

PROPERTIUS 2.18: "KEIN EINHEITLICHES GEDICHT. . ." ¹⁾

WILLIAM R. NETHERCUT

Elegy 2.18 is one of those poems in Propertius whose abrupt changes of thought have made it a favorite target for division. In fact, it is one of the two elegies in Book Two which have seemed sufficiently incoherent to merit a *triple* severance: Part "A" (verses 1-4), Part "B" (verses 5-22), and Part "C" (verses 23-38). ²⁾ Hetzel separated the first two couplets in 1876, taking them as a fragment of some other elegy which had wandered to its present position in the text; Rossberg followed him. ³⁾ Among more recent editors of Propertius, W.A. Camps, acknowledging that the thirty-eight lines of 2.18 do appear in the MSS as a continuous

1) The title is drawn from K. Rossberg, "Zu Kritik des Propertius" *Jahrb. klass. Phil.* 127 (1883), 71.

2) E.g. by H.E. Butler, *Propertius* (Loeb Classical Library, Harvard 1912) 112-117; H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford 1933), 51-52; E.A. Barber, *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford 1957) 55-57; W.A. Camps, *Propertius: Elegies Book II* (Cambridge 1967) 35-36. Among translators, A.E. Watts, *The Poems of Sextus Propertius* (Chichester 1961) 71-72, and C. Carrier, *The Poems of Propertius* (Bloomington 1963) 84-86, follow this division. The "reconditioned text" and translation of S.G. Tremenheere, *The Elegies of Propertius* (London 1931), derives its approach from O.L. Richmond's version and scatters 2.18 in various directions: the first four verses, Part "A", are joined with elegy 2.25 to create a new composition, "Elegy 2.16" -- cf. p. 106; most of 2.18 follows another cutting from 2.25 to make another new piece, "Elegy 2.22", pp. 128-133; then several couplets are assigned elegies where they seem to share subject interest -- 2.18.21-22 and 37-38, on rumor, is given to elegy 2.5 (p. 72); 2.18.35-36, on Cynthia's bed (*lectus*) as *custodia*, belong in elegy 2.6 on the decline of morals in Rome (p. 78); and 2.18.33-34, in which Propertius compares himself to Cynthia's "brother" and "son," is included in elegy 2.7 -- the poem on Propertius' loyal union which Caesar's marriage law had threatened.

3) Rossberg (above, note 1), 71: "Vs. 1-4 sind ein irgend woher stammender Fetzen, der Rest das Bruchstück eines andern Gedichtes."

unit, yet argues that "Lines 1-4 appear . . . to be separate from what follows; and no cogent reason is apparent for attaching them . . . to the preceding elegy xvii."⁴⁾ And the latest edition of the elegist, by L. Richardson, Jr., prints 2.18.1-4 at the conclusion of a new poem comprised of 2.22 "B" and elegy 2.17.⁵⁾

It has been proposed that we may consider joining 1-4 to the conclusion of 2.17, as "reflections provoked by his misfortunes."⁶⁾ If we leave out of the question 2.22 "B", this reading of Propertius may merit appreciation on grounds of style: the structure of 2.17 (+ 18.1-4) is tight indeed. Propertius is exclaiming that he will only gain Cynthia's hostility if he complains at her; a woman is often "broken" (*frangitur*, 2.18.2) by the man who keeps silent when she does him wrong. The advice is not new: we remember it from 1.18.26, in which the poet asked whether Cynthia was angry at him because he had been complaining too much; the same idea is found in 2.14.19-20, where Propertius tells us that the best plan is to ignore the attractions your woman will feel for other men, and to scorn her unfeeling behavior toward you. If we do take *frangitur* ("she is broken") from the beginning of 2.18 (verse 2) and set it to round off 2.17, this verb will answer, three lines from the ending of our new elegy (= 2.17 + 2.18.1-4), *fractus* in 2.17.4, where it is Propertius who is "broken" by tossing himself from one side of his lonely bed to the other.⁷⁾ There will also be a fram-

4) Camps (above, note 2), 138.

5) L. Richardson, Jr., *Propertius, Elegies I-IV* (Norman 1976) 76, 275-278.

6) Butler and Barber (above, note 2), 221. Cf. G. Luck, *Properz und Tibull, Liebeselegien* (Zürich 1964) 98-99. M. Rothstein, *Propertius Sextus, Elegien* (Berlin 1898) vol. 2, 347, set the first 22 verses of 2.18 together with 2.17 on the grounds that they shared the same argument; this was disputed by M. Ites, *De Properti Elegiis inter se conexas* (Diss. Göttingen 1908) 33-34, who felt that the beginning of 2.18 did not "square with" the end of 2.17 (*sed initium el. 18 non quadrat ad finem 17.*).

7) For additional instances of such "echoing," see P.J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Leiden 1962) vol. 2, 420-421, drawing on D.R. Shackleton-Bailey, in *Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc.* (1952-1953) 18.

ing of the elegy by *mentiri*, the first word of 2.17 which announces Cynthia's falsity in leading him on to believe that she would spend the night with him, and *nega!*, with which the new composition will finish: it is Cynthia's denial which occasions the poem, and, in characteristically Propertian fashion, a reversal will have switched negation to the poet's side at the end.

This is all very tidy, but we cannot be sure. Propertius often uses verbal repetitions, not only to frame, but to connect *separate* elegies: for example, *Amor* appears at the beginning of elegies 2.12 and 2.13. This is a typical Propertian device to insure the easy flow of his adventures.⁸⁾

Instead, I would follow the MSS and see, in 2.18, a single elegy unified by high irony. Propertius has just written (1-4) that if the lover sees his mistress do anything, he must deny having seen this, or if he feels hurt over

Also T.A. Suits' review of Enk in *CP* 60 (1965), 38. Cf. now the dissertation by J.K. King, *Studies in Verbal Repetition in the Monobiblos of Propertius* (Boulder, Colorado, 1969), which is an exhaustive correlation of internal echoes within the individual elegies of Book One. See, too, A.G. Robson, "The Enfolding Couplets: Their Relation to the Problems of Propertius IV, 9, 71-74" *Mn* 26 (1973) 234-238.

8) In Book One, the *duro sidere* beneath which Propertius lives in 1.6 changes to the *dura domina* who rules his life in 1.7; 1.11 ends with *crimen amoris*, and 1.12 opens with a kind of pun at the end of the first two verses, *crimen ... moram* (Propertius' delay in Rome is as much a reproach as Baiae itself); in 1.14 Propertius -- no Odysseus -- bids a long farewell to the riches of any Alcinous, while in 1.15 he suddenly becomes Odysseus to complain that Cynthia will not weep after him as Calypso did for Ulysses! *Desertus* appears at the start of 1.17, picking up the isolation Propertius endures as *exclusus amator* in 1.16, and *desertus* is stated again both at the beginning and end of the next poem, 1.18, while *vacent* at the conclusion of 1.18 is recapitulated by *vacet* close to the beginning of 1.19, and continued by *vacuo* in 1.20.2 (*amor* at the end of 1.19 goes to *amore* in 1.20.1); Gallus in 1.20 is succeeded by another Gallus in 1.21; and so on. Such a brief survey establishes the kind of continuity which is able to be documented fully for Book Two. For one example: at 2.10, where Lachmann thought a new book should begin (see now O. Skutsch, *HSCP* 79, 1975, 229-233; J.P. Sullivan, *Propertius*, Cambridge 1976, 7; M. Hubbard, *Propertius*, London 1974, 40 and 44), *Haemonio equo* in line 2 relates most closely to the *Thebani duces* at the end of 2.9, but can also include allusion to the "Haemonian hero," Achilles, to whom Propertius compares himself in 2.8-9. Moving forward, 2.10 ends by disavowing Propertius' ability *laudis conscendere carmen*, while in 2.11 he also refuses to praise Cynthia, whom he despises (*laudet, qui sterili ...*).

anything, he ought to deny that too. "If you see anything . . .," "If anything hurts . . .," both have the words *si quid* (3-4); now, at verse 5, where editors start a new elegy, -- Part "B" --, Propertius reverses *si quid* ("if anything") to *Quid si* ("But WHAT would you do IF my span of years were whitely evident?!"). The "Preceptor of Love" has no sooner counselled us to bear all in loyal silence, than he begins a long and witty harangue, complaining as loudly as any lover could!⁹⁾ The Dawn, Aurora, married Tithonus: obtaining for him immortal life, she neglected to request, too, immortal youth. And so he shrivelled up, grew incredibly aged, and never could die. Propertius says that Aurora still cradles old Tithonus in her arms; in fact, she is in such a hurry to embrace him that she puts this delight ahead of her horses' comfort, when she returns home in the afternoon.¹⁰⁾ But Cynthia, while Propertius is vital and good-looking, shuns him even now!

Even those editors who have been inclined to keep 1-4 and 5-22 together mark a division before 23-38.¹¹⁾ The final couplet of "B",

9) P.J. Enk (above, note 7), 253-254: "Interpretemur elegiam *psychologicè* rogantes, quo animo fuerit Propertius, cum carmen nostrum scriberet. Ut in elegia 17, poeta iratus tristisque est. Sed ipse se erigit, non iam queri vult, nam assidue querelae odium pariunt, puellisque displicent: 'fortasse si tacebo', inquit, 'miserebitur mei et frangetur. Nonne omnes semper in ore habent illud: si quid vidisti, nega te vidisse; cela dolorem?' Sed dum sibi ea verba repetit, sentit se tacere non posse; indignatio eius nimia fit et erumpit in haec verba irata: 'Quid faceres, si senescerem? Odisti me, quamquam iuvenis sum'."

10) It is perhaps fanciful, but pleasant, to note, in this connection, the inversion of *quam prius* in 2.18.10:

"Illum saepe suis decedens fovit in ulnis
quam prius abiunctos sedula lavit equos."

Prius abiunctos, postponed, shows where her priorities might have lain.

11) C. Lachmann, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina* (Leipzig 1816) 164-168; C. Hosius, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV* (Leipzig 1911) 53-55; M. Rothstein, *Propertius, Sextus. Elegien* (Zürich 1966³) vol. 1, 326-332; F. Dornseiff and M. Schuster, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV* (Leipzig 1954) 58-60; P.J. Enk (above, note 7) vol. 1, 95-97, and vol. 2, 253-262; E.V. d'Arbela, *Properzio. Elegie* (Milan 1965) vol. 2, 149-155; G. Luck (above, note 6), 100-101. Cf., too, the translation of J. Warden, *The Poems of Propertius* (New York 1972) 89-91.

"Quin ego diminuo curam, quod saepe Cupido
 huic malus esse solet, cui bonus ante fuit"
 (2.18.21-22)

has been judged a trite commonplace which ill accords with the apparent passion of the foregoing verses (Scaliger transposed it to follow 1-4) and also seems to have nothing to do with what now ensues. On both accounts -- that it is "weak" where it comes, and that it does not lead into the subsequent part of the elegy -- a new look may be taken.

Lachmann justified 21-22 in position as an appropriate conclusion for 5-20, citing Corydon's final words in Bucolic 2 (*invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexim*), as well as the sentiment of Asclepiades of Samos, Epigram 11 (= *Anth. Pal.* 12. 153):

Πρόσθε μοι Ἀρχεάδης ἐθλίβετο· νῦν δὲ τάλαιναν
 οὐδ' ὅσον παίζων ἐς ἔμ' ἐπιστρέφεται.
 Οὐδ' ὁ μελιχρὸς Ἔρως αἰεὶ γλυκὺς· ἀλλ' ἀνιήσας
 πολλάκις ἡδίων γίνετ' ἔρῳσι θεός.

Lachmann comments: "Nihil erit diversitatis, si . . . scribamus 'Huic BONUS esse solet, cui MALUS ante fuit.'"¹²⁾

Not only may it be possible to say that the last couplet of Part "B" ties off this section of the poem in a satisfactory manner (if we envision, in what seems a characteristic distancing by Propertius, the "passionate" lover suddenly lifting himself off out of the welter of his feelings to offer a "philosophic" *sententia*), but Lachmann's formulation serves to point up the way in which "B" proceeds into "C" (2.18.23-38). Lachmann's comment, quoted above, emphasizes for us that Propertius, instead of writing what we find there, in fact placed MALUS, not *bonus*, at the beginning of 2.18.22, occupying the present. In line 22, Propertius is thinking about his world as it *now* stands in disarray. Corydon and the Greek girl can look to a better day.¹³⁾ For

12) Lachmann (above, note 11), 165.

13) We may also compare, in a different context, Horace C. 2.10.17-20:

Propertius, there is no future, no look ahead: where he finds himself now, it is implied, is all there is.

That Propertius makes his present misfortunes the end toward which Cupid has been aiming on earlier, happier occasions, smooths the way for *Nunc*, which brings out into the open, at the start of Part "C", what is implicit at the end of "B". Propertius has contrasted what he once was, a happy lover, with what he is *now*, unhappy: this is contained at the end of "B". And NOW (*Nunc*) to *add* to his unhappiness (*etiam* = "also, too, moreover"), Cynthia has laid at his door an additional aggravation, turning herself into a monstrosity!

*"Nunc etiam infectos demens imitare Britannos,
ludis et externo tincta nitore caput?"*

(2.18.23-24)

The falsity of her contrived appearance is as much a breach of her loyalty to Propertius as her refusal to let him visit her for ten days, in elegy 2.17: the same words which began that poem, *mentiri* and *infectas*, are repeated rather closely together in 2.18 "C", where Cynthia now is eager to imitate the "dyed" or "stained" Britons (*infectos Britannos*, 23) and can consequently look forward to punishment in the afterlife for "falsifying" her hair (*mentita comas*, 28).

In brief: elegy 2.18 is effective as a unified poem:

(1) the interpretation of P.J. Enk, that Propertius' "good advice" at the start of 2.18 is immediately undercut by his lack of will-power to persist in silence, is strengthened by the reversal of *si quid* to *Quid si*; (2) the words *nunc etiam* can be tied, at the beginning of Part "C", to the temporal premise inherent in Propertius' words at the last of "B"; (3) the expostulatory tone which breaks into the elegy at verse 5 (the start of "B") is renewed at the first verse of "C" (line 23) -- in other words, there is a *double rhythm* to

"Non, si male nunc, et olim
sic erit: quondam cithara tacentem
suscitat Musam neque semper arcum
tendit Apollo."

Horace resembles the parallels adduced by Lachmann, in looking ahead for happier times to come. Therefore, if he resembles Propertius in assigning *male* to the present, he is quite different.

2.18: advice and outburst, and, after an attempt to dampen the passion of his censure by a semi-philosophical pose, renewed outburst. The experience of 2.18 runs smoothly, and with abundant humor, from Propertius' original instructions about keeping silence even while in pain, through two sections of resounding irritation! It would be witty enough for the poet to have undercut himself as he does in leaping, after 2.18.1-4, into 5-22; the quasi-philosophic distancing in 21-22, just preceding a further immersion in agony, compounds our enjoyment. (4) It is not precise, but perhaps suggestive, to recall that in an elegy close to 2.18, Propertius employs just such a double rhythm: elegy 2.14 opposes Propertius' sense of triumph, upon his return, after a long period of rejection, into Cynthia's arms (2.14.1-10), against his erstwhile misery apart from her (2.14.11-14); he then repeats this movement from triumph, to doubt and insecurity, in lines 19-28 and 29-32, respectively.¹⁴⁾

If we grant that elegy 2.14 does repeat its essential contrast, albeit in a more brief form, even as 2.18 does what it wants to do not only once, but a second time, the author's conception of the latter poem may seem less novel. At the same time, however, it is important to admit that, because of its more lengthy development of seemingly unrelated portions, 2.18 needs to be studied in a way quite distinct from 2.14. I shall propose that the surprise we feel when we understand that Propertius has not finished with his philosophic commonplace in 2.18.21-22,¹⁵⁾ but

14) N. Tadic-Gilloteaux, "À la Recherche de la Personnalité de Propertius" *Latomus* 24 (1965), 238-273, schematizes 2.14 as A - B - A - B. This is accurate as a representation of the shifting mood of the elegy, but for a closer structural analysis, cf. J. Vaio, "The Authenticity and Relevance of Propertius II, 14. 29-32" *CP* 57 (1962) 236-238.

15) If we really think that 2.18.23ff. (= "C") are a new elegy, we shall have to end 1-22 with an erotic commonplace, which, now that we have perceived the extreme originality and interest of the leap from 1-4 into 5-20 (and now that we reflect, also, upon the freshness of Propertius' handling of the Aurora-Tithonus relationship), will indeed be commonplace. One will feel all the greater sympathy for Scaliger's impatience with 21-22 as an ending, though his dissatisfaction was at least partially countered by Lachmann's citation of Corydon at the end

rather intends to carry us on into another development ("C"), is appropriate to the position this elegy maintains within the second book of Propertius.

Elegy 2.18 continues the train of thought -- the lover's despair -- worked into 2.17 and 2.16: it fits, where we find it. Elegies 2.16-18 all have to do with Cynthia's falsehood: the first warns her that Jupiter will destroy the perjured lover who takes another to her arms; the second tells us that she promised to meet Propertius, but has lied; the third, that she has falsified her looks. Then, in 2.19, we suddenly find her all purity and innocence visiting on a farm. The departure from Rome in Book Two is meant to vary the circumstances of 1.11-12: in Book One, Cynthia left Propertius and Rome for Baiae, hotbed of iniquity. In Book Two, Propertius reworks the material of the *Monobiblos* through the first half of his book; then he reverses positions, with Cynthia exemplifying *fides* while Propertius goes out on the town (in 2.22). The start of this new development may be seen to commence with the intriguing recasting, in 2.19, of the situation in 1.11-12. All of this is set in motion by 2.18 "C", which, in its juxtaposition of elegies 1.2 and 1.11, prepares the reader to have fresh in mind the events of Book One and to appreciate with all the more interest just how Propertius is now going on to work out something very new and different.¹⁶⁾

of Bucolic 2. Instead of thinking that 21-22 are an end to anything, we should view them as a point, within the whole of 2.18, which, like the beginning lines, 1-4, set out a reflection -- perhaps in calmer tone -- that will provide the occasion for a long expostulation.

16) 2.18.23-32 echo elegy 1.2; 2.18.33-34 recapitulate 1.11.23-24. M. Ites (above, note 6), 32-36, is worth re-reading on the development of Book Two in this central portion of the volume. 2.16-19 belong together as a complement to 2.12-15: the first poems celebrate abiding love; this second set shows love's deterioration. "Orditur narratio a praetoris adventu, et Cynthiae discessu finitur in el. 19. Tria carmina quae nihil fere praeter querimonias perfidiae continent, illis includuntur. El.19 autem non hunc modo cyclum concludit, sed totius libri terminum quendam efficit . . ." (p. 34). "*Sic totum amoris cursum his ell. 1-19 conspiciamus ut in libro primo; et hic quoque conficitur concordia quadam et reconciliatione in el. 19, ut el. 19 libri I.*" (p. 36). The words I have italicized underline my own approach to the unity of Book Two, as stated below.

In a general way, Book Two may be read as two "cycles" which reach from 2.2-15, and then from 2.16-28(29?). In the first, Propertius works with the same idea he developed in Book One -- the progressive alienation of Propertius from Cynthia. As in Book One, the lovers start out quite close, then move apart with a more painful and violent tone predominating in 2.8-9, and 11, than anything in Book One. Just as this separation led Propertius to contemplate his death in 1.19, so, near the end of the first "cycle," in 2.13, does he give instructions about his end. But in 2.14-15, poems in which light and darkness play a major role, he is restored to life from death, and in 2.16 he can begin to suffer anew, all over again.

In the second cycle, the roles are reversed for *variatio*. In 2.20.1 Cynthia is compared to Briseis -- she is Propertius' *serva amoris*, by implication. The departure from the climate of the first half of the book is all the more sharply figured, insofar as it was precisely Briseis with whom Propertius' unyielding *domina* was contrasted in 2.8.29-40. Propertius goes out on the town, in 2.22 and 23-24. And in 2.26 ("B") -- perhaps even in the shipwreck scene in "A" -- she is again associated with the imagery of *servitium*.¹⁷⁾ Elegies 2.27-28 are on death, and just as Propertius suffered from love and came to speak of death in 2.13, so does 2.28 round out the portion of Book Two in which the lovers' roles have been inverted to place Cynthia subordinate to Propertius. Just as 2.14-15 return *Propertius* to vitality and are poems in which light shines in darkness (cf. Cynthia as Propertius' light, *mea lux*, in 2.14.29), so at the end of 2.28 does the phrase *mea lux* reappear -- after a second fourteen poems -- as *Cynthia* returns to life (2.28.59). *Mea lux* appears for the last time in Propertius at the beginning of

17) 2.26.21-22 rejoice that so beautiful a girl does service to Propertius (*tam mihi pulchra puella/ serviat*). If 2.26 "B", which these verses introduce, is in fact a continuation of a single elegy which opened with the dream of Cynthia's shipwreck, we can compare 2.25.23-24, where Propertius characterizes the lover's "voyage" as one all too exposed to disaster. Cynthia's shipwreck would be the metaphor for her overwhelming passion for Propertius.

2.29, in which the poet finds himself back in the familiar role of *servus*.¹⁸⁾

Clearly Book Two is a "bigger and better" Book One -- using the formula for the first volume, and then elaborating with interesting new reversals. Book Two was planned as a work which would embrace two "mini-books" -- two broad areas of reversed action -- after each of which several more poems would intervene to re-establish the ironic fact that, whether Cynthia or Propertius should be "restored to life," the result would be the same: Propertius' *labor*. This conception is what is responsible for its much greater length. The double rhythm of elegy 2.18, worked out at the length that we encounter it, not only is in accord with the tenor of the book whose center it approximately occupies, but serves effectively to move us on ahead into the second stage of action in Book Two. Just when we think we have reached a point at which a pause will allow us to regroup our thoughts for what is to happen next, we are caught up and hastened onward. Even the re-statement, in 2.14-15, of Propertius' nighttime adventures, is something of the same kind: we finish 2.14 and think we are done; suddenly, *excitedly* ("O me felicem! o nox mihi candida! et o tu . ."), there is more. The experience is not unlike that of reading 2.18.

We may mention, finally, the central position 2.18 occupies within the first three books of Propertius. These books are balanced and interrelated so harmoniously that it would be difficult to argue that Book Two, which plays an important role vis-à-vis both One and Three, exists in other than a planned order.¹⁹⁾ Elegy 1.1 and 3.24 are reciprocal in

18) F. Cairns, "Propertius 2.29 A" *CQ* 21 (1971), 455-460, has shown that the Cupids which bind Propertius for Cynthia are *fugitivarii*, "hands" sent out to shackle and return to their quarters runaway slaves!

19) G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968), 480-495, argues that Propertius planned I-III at an early stage and left the outline flexible for his personal growth. J.A. Barsby, "The Composition and Publication of the first three books of Propertius" *G & R* 21 (1974), 128-137, stresses that the individual books, if published separately as tradition has it, nevertheless exhibit a great degree of re-shaping into the balanced organization they presently evince. The

their discussion of the family friends who try to call Propertius back from his affair; both mention cutting and burning, medicine, sea-faring. At the start of Book One (1.6) Propertius will not leave Cynthia for "learned Athens" (*doctas Athenas*); the phrase appears only once elsewhere in Propertius, in line 1 of 3.21, which is set in from the end of Three so as roughly to balance 1.6 in its position relative to the start of Book One. At the beginning of his poetry Propertius will not sail from Cynthia; at the end of Book Three he does just this (seen otherwise: in 1.1 Propertius wishes he could escape over the sea from his torment; in 3.24, he has done so).

The lengths of the books make a harmonious form, 22(23?) -34-25. If the much greater length of the center book seems untoward, it should be remarked that Propertius enjoys setting elegies of great length against *short* poems, e.g. 2.1 against 2.2 (78 to 16 lines), or, in Book Four, 4.1 and 4.11, both over 100 verses, against 4.2 and 4.10, the shortest poems in the book. When Ovid revised his *Amores*, he published them in three books of 15-19-15: the longest book of elegies is in the center. That he *revised* his book to this shape is interesting, for it might seem to imply that he had a model in mind (as he did for practically everything); this may confirm the existence of Propertius I-III in the proportions we assign them today.

Within this pattern, Propertius uses, as a leitmotif, his concern for Cynthia's abuse of cosmetics. Extended reference comes three times: in 1.2 and 3.24 -- each the elegy next from the extremities of the set -- and in 2.18 ("C").²⁰

answer must lie in that period at which Propertius became aware of Horace's three books of *Odes*, to be published ca. 23 B.C. The entire arrangement of Propertius Book Three is most strongly posed as a challenge to Horace's third book. For this relationship, cf. J.P. Sullivan (above, note 8), 12-31, and W.R. Nethercut, "The Ironic Priest. Propertius' Roman Elegies, III, 1-5. Imitations of Horace and Vergil" *AJP* 91 (1970), 385-407, and 385-386 for bibliography.

20) Although 1.15 mentions in passing the way in which Cynthia adorns her hair, listless toward Propertius, eager like a bride going out to meet her new man (verses 5-8), those passages which are intended to recall and echo each other are the three mentioned. Verbal echoes under-

The number of poems on either side of 2.18, taking all three parts of it as a single elegy, is roughly the same: 39, or 40 (if we count 1.8 "A" and "B" as two separate elegies) precede 2.18; 41 follows it.

We can summarize: 2.18 is a single elegy, unified by a humorous undercutting, through two long sections of expositulation (5-20, 23-38), of two attempts (in 1-4 and 21-22) by the poet to affect a posture of competent insouciance. This plan is punctuated by the reversal of *si quid*, in 3-4, to *Quid si* in 5, where editors have wanted a new elegy to begin, and by (*Cupido*) *malus esse solet* ("nunc mihi malus est"), at the "conclusion" of Part "B" in 22, preparing the way for *Nunc* at the start of "C" in 23. *Etiam*, which follows *Nunc* in 23, makes the point that now, in addition to her spurning of Propertius who is in the prime of life, Cynthia also is insulting him by making up her hair garishly. *Etiam*, at the start of 23, where the division into "C" has been made (or into "B"), in fact echoes *etiam* toward the end of the preceding section, in line 19: *at tu etiam iuvenem odisti me, perfida* . . . The two subjects of parts "B" and "C" -- Cynthia's scorn for a young lover (Propertius) when Aurora cherished Tithonus even when he was old, and Cynthia's cosmetic taste -- are in this way both joined by the only two occurrences of *etiam* in the elegy.²¹⁾ We can add, to all of the foregoing, that

line the interconnection: *natura* (the question of what nature grants, as opposed to what cosmeticians contrive) in 1.2.5, 2.18.25; *forma* in 1.2.8 and 2.18.32, *formosa* 1.2.9 and 2.18.29; *color* (native complexion and coloring vs. artificial dyes and rouges) in 1.2.9 and 22, 2.18.26, 3.24.7; *ornatus* (false adornment) with *ornato capillo* in 1.2.1 and *ornata fronte* in 2.18.36; *candor* (purchased "brilliance" for the face) 1.2.19 and 3.24.8 -- cf. *nitor*, of the same concept, in 1.2.6 (the verb *nitere*) and, for the noun, 2.18.24; *figura* (the natural bodily endowment, vs. falsifying accretions) in 1.2.7, 2.18.25, 3.24.5.

21) *Etiam* has different colors in the two lines: although it may be translated "even" and fit both contexts, it has, in *tu etiam iuvenem odisti me* (2.18.19) rather the force of "even (though)" -- "however much I may be in the prime of my life". *Etiam* = καίπερ. In verse 23, on the other hand, I have argued that it carries the weight of "also, even (more), on top of everything else." In this view *etiam* = καὶ δὴ καί. Butler and Barber (above, note 2), 222, write that *etiam* can be taken (1) with *nunc* (2) with *infectos Britannos*. They would have the first possibility referring to Cynthia's youth: "even now while you are young

while there are no verbal links between the beginning of 2. 18 (1-4) and its final verses (33-38) -- the presence of which feature would have encouraged commentators to look more closely at the possibility that everything fits together -- we do find, at the beginning, and again at the end, Propertius expecting Cynthia to behave in such a way that what she has done will be known to him, to his regret.

Elegy 2.18 is a poem of double rhythm: Propertius twice stands off from the whole affair with Cynthia and gives "sane advice" to himself and for anyone who may be listening, only to discover this all an empty pretence. The double swing occurs in Propertian elegy: on one occasion, 2.14 twice subverts the lover's triumph over his mistress by referring to her control upon his happiness, his very life. Repetition informs Book Two as a whole: we go through a double story in which, at first, Propertius must suffer while Cynthia entertains his rivals, though later it will be Propertius who enjoys variety and claims Cynthia as a faithful "Briseis", his *serva amoris*. Elegy 2.18 fits harmoniously into this arrangement, at the center of Book Two. The reversal in Cynthia's role begins with her departure from Rome in 2. 19, to lead a life of rustic purity. But that we may be the more astounded when this comes to pass, Propertius has planted in 2.18 an echo from 1.11, where Cynthia had left him in Rome, going "on vacation" to dissipated Baiae: 2.18.33-34

and fair." That is, Cynthia, even though young, is pasting herself with a vulgar new face, which -- one assumes -- an older lady might do to conceal the ravages of time. Cynthia's age might be a question at hand, since Propertius is talking about her makeup; however, this elegy does not expressly equate cosmetics with concealment of the years. And, when Propertius does show us an old Cynthia seated despairingly before her mirror, in 3.25, we find no mention of cosmetics. Once more, when 1.2 does address the theme, there is no allusion to old age. Therefore, the imputation of *etiam* to *nunc* as envisioned above introduces what is extraneous to the elegy. Enk (above, note 7), 259, thus elects the second possibility -- that Cynthia is now going so far as to mimic even those (extraordinary) Celts! My own proposal is different: *etiam* expresses the further fact, now to be discussed, because of which Propertius can not keep silent. Camps (above, note 2), 140, agrees with the assumption I make: *etiam* need not go closely with *nunc*, but may be taken with the verb and the whole query -- "What, are you up to *yet another* folly, imitating . . .?" (*italics mine*).

compare Propertius' love for Cynthia to that of a brother for his sister, of a son for his mother; he had written in just such accents to her at Baiae, in 1.11.23-24. Thus, when we move on to 2.19, "Etsi *me invito* discedis, Cynthia, Roma . . .," we think only that her sojourn will continue the poet's misery as we have heard this described in 2.16-18. Suddenly this is all overturned, as the pentameter loves to do: *laetor* (!). Propertius is HAPPY with Cynthia moving . . . to the country.

At the same time that it looks ahead, 2.18 looks back to the elegies that have come before it: 2.18.1-4 resume 2.14. 19-20 (cf. *negare* in both passages), *periuras puellas* in 2.16. 53 is picked up by *mentiri (noctem)* in 2.17.1, and carried on by *mentita . . . comas* in 2.18.28. We also remember how the association of *mentiri* and *infectas (habere manus)* in 2.17.1-2 seems to be echoed in the last "section" of 2.18 (23, 28), while *fractus*-- again close to the opening of 2.17 (verse 4) -- is taken up immediately by *frangitur* at the start of 2.18. Elegies 2.17 and 18 mirror each other: *mentiri - infectas - fractus*, in 2.17, are answered by *frangitur - infectos - mentita* in 2.18.²²⁾

22) There are the only two elegies in Propertius in which all three verbal echoes occur, cf. B. Schmeisser, *A Concordance to the Elegies of Propertius* (Hildesheim 1972) 383: *infectus*, meaning "stained," appears only in 2.17.2 and 2.18.23, while but one additional line has *infecto . . . cursu* (2.25.25); here, however, the idiom is different, as *infecto* comes literally from *in + facio* ("un-made, in-completed"). Rothstein (above, note 11), 371, compares Livy 9. 23. 11, *infecta victoria* ("victory not yet fully in our possession"). Propertius' chiasmic reversal of *mentiri - infectus* (a, um) - *frangere* points up the fact that 2.17-18 reverse each other: at the start of 2.17, Propertius speaks of murder (*infectas sanguine habere manus*), or suicide, but he finishes the poem reaffirming his intent to stay by her, without changing; Cynthia will weep (*tum flebit . . .*) when she sees him endure. In 2.18, he begins with the same calmer tone: he will not moan and groan (*querelae*, of what Propertius will not do, picks up *tum flebit*, which Cynthia will do - a small reversal in itself). And then Propertius bursts out in the impassioned reproach we have studied. The circle of his thought begins with a lie, and physical punishment -- either for Cynthia, or inflicted on himself (2.17.13 makes suicide the likely thought behind 2.17.2) -- and returns to punishment (*illi sub terris fiant mala multa puellae*, 2.18.27) inflicted upon the liar (*quae mentita . . . comas*, 2.18.28). This analysis allows us once again to appreciate how very much Propertius aims for each of his elegies to grow out of that poem which

The central position of 2.18 within its own book also grants it a key location within the collection of Propertius' first three volumes, since Books One and Two stand with virtually equal lengths (i.e. by number of elegies) on either side of Book Two. And we have learned that the subject of Cynthia's pretensions, her falsification of beauty, is enunciated at the start, middle, and conclusion of the set of three.

All of this will, I hope, lay to rest discontent with what has seemed to be the static and confusion, the lack of solidity, lying at the heart of Propertius' most controversial book -- but also, interestingly, at the heart of a collection of three volumes whose symmetry and internal connection has lately been increasingly a matter for pleasant surprise. Not only does 2.18 not lack *Einheit* in itself, but it is a kind of model for Propertius' technique in Book Two, as it rounds out what previous elegies have just stated and simultaneously advances us to a new surprise in 2.19. In this way, 2.18 also contributes to the integrity of all three books of Propertius, in which it appears to have been conceived as a central architectural element.²³⁾

University of Texas at Austin

directly precedes it. This linear unity, as much if not more than the chiasmic paneling set forth by H. Juhnke, "Zum Aufbau des zweiten und dritten Buches des Properz" *H* 99 (1971), 91-125, should begin to convince us that Book Two is well-organized.

23) Two translations which follow 2.18 through without re-arrangement are, in German, W. Binder's edition of F. Jacob, *S. Aurel. Propertius, Elegien* (Stuttgart 1860) 46-47, and -- in English -- J.P. McCulloch's *The Poems of Sextus Propertius* (Berkeley 1972) 96-97. Recently, an argument for the division of 1.8 "A" and "B", similar to that between 1.11-12, and also for 2.29 "A" and "B", as well as one at 2.28.35 into "A" and "B" parts supported by Ovid's adaptation in *Amores* 2.13-14, has been advanced by J.T. Davis, *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid* (Berne 1977). The criterion, that a pause between paired poems allows time to elapse, so that something new can occur which will cause Propertius to write differently on the same subject, may seem to apply in 2.18: in "A" (1-22), he writes ironically, hoping to change Cynthia's heart; in "B" (23-38), there is no irony -- only vehement castigation. (The answer Cynthia gave to "A" was to flaunt her

makeup, the better to infuriate Propertius when he responds in "B"). I include this possibility for the sake of developing my discussion of 2.18 as completely as possible; however, my own sense of the elegy's continuity (e.g. the fact that its double rhythm is in accord with the movement of Book Two, the speedy progression from 2.18.22 to *Nunc etiam* at the start of verse 23) make me less certain that we have what Professor Davis works to identify. It can be pointed out that -- as I noted above, footnote 8 -- Propertius likes to iterate an idea or word at transitional points in his poetry, pivoting on it and spinning off in a new direction the next instant. Thus, in 2.29 "A", *mānērē* in line 22 may be punned upon by *Mānē*erāt at the start of "B" in 23; and *crimen amoris* at the end of 1.11 appears to be picked up by *crimen . . moram*, a faint echo, at the start of 1.12. But what is difficult is how to interpret such resonances: are they there to bridge what would otherwise be too perceptible a gap between separate poems, or do they rather stand for puns of a kind, the "pivot-points" I mentioned, in a fast-moving repartee? At the most cautious, we can observe that Propertius enjoys this tactic as a means to insure the continuous flow of his elegies. Since, when all is said and done, Prof. Davis has not felt that 2.18 qualifies under the rather precise terms he establishes for identifying dramatically paired elegies, perhaps we may be the more encouraged to read this poem as one.