustan poetry see most recently David O. Ross, Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge 1975) *passim*, and two articles forthcoming in *ICS* 8.2 (1983), "Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion" by James E. G. Zetzel, and "Roman poets as literary historians: Some aspects of *imitatio*" by Gordon Williams.

[6] For a detailed study of the imitations in Propertius 3.1 and 3.3 see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960) 214ff.

[7] This is the interpretation of Michael C. J. Putnam, "Propertius and the New Gallus Fragment," *ZPE* 39 (1980) 53–55. Such distancing exists even if the interpretation of the entire fragment as a *recusatio* is correct (see J. K. Newman, "De novo Galli Fragmento in Nubia eruto," *Latinitas* 28.2 [1980] 83–94, who takes [87–88] the Propertian stance in 3.4 to be essentially the same as that of Gallus; also Guy Lee, "The Gallan Elegiacs," *LCM* 5.2 [Feb. 1980] 45). The Gallan influence on 3.4 was first discussed by Nisbet in the *editio princeps*, R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons and R. G. M. Nisbet, "Elegiacs by Gallus from Quaṣr Îbrim," *JRS* 69 (1979) 152.

Odes.[8] The latter ode is again echoed in the same elegy's declaration of Propertius' immortality.[9] Taken together, these close imitations of various poets rather self-consciously assert the place of Propertian elegy against other poetic models. They also help to announce the ambitious character of Book 3, which widens the scope of his elegy beyond the subjective love elegy that dominates his earlier books.

It is within this imitative scheme of self-definition that 3.2 must be read. The structure of the poem itself, as I shall argue below, demands such an approach. Rightly abandoned now are the old ideas that the Horatian echoes here are "unconscious"[10] or are "plagiarisms"[11] in the sense of not being acknowledged by Propertius as imitations. Let us also set aside speculation on whether this elegy compliments or attacks Horace, or is otherwise expressive of Propertius' personal opinion of his contemporary.[12] The focus of the poem and of the entire cycle is poetics, not autobiography.

Two more recent views of the meaning of the Horatian echoes in 3.2 have gained some measure of acceptance and are closer to the mark. The first is that Propertius, in search of new subjects for his elegy, appropriates lines of Horace and refashions them to express rivalry of his contemporary.[13] Such *aemulatio* or *zêlôsis* seems to be at the heart of much ancient imitation.[14] The second, best discussed by William Nethercut,[15] argues that Propertius here parodies Horace, that these allusions are part of an ironic allusive pattern found throughout Book 3. These two views are not

---

[8] Compare Propertius 3.1.3–4 ("primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos / Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros") with Horace, *Odes* 3.1.2–3 ("carmina non prius / audita Musarum sacerdos") and 3.30.13–14 ("princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos"). Virgil, *Georgics* 2.175–76 and 3.10–11 are also in mind here.

[9] Cf. Propertius 3.1.34 ("posteritate suum crescere sensit opus") and Horace, *Odes* 3.30.7–8 ("usque ego postera / crescam laude recens"); Solmsen (above, note 3) 107–8 (= *Kleine Schriften* 280–81). Elegy 3.5 also seems to recall Horace at several points; see Solmsen 106 (= *Kleine Schriften* 279).

[10] J. P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius* (London 1884, repr. 1950) cxliv.

[11] H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford 1933) xxiv.

[12] See Ross's criticism of "the old legend of the 'quarrel' between Propertius and Horace" (above, note 5; 136, note 1); also W. Wili, "Die literarischen Beziehungen des Properz zu Horaz," *Festschrift für E. Tièche* (Bern 1947) 181: "Eine solche Plagiat-Feindschaft ist nämlich gänzlich un-Augusteisch; man plagiiert nicht in feindlichem Sinn."

[13] E.g., Brouwers (above, note 4) 138; A. La Penna, "Properzio e i poeti latini dell'età aurea," *Maia* 4 (1951) 53–55; Solmsen (above, note 3).

[14] See, for example, Quintilian 10.5.5. and 'Longinus' 13.2–4. On this and other aspects of the ancient theory of imitating other authors see A. Reiff, "Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern," (diss. Cologne 1959) and D. A. Russell, *"De imitatione,"* in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. D. West and T. Woodman (Cambridge 1979) 1–16.

