132. Eclogues III, VII, VIII passim.

133. Eclogue II 39.

134. Eclogue VI 13 sqq. L A.G.Strong was as inspiring as Virgil's Silenus, and as easy to sidetrack, but I never remember him other than sober.

135. Eclogue V 173.

136. Eclogue IV 10-11.

137. G.K.Chesterton, dedication (to E.C.Bentley) of The Man Who was Thursday, 1908.

138. Georgics I 145-6.

139. Hdt. VI 109., 3, 6. Not necessarily a vaticinium post eventum, any more than Churchill's forecast of "sunlit uplands" in 1940.

140. Isaiah lxvi. 17-25, and passim.

141. Matt. xx. 12; a remarkably mundame image for so magnificent a theme.

142. Lucretius III 16-7, fairly clearly recalled in Georgic II 490-2.

143. Eclogue IX 36, and Servius' note.

144. Eclogue I, 82-3.

V.S. Lectures, No. 96.

NESCIO QVID MAIVS

Text of a lecture read to the Virgil Society
21st February, 1970.

by D.W.T.C.Vessey, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.A.

The purpose of this paper is not to follow in the footsteps of Juvenal's blue-stocking by measuring Virgil against Homer,(1) nor to discuss the various problems involved in Propertius' reference to Virgil's works in 2.34.(2) It will not venture into the vexed problem of the unity of that poem,(3) nor into the arguments that seek to identify Lynceus with Varius Rufus. Its aim is to elucidate certain literary allusions and attitudes in the elegy, which exercise, it is hoped, will place Propertius' laudation of Virgil in its proper perspective.

For the foundation of my argument, it is necessary to turn to book 1 of Propertius, for in poems 7 and 9 we find the poet dealing with a theme which is

clearly related to that of 2.34. The three elegies have been discussed together by Walter Wimmel, whose analysis provides a vital basis for my own work;[4] but it will be seen that my attitude diverges from his on several points. It is fortunate that in 1.7 and 9 we are faced by fewer problems than in 2.34. In the latter elegy Wimmel has detected "den schmerzhaften Einschnitt, den Verlust von Unmittelbarkheit"[5] which affected Propertius as he became involved, whether as witness or as protagonist, in the new outlook of the Restored Republic. I should prefer to say that in 2.34 Propertius gave a more detailed and serious treatment to a theme which he handled only frivolously in the Monobiblos, a collection of amatory poems in which literary discussions could have but little place. Yet 1.7 and 9 have, in my view, a greater theoretical basis than Wimmel recognises.

These two elegies are a pair within the careful structure of the first book.[6] They are both addressed to one Ponticus; there can be little doubt that this name, like Lynceus in 2.34, is factitious,[7] and there is no need to believe that Propertius had a real person in mind. In addressing Ponticus, Propertius, in a playful manner, argues that epic poetry is totally useless, if the poet falls victim to amor. Ponticus, we are told, is composing a Thebaid, dealing with arma ... fraternae tristia militiae (7.1-2), with the campaign of the Seven against Thebes. Propertius, half-flattering, half-ironical, tells Ponticus:

> atque, ita sim felix, primo contendis Homero
> (sint modo fata tuis mollia carminibus) ... (3-4)

But his promise, like those of Holy Writ, has its premiss: the fates would have to be mollia (in contradistinction to Ponticus' epic) if he was to rival Homer. Part of the humour lies, of course, in the fact that mollis (here purposely placed next to carminibus) was an adjective which Propertius liked to apply to his own poetry.[8] If the poem was not molle, then fate would have to be. Propertius continues by contrasting his love-elegies with Ponticus' epic: Propertius says that his fama and nomen rest simply on pleasing his docta puella - his works will be read by the neglectus amator who will profit from hearing about the poet's troubles. But, should Ponticus fall in love, his epic will be quite valueless:

> longe castra tibi, longe miser agmina septem
> flebis in aeterno surda iacere situ;
> et frustra cupies mollem componere versum,
> nec tibi subiciet carmina serus Amor. (17 ff.)

The lover must concentrate his energies on mollem versum: epic is useless, as Ponticus will learn if he falls under the spell of a late love. In these circumstances, it comes as no surprise to find in poem 9 that Propertius' prognostications have been proved right: Ponticus is in love, the irrisor is humbled. Triumphantly the elegist asks him:

> quid tibi nunc misero prodest grave dicere carmen
> aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae?
> plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero:
> carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor. (9.9 ff.)

Ponticus should forget all about his Theban epic, tristes illos .. libellos (13) and write the sort of poems a mistress likes to hear. Propertius utilises two associated antitheses: grave carmen and lenia carmina, Homer and Mimnermus. The genres are named, their representatives set in opposition. That this dichotomy looks back, in general terms, to Hellenistic literary disputes, and especially to Callimachus' Aetia-prologue, is clear enough, but more detailed conclusions can, I think, be drawn. The clue is to be found in the fact that Ponticus is represented as having selected the Theban War as the subject of his epic. This is not chosen simply as a typical example of the theme of a grave carmen. To understand its significance, we must glance back into Greek literature and in particular to Antimachus of Colophon, author of the most celebrated epic poem on the war between Eteocles and Polynices. The history of his reputation is of intrinsic interest and it is necessary, if we are fully to understand Propertius' poems to Ponticus and Lynceus, to sketch what we know about it.

According to a fragment of Heracleides Ponticus preserved by Proclus, it was through the efforts of Plato that Antimachus' works were preserved for posterity; the philosopher is said to have sent Heracleides to Colophon τὰ ποιήματα συλλέξαι τοῦ ἀνδρός. (10) Because of this, Proclus opined that Callimachus and Duris of Samos were foolish to maintain that Plato was no judge of poetry. (11) Plato's views on poetry are, of course, as famous as they are stringent, and Bernhard Wyss has discussed the reasons why Antimachus may have recommended himself to the severe tastes of the author of the Republic. (12) Cicero tells us that Plato's view of Antimachus was not shared by his fellow-citizens, except Demosthenes, who loyally adopted the view: Plato .... mihi unus instar est centum milium. (13) Whether popular or not, whatever the basis for such tales may be, Antimachus' poems were transmitted to Alexandria and there became the centre of learned controversy.

Apart from illud magnum volumen, the Thebaid, Antimachus' best known work was the elegiac poem Lyde, written, so the story runs, after the death of his mistress as a tribute to her memory and to console himself on his loss. (14) The Lyde collected together a large number of legends, presumably round a central theme, that of tragic love, (15) and its influence on later writers has probably been in general underestimated. (16) It was certainly a work of originality, transitional in its methods between the 'old' and 'new' elegy and a founder of the tradition of narrative elegies so popular among the Alexandrians. (17) Callimachus, however, had a low opinion of the Lyde and in a famous judgment dismissed it as παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τόρον. (18) It is also likely that he attacked Antimachus in the prologue to the Aetia, in which he set out his influential poetic manifesto in face of criticism. (19) But others in the Hellenistic era held the Clarius poeta in higher esteem. Hermesianax, for example, listed Antimachus in his catalogue of his predecessors from Orpheus down to Philitas, (20) referring to his composition of the Lyde in the following terms.

γόων Δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους
ἱράς.

Asclepiades also oposed the Callimachean dictum, asserting that the Lyde was in fact τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα (21) and Poseidippus, linking and

contrasting the work with the Nanno of Mimnermus, Antimachus' predecessor and compatriot, calls the former φιλέραστος and the latter σώφρων. (22)

Callimachus' judgment was dutifully echoed by Catullus who, in writing a laudatory elegy on his friend Cinna's Zmyrna, said: (23)

parva mei mihi sint cordi monimenta sodalis ,
at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.

That there is a relation between the epithet tumidus and Callimachus' words παχὺ γράμμα is obvious, just as the words parva monimenta reflect the prejudices of the poet of Cyrene and his followers, summed up in the aphorism μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν . (24) It does, however, seem probable that Catullus had the Thebaid in mind here, and not the Lyde, for it presents a more natural contrast with Cinna's Zmyrna. Callimachus, if he disliked the Lyde, must have had an even lower opinion of the Thebaid, which he would have regarded as an example of that hated genre τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν . (25) It is not necessary to take at its face value Catullus' assertion that the populus delighted in Antimachus' work; what evidence we have does not point to any great love for Antimachus among the Romans. It is clear that Catullus is merely echoing Alexandrian sentiments and is using the name Antimachus paradigmatically as the prime representative of a type rather than with any special or individual reference to him: he is an example of the stuffy, long-winded, turgid poetry which Callimachus and Euphorion detested and which the cantores Euphorionis also naturally condemned. They were coterie-poets, and the worst abuse they could direct against their opponents was that they were esteemed by the profanum vulgus. Such learned poets had no time for πάντα τὰ δημόσια. (26) It seems plain that Callimachus had used the author of the Thebaid as a weapon in a larger feud with his contemporaries, among them Apollonius of Rhodes. (27) Apollonius was influenced by the Thebaid and evidently made a careful study of it when composing the Argonauticon. (28)

Only a relatively small number of critical opinions on the work of Antimachus remain and they all present a generally uniform view. Dionysius of Halicarnassus classified him with Pindar and Aeschylus as a representative of τῆς αὐστηρᾶς ἁρμονίας . (29) Elsewhere Dionysius comments: Ἀντίμαχος δὲ ἐφρόντισεν εὐτονίας καὶ ἀγωνιστικῆς τραχυτῆτος καὶ τοῦ συνήθους τῆς ἐξαλλαγῆς. (30)
This judgment is paralleled by that of Plutarch, who compares the epics of Homer and Antimachus: (31) the latter's poetry, in his view, may have ἰσχὺν καὶ τόνον but nonetheless ἐκβεβιασμένοις καὶ καταπόνοις ἔοικε, whereas in Homer μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης δυνάμεως καὶ χάριτος πρόσεστι τὸ δοκεῖν εὐχερῶς καὶ ῥᾳδίως ἀπεῖργασθαι. Antipater, in his elegiac tribute to Antimachus mentioned the ὄβριμον ἀκαμάτου στίχου Ἀντιμάχου. A reader, he says, would appreciate Antimachus

εἰ τόρον οὖας
ἔλλαχες, εἰ ζαλοῖς τὸν ἀγέλαστον ὄπα
εἰ τὰν ἄτριπτον καὶ ἀνέμβατον ἀτραπὸν ἄλλοις
μαίεαι.

This is obviously another counterblast to Callimachus' viewpoint and Antipater goes on to rate Antimachus second to Homer. (32) This was the place accorded to him in the canon of epic writers as established by most Hellenistic critics.

This honourable position was preserved for him by Quintilian, who commented in the tenth book of the Institutio: in Antimacho vis et gravitas et minime vulgare eloquendi genus habet laudem; sed quamvis ei secundas fere grammaticorum consensus deferat, et adfectibus et dispositione et omnino arte deficitur, ut plane manifesto appareat quanto sit aliud proximum aliud secundum. (33) It is a harsh criticism and plainly derives from that of Dionysius, who was a source for this part of the treatise. (34) There is virtually a communis opinio in these citations: despite his faults, Antimachus was conventionally compared with Homer and was awarded the second place in the epic canon. (35)

We must now return to Propertius. In 1.7 and 9 he is giving assent to Alexandrian literary ideas and it is my opinion that Ponticus, as the supposed author of a Latin Thebaid, stands in place of Antimachus, the author of the Greek Thebaid. After these preliminary investigations, it is possible to understand more fully the allusions in these two poems, which were to be expanded and clarified in 2.34.

(1) It will be remembered that in 7.3-4 Propertius suggested that, given the favour of destiny, Ponticus would contend with Homer for first place among writers of epic (primo contendis Homero, 3), that is for the supreme position in the canon. Though Antimachus is not directly mentioned, he must surely have been in the elegist's mind. By becoming a Roman Antimachus, author of a Latin Thebaid, Ponticus may well, like his Greek predecessor, be rated second to Homer, who is primus among epic writers. But this, of course, is said in irony, as Propertius, the poet of love and follower of Callimachus, rejects the epic genre in favour of mollem versum.

(2) When Ponticus falls in love, he learns that a line of Mimnermus is more valuable than a line of Homer. The naming of Mimnermus is important, for it identifies Propertius with a particular literary school. I have already noted that Poseidippus contrasted the σωφροσύνη of Antimachus of Colophon with the φιλεραστία of Mimnermus of Colophon. According to Callimachus and other Hellenistic writers, Mimnermus was the εὑρετής or founder of elegiac poetry; (36) as Horace remarked in the Ars Poetica, the controversy relating to the true auctor of elegy was still sub iudice. (37) Callimachus' opponents asserted that Mimnermus was not the εὑρετής at all, advocating the claims of Callinus or Archilochus - and we may surmise that Antimachus too had an honoured place in their elegiac stemma. (38) But to Propertius there is no doubt: he takes up his stand behind Callimachus in proclaiming Mimnermus as his earliest predecessor, as the true auctor of the love elegy; so in 1.9.11 he juxtaposes the auctor of epic, Homer, with the auctor of elegy, Mimnermus, and assures Ponticus that the latter is a far better model for a man in his predicament. The view is indeed partisan. Callimachus esteemed Mimnermus highly, acknowledging him as a forerunner of his own work; conversely, he rejected and scorned Antimachus, who, in truth, had as good a claim, or even a better one, to be the precursor of Alexandrian elegy. For if the Thebaid was an ancestor of the Argonauticon of Apollonius of Rhodes, so was the Lyde, quite as much as the Nanno, a forerunner of Callimachus and the other Hellenistic elegists. (38) But it was Antimachus' fate to become part of the Hellenistic poetomachia, and the critical tradition spread to Rome under the influence of the novi poetae.

The Thebaid of Antimachus was a perfect example of the grave carmen, the product of an αὐστηρὸς ποιητής, whereas Mimnermus' poems were mollia. In the Ponticus poems, Propertius restates the Alexandrian dispute in which Antimachus figured and in which his poetry was unfavourably contrasted with that of Mimnermus. Antimachus may have been second to Homer, but what use was he in the lists of love? Ponticus was little more than a name on which to hang this theme. The Alexandrian controversy rested on literary and stylistic questions, but Propertius views it in different, more introspective terms; whereas Callimachus and his associates considered Antimachus in the light of their discussions and theorising on the nature, form and aim of poetry, Propertius - unlike Catullus - concentrates on the emotional inadequacy, the lack of relevance which Antimachean poetry has for the poet of and in love.

(3) The implication of this is surely that, if Ponticus, the Roman Antimachus, is setting out to rival Homer, so Propertius is rivalling and emulating Mimnermus: Propertius envisages that Roman literature is able to equal Greek and to establish its own canons, but he does not believe that this can be done in the epic genre. He clearly establishes the kind of poet that he seeks to be; he is compelled to be a slave to dolor rather than to his ingenium (7.7).[39] If Ponticus is subdued by serus Amor, then he too, like the neglectus amator, will be compelled to recognise Propertius' merits:

> tum me non humilem mirabere saepe poetam,
> tunc ego Romanis praeferar ingeniis. (7.21-22)

Before he learns the power of love, the epic poet Ponticus is able to designate Propertius as a mere humilis poeta, one capable of producing poems only in the humble, lesser genre of elegy - certainly not a vates.[40] The elegist admits freely at this stage that the impulsion for his work does not come from ingenium - that was the possession of poets in the greater genres;[41] those who restricted themselves to the Callimachean μούση λεπταλέη[42] had to rely on ars, for to Callimachus poetry was above all a τέχνη.[43] For this reason, Ovid asserts of Callimachus that ingenio non valet, arte valet. Propertius, in book 2, claims that Cynthia herself was the origin of or the substitute for his ingenium, an idea that he may have derived from Gallus, of whose writing Martial remarked: ingenium Galli pulchra Lycoris erat.[44] It was only later that Propertius, boldly and without hesitation, laid claim to his own ingenium. Not so in 1.7. Quintilian, it will be remembered, asserted that Antimachus, whatever his merits, was totally lacking in ars - the implication is that such good qualities as he possessed were derived from ingenium; he was not a craftsman-poet, the ideal of the learned Alexandrians. But, Propertius boasts, Ponticus will ultimately realise that the despised elegist, the humilis poeta, is of greater value than the Romana ingenia, that is, as Friedrich Solmsen has rightly said, than "the recognised poets of the grand manner."[46] Horace,[47] in the Ars Poetica, argued that both ingenium and ars are needed by a poet; but in 1.7 Propertius takes a different view: he is prepared to allow the epic writers their claim to ingenium; but he asserts that his own poetry, the lesser genre, the product of experience, of dolor, is more suited to the needs of the age. Once again, we notice how Propertius takes a subjective and personal line in his literary argument, opposing ingenium not with ars, but

with dolor. He is the magnus poeta of love (7.24) and Ponticus is warned not to despise his poems: tu cave nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu ...(25). This fastus summarises the attitude of the epic writer for the poet of the minor genres, the successor of Mimnermus. But, the elegist asserts, his position, not that of Ponticus, is truly the only tenable one.

(4) There is one more phrase which we should not overlook. In 7, Propertius tells Ponticus that, when the love-god strikes him down, he will abandon his epic in tears:

> longe castra tibi, longe miser agmina septem
> flebis in aeterno surda iacere situ .. (18-19)

As Propertius is drawing general conclusions from a particular situation, it is clear that here he expresses his own view of the state of epic-writing. Epic lies in aeterno situ; its day is over, its dominance past. It is probable that the phrase accurately describes the fate of Antimachus' Thebaid. Certainly when the perverse tastes of the Emperor Hadrian led him to prefer Antimachus to Homer and to attempt to revive interest in him, even to the extent of composing libros obscurissimos in the Antimachean style, we are told that most people had never even heard the name Antimachus.(48) There is no reason to suppose that the situation was very different in the days of Propertius. The neglect into which the Thebaid had fallen was an example, a warning. But we need not make the reference so explicit. It is epic generally that the elegist sees as passé. By falling in love, Ponticus becomes a man of his time, a time when highfalutin' poetry was in aeterno situ. In 1.7 and 9, Propertius' attitude is immutable: the dichotomy is complete, the two attitudes irreconcilable. Bearing these conclusions in mind, we can now turn to 2.34.

For the purpose of this paper, I am disregarding 34a, i.e., lines 1-24, which, unlike Wimmel, I believe to be a separate poem.(49) In 34b, Propertius is addressing Lynceus, who is another Ponticus. Like Ponticus, he has fallen into the grip of seros amores (25; cf.1.7.20, 26). Like Ponticus, Lynceus is envisaged as a poet who has devoted his energies exclusively to the greater genres, and the elegist is delighted that at last he is compelled to recognise the power of love. Lynceus is now forced to admit that his philosophical learning and his cultivation of the bards of old are no help to him in his passion:

> quid tua Socraticis tibi nunc sapientia libris
> proderit aut rerum dicere posse vias?
> aut quid Erecthei tibi prosunt carmina lecta?
> nil iuvat in magno vester amore senex.

The first distich, in my view, simply implies an interest in moral philosophy and cosmology; Socratici libri are not merely the Platonic dialogues but, as Enk puts it, "libri de philosophia agentes";(50) Lynceus is a man who has spent his time in abstract speculations, which are valueless in magno amore. There is no need for us to discuss at length the identity of the poet referred to in 29-30. The main contenders are Homer and Aeschylus;(51) unlike Wimmel, I

favour Aeschylus and believe that the reference to Aeschyleo ... coturno at 41 strengthens, rather than weakens, the identification. The words vester senex suggest a poet whom Lynceus especially esteemed and used as a model, and it is Aeschylean tragedies that, in 41, he is said to have been writing. It is possible that Propertius had in the back of his mind the famous story at the beginning of Plato's Republic, in which another Athenian dramatist, elderly Sophocles, characterises love as a "frantic and savage master" and expresses his delight at being freed from its tyranny.(52) Lynceus the tragedian, now in advanced years, has by contrast come late to a realisation of love's power and is "mad with love" (insanit, 25.)(53) There is no escape from the tyrant, philosophical or otherwise.

The essence of the lines is clear enough: now he is in love, Lynceus will have to reject his severe interests and his pursuit of the greater genres. A change of state must produce a change of style. Propertius immediately suggests an alternative:(54)

> tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philetan
> et non inflati somnia Callimachi. (31-2)

Lynceus must now follow the example of Philetas and Callimachus, who were, after Mimnermus, the auctor of the elegiac genre, the two principal names in the canon of elegists.(55) The word somnia refers, of course, to the famous dream described by Callimachus in the first book of the Aetia,(56) which was to inspire Propertius to high-flown fantasies in book 3.(57) Non inflatus is descriptive of the style of a humilis poeta, of the author of mollia carmina. Its opposite is tumidus, the epithet applied by Catullus to Antimachus, the typical exemplum of the grand style rejected by Philitas, Callimachus and their Roman successors.(58) This recommendation to Lynceus is related to the earlier advice to Ponticus that Mimnermus would be of more value than Homer. In addressing his poems to men who are supposed to have fallen in love Propertius is deliberately objectifying a literary argument: the emotional fact of amor is to lead Ponticus and Lynceus to a change of poetic genre and style, to convert them to the Callimachean faith. This subjective justification for the Alexandrian viewpoint is of course different from the polemic that gave it birth. But it is true to add that in general the ancients failed to distinguish between an author's style and his moral/ethical values, his life-form. Style was the man, and so it is not totally unexpected that Propertius frames essentially literary ideas in terms of emotional events. A man's 'humour', as the Elizabethans called it, would predicate a great deal about his art.

In the lines immediately following, Propertius lists certain themes unsuitable for a follower of Philitas and Callimachus (33 ff.). He does not say directly that Lynceus had already written on those themes, although he may imply it by the introductory formula nam rursus licet ... referas (33): the primary implication is that it would do Lynceus no good if he were to retraverse such popular epic subjects. The themes that he lists fall into two halves, each of four lines. The second half, despite textual difficulties, refers unambiguously to certain episodes in the war of the Seven against Thebes (that is, the same legend on which Ponticus was said to be writing his grave

carmen): Adrastus and the famous horse Arion at the funeral of Archemorus, the disappearance of Amphiaraus into the Underworld, the destruction of the impious Capaneus. These references present no problem. Lines 35-36 are more vexatious. I believe that commentators have been correct in seeing allusions to incidents in the history of Hercules; 33-34 clearly enough refers to the struggle between the river-god Achelous and Hercules for the hand of Deianira. In 35-36, like Rothstein, Butler/Barber, et al., but pace Shackleton-Bailey and Boucher,[59] I envisage an allusive but comprehensible glance at Hercules' shameful love for Omphale, Queen of Lydia, with which Propertius had some fun elsewhere.[60] As Butler/Barber summarise the lines: "Propertius warns [Lynceus] that, though he writes on the deeds of Hercules or of the Seven against Thebes, neither will help him in his love."[61] The elegist insists that such trita vatibus orbita[62] must be eschewed: Lynceus will have to cease from writing in the grand style and turn to the lesser genres, become in fact a humilis poeta.[63] If he does not, he will be no safer than Antimachus or Homer:

> desine et Aeschyleo componere verba coturno
> desine, et ad molles membra resolve choros.
> incipe iam angusto versus includere torno,
> inque tuos ignes, dure poeta, veni,
> tu non Antimacho, non tutior ibis Homero:
> despicit et magnos recta puella deos. (41 ff.)

The direct mention of Antimachus immediately reminds us of 1.7 and 9, and it assists in drawing out the full significance of lines 32-46. Lynceus is urged to give up writing verse in Aeschylean tragic vein and turn to molles choros. Mollis requires no explanation, for we have met if before. The style of Aeschylus was its antithesis, severe, hard and grand. As has been mentioned, Aeschylus was linked with Pindar and Antimachus by Dionysius as an example of τῆς αὐστηρᾶς ἁρμονίας . In fact he represents in tragedy what Antimachus stood for, at least theoretically, in epic. Lynceus has been using Aeschylus as a model, and in 44 Propertius terms Lynceus dure poeta. The adjective has two nuances. First, Lynceus has been durus in his rejection of love;[64] but he has also been durus in his literary productions. Durus, as an opposite to mollis, is a suitable equivalent for the Greek αὐστηρός and so the term durus poeta is a rendering of the Greek αὐστηρὸς ποιητής, the kind of poet Plato (the admirer of Antimachus) had said to be necessary in his ideal state to write about the virtuous man.[65] Lynceus, before falling in love, had been a durus poeta, his philosophy, his style, his subject-matter and his genre all attuning with his severe attitude. But now he must change and cultivate the μοῦσα λεπταλέη, rejecting his former literary allegiance. He must learn to shape his verses angusto torno, that is to compose the type of poetry favoured by non inflatus Callimachus. Propertius had already used the two adjectives durus and angustus in a similar context. In 2.1., making a personal recusatio to Maecenas, he remarked:

> sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus
> intonet angusto pectore Callimachus,
> nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu
> Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos. (39 ff.)

The contrast is identical: Callimachus' angustum pectus is measured against the duri versus of epic, which Propertius asserts he is incapable of writing.(66)

The allusion to Antimachus and Homer together in 2.34.45 is immediately illuminated when we remember that they were the two names which headed the epic canon as established by Alexandrian grammarians. Propertius balances Homer and Antimachus against Philetas and Callimachus: that is, the epic canon against the elegiac canon. However distinguished an epic writer Lynceus may become, the same will hold good for him as for Ponticus: he will still find his achievements useless when faced by love. The direct mention of Antimachus is to be related to 35 ff., in which Propertius had listed some of the more famous episodes from the Thebaid.(67) This balance helps us to understand why the Hercules legends are mentioned in 33-36. The allusion is, I believe, to the Heracleia of Panyassis, which was conventionally placed third in the epic canon.(68) Unfortunately we know little of this epic (even less about Antimachus' Thebaid),(69) but it seems inevitable that Panyassis dealt with the struggle between Achelous and Hercules; as for the hero's enslavement to Omphale, I can only agree with Professor Huxley, in his recent discussion of the Heracleia, that "we may surmise that the half-Karian Panyassis relished the Lydian episode above all, and delighted to tell how his hero submitted to menial tasks imposed by a barbarian and a woman."(70) It may well be that Panyassis' account of this legend included an ecphrasis on the Maeander, perhaps at similar length to Antimachus' notorious description of Teumessus.(71)

We are now better able to appreciate the development of ideas in the poem up to this point. In warning Lynceus to reject epic themes, Propertius progresses through the canon in reverse order: Panyassis, Antimachus, Homer. They do not present viable models for the situation in which the durus poeta now finds himself. He must now consider the tastes of a recta puella (= the docta puella of 1.7) and turn to poetry in keeping with the precepts and practice of Philitas and Callimachus. So far the argument, though more schematic, detailed and theoretical, is basically the same as that of the Ponticus-poems. But from 47 we move into a new departure in Propertian literary ideals, in which the eulogy of Virgil is the culmination.

In 47-58, we have what is virtually a defence of Propertius' own position.(72) He sets himself up as a praeceptor amoris, and maintains that Lynceus must learn from him how to deal with his new state. Propertius compares him to a bull being tamed for the plough:

> sed non ante gravi taurus succumbit aratro,
> cornua quam validis haeserit in laqueis,
> nec tu tam duros per te patieris amores:
> trux tamen a nobis ante domandus eris. (47 ff.)

The language is subtle. Lynceus must learn to endure the yoke; the sometime author of serious poetry must submit to the gravi aratro; he, the durus poeta, must now learn the meaning of duros amores. Durus and gravis, both epithets that could previously have been applied to Lynceus' poetry and to his way of life, are now paradoxically applied to the new burdens he must bear. Formerly trux, he must learn a new way of life and a new literary form from Propertius, the lover-poet. Lynceus' whole life-style is subtly inverted. The elegist gives the reason. Girls have no interest in cosmology, