

# PROPERTIUS 2.10 AND 11 AND THE STRUCTURE OF BOOKS '2A' AND '2B'

By R. O. A. M. LYNE

## I. THE DIVISION OF 'BOOK 2'

The manuscripts of Propertius present us with a single, massive 'Book 2' over thirteen hundred and sixty lines long. Like many before me, I am convinced that this 'Book 2' is a mistake of transmission and actually preserves the remnants of *two* ancient books. In this article I identify and discuss the poem which I believe closed the first of the ancient books; for convenience's sake we can call this book 'Book 2a'. I shall be saying something, too, about the structure and content of both ancient books — of Book 2b as well as Book 2a.

It was Lachmann who first made the — to me — irresistible suggestion that our 'Book 2' is the product of two ancient books.<sup>1</sup> There has been strong support for this view. For example,<sup>2</sup> a succinct case is put forward by Otto Skutsch,<sup>3</sup> and highly convincing and detailed support has been offered in an important recent paper by Heyworth.<sup>4</sup> There are intricacies of evidence to consider (for example, Nonius Marcellus' citation of our 3.21.14), but I shall set these to one side.<sup>5</sup> I shall simply cite two crucial and probably familiar facts, which are in summary as follows. (i). 2.13.25–6. Propertius wishes to be accompanied to the underworld by the corpus of his poetry. He refers to this work as 'tres . . . libelli'. It is hard to see how this can appear in anything but a third book; indeed it seems to belong in the front of a third book, just as 2.3.4 'et turpis de te iam liber *alter* erit' clearly belongs in the front of a second book. (ii). The number of lines in 'Book 2'. According to Barber's Oxford text, the transmitted Book 2 contains 1,362 verses, almost 300 more than any other Augustan book. And consider this total within the context of Propertius' other books, as transmitted to us: Book 1, 706 lines, Book 3, 990, Book 4, 952. The anomaly of 'Book 2' stands out. It contains too many verses not only for a natural Augustan book, but for a natural Propertian book. Of course, it also contains too few for two Propertian books, and we cannot simply divide 'Book 2' somewhere and find the two original ancient books; but on this question see Section VI.1.

I cannot claim that the basic Lachmann view is an overwhelming orthodoxy, and I refer to some dissenting voices. Williams believed that Propertius wrote 2.13.25–6 'contemplating an act of publication which comprised three volumes',<sup>6</sup> like Horace's simultaneous publication of *Odes* Books 1–3; but I think this view is sufficiently rebutted by Hubbard and Skutsch.<sup>7</sup> Camps in his edition of Book 2<sup>8</sup> rejected Lachmann's division chiefly on the grounds that 'tres . . . libelli' in 2.13.25 'is not likely to be meant as a statistic'; but 'tres' is after all naturally a statistic, and the previous reference to 'iam liber alter' (2.3.4) rather encourages us to take it as a statistical reference to the number of Propertian books existing at that time. Wyke assumes the integrity of our 'Book 2', perceiving (a) framing motifs in 2.1 and 2.34, and, what is more, (b) understanding

<sup>1</sup> It was first made in his edition *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina* (1816).

<sup>2</sup> cf. too the terse statement of facts by M. Hubbard in *Propertius* (1974), 41–2, and the cautious survey in the commentary of H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber (1933), xxviii–xxxv.

<sup>3</sup> O. Skutsch, 'The Second Book of Propertius', *HSCPh* 79 (1975), 229–33.

<sup>4</sup> S. J. Heyworth, 'Propertius: division, transmission, and the editor's task', in R. Brock and A. J.

Woodman (eds), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, Vol. 8 (1995), 165–85.

<sup>5</sup> For Nonius Marcellus and Propertius, see esp. Heyworth, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 178–81. Further evidence is cited and discussed by Heyworth.

<sup>6</sup> G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968), 481.

<sup>7</sup> Hubbard, *loc. cit.* (n. 2), and Skutsch, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 229–30.

<sup>8</sup> W. A. Camps, *Propertius Elegies Book II* (1967), 1.

2.10–13 as ‘not only interrelated’ but ‘also integrated with the second Propertian poetry-book’.<sup>9</sup> Regarding (a), I do not think that the motifs are particularly salient, not nearly so salient as those I shall cite between 2.10/11 and 2.1.<sup>10</sup> As for (b), my present paper will argue that 2.10/11 is heavily and finally *closural*, and a forthcoming paper will argue that 2.12 is inceptive and programmatic; so (in sum) I am prepared to see a certain ‘interrelation’, but must deny any ‘integration’ within a single ‘Book 2’.

Lachmann presented 2.10 as the opening poem of Book 2b. Heyworth puts the case persuasively for believing that 2.10 was *closural* in Book 2a.<sup>11</sup> Much of Heyworth’s argument regarding 2.10 I accept, but I have much to add to what he says, and I also believe that our poems 2.10 and 11 were a single concluding poem in Book 2a.<sup>12</sup>

## II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF 2.10 AND 11

First I provide a text of 2.10 and 11 together. Following one half of the manuscript tradition (FP) and, say, Scaliger, I believe they are one poem.

sed tempus lustrare aliis Helicon choreis, et campum Haemonio iam dare tempus equo.	2
iam libet et fortis memorare ad proelia turmas et Romana mei dicere castra ducis.	4
quod si deficiant uires, audacia certe laus erit: in magnis et uoluisse sat est.	6
aetas prima canat Veneres, extrema tumultus: bella canam, quando scripta puella meast.	8
nunc uolo subducto grauior procedere uultu, nunc aliam citharam me mea Musa docet.	10
surge, anime, ex humili; iam, carmina, sumite uires; Pierides, magnis nunc erit oris opus.	12
iam negat Euphrates equitem post terga tueri Parthorum et Crassos se tenuisse dolet;	14
India quin, Auguste, tuo dat colla triumpho, et domus intactae te tremit Arabiae;	16
et si qua extremis tellus se subtrahit oris, sentiat illa tuas postmodo capta manus!	18
haec ego castra sequar: uates tua castra canendo magnus ero. seruent hunc mihi fata diem!	20
ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis, ponitur his imos ante corona pedes,	22
sic nos nunc, inopes laudis conscendere carmen, pauperibus sacris uilia tura damus.	24
nondum etiam Ascraeos norunt mea carmina fontes, sed modo Permessi flumine lauit Amor.	26

<sup>9</sup> M. Wyke, ‘Written women: Propertius’ *scripta puella*’, *JRS* 77 (1987), 47–61, esp. 48, 61.

<sup>10</sup> Wyke, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 48 summarizes, ‘The second book is framed by the naming of Callimachus, by extensive borrowings from the Callimachean polemic in favour of writing elegy, and by references to the Elegiac Woman as Propertius’ poetic material’. It seems to me that these quite general motifs could be exhibited by the opening poem of a second book and the closing poem of a third book without surprise. The devices of ring-composition that I cite (see below VI.3, esp. (v)) seem to me much more insistently to mark the beginning and end of a book.

<sup>11</sup> Heyworth, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 166–7, following a point made by G. O. Hutchinson, *JRS* 74 (1984), 100 who does not, however, believe in the division of ‘Book 2’.

<sup>12</sup> T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* (1882), 419–20, first accepted Lachmann’s suggestion that 2.10 opened Book 2b, but by *RhM* 64 (1909), 398–9, and *RhM* 70 (1915), 266, he suggested, in summary form, that 2.10 and the ‘epigram’ 2.11 closed Book 2a. On neither of these occasions did he offer any substantive argument for his thesis.

scribant de te alii uel sis ignota licebit:	
laudet, qui sterili semina ponit humo.	2
omnia, crede mihi, tecum uno munera lecto	
auferet extremi funeris atra dies;	4
et tua transibit contemnens ossa uiator,	
nec dicet 'cinis hic docta puella fuit.'	6

But now it is time to traverse Helicon with other dances, and to give the field to the Thessalian horse. Now I am pleased to bring to remembrance squadrons brave for battle and to tell of the Roman camp of my leader. And if strength should fail me, certainly daring will bring me praise: in great matters, even to have wished is enough.

Let first years sing of Venuses, let the last of tumults. I shall sing of wars, since my girl has been written. Now I want to walk forth with serious mien, now my Muse teaches me another lyre. Ascend, my soul, from the lowly; now, my songs, take on strength; Pierians (Muses), now a grander voice will be needed.

No longer does the Euphrates allow the Parthian cavalymen to look over their shoulders, and it grieves that it has kept possession of the Crassi; India, indeed, offers its neck to your triumph, Augustus, and the house of untouched Arabia trembles before you; and if any land withdraws to the furthest shores of the world, may it hereafter be captured and feel your hand!

This is the camp I shall follow: by singing of your camp I shall become a mighty bard. Oh that the fates may reserve this day for me!

Just as, when it is not possible to reach the head of tall statues, a garland is placed before the feet below, so I now, helpless to climb the poetry of praise, offer paltry incense in a poor man's sacrifice. Not yet do my songs know the Ascræan springs, but Love has merely bathed them in the river of Permessus.

Others may write about *you* (Cynthia) or you may be unknown: let him praise you, who sows seed in barren soil. Believe me, the black day of the final funeral will bear off all your gifts with you on one bier; and the traveller will pass by your bones in disdain, and will not say: 'This ash was an artful girl.'

I append some preliminary notes, adding to, highlighting, or adjusting the standard commentaries:

Line 1. 'sed': the justification of the adversative. Goold,<sup>13</sup> following Lachmann (who, however, believed 2.10 opened Propertius' third book), signals missing text before 2.10.1. I see no reason for this. Propertius opposes the thrust of the present poem ('But it is time to write laudatory poetry. . .') to what has preceded (love poetry). Camps<sup>14</sup> ad loc. cites other Propertian elegies which begin with conjunctions (note especially 2.27.1 'at'), but the usefulness of the parallels is limited, since particular reasons obtain in each case. The 'at' of 2.27.1, for example, seems to me to be in anticipation of the contrast between the uncertainty of 'mortales' (1-10) and the certainty of lovers (11-12). The best parallel for our 'sed' is perhaps Verg., *Georg.* 2.541. Vergil opens his dissociating, closural paragraph with 'sed' as Propertius opens his dissociating closural poem with the same adversative conjunction. We shall return to these lines of Vergil below: they are in Propertius' mind.

Line 2. 'Haemonio . . . equo'. Surprisingly the commentaries of Camps, Enk,<sup>15</sup> and Rothstein<sup>16</sup> miss the point of the epithet 'Haemonian' = Thessalian. Heinsius wished to emend to 'campum et Maeonio'; Enk wanted to write 'Aonio'. Of course Thessalian horses were prized, as Camps and others who keep 'Haemonio' say; but that is hardly sufficient explanation for Propertius' choice. Propertius' main allusion is to his own Achilles' horses at 2.8.38 'fortem illum Haemoniis Hectors traxit equis'. We must recall Choerilus' literary imagery of untouched meadows and chariots of poetry;<sup>17</sup> likewise Vergil's horse image of composition at *Georg.* 2.542 ('et iam tempus equum fumantia soluere colla'). Then, putting these together with Propertius' own quintessentially

<sup>13</sup> G. P. Goold's Loeb *Propertius* text (1990).

<sup>14</sup> Camps, op. cit. (n. 8).

<sup>15</sup> P. J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber Secundus* Vol. II (1962).

<sup>16</sup> M. Rothstein, *Propertius Sextus Elegien, Erster Teil* (1920).

<sup>17</sup> H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (1983), 147, fr. 317; it is quoted by Enk, op. cit. (n. 15), in his note on line 2.

heroic horses ('Haemonian', 'Achillean'), we find a most effective image for the proposed epic poetry: 'giving the field of literature to the horse of epic'.

Line 11. 'humili' is neuter, I think: cf. Cic., *Tusc.* 2.5 'atque oratorum quidem laus ita ducta ab humili uenit ad summum, ut . . .'. Propertius is quite close to saying 'get up off the ground'; the root of 'humilis' is 'humus', the ground, ground-level. (In Hor., *Odes* 3.30.12 'ex humili potens', 'humili' is masculine.)

Line 13. 'iam negat . . .' The interpretation of this line is troublesome. Camps offers two ways of taking it: (1) 'Euphrates declares that the Parthians' horsemen look behind their backs no more', (2) 'Euphrates refuses any more to keep the Parthians' horsemen safe behind him'; Goold plumps for something in the middle, which I have followed. It is certainly hard to imagine that 'post terga tueri' refers to anything other than the renowned Parthian method of shooting over the shoulder. The gist of the sentiment I take to be that the Euphrates, hitherto boundary and protection of Parthia, now repents of and withdraws its patronage.

Lines 15–16. 'India . . . Arabiae'. These references to the submission of India and to an impending expedition against Arabia date the poem (and Book 2a) to 26–25 B.C.: this I have discussed in a forthcoming paper ('Propertius and Tibullus: early exchanges'), but the evidence can be summarized.<sup>18</sup>

Line 23. I have kept 'carmen' tentatively. I am confident that 'currum' (Markland, followed by Camps and Goold) is wrong (though Lucr. 6.47, adduced by Camps, is initially enticing<sup>19</sup>). The important ascent metaphor at play here is ascent of a mountain: see below Section III. 2, and a chariot at this point, by this stage,<sup>20</sup> is alien and intrusive. So the right reading may be 'culmen',<sup>21</sup> or 'in arcem' (Palmier); parablepsy ('carmina' in 25) could have ousted something with no resemblance to the paradosis in 23. But 'carmen' is justifiable as a 'trespassed' term — as the language of the 'tenor' (the ultimate thrust of the message) 'intruded' into the 'vehicle' (the imagery conveying it),<sup>22</sup> Shackleton Bailey supports 'carmen' citing Lucian, *Menipp.* 1 ('the metaphor in *conscondere carmen* is hardly bolder than in Lucian, *Menipp.* 1 λέγε οὐτωςί πως ἀπλῶς καταβάς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰαμβείων').<sup>23</sup> And 'carmen' has an advantage over, say, 'culmen'. Propertius has adduced a simile in 21–2 to illustrate his failed attempt to ascend and its consequences; he will have a metaphor allied to, but not the same as, this simile in 24. To assert the ascent and hill metaphor too concretely in between, rather than imply it, is perhaps clumsy.

<sup>18</sup> Indian embassy in 26–25 B.C.: *Res Gestae* 31 records embassies from India; Orosius 6.21.19 tells us that 'legati Indorum' met Augustus at Tarraco in Spain; Dio 53.22.5 tells us that Augustus left Rome in 27 B.C., 'lingered in Gaul', then proceeded to Spain; Suet., *Aug.* 26.3 tells us that Augustus began his eighth and ninth consulships (26 and 25 B.C.) at Tarraco; another datable embassy from India falls in 20 B.C. (Dio 54.9.8), clearly too late for our poem. The date of the Arabian expedition (still impending in Prop. 2.10, note 'intactae') is 25–24 B.C., and the best evidence for this comes from Dio 53.29.3–8; but it needs careful interpreting. This it gets from G. Hardy, *The Monumentum Ancyranum* (1923), 123; the essential points made by Hardy are quoted by Enk, op. cit. (n. 15), 152. Cf. too J. W. Rich's note (1990) on Dio 53.29.3–8, and A. La Penna, *L'Integrazione difficile. Un profilo di Properzio* (1977), 48 n. 1. Augustus himself refers to the Arabian expedition at *RG* 5.26.

<sup>19</sup> Lucr. 6.47 'quandoquidem semel insignem conscendere currum. . .' has to do with Lucretius' literary enterprise, but we are hampered by an immediately following lacuna. However, since he has just recalled how, in Book 5, he explained the workings of heaven and the heavenly bodies, and will now proceed to explain 'cetera quae fieri in terris caeloque tuentur /

mortales', 50, cf. 83 etc., a chariot image (the sun is drawn in a chariot, and so on) is arguably appropriate to his context in a way that it is not in Prop. 2.10.23. (Propertius uses 'currum conscendere' of Aurora at 2.18.13.)

<sup>20</sup> Even in lines 1–2, where the precedent of Choerilus (referred to above) might have induced him, Propertius did not employ chariots.

<sup>21</sup> A manuscript reading according to Passerat: Barber, *uet. cod. Memmii teste Passerat.* Sil. 3.510 cited in its support is not cogent, since its context is not literary.

<sup>22</sup> 'Trespass' is the simple term I prefer for the analogous phenomenon in similes (when narrative terms appear in the simile): cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Words and the Poet. Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid* (1989), 92–9 and index s.v. 'trespass'. 'Tenor' and 'vehicle', stemming from I. A. Richards, are terms employed by M. S. Silk in his excellent *Interaction in Poetic Imagery, with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (1974), who refers to this phenomenon as 'intrusion'. For 'tenor' language 'intruded' into the 'vehicle' see Silk, 138–42.

<sup>23</sup> Rothstein, op. cit. (n. 16), ad loc. supports it too, but he thinks the concealed metaphor is ascent of a chariot.