[15] "The Ironic Priest" (above, note 1) 386–88 and 406. See further J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius. A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge 1976) 12ff.

entirely incompatible with one another, and both are, at least in the case of the present elegy, in large measure correct; yet both are also in need of some modification. On the one hand, the view of *aemulatio* should be more clearly focused on the problem posed by the poem's first line,[16] namely, how the following lines, which are rich in Horatian echoes, mark a return (*redeamus*) to the orbit of his elegy, the *carminis nostri orbem*; and thus how rivalry means essentially a transformation of the Horatian texts into *peculiarly elegiac* terms. On the other hand, the ironic light cast on the Horatian models in the course of this transformation is not so heavy-handed in the present instance as to be called parody. The extensive imitation of the lyric poet is itself ironic in a poem which professes to return to love elegy. But this and the other ironies in the poem are more oblique than, say, Propertius' inversion in 3.1 of the epic triumph at the beginning of Virgil's third *Georgic*, a passage more properly described as parody.

  After Propertius in 3.1 declares his impressive status as a poet and his resultant immortality, he turns in the second poem to the power of his elegy to win the beloved and to win immortality for her. The opening poem had developed its claims largely as a challenge to epic—the triumph with its heroic associations, Ennius, Homer, the writers of historical epic.[17] Now he urges a return to elegy and thus to pleasing his elegy's usual subject, his (or any) girl: "Carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem, / gaudeat ut[18] solito tacta puella sono." The rest of the poem, which in a sense explains the girl's pleasure, falls naturally into three parts, each a sort of priamel[19] in which a list of examples is crowned or

<hr>

[16] In preserving the MSS' division of the poems at 3.2.1 I follow Barber, Camps, Richardson, Palmer and Phillimore, rather than Schuster, Rothstein, Hosius and Postgate, who affix 3.2.1-2 to the end of the preceding poem. On the problematic *interea* of line 1 see especially Camps *ad loc.* and Brouwers (above, note 4) 124, who compares the similarly abrupt openings of 2.10.1 (*sed*), 2.27.1 (*at*), 3.7.1 and 3.23.1 (*ergo*), and 3.17.1 (*nunc*). One may add that, while *interea* looks back to the previous poem, *carminis nostri orbem* and especially the connection between Propertius' *carmen* and his *puella* in 3.2.1-2 more forcefully point ahead to the following lines (cf. esp. 7-8, 9-10, 15-16, 17-18). Moreover, the *exempla* of music's power in lines 3-8 seem to take off from *sono* in line 2. Some read 3.1 and 3.2 as a single elegy (e.g., Lachmann and Richmond; most recently Sullivan, *Propertius* [above, note 15] 19; G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* [New Haven 1980] 124 and 174). But the different structures of what the MSS present as separate elegies seem (together with the above mentioned factors) to suggest rather that we read the two texts as a closely related pair of elegies like 3.4 & 3.5 and 3.24 & 3.25.

[17] See Steele Commager, *A Prolegomenon to Propertius* (Norman, Okla. 1974) 43 and J. F. Miller, "Ennius and the Elegists," forthcoming in *ICS* 8.2 (1983) 278-80.

[18] I follow Hanslik, Camps, Postgate and Palmer in reading *ut*, rather than Barber, Schuster and most others, who read *in*. See Camps *ad loc.*

[19] On this point see D. P. Harmon, "The Poet's Initiation and the Sacerdotal Imagery of Propertius 3.1-5," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* I, ed. C. Deroux, Collection Latomus 164 (Brussels 1979) 324-26. For complementary discussions of the

contrasted with Propertius and his poetry. The first of these (3–10) con-
cerns the great power of song: in the legendary past Orpheus restrained
beasts and rivers with his lyre, Amphion built Thebes' walls *per artem*,
even the monster Polyphemus successfully wooed the sea-nymph Galatea
with his songs. Following closely on the last example, which deals with
love, Propertius asks (9–10) rhetorically and boastfully whether he should
be surprised that his own poetry, a more refined sort inspired by both
Bacchus and Apollo,[20] attracts a whole crowd of girls. Now that we have
"returned to the orbit of his elegy," the *turba scriptorum* behind his
triumphal chariot in 3.1.12 has given way to a *turba puellarum* (3.2.10).
The familiar elegiac idea of poetry's power over womankind[21] is thus
playfully elaborated in typically Propertian fashion, with a series of
mythological *exempla*.

    In the next three couplets he contrasts his poetic gifts with luxurious
material possessions. The theme of the good life shrinking from riches will
appear throughout Book 3, just as it does throughout Horace's *Odes*.[22]
Propertius himself indicates this parallel by closely patterning the section
after the opening of *Odes* 2.18:

> quod *non* Taenariis *domus* est mihi fulta *columnis*,
>   *nec* camera *auratas* inter *eburna trabes*,
> *nec* mea Phaeacas aequant pomaria silvas,
>   *non* operosa rigat Marcius antra liquor;
> *at* Musae comites et carmina cara legenti,
>   et defessa choris Calliopea meis. (11–16)

>   *Non ebur neque aureum*
> mea renidet in *domo* lacunar,
>   *non trabes* Hymettiae

---

elegy's structure see Brouwers (above, note 4) 124–27, W. Nethercut, "*Ille parum cauti
pectoris egit opus*," *TAPA* 92 (1961) 391–92, and L. Richardson, Jr., *Propertius. Elegies
I–IV* (Norman, Okla. 1977) 322.

[20] For Apollo—especially the Callimachean Apollo—as Propertius' patron see 1.8.41,
3.1.38, 3.3.13ff.; later 4.1b.133ff., 4.6.69–70. For Propertius' association with Bacchus see
2.30.38–39, 3.17, 4.1.62, 4.6.76. Flach (above, note 1) 86 argues that the greater frequency
of Bacchus' appearance as a god of inspiration in Books 3 and 4 reflects the influence of
Horace's *Odes*, especially *Od.* 2.19. But if Propertius' references to the god in this role
suggest a literary precedent, a more likely candidate is Callimachus. See *epigr.* 7 and 8 Pf.
and fr. 191.7–8, in the last of which Callimachus seems to have mentioned Dionysos
together with Apollo and the Muses—the same combination occurs in Prop. 3.2 (cf. lines 9
and 15–16). At 4.1.61–62, immediately before Propertius refers to himself as *Romanus
Callimachus*, he contrasts the ivy of Bacchus with Ennius' *hirsuta corona*. See further
Miller (above, note 17) 281 and note 28 with bibliography.

[21] E.g., Prop. 1.8.40, 1.9.11–14, 2.13.3–16; Ov. *Am.* 2.1.21–22; on the topos see A. L.
Wheeler, "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources. Part II," *CP* 6 (1911)
65.

[22] See Hubbard (above, note 1) 72; Prop. 3.5, 7, 12, 13, 20; Hor. *Od.* 2.15, 2.16, 3.1, 3.16,
3.24, 3.29.

> premunt *columnas* ultima recisas
>   Africa, *neque* Attali
> ignotus heres regiam occupavi,
>   *nec* Laconicas mihi
> trahunt honestae purpuras clientae:
>   *at* fides et ingeni
> benigna vena est, pauperemque dives
>   me petit: nihil supra
> deos lacesso nec potentem amicum
>   largiora flagito,
> satis beatus unicis Sabinis. (*Odes* 2.18.1–14)

Adapting an argument found in Bacchylides and Lucretius,[23] Horace solemnly announces that, although he lacks a house aglitter with ivory and gold ceiling, marble beams and impressive columns, he is compensated by his "lavish vein of talent" and his Sabine farm, a gift of the wealthy patron to whom he is devoted. Propertius' lines open with the same splendors of the Roman house in wording remarkably similar to that of Horace. He varies the two latter clauses with the mention of orchards and opulent grottos and he replaces the Horatian series of proper names with one of his own. *Phaeacas silvas* (13), referring to the legendary orchards of Alcinoos, continue the association with the world of myth from the elegy's first priamel. Appropriate to the poem's programmatic context, Propertius' alternative to riches is exclusively literary (*Musae* and *carmina*), while Horace's was both literary and moral (cf. *fides*). But the structure of the Horatian passage is maintained: four clauses, all with initial negatives,[24] immediately followed by the alternatives introduced by *at*. Propertius thus reworks the Horatian model for his elegy's second priamel, and for an additional argument pointing to his own poetry's special status.

As an allusion, however, this passage differentiates Propertius from Horace as much as it suggests a kinship with his contemporary's sentiment. For Propertius here hints at another, more typically elegiac, application of the contrast between riches and poetry, that concerned with the winning of the girl. The elegiac mistress is notoriously avaricious, but on occasion she is said to prefer poetry to wealth.[25] When Cynthia recites Propertius' elegies in 2.26, for instance, "she says that she hates wealthy suitors" (*dicit se odisse beatos*, 25). Similarly in 1.8 the poor elegist persuaded her not to sail off with the wealthy praetor, not with

---

[23] Bacchylides fr. 21; Lucretius 2.20ff.; compare also Virgil, *Georg.* 2.461ff. For a full discussion see R. G. M. Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford 1978) 287–92.

[24] Here too we may note an artful variation of the Horatian model. Horace's anaphora of negatives (*non . . . non . . . neque . . . nec*) is refashioned into a chiastic pattern by Propertius (*non . . . nec . . . nec . . . non*). I owe this observation to James Zetzel.

[25] See Saara Lilja, *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women* (Helsinki 1965) 135–36 with note 6; also 48–50, on the related topos of love versus wealth.

gold or pearls, but with poetry, *blandi carminis obsequio* (39–40). This
idea is suggested in the present context not only by the location of
Propertius' imitation of *Odes* 2.18 immediately after the declaration of
elegy's ability to win the beloved (9–10), but also by the reformulation of
that declaration in Propertius' alternative to wealth. Lines 15–16 are
essentially a repetition of 9–10. He has the customary gods of inspiration,
here Calliope and the other Muses, earlier Bacchus and Apollo.[26] More
importantly, *carmina cara legenti* (15), his poems are pleasing to his
reader, which restates the attraction of the *turba puellarum* to his words
(10; cf. 2: *gaudeat . . . puella*). The rich patron of Horace's text has
disappeared to make room for Propertius' girl. The Horatian contrast is
given a peculiarly elegiac twist. In the process the high seriousness of
Horace is, I think, subtly undercut. Horace becomes not only a prece-
dent, but also a foil for elegiac poetics.

   The companionship of the Muses in line 15 looks both forward and
backward. Besides enabling Propertius to win the *puella*, they confer on
him the power to immortalize his beloved:

> fortunata, meo si qua es celebrata libello!
>   carmina erunt formae tot *monumenta* tuae.
> nam neque *Pyramidum* sumptus ad sidera ducti,
>   nec Iovis Elei caelum imitata domus,
> nec Mausolei dives fortuna sepulcri
>   mortis ab extrema condicione vacant.
> aut illis flamma aut *imber* subducet honores,
>   *annorum* aut ictu, pondere victa, *ruent*.
> at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aevo
>   excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus. (17–26)

Here begins the more elaborate, easily recognizable, imitation of *Odes*
3.30, perhaps the most famous of Horace's *Odes* in antiquity,[27] and one
echoed by Propertius in the preceding companion-poem (see above,
note 9):

> Exegi *monumentum* aere perennius
> regalique situ *pyramidum* altius,
> quod non *imber* edax, non Aquilo impotens
> possit *diruere* aut innumerabilis
> *annorum* series et fuga temporum. . . .

---

[26] Ross has recently drawn attention to the linking of Calliope and Apollo by Propertius
also at 1.2.27–28, 2.1.3–4, and in 3.3, and by Virgil in *Eclogues* 4.57 (above, note 5; see
the Index s.v. "Apollo and Calliope"). He argues that the connection can be traced back to
the poetry of Gallus and convincingly demonstrates how in each of these passages the poet
refers to Callimachean poetics, as does Horace with his pairing of the same deities in
Odes 3.4.1–4. On Bacchus see above, note 20.

[27] See Ovid, *Am.* 1.15.39–42, *Met.* 15.871–79, Seneca, *Epigr.* 27 and 28, and Jerome, *Ep.*
108.33; Tony Woodman, "*Exegi monumentum.* Horace, Odes 3.30," in *Quality and Plea-
sure in Latin Poetry*, ed. T. Woodman and D. West (Cambridge 1974) 127–28.

As in the echo of 2.18, this allusion to Horace both suggests a poetic precedent and uses it as a foil to emphasize a distinguishing characteristic of Propertius' poetic power.[28] And again that characteristic concerns his elegy's intimate connection with a *puella*. Horace's notion of the immortality of his verse and himself, which is also implied in Propertius,[29] is shifted to the subject of Propertius' poetry. His poems will be *monumenta*, like that of Horace more lasting than architectural monuments which will eventually succumb to nature's elements, but they will be *monumenta* to the beauty of his girl. The girl is idealized as beautiful, and generalized in *si qua* (17), as above in the unnamed *puella* of line 2 and the vague *turba puellarum* (10) and *legenti* (15). Whether or not Cynthia is meant is really not important. Propertius is not so much writing love elegy in 3.2 as reflecting on its nature and status. At the end of Book 2 he had noted the close relationship of Cynthia's *fama* to that of himself and his verse.[30] Here, adapting the theme and language of Horace, he makes the grander assertion that the girl's reputation will be immortal; in so doing, he again playfully differentiates himself from his contemporary.

   Nethercut suggested that the juxtaposition of this imitation with the Horatian echoes above, which he took to be of *Odes* 3.1 rather than 2.18, is intentionally humorous and planned as a criticism of Horace.[31] He argued that Propertius aims to remind Horace of the disparity between his imposing *monumentum* in 3.30 and his scorn for such grand structures elsewhere. There may well be a designed incongruity in the juxtaposition of these two imitations, but I would like to follow Nethercut's lead in a somewhat different way toward a striking aspect of Propertius' revision of "Exegi monumentum" that is generally overlooked: namely, the manner in which it is combined with the other imitation of Horace. For a part at least of the aesthetic effect of this last section lies in this very combination, whether interpreted as ironic or not. Propertius ingeniously rewrites *Odes* 3.30 in the light of 2.18 echoed just above. To Horace's pyramids are added two other architectural wonders, the tomb of Mausolus and the Temple of Jupiter at Olympia. What results is not only the poem's third priamel, but one designed to recall the one in the lines echoing *Odes* 2.18. The rhetorical structure is the same: a series of negative clauses contrasted with a concluding couplet introduced by the

---

[28] Cf. Harmon (above, note 19) 326, whose discussion focuses on the poem's sacerdotal imagery: "The reminiscence sets the special quality of the elegist's verse in relief: Horace's poetry is a monument to his own talent. Propertius, as the *Musarum sacerdos*, shares the immortality which his verse affords with the members of his circle."

[29] On the ambiguity of the final couplet see W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter* (Hildesheim 1968) 196–97.

[30] 2.34.93–94: "Cynthia quin etiam versu laudata Properti— / hos inter si me ponere Fama volet."

[31] "The Ironic Priest" (above, note 1) 387.

word *at*. The list of examples is again one of impressive buildings. Their height (*ad sidera ducti*, 19; *caelum imitata*, 20) may derive from the *altius* of *Odes* 3.30.2, but their wealth (*sumptus*, 19; *dives fortuna*, 21) calls to mind the earlier Horatian series. Significantly, the Temple of Jupiter is called his "house" (*domus*, 20)—the rich house we remember was the controlling idea of the second priamel. One might argue that Propertius is here simply adapting *Odes* 3.30 to the structure of his elegy;[32] but that adaptation is in large part to a rhetorical and thematic structure borrowed from another Horatian passage. Just as Virgil at times changes a Homeric model by conflating it with another Homeric passage, or Horace does with Bacchylides, or other Roman authors with other models, so here Propertius achieves a unified elegy through an artful "contamination"[33] of Horace with Horace. The final product is what every good imitation should be, an original poetic achievement, in the words of the *Ars poetica* (131), *privati iuris*. The victory of Propertian elegy over splendid commemorative buildings is parallel to the preference for Propertian elegy over the riches of a grand residence.

If this interpretation is correct, that our elegy's final section is designed to recall both Horatian passages, then the poem's last couplet may contain a Horatian echo which has not previously been recognized. It is clear enough that in the final hexameter *quaesitum nomen*, the immortal glory won for Propertius' girl, and implicitly for himself, is a reminiscence of *superbiam quaesitam* at the end of *Odes* 3.30, thus rounding off the imitation of that lyric. Both times the accusative participle modified by an ablative means "won" rather than "sought"; both times the word occurs in the poem's penultimate line. It is an indication of Propertius' greater self-confidence,[34] and probably of his rivalry of Horace, that the latter's offering of his hard-earned pride to a deity is replaced by the more direct statement of Propertius' achievement

---

[32] See Brouwers (above, note 4) 138, who rightly concludes regarding Propertius' emphasis on great material riches in the final section: "Hiermee wordt de eenheid van het gedicht versterkt."

[33] For the use of the term *contaminatio* in modern scholarship to describe without prejudice the combination of models see West and Woodman, *Creative Imitation* (above, note 14), General Index s.v. "contaminatio." The Roman poets seem to have adopted the practice from their Hellenistic predecessors. See W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924) 171–74, and G. A. Sheets, "The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poetics and Livius Andronicus," *AJP* 102 (1981) 62. Augustan poetic examples of the conflation of two passages from the same author include Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.92 (*Od.* 5.297 and *Il.* 15.436; cf. Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.3.9, cited by Sheets), the second *Eclogue* (Theocritus' *Idylls* 3 and 11 combined), and one of the passages under discussion here, Horace, *Odes* 2.18.1ff., which combines two texts of Bacchylides (see Nisbet and Hubbard [above, note 23] 287–88). Note also Propertius' apparent "contamination" of Horace with Horace (and Virgil) in 3.1.3–4 (quoted above, note 8).

[34] See Brouwers (above, note 4) 137.

through his genius. The same sort of *aemulatio* seems to underlie Propertius' earlier multiplication of Horace's single impressive *monumentum* into his own *tot monumenta*. In the elegy's last couplet, however, the very mention of Propertius' talent may itself be another Horatian echo. If, as I have suggested, we are still in mind of the opening period of *Odes* 2.18, the Propertian combination *at . . . ingenio*—heightened by the repetition of *ingenio* in the pentameter, where it again occurs at the caesura—cannot fail to recall the conclusion of that passage, where line 9 opens with *at* and ends with *ingeni*. That Propertius elsewhere makes much of his *ingenium*[35] need not dissuade us from speaking of imitation here. Not only do the two texts have identical structures, but *ingenium* in each marks an alternative to wealth, especially wealth as represented by impressive buildings. The Horatian *ingenium* which provided a wealth more genuine than material possessions is matched by the genius of Propertius, which achieves the immortality inaccessible to rich architectural monuments. From the point of view of imitation, there is a complex closural effect through the echo of the endings of both Horatian passages in our elegy's concluding couplet.

Propertius 3.2, then, is a masterful, elaborate, and sometimes ironic combination of Horatian texts[36] which are used as foils in the definition of elegy's power. Propertius here rewrites Horatian lyric into elegy both to rival his contemporary and to assert his own place in the poetic tradition. His allusions to specific passages from other authors and genres in 3.1–5 share these same programmatic functions. The extensiveness of the imitation of Horace near the opening of the book also effectively announces the "Horatian" character of much of Book 3. More specifically, the allusions in 3.2 may hint, when taken together with the Horatian stance of *sacerdos* in 3.1.3–4, that Propertius will in this book be addressing the ethical issues and public themes handled in *Odes* 1–3.[37] By carefully differentiating himself from Horace in 3.2, however, Propertius also demonstrates that these new themes for his elegy will be treated with his own characteristic style and perspective. He does not

---

[35] See 2.1.4, 2.30.40, 2.34.58; later 4.1.126; Solmsen (above, note 3) 107 (= *Kleine Schriften* 280).

[36] A third Horatian text may be reflected, if the adjective *operosa* in line 14 really is a reminiscence of *Odes* 3.1.48, as Nethercut suggests ("The Ironic Priest" [above, note 1] 387). However, the Propertian frequency of usage argues against his observation ("*Ille parum . . .*" [above, note 19] 397, note 9) that Propertius' emphatic use of the word *carmen* (lines 1 and 18; cf. 8 and 15) recalls *Odes* 3.1.2–3.

[37] See Ross (above, note 5) 123–29 and 136–37. On the new themes of Book 3 see also the recent remarks of M. C. J. Putnam, "Propertius' Third Book: Patterns of Cohesion," *Arethusa* 13 (1980) 97–98 (= *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy, and Epic* [Princeton 1982] 208–9).

aim to follow Horace, but, as Michael Putnam has phrased it, "to com-
pete with the heroic ode."[38]