III. THE DOMINANT MESSAGE AND MOTIF IN '2.10'<sup>24</sup>(1) *The Dominant Message; The Question of 'Recusatio'*<sup>25</sup>

To be sure, Propertius appears to announce an imminent epic poem (1-4, 7-8 etc.); to be sure that intention falters (20-6). But to call this a 'recusatio', even in the derived category I have given it elsewhere,<sup>26</sup> is slightly misleading. The following quotation is certainly misleading:<sup>27</sup> '2.10 is a proper *recusatio* (that is, the poet refuses on Callimachean grounds to relate epic themes or the deeds of Augustus)'. My own verb was cannier (Propertius 'ducks' the epic). We should be yet cannier and more precise. Propertius alludes through Vergil and Gallus to Callimachus (see (2) below), but his primary ground for demurring here is, not Callimachean authority, but the panegyrically acceptable one of insufficient talent (5 'quod si deficiant uires . . .', 23 'inopes conscendere').<sup>28</sup> And we must choose the verb we use to describe Propertius' action with great care. Propertius does not 'refuse'. He demurs, he postpones the epic — at least he goes through the motions of postponing it (20 'seruent hunc mihi fata diem').<sup>29</sup> Most importantly, he compromises meanwhile, because — meanwhile — he offers his mite. He offers this piece of text. And this text is not the *praeteritio*-type of compromise to be found in e.g. 2.1, which is a 'recusatio' ('were I to write of such things, I would write of . . .').<sup>30</sup> Lines 13-18 actually get under way, singing of Parthians etc.; the poem does involve some high poetry, however specious, however locked into elegiac metre. In short, in Propertius' imagery, this piece constitutes the offering at the foot of the statue, the 'ante corona pedes', the 'uilia tura', instead of (to drop the imagery) the whole twelve hexameter books. The expressed intention to write an epic falters and compromises, but this is not exactly a refusal.

(2) *Motif; The Ascent of Helicon*

There are minor motifs in 2.10. E.g. 'it is time to traverse Helicon with other dances' (i.e. change type of literature), 'give the field to an epic horse' (see above Section II), but these need not detain us. I wish to concentrate on the motif of (failed) *ascent*.

First, the simple idea of ascent. There is line 11 'surge, anime, ex humili', 'ascend from the lowly', 'get up from ground level'. Then 23 'inopes laudis conscendere carmen', 'I am helpless to climb the poetry of praise'. The notion of ascent again: but the poet is unequal to it. (Note too the simile in 2.1-2: the imagery describes reaching for the top, but having to be content with the base.)

A geographical location for this motif of ascent, and the key to understanding it, is clearly given in the first line: Mt Helicon. True, in the confidence of that line, Propertius seems in command of the mountain. But in line 11 he instructs himself to ascend. The natural inference would be, I think, that he wishes to mount to the summit of Helicon.

<sup>24</sup> On this 'poem' see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines Apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerkzeit* (1960), 193-202 (with ample bibliography), a useful discussion.

<sup>25</sup> On 'recusatio' see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace. Behind the Public Poetry* (1995), 31-9 with bibliography.

<sup>26</sup> Lyne, op. cit. (n. 25), 36.

<sup>27</sup> D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry. Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (1975), 118.

<sup>28</sup> For the panegyrically acceptability of demurring for this reason, see Lyne, op. cit. (n. 25), 38. Hor., *Serm.* 2.1.12-13 is perhaps Propertius' immediate source (where Horace plays tricks with Callimachean topoi

in addition); cf. then *Epist.* 2.1.250-59, also (though not in a panegyric context), Verg., *Georg.* 2.483-4.

<sup>29</sup> Note the phrasing of Wimmel, op. cit. (n. 24), 194 and 201 ('compromise' etc.).

<sup>30</sup> We may also distinguish the 'inclusion' or 'incorporation' of disavowed genres performed by e.g. Horatian 'recusatio', and observed by e.g. G. Davis, *Polyhymnia. The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (1991), 28-36, and M. C. J. Putnam in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace, A Bimillenary Celebration* (1995), 59. The poet shows potential mastery of the supposedly disavowed genres by such 'inclusion', but does not actually proffer a piece of encomiastic text as Propertius does in 2.10.

And if he gets to the summit of the mountain, this will symbolize his command of the desired laudatory and epic poetry. But the attempt fails, or rather falters and finds compromise (see above). That the geography of Helicon and its summit is envisaged in the body of the text is confirmed by the references to allied geographical features, to Permessus and Hippocrene ('Ascreaos fontes'), in 25–6: cf. immediately Vergil, *Ecl.* 6.64–73. But we must pursue this further.

Most influential upon the Propertian scene and action (Helicon, ascent, Permessus) is almost certainly a scene of poetic initiation in Cornelius Gallus. This we can reconstruct from Vergil.<sup>31</sup> I sketch it first with all possible brevity. From *Ecl.* 6.64–73 we infer the following. In his poem on the 'Grynean Grove' Gallus pictured himself conducted from the river Permessus up to the summit of Mt Helicon by one of the Muses ('errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum / Aonas in montis ut duxerit una sororum'); he described himself being given 'calami' by Linus, on behalf of the Muses; and these reed-pipes were to enable him to compose a poem on the origin of the Grynean Grove, 'his tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo'. We note, of course, that Gallus succeeded in his ascent. Propertius fails.

Ultimately a scene of initiation like the Gallan one derives from Hesiod's initiation in *Theog.* 22–34 via, most influentially, Callimachus' 'Dream' preface, our fr. 2 Pf.<sup>32</sup> Another important contributor to Gallus' scene may well have been Ennius. At the beginning of Book 7 of the *Annales* (a new proem in which Ennius explained why he did not propose to dilate on the First Punic War), Ennius glanced at, perhaps dilated upon, some interaction between himself and the Muses on one of the mountains of the Muses;<sup>33</sup> and most likely he spoke of ascent. Cf. *Ann.* 208–9 Sk. (with Skutsch's conjectured supplement)<sup>34</sup> '<nam> neque Musarum scopulos <escendit ad altos>, / nec dicti studiosus <fuit Romanus homo> ante hunc'; cf. too *Ann.* 210 'nos ausi reserare <... fontes? claustra?>'.<sup>35</sup> That 'ascent' was involved in Ennius is suggested by — as well as many of the texts that imitate or allude to him — the summit position at which Hesiod set the Muses' dances in *Theog.* 7 ἀκροτάτῳ Ἑλικῶνι χοροῦς ἐνεποιήσαντο, 'and they made their dances on topmost Helicon'.<sup>36</sup>

I now amplify a couple of points about the Vergilian and putatively Gallan Helicon scene (*Ecl.* 6.64–73), points with which, I have to say, not all Gallan scholars would agree. (There is an appendix at the end of this paper containing supplementary notes on Permessus etc. as imagined by Vergil, Gallus, Propertius, and others.) Permessus, leastwise the part of Permessus Gallus knows, is situated for him at the foot of Helicon; and his 'wandering' there symbolizes the love elegy that he wrote for Cytheris/Lycoris.

<sup>31</sup> For the Gallan origin of *Ecl.* 6.64–73, see F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (1901), 34–8, Ross, op. cit. (n. 27), 34 with bibliography in his n. 1.

<sup>32</sup> Important adjunct texts for fr. 2 are fr. 2A, a commentary on the scene (which tells us among other things that Callimachus made reference to Permessus, fr. 2A.20), and *AP* 7.42. For discussion of Callimachus' 'Dream' scene, cf. e.g. A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Propertius und Ennius* (1965), esp. 69–75, 89–109. But it has recently been subjected to fresh scrutiny by A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (1995), 127–32, also ch. 4, esp. 119–32, and many familiar assumptions challenged. I am still however persuaded that Callimachus' 'Dream' pictured his initiation by a draught of spring water (cf. Lyne, op. cit. (n. 25), 36–7 with n. 11).

<sup>33</sup> Kambylis, op. cit. (n. 32), 194, insists that we cannot pin down the identity of the mountain — presumably Parnassus or Helicon — referred to in *Ann.* 208–9 Sk., and this is true; cf. O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (1985), 374 and 149–50. (Kambylis, 196 thinks that, on the basis of Persius, *Prologus* 2 and its scholiast, we can identify the mountain on which Ennius' dream encounter with Homer — in Book 1 — took place: Parnassus. Skutsch, 149–50, is more sceptical.)

<sup>34</sup> O. Skutsch, op. cit. (n. 33), 374.

<sup>35</sup> O. Skutsch, op. cit. (n. 33), 375 favours a door metaphor, 'claustra (Musarum)', or 'fores'; Kambylis, op. cit. (n. 32), 194–5, favours 'fontes'.

<sup>36</sup> More or less certain imitations of, or allusions to, Ennius' scene in Book 7 are, I think: *Lucr.* 1.117–18, *Verg.*, *Georg.* 2.175–6, 3.10–11, *Prop.* 2.30b.25–40, 3.1.15–8 and 20 (cf. 4.10.3–4), and possibly 3.3.6; and 2.10 may allude directly to Ennius as well as indirectly via Gallus. I would even be tempted to include *Catull.* 105 'Mentula conatur Pipleium scandere montem: / Musae furcillis praecipitem eiciunt'. Those interested in trying further to reconstruct Ennius' scene can profitably exploit these texts. Cf. too O. Skutsch, op. cit. (n. 33), 367, 373–5 (Skutsch seems to imagine nothing extensive), Kambylis, op. cit. (n. 32), 191–204, esp. 194–5, 202. (It should be noted that Skutsch, 147–8, and Kambylis, loc. cit., esp. 198–201, convincingly argue *against* any meeting with, and initiation by, the Muses back in Book 1, within or in addition to the 'Dream' scene in that book in which Ennius encountered the ghost of Homer (*Ann.* 2–11 Sk.; this is modelled in some other respects on Callimachus' 'Dream' which did, according to most scholarly opinion, stage an initiation by the Muses).)

His ascent of Helicon and the bestowal of the pipes marks his ascent to an aetiological ('origo') and therefore more ambitious and truly Callimachean poem — his 'Grynean Grove'.<sup>37</sup> That the river Permessus symbolizes love elegy is confirmed by among other things our present text of Propertius. The reference in Prop. 2.10.26 containing Permessus can only be to Propertius' love poetry.<sup>38</sup>

We may now return to Propertius, and to his use of the Permessus-ascent-Helicon motif. First, Permessus. We may assume that Permessus is for Propertius, as for Gallus, situated at the foot of Helicon. In his reference to Permessus in 26 ('Love has merely bathed my poems in the waters of Permessus'), he can only, as I say, be referring to love-elegy: he has not significantly or decisively progressed beyond such poetry. But the reference contains a joke, neglected by Propertius' commentators, and if we miss jokes we shall misappreciate the total message of the poem. The commentators undervalue, indeed they mistranslate, 'lavit' ('dipped', Goold; Permessus is 'a source of . . . poetic inspiration . . . i.e. that required for love-elegy', Camps). 'Lauo' means 'wash' or 'bath', and Propertius refers to the bath of the Muses in Hesiod, *Theog.* 5–7: *καί τε λοεσσάμεναι τέρενα χρώα Περμησσοῖο / ἢ Ἴππου κρήνης . . . / ἀκροτάτῳ Ἑλικῶνι χοροῦς ἐνεποιήσαντο / καλοῦς ἡμερόεντας*, 'and having washed their tender skin in Permessus or Hippocrene. . . , the Muses made their fair, graceful dances on topmost Helicon'. Instead of the Muses bathing themselves in Permessus before their dances, Love baths Propertius' poems: the message is ultimately as, say, Camps sees it (Propertius' poetry has not seriously progressed beyond love elegy), but the poet handles the topic with wit, creating for us this funny picture.

Next we must explain exactly line 25, the reference to 'Ascraeos fontes': Propertius fails in his ascent, his poems have only been bathed in Permessus; 'not yet do they know the Ascraean springs'. These springs, named after Hesiod ('Ascraeos' denotes 'Hesiodic', *Ecl.* 6.70 etc.),<sup>39</sup> must in the first place refer to Hippocrene; Hesiod is tied to Hippocrene by the canonical Call., *Aetia* fr. 2.1–2 and (according to the traditional interpretation)<sup>40</sup> by the equally prominent fr. 112.5–6. And Propertius must presumably picture Hippocrene high up, if not at the summit of Helicon: his poems would, we infer, 'have been able to know the springs', if he had succeeded in his ascent. Now (most importantly) 'Ascraean' *Hesiodic* springs must in the post-Callimachean, post-Gallan world supply inspiration for Callimachean, aetiological poetry. Hesiod's figure-head status for the aetiological Callimachus has been challenged,<sup>41</sup> but is borne out by, say, the *Aetia* 'Dream' preface (fr. 2) which draws on Hesiod's initiation; it is borne out indeed by the *Aetia* lines just referred to; cf. too the praise of Aratus in Epigram 27 Pf.<sup>42</sup> His figure-head status for the aetiological Gallus is borne out by Verg., *Ecl.* 6. 70. When, therefore, Propertius says that 'his songs do not yet know the Ascraean springs', he must mean that he has 'not yet' essayed Gallan or Callimachean aetiology. 'Ascraeos fontes' can by no stretch of the imagination be made to refer to epic inspiration, although that

<sup>37</sup> cf. F. Skutsch, op. cit. (n. 31), 36–8, W. Clausen's note in *A Commentary on Virgil Eclogues* (1994) on Verg., *Ecl.* 6.64. Contrast Ross, op. cit. (n. 27), 31–4, advancing a thoughtful, stubbornly defended minority opinion regarding Permessus, its situation, and significance, an opinion which needs to be considered carefully. Naturally, in the absence of Gallus' text scholars dispute what sort of poem the 'Grynean Grove' was, indeed whether Gallus ever wrote the poem. But there is broad agreement that the poem was written, and that it was aetiological and Callimachean. For a conjecture on its subject (Apollo's rape of the Amazon Gryne in the grove which then took her name: Serv. *auct.* on *Aen.* 4.345) see *CQ* 28 (1978), 186. Most scholars assume that it was the story of the contest in divination between Calchas and Mopsus (thus F. Skutsch, op. cit. (n. 31), 34; cf. Servius on *Ecl.* 6.72).

<sup>38</sup> With relief I here find myself in some agreement with Ross, op. cit. (n. 27), 119–20.

<sup>39</sup> The epithet Ἀσκραῖος applied to Hesiod first appears in the Hellenistic period, in Nicander (*Ther.* 11) and in epigram; we may conjecture that Callimachus used it thus, but no instance survives. Cf. R. F. Thomas, *Virgil Georgics* Vol. 1 (1988) on Verg., *Georg.* 2.176, and Clausen, op. cit. (n. 37) on Verg., *Ecl.* 6.70.

<sup>40</sup> Cameron, op. cit. (n. 32), 371 challenges the usual interpretation of 112.5–6, arguing that they refer to Callimachus himself, not Hesiod.

<sup>41</sup> Cameron, op. cit. (n. 32), 362–86.

<sup>42</sup> In spite of Cameron, op. cit. (n. 32), 374–9, which is convincing in some details, we must surely still see Callimachean veneration for Hesiod in this epigram.

would superficially fit the poem's logic better.<sup>43</sup> Propertius is joking again. The poem announces epic poetry, then it acknowledges that the time is not yet ripe for the full performance. But in lines 25–6, when admitting that the poet is stuck in love-elegy, it says, not the straightforward thing that the poet has not yet had epic inspiration: it says he has not yet even<sup>44</sup> ascended as far as Gallus, he has not even essayed an aetiological poem like the *Aetia* or the 'Grynean Grove'. Much less epic, we infer.

So, to sum up. These lines *compromise* on the statement that an epic is imminent, they falter and they offer a mite instead: this text. They admit that Propertius is not ready for the peak of poetry, exploiting imagery of ascent and Helicon which derives most immediately from Cornelius Gallus. And the whole topic is handled with wit, containing two clear jokes: the Bath of the Poems, and Propertius' unexpected confession that he has not even got as far as Gallus had.

#### IV. THE THRUST OF '2.11'

There are two primary questions to answer: (1) What are these 'munera', these 'gifts' of Cynthia's? (2) Why is writing about Cynthia, praising her, now deemed effort wasted, 'sowing seed in barren soil'? I shall give swift and summary answers, in order to identify the essential thrust of '2.11'; full explanation will come in stages.

(1) The 'munera' in question, now seen as mortal, must predominantly be the wonderful endowments of Cynthia, recounted in 2.2 and 2.3 and summed up as 'caelestia munera' in 2.3.25: those 'heavenly gifts' which inspired Propertius' second book, and which, so Propertius insisted, must have been gifts from the gods.<sup>45</sup> We note: these 'munera' in 2.3.25 were really climactic. 2.2 stressed the beauty of Cynthia, her face, hair, fingers, build, gait, all things which meant that Propertius could not be free of her. 2.3 then trumped this poem by saying, 'yes, her face, hair and so on, all inspire me; but it is not so much physical attributes like these, as artistic accomplishments, to which my second book of poetry is owed'. And the climactic summary of the totality was 'caelestia munera', gifts of heaven. So: simple paradox and a total and convincing sense of reversal underline that it is to the 'munera' of 2.3.25 that Propertius now refers in 2.11.3. What was earlier seen as divine, artistically inspirational, and climactic is now seen as bathetic, paltry and emphatically mortal. This is a topic to which we will return.

(2) 'laudet qui sterili . . .' It should be stressed first that Propertius does not deny the possibility that someone will write about Cynthia, indeed praise her: it may not happen, 'uel sis ignota', but it well may. The emphasis is that it will be effort wasted. Why? It must be because the material will be not worth praising. Of this there is immediate confirmation and indeed justification (3–4). The quintessential Cynthia material (her 'munera') is now stated to be emphatically mortal, as paltry as the corpse from which it will be inseparable: therefore not worth writing about.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Pace e.g. Enk, op. cit. (n. 15), ad loc., following F. Skutsch, op. cit. (n. 31), 37 ('der Strom des Permessus bedeutet für Propertius die niedere, die erotische Poesie, die Musenquellen aber die höhere, die heroische.'), Goold, op. cit. (n. 13), ad loc. An attempt at explanation and compromise, to me not successful, is made by Wimmel, op. cit. (n. 24), 200. Camps, op. cit. (n. 8), ad loc. retreats into vagueness: 'higher up the mountain is another spring from which a higher inspiration could be drawn.'

<sup>44</sup> I am inclined to lean on 'etiam', in spite of Camps' (op. cit. (n. 8)) note on 'nondum etiam' ('meaning the same as plain *nondum*; cf. 1.3.11, 9.17, etc.').

<sup>45</sup> Rothstein, op. cit. (n. 16), on 2.11.3, sees the reference to 2.3.25 (and pertinently compares too 1.2.27), but does not appreciate how climactic 2.3.25 is. Camps, op. cit. (n. 8) on 2.11.3, who also sees the reference to 2.3.25, thinks that mercenary 'munera'

'in the sense of II, xvi, 15 and 21' may also be in mind. We could add 1.16.36, 2.8.11, 2.16.9, 2.20.25, 2.23.3 and 8 and others. But I think this sense is marginal and unimportant. The only uses of 'munus' in the remnants of the putative Book 2a (2.1–11; cf. below vi.1) are those in 2.3, 2.8, and 2.11.

<sup>46</sup> Rothstein's extensive, paraphrasing efforts to explain the reasoning (in his notes on both 2.11.1 and 3, op. cit. (n. 16)) boil down to: 'others may praise you, but I won't because there is no lasting fame in it for me' ('dauernder Ruhm ist auf diesem Gebiete doch nicht zu erreichen'). He sees an important connection to 2.10 ('also *bella canam*'), but to harp on the question of Propertius' fame is not hitting the centre of the target. Enk, op. cit. (n. 15), has nothing helpful to offer ad loc. Camps, op. cit. (n. 8), ad loc. has nothing.



So here is the essential thrust of '2.11'. Cynthia's 'munera' are after all merely paltry, their writing a worthless pursuit, something for others to do, if anyone. But we may observe two questions. One might expect this mere mortal, effort-wasting material (as it is now said to be) to be contrasted with something immortal and worth a poet's time and trouble. Second, we will wonder at the function of this reversal: from *raison d'être* of a book to waste of effort, 'munera' 2.3.25 to 'munera' 2.11.3.

#### V. 2.10/11: BASIC REASONS FOR UNITY

We will first remind ourselves that one of the two main halves of the manuscript tradition (FP) does not disjoin 2.10 and 11. And from Scaliger to Rothstein the unity of the FP text has found defenders. In recent times (Butler and Barber, Enk, Camps, Goold) this has gone out of fashion.

Second, we will note that an unprepared apostrophe of Cynthia in the middle of a poem (as 'te' would be in 2.11.1) should cause no problems. In 'Book 2' Propertius is given to such apostrophes, making demands upon the reader: cf. e.g. 2.3.23–32 addressed to Cynthia, within a poem that first talks about her in the third person and contains other apostrophes; 2.8.13–16 to Cynthia, unnamed as yet, after 1–12 to 'amice', and then again 25–8 to Cynthia after 17–24 to Propertius himself; 2.9.15 to Achilles, with Enk ad loc. (though Housman and Goold reject this text); 2.15.11–30 to Cynthia, after an apostrophe to the bed, and followed by lines about Cynthia in the third person, followed eventually by yet more lines which apostrophize her (49–54).

But perhaps the main reason I see for asserting the unity of the piece is the convincing structure it offers.<sup>47</sup> It fits or rather reverses a conventional pattern. Once (incidentally) we observe this structure one of the questions left unanswered above will be disposed of.

There is a repeated rhythm, we may say structure, in the Roman 'recusatio'.<sup>48</sup> 'Others will write the uncongenial epic material: *I* by contrast will write love poetry vel sim . . .' The ancestor of this is in Callimachus' 'Telchines' preface, *Aetia* fr. 1.26 ἐτέρων and (especially) 32 ἄλλος, ἐγὼ δ'. Cf. Verg., *Ecl.* 6.6–8 'nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes, / Vare, tuas . . .) / agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam', Prop. 2.1.43–5 'navita de uentis . . ./enumerat miles uulnera . . ./nos contra . . .',<sup>49</sup> then (subsequent to our poem, but no doubt confirming the pattern of other lost 'recusationes'<sup>50</sup>), 2.34.59–62 'me iuuat hesternis positum languere corollis . . ./Actia Vergilio est<sup>51</sup> custodis litora Phoebi, / Caesaris et fortis dicere posse ratis . . .', 93 'Cynthia quin uiuet<sup>52</sup> uersu laudata Properti', 3.1.15–18 'multi, Roma, tuas laudes annalibus addent // sed quod pace legas . . ./detulit intacta pagina nostra uia', Hor., *Odes* 1.6.1–5 'scriberis Varro . . ./nos, Agrippa . . .' What 2.10 and 2.11 combined (the FP text) give is a convincing reversal of this pattern: '*I* will write the epic material, others by contrast may write the Cynthia poetry': 'iam libet et fortis memorare ad proelia turmas . . ., nunc uolo' etc.; 'scribant de te alii'. To appreciate the completeness of the reversal of structure it is necessary to have absorbed a point made above: that Propertius falters in '2.10', he postpones, compromises but does not 'refuse'; indeed he writes something in the way of epic material — his mite, 'uilia tura', lines 13–18: '2.10' is not really a 'recusatio'. And

<sup>47</sup> I think I make a convincing case in this article that 2.10/11 closed Book 2a. But while much of what I say is consonant with, and is I think most comfortable with, the assumption that 2.10/11 formed one poem, much is not incompatible with an assumption that Propertius closes with a pair of allied poems, 2.10 and 11. But the argument on structure that I here give is very strong support for the contention that 2.10/11 is indeed one single poem.

<sup>48</sup> Many examples are gathered in the discussion referred to above n. 25.

<sup>49</sup> Propertius here plays between the doing of the

actions and the description of the actions in a way which I have discussed elsewhere ('Propertius 2.3ob', forthcoming), but the message and the structure are essentially the same as in other 'recusationes'.

<sup>50</sup> For the likelihood of lost 'recusationes', see Lyne, op. cit. (n. 25), 34–6.

<sup>51</sup> I have adopted the text recommended by S. J. Heyworth, *CQ* 34 (1984), 399; Goold, op. cit. (n. 13), follows Housman's 'mi libet . . .posito'. Surely *iuuet* (NFL) cannot be right.

<sup>52</sup> 'iuuet' Barber followed by Goold, op. cit. (n. 13); *etiam* MSS.

now we have an answer for a question I left open above. The thrust of 2.11 was that Cynthia was effort-wasting material for a poet, her 'munera' paltry and mortal. I said that we might expect Propertius to contrast this material with something immortal, worth a poet's time and trouble. He is doing so, in this very poem, if we see 2.10 and 11 as one text. The immortal subject matter worthy of the poet's efforts are the achievements of Augustus — to which he accords some attention.

Now, granting that Propertius reverses the 'recusatio' structure and pays some attention to the achievements of Augustus, it may be timely to recall the humour in the piece. I would not wish to construct too ideologically obsequious a poet. We have lines 13–18, but — poems in baths, cheap offerings at the foot of statues, trying and failing to climb, the inability even to match Gallus' aetiological poetry — there is sport going on here, this is not the Horace of the Roman Odes. And, of course, this reversal of the 'recusatio' structure in 2.10/11 will itself soon be reversed: in 2.34 and 3.1; it will simply be ignored in what I think are the opening poems of Book 2b (2.12 and 13; see below VI. 1). And there is another point we could include at this time, line 10 'nunc aliam citharam me mea Musa docet'. Talk of 'my Muse' might take us back to the quirkily proprietary Callimachus with his talk of 'our Calliope' (*Aetia* fr. 75.77). It will take us back more immediately to Prop. 2.1 where Propertius offered us the delightful conceit that his Muse was not Calliope, who had been Callimachus' source of song (cf. too fr. 7.22), nor any other recognized divinity, but Cynthia herself ('non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo. / ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit', 2.1.3–4). We might wonder whether Cynthia ('mea Musa') will be very adept at teaching the poet another, non-amatory lyre.

#### VI. THE STRUCTURE OF BOOKS 2A AND 2B AND THE CLOSURAL FUNCTION OF 2.10/11. MORE EVIDENCE OF UNITY

##### (1) *The Structure of Books 2a and 2b*

I offer some thoughts on the original form of 'Book 2' as context for my closing discussion of 2.10/11.

'Book 2' opens with a clearly inceptive sequence. 2.1, Cynthia is my Muse: hence more love poetry; 2.2 and 3, more explanation of the second book, 'liber alter'. But I, like many editors from the Aldine edition of 1502 to Goold, feel 2.3 ends at line 44; and the rest of '2.3' and 2.4 read to me like fragments and excerpts.

'Book 2' ends with patently closural lines. 2.34.25–94 proceed from the uselessness of the literary interests of Lynceus (who is now a lover in the Propertian mould), via Vergil, to praise of Propertius' own literary achievement: the lines set Propertius triumphantly at the conclusion of a canon of Latin love poets. Working backwards hence we find 2.34.1–24. Unless lines have dropped out, I find it hard to believe that this is the same poem as 25–94. So I would talk as Barber's *Oxford Classical Text* does of 2.34a and 2.34b. I am then prepared to believe that 2.34a was paired with, and perhaps adjacent to, 2.34b, as 1.5 was paired with 1.10: the presumptive rival has his come-uppance; the come-uppance of Lynceus leads neatly into the literary finale. But before 2.34a I can detect no closing sequence like, say, poems 20–25 in 'Book 3', which can be argued to represent a tight-knit closing sequence to that book.<sup>53</sup> But 2.30b can be argued to be a 'proemio al mezzo',<sup>54</sup> perhaps introducing the poems following it.

But, anyway, we have a convincing beginning for a Book 2a (a sequence of three poems. 2.1–2.3.44) and a convincing end (2.34b) for a Book — most obviously for

<sup>53</sup> On 3.22, 23, 24 and 25 cf. the brief but suggestive comments of Williams, op. cit. (n. 6), 490–1. Cf. how 1.17–19 arguably form a closing sequence to the Cynthia poems of Book 1. But in 'Book 4', while 4.11 has clearly closural force, 4.9 and 10 seem to me to contribute in no obvious way to a closing sequence.

Back in Book 1 again, 21 and 22 clearly pair as a mixture of closing *sphragis* and political statement; but 20 requires comment.

<sup>54</sup> See my forthcoming article 'Propertius 2.30b'; the phrase is borrowed from G. B. Conte, *Virgilio. Il genere e i suoi confini* (1984), 121–33.

Book 2b, if we are accepting that two ancient books have been compressed into our Book 2. What may now occupy us is with what poem or poems Book 2a ended and with what poem or poems Book 2b began — always supposing that these poems survive.

Heyworth argued that 2.13 opened Book 2b.<sup>55</sup> I agree it is inceptive. 2.14 is then a magnificent candidate for the next poem in a continuing opening sequence: containing the secret of successful love (11–20), it provocatively and publicly celebrates the triumph of *militia amoris* (1–10, 23–8.), and it suggests the conquest of death by love (10, 16), thus countering the death *for* love that 2.13 suggested. And 2.15 also plausibly maintains the progress. It works from a particular event, a ‘nox candida’ of love; this prompts Propertius to advocate love-making in light and nudity (12, ‘si nescis, *oculi sunt in amore duces*’); and this then turns into a brilliantly concrete restatement of the ‘life of love’, of ‘uiuamus . . . atque amemus . . .’ and of Propertius’ own ‘quare, dum *licet*, inter nos laetemur amantes’ (Catull. 5 and Prop. 1.19.25): note especially lines 23–4 ‘dum nos fata sinunt, *oculos* satiemus amore: / nox tibi longa uenit, nec reditura dies’, 49 ‘tu modo, dum *lucet*, fructum ne desere uitae’. I have argued elsewhere<sup>56</sup> that it is 2.12 which in fact opened Book 2b, while 2.13 continues the process of introduction. And if we view 2.12–15 as a whole we have an utterly convincing inceptive sequence, as convincing in its own way as 2.1–3.44.

But where did Book 2a end? 2.8 and 9a<sup>57</sup> read to me as closural: 2.8, Cynthia has been snatched away, and Propertius is shattered; 2.9a, Propertius adverts to his supplanter, complains of Cynthia’s faithlessness, compares her with faithful figures of myth — and, in spite of it all, promises his fidelity to her, 45–6 ‘nec domina ulla meo ponet uestigia lecto: / solus ero, quoniam non licet esse tuum’. A bitter little joke then rounds off the poem. Do we not have a sense of impending closure? And then comes 2.10. Hutchinson and Heyworth have usefully argued for its closural force, rebutting Lachmann’s belief that it opened Book 2b.<sup>58</sup> In many respects I am in agreement with them. But the biggest difference between us is that I join 2.10 to 2.11.<sup>59</sup> My belief is that we have a closural sequence 2.8, 2.9a, 2.10/11.

Before I offer my final thoughts on 2.10/11, we might try to take stock of what may be the two books, 2a and 2b, or rather their remnants.

Let us suppose that Book 2b opened with 2.12–15 and closed with 2.34b and contained the text in between. Book 1 contained 706 lines, our ‘Book 3’ has 990, and ‘Book 4’ 952 (cf. Section 1). In 2.12–34 there are 976 lines. *Prima facie* we may see here our Book 2b — though there is, among other numerous problems, the question of dislocation mentioned in the next paragraph.

2.1–3.44 opened Book 2a. 2.8–10/11 are I think convincingly closural. But in 2.1–11 there are only 386 lines *in toto*. So, for a start, we should have to suppose that there has been severe loss of text if 2.1–11 are the remnant of Book 2a — but we are faced from time to time with what seem to be accidental fragments or intentional excerpts, so explanations for this can be found. Then, however, there is the question of dislocation of poems between our putative books. Heyworth thinks that the position in which some poems now stand suggests membership of the wrong book. He thinks for example that 2.9.25–28 (lines on Cynthia’s illness), presumptively in Book 2a, may presuppose 2.28, presumptively in Book 2b. I rather doubt this. The topic is one that is available enough (cf. e.g. Tibull. 1.5.9–18). More troublesome to me is 2.23/24.1–10: this piece surely belongs, as Heyworth sees (though he concentrates on 2.24), in Propertius’ second book.<sup>60</sup> Substantially, however, 2.12–34 may reflect Propertius’ original third book, and 2.1–11 may be the residue of his second.

<sup>55</sup> cf. Heyworth, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 167–8; cf. too Heyworth in *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), 45–9, discussing the unity of 2.13, its opening status, etc.

<sup>56</sup> See my forthcoming article ‘Programmatic poems in Propertius: 1.1 and 2.12’.

<sup>57</sup> i.e. 2.9.1–48. With Goold, *op. cit.* (n. 13) and many before him I can find no place for 2.9.49–52 in 2.9, even supposing a lacuna. This is one of the many floating fragments or excerpts that complicate our reading of ‘Book 2’.

<sup>58</sup> Hutchinson, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 100, Heyworth, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 166–7. See further below sub-section (2).

<sup>59</sup> Heyworth, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 168 wonders how 2.11 and 2.12 ‘intruded’ between the end of Book 2a and the beginning of Book 2b.

<sup>60</sup> For Heyworth’s views on both 2.9.25–8 and 2.24 see *op. cit.* (n. 4), 169. I am accepting, provisionally, Scaliger’s junction of 2.23 and 2.24.1–10, adopted by Goold, *op. cit.* (n. 13).

But now let me get to grips with 2.10/11 as a closural poem.

(2) *Propertius 2.10/11 as Closural: '2.10'*

Working with 2.10 alone, Hutchinson and Heyworth have shown its affinities with other closural texts. Hutchinson<sup>61</sup> compared the first couplet of 2.10 with the closing lines (541–2) of Verg., *Georg.* Book 2: 'sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus aequor, / et iam tempus equum fumantia soluere colla'. It should be added that Propertius' allusion in 2.10 is not just to the close of *Georg.* 2, but also to the opening of *Georg.* 3.<sup>62</sup> Vergil, who there looks forward to his epic, has the same idea of ascent: 8–9 'temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim / tollere humo' (cf. Prop. 2.10.11) 'uictorque uirum uolitare per ora' (and in Vergil an allusion to Ennius is unmistakable);<sup>63</sup> and Vergil gives the same sense of his enterprise already beginning: 22 'iam nunc . . .' (cf. Prop. 2.10.13). I would see these further allusions not as marring the closural status of '2.10', but as reinforcing points in it which I have mentioned above. Propertius, talking of epic in this poem, is compromising and postponing (or at least wishing to give us this impression), as Vergil is in *Georg.* 3; indeed he is offering his interim mite, as Vergil does: he is not actually 'refusing'. The poem is closural, but also promissory. Propertius is closural and promissory in the one poem, where Vergil had been closural at the end of one book, and promissory at the beginning of the next. Vergil will go on to higher things. In the next book, in some other book, Propertius too will proceed to higher things. Maybe.

Heyworth<sup>64</sup> adduces among other pertinent texts the very relevant last line of Callimachus' *Aetia* epilogue, fr. 112.9 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν ἔπειμι νομόν, 'but I will pass on to the prose pasture of the Muses'. Whether this signalled a succeeding text of the *Iambi* in a collected edition of Callimachus' works (vel sim.), or whether it announced the imminence of *Iambi* not yet published,<sup>65</sup> it too is both closural and promissory, as Propertius '2.10' wishes to appear. As, yet again, I use the word 'promissory', I should perhaps be quite explicit: unlike Vergil and Callimachus, Propertius' feinting promise is no doubt insincere. Anything more than the interim mite which '2.10' itself offers is unlikely even to be in the planning stages.

But let me now suggest how the whole text, 2.11 with 2.10, most convincingly and cleverly draws Book 2a to a close.

(3) *2.10/11: The Contribution of '11' to Closure*

(i). The *scribo* motif. We have seen that the total structure of 2.10/11 reverses that of a 'recusatio': 'I shall tell of Caesar (but not yet, not anyway in full), others may write of Cynthia.' The first part of the structure ('I shall tell of Caesar') is closural in the forward-looking ('promissory') mode of Callimachus (and cf. Verg. in *Georg.* 3 *imit.*). The second part ('Others may write about you, Cynthia, and waste energy on paltry,

<sup>61</sup> Hutchinson, loc. cit. (n. 58).

<sup>62</sup> Wimmel, op. cit. (n. 24), 193, 195–6, 199, 201 already well brings out the influence on Prop. 2.10 of the end of Verg., *Georg.* 2 and the beginning of *Georg.* 3.

<sup>63</sup> With 'uictorque uirum uolitare per ora', cf. Ennius' 'epitaph' *Varia* 18V = Epigrams 10 War-mington 'uolito uiuos per ora uirum'. Cf. above n. 36.

<sup>64</sup> Heyworth, op. cit. (n. 4), 166–7.

<sup>65</sup> R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* Vol. I (1949) on fr. 112.9 briefly states the thesis of a later, collected edition of Callimachus' works in which the epilogue was added to the *Aetia*, its last line effecting the transition to the text of the *Iambi* (he likewise argued that the 'Telchines' preface, our fr. 1, was added to a second edition

of the *Aetia* or to a collected edition of his works: *Hermes* 63 (1928), 302–41). P. J. Parsons (*ZPE* 25 (1977), 50) intrudes caution, elaboration and refinement: he thinks that the epilogue was fitted (together with the new prologue, fr. 1) to a new edition of the *Aetia*, when Books 3–4, framed by honorific pieces to Berenice, were added to Books 1–2 (and at that point the *Iambi* would already have been published). But P. E. Knox (*GRBS* 26 (1985), 59–66) suggests that the epilogue was composed for the earlier issue of *Aetia* Books 1–2 and looked forward to *Iambi* not yet published. For a summary of the views of Pfeiffer, Parsons, and Knox, see Cameron, op. cit. (n. 32), 104, 112, 145, 157–8.

mortal "munera") closes in retrospective mode, surveying the preceding production, Book 2a.

'Scribant de te alii' (2.11.1) picks up Propertius' statement in 2.10.8 'scripta puella mea est'; and both these close the dominant introductory motif of Book 2a: the *writing* of the book. The book opened with the interrogatory 'quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores' (2.1.1) . . . How come all these love poems are *written*? Whence this *book* (2.1.2, cf. 2.3.4)? The answer: the inspirational Cynthia. In 2.10/11 the closure: 'my girl has now been written by me; others can write about her and waste their time.' In short, the whole key conceit of the programmatic 2.1 and following (Cynthia inspires writing) is now dismissed, denied and closed.<sup>66</sup>

(ii). *Munera*. We should now affirm the full impact of 'munera' in 2.11.3 (cf. Section IV). In poems 2.2 and 2.3 Propertius praised Cynthia's inspirational physical features; in 2.3 he said that it was not so much these physical attributes (though deserving further recital) that inspired his second book of poetry, but her artistic accomplishments. And the climactic summary of this totality was 2.3.25 'caelestia munera', 'heavenly gifts': 'haec tibi contulerunt caelestia munera diui, / haec tibi ne matrem forte dedisse putes. / non, non humani partus sunt talia dona . . .', 'these heavenly gifts the gods bestowed on you, lest you think your mother gave you them. No, no, such presents are no part of human parentage . . .'. Now we find that, just as the inceptive, positive presentation of Cynthia and writing was dismissed and abandoned, so too the divine and inspiring 'munera' of the opening sequence are conclusively dismissed as topics for poetry. These gifts are (Propertius now says) merely mortal, they will die with Cynthia, they are not — for Propertius — worth writing about. By contrast, the achievements of Caesar (2.10.4, 13–18): they, we infer, are immortal and worthwhile. (We may also infer an implied play on words. 'Munera', 'gifts', are also the 'duties' of statesmen.<sup>67</sup>) Further effective closure.

(iii). *Docta puella*. Cynthia has been 'written', her 'gifts' are merely mortal, not worthy of poetry. What of the 'docta puella', the 'learned', 'artful' girl (2.11.6)? Here too we find closure, and in the same vein. 'Doctrina' had been a leading, indeed programmatic, Cynthia motif. Prop. 1.7.11 presented her as 'docta', in the cycle of poems explaining the source and purpose of love poetry to the epic poet Ponticus: 'me laudent doctae solum placuisse puellae', 'let them praise me that I alone found favour with a learned, artful girl' (where the sense is equivocal between Propertius the lover/poet and Cynthia the accomplished beloved/discerning critic); we heard about Cynthia's accomplishments, enough to merit the epithet 'docta', in 1.2.27–30. At the beginning of Book 2a (2.1.3–4) the inspirational Cynthia, in a nice play with Callimachus, is presented as Propertius' Muse (see above Section v). We remember that way back in Hesiod's time the Muses are associated with teaching, they 'taught' Hesiod song (*Theog.* 22 ἐδίδαξαν ᾠοδῆν), and for the post-Catullan poet (at least) the Muses are 'doctae'.<sup>68</sup> Catullus 65.2 refers to the 'doctis . . . uirginibus', and this is echoed in Prop. 2.30b,

<sup>66</sup> 'Scribo' is used in a self-reflexive manner within the remnants of the putative Book 2a too: 2.5.27, Tibullus may knock his girl around, but Propertius will *write* his retaliation to bad behaviour on Cynthia's part (cf. F. Solmsen, 'Propertius in his literary relations with Tibullus and Vergil', *Philologus* 105 (1961), 273–89). The one other use of a 'scribo' cognate in this Book 2a is 2.3.21: Cynthia produces 'scripta'. In 2.13.12 'scripta' plays a leading role in the introduction of the putative Book 2b; it plays a prominent role in 3.9.45 in the description of 'Book 3', and in 3.23.2 it contributes to a closural motif. 'Scribo' and cognates occur often in other passages of Propertius, but not with quite the same key force as in Book 2a and perhaps 'Book 3'. Interesting from my present point of view (self-reflexive, or potentially self-reflexive) are 1.18.22, 2.34.87, 3.9.3, 3.23.19, 4.1.136 (and perhaps 3.3.21 deserves consideration in this context); less interesting (from this point of view) are 2.23.8, 2.28.44, 3.8.26, 3.20.16, 3.23.24, 4.3.72, 4.5.37,

4.7.83. There are 'scriptores' at 2.34.65 and 3.1.12. (This is I think a complete list of 'scribo' cognates in Propertius.)

<sup>67</sup> cf. *OLD* s.v. 2 'A duty owed by a citizen to the State (e.g. military service, tenure of magistracies) . . .'. Cf. Cic., *Ver.* 3.98 'multa sunt imposita huic ordini munera, multi labores', Livy 9.3.5 'is grauis annis non militaribus solum sed ciuilibus quoque abscesserat muneribus'. The only other use of 'munus' in Book 2a is 2.8.11. For other uses of the word in Propertius (but not a complete list) see n. 45 above.

<sup>68</sup> Some post-Catullan examples are cited by For-dyce, *Catullus. A Commentary* (1961), ad loc. See too *TLL* 5.1.1757.34–44 which gives Catullus 65.2 as the first instance of 'doctus' 'de deis'. In Greek culture, it is typically the poet who is σοφός: cf. e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor., *Odes* 1.1.29. The use of διδάσκω cited above in connection with the Muses in Hesiod is perhaps particularly interesting.

where the Muses are 'uirginibus' (33) and the epithet 'docta' is transferred to the accompanying Bacchus' 'cuspis' (38). So, Cynthia presented as Muse in 2.1.3-4, has her aura of 'doctrina' reinforced. Then, among Cynthia's divine, inspirational accomplishments in 2.3 is the fact that she is 'par Aganippaeae ludere docta lyrae', 'artful to play something to match Aganippe's lyre' (20); nor do we need the explicit word 'docta' to infer Cynthia's treasured artistic 'doctrina' from 2.3 esp. 19-22. Cynthia, therefore, in these inceptive and programmatic poems, is 'docta'. But then in 2.11.6: a chilling closure. Looking forward to Cynthia's death, to the death of her 'munera', and to the disdain her bones will incur, Propertius says: 'the traveller will *not* say: "this ash was a *docta puella*".' This is closure, forceful and damning. The great inspirational characteristic that this book and the previous one had constructed for Cynthia is effectively undone. Her 'doctrina' will be lost to knowledge.

(iv). *Docta puella*, and the ironic mode. 'Her "doctrina" will be lost to knowledge.' But of course it won't. This is a brilliant, ironic, ambiguous closure. Maybe the 'uiator' will not say Cynthia was a 'docta puella', but it is being said. Propertius is saying it: 'cinis hic docta puella fuit'. And the words will last as long as literature lasts: and for the sanguine, this is forever, as Propertius will tell us in 3.2, drawing on Horace and a long tradition.

Propertius' ironic method of (ultimately) immortalizing Cynthia as 'docta' is — one might feel — related to the post-modern mode of expression that Umberto Eco talks about.<sup>69</sup>

We could say similar things about the whole tenor of 2.11.3-6. On the face of it they deny, they chillingly close the bright opening that is (for example) 2.3.29-32:<sup>70</sup> there Cynthia has a future, and it sounds like an immortal one, as consort of Jupiter. 2.11.3-6 tell us that she and everything about her will die (no sharing Jupiter's bed for example, her bed will be her bier). On the other hand the lines ensure precisely the opposite: that she will live. Here we are now reading about her and her accomplishments. The lines participate in the perpetuation of her future.

(v). More parallels with 2.1; closural ring-composition. Cynthia inspires (2.1), Cynthia doesn't inspire — it's all written etc. (2.10/11). Augustus doesn't inspire (2.1), Augustus does inspire (2.10/11). 'Laus' has now been transferred from love and Cynthia (2.1.47 *bis*) to Augustan praise-poetry and its rewards (2.10.6 and 23); 'bella', refused as a subject of poetry in 2.1.25 and 28, are accepted in 2.10.8; likewise 'tumultus': refused in 2.1.39, accepted in 2.10.7.<sup>71</sup> On top of these thematic and lexical rings between the two poems, we will also note the theme of death, tomb, and epitaph.

In 2.1 Propertius envisages his death, his death-for-love, 2.1.47-78 'laus in amore mori . . .' He imagines his tomb. The great Maecenas, passing by on the road (75-6), is asked to pause, and (77-8),

taliaque illacrimans mutae iace uerba fauillae:  
'huic misero fatum dura puella fuit.'

and shedding a tear, let fall these words for my silent embers: 'a harsh girl was the death of this wretched man'.

<sup>69</sup> I refer to a well-known passage in the 'Postille a "Il nome della rosa" 1983' (see *Il Nome della Rosa* (1995), 528-9: 'Il post-moderno . . . Ironia, gioco metalinguistico'). In Eco's now celebrated example, the post-modern lover is inhibited from saying 'ti amo disperatamente', since it has been said too often, it is the sort of thing that is said in the sentimental novels of Liala; and he says instead 'Come direbbe Liala, ti amo disperatamente'. In this way he is dissociated from the unsayable sentiment, but nevertheless manages to say it in an *ironic* mode. Comparably, Propertius is dissociated from saying 'cinis hic docta puella fuit', but in an ironic mode still manages to say it. (In the English version of the *Postille, Postscript to the Name of the Rose* (1984), 67-8, Barbara Cartland is used instead of Liala. The post-modern lover is unable to say 'I love you madly', but can say 'As

Barbara Cartland would put it, I love you madly.') D. P. Fowler has already used the insight of Umberto Eco, and the quoted passage, to illuminate brilliantly Catullus 51: see Fowler, 'First thoughts on closure: problems and perspectives', *MD* 22 (1989), 112-13. Cf. too Fowler, 'Postmodernism, romantic irony, and classical closure', in I. J. F. De Jong and J. P. Sullivan (eds), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (1994), 231-55, esp. 236-7, citing the same passage of Eco in an interpretation of Theognis 236-54.

<sup>70</sup> Goold, *op. cit.* (n. 13), prints Sterke's re-ordering of these lines (29, 32, 31, 30), correctly I think.

<sup>71</sup> These are the only examples of 'laus' and 'tumultus' in the putative Propertius Book 2a. 'Bellum' occurs in addition to the examples cited at 2.3.35 and 40, safely mythical.

And so poem 2.1 ends. Romantic agony, *Liebestod*, and so on:<sup>72</sup> but also, of course, self-praise and fame in death: 'laus', attention from the great man, and Maecenas' succinct, commiserating *epitaphios*.

2.11.5–6 gathers up the theme of death and *epitaphios*, in neat closural ring-composition:

et tua transibit contemnens ossa uiator,  
nec dicet 'cinis hic docta puella fuit'.

and the traveller will pass by your bones in disdain, and will not say: 'this ash was an artful girl.'

Propertius delivers chilling contrast to the close of 2.1. Cynthia's death and tomb are envisaged, not his. And for her there will be no great man pausing at her tomb, and no *epitaphios*. Far from it, an anonymous traveller will pass on by in scorn, and will not bother to utter her commemoration. So: ring-composition, stark with contrasts, closes the book.

Unless, of course, you read the close in what we may call an Eco way. There is after all a great man at Cynthia's tomb, and there is an *epitaphios* to match Maecenas' *epitaphios* for Propertius. Propertius is there, and Propertius delivers the eulogy: 'cinis hic docta puella fuit'.

(vi). A final point is worth noting. Given that the ironic, Eco reading of the close of 2a is magnificently available — *Propertius* constructs an *epitaphios*, *Propertius* still assigns the key epithet 'docta' — this close is indeed not as devastating as it might at first sight seem, especially when we remember that death is an inseparable part of Propertius' erotic thinking.<sup>73</sup> There is therefore no great surprise that a third book of Cynthia poetry quite swiftly followed, nor that her lead epithet is 'docta' (2.13.11).

APPENDIX: SOME SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ON PERMESSUS ETC. AS IMAGINED BY VERGIL, GALLUS AND OTHERS<sup>74</sup>

(i). *A Low-lying River Permessus in Relation to Mt. Helicon*

Callimachus made reference to Permessus in his Helicon scene (cf. *Aetia* fr. 2a.20), but we cannot tell how he situated it. We can say more about Vergil and Gallus. If Gallus, wandering by the river Permessus, is led onto Helicon (*Ecl.* 6.64–5), Permessus or the relevant stretch of Permessus is presumably imagined — by Vergil and Gallus — as situated at the foot of Helicon. This is plausible, in real terms. Strabo 9.2.19 (C 407) tells us that 'the Permessus and the Olmeius, flowing from Helicon, meet one another and empty into Lake Copais near Haliartus'; Pausanias 9.29.5 tells us that the Permessus (under its variant name Termessus) flows 'round Helicon'. West on Hesiod, *Theog.* 5 discusses modern brooks which might suit Strabo's quite detailed description and favours the stream Zagará 'which flows from the northern side of the same watershed [as a rival candidate, Archontitsa] near the top of the mountain [Helicon]'. More importantly for us (because more important for the key Roman poets), the text of Hesiod, *Theog.* 5–7 might imply that Permessus is low-lying compared with the summit of Helicon: 'having washed their tender skin in Permessus or Hippocrene or holy Olmeius, the Muses made their fair, graceful dances on topmost Helicon.'

<sup>72</sup> cf. the interesting comments on this poem of T. D. Papanghelis, *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (1987), 47–9 (and see his Index of Passages for further comments).

<sup>73</sup> It is worth here referring the reader in a general way to the important book of Papanghelis (n. 72).

<sup>74</sup> cf., most recently, Clausen's note (op. cit. (n. 37)) on Vergil, *Ecl.* 6.64.

*(ii). Hippocrene and Helicon*

This text (Hes., *Theog.* 5–7) would then also imply, of course, that *Hippocrene* is low-lying in relation to the summit of Helicon. And if one puts together Hesiod, *Theog.* 23 (Hesiod met the Muses while ‘shepherding lambs beneath holy Helicon’) and Callimachus fr. 2.1–2 (Hesiod met the Muses while tending sheep by Hippocrene) and fr. 112.5–6 (according to the conventional interpretation of these Callimachean lines which sees them again linking Hippocrene to Hesiod: but see above n. 40), one would make the same inference. We do not know what Gallus did with Hippocrene. But Prop. 2.10.25 seems to envisage Hippocrene high up, if not at the summit of Helicon. This actually accords with modern views of the identity and situation of Hippocrene (West on Hesiod, *Theog.* 6, Hippocrene ‘can with some confidence be identified with the modern Kriopigádi, a perennial source of cold, clear water near the summit of Helicon’). But I doubt that Propertius’ autoptic knowledge of the summit of Helicon would have survived a searching viva-voce examination; I imagine he suggests its summit position (if that is what he does) through a combination of luck and desire, and perhaps the precedent of Gallus and / or Ennius.

*(iii). A Detail in Nicander*

Another text to observe is Nicander, *Ther.* 11 εἰ ἐτέον περ / Ἄσκραϊὸς μυχάτοιο Μελισσήεντος ἐπ’ ὄχθαις / Ἡσίοδος κατέλεξε παρ’ ὕδασι Περμησσοῖο, ‘if indeed he spoke the truth, Ascræan Hesiod, on the rising ground (banks, heights) of secluded Melisseeis by the waters of Permessus.’ The scholiast on Nicander tells us that Melisseeis was the part of Helicon where Hesiod received instruction from the Muses: ‘beneath holy Helicon’, according to *Theog.* 23. So Nicander’s picture is not inconsistent, I suppose, with a Permessus low-lying at the foot of Helicon, as imagined by the sources already mentioned. But there is an important point of conflict with other texts (with Vergil-Gallus, Propertius 2.10, perhaps Callimachus, Hesiod himself): the close association of Hesiod’s own composition with Permessus. For Hesiod, Permessus (*Theog.* 5) is incidental to his own composition, in particular to his initiation (22–35); in Vergil-Gallus and Propertius, at least, Permessus is opposed to Hesiodic production. This reminds us that for these poets invention and variation could be a potent factor, and a predecessor’s authority — even the master’s — could be more or less important.

*Balliol College, Oxford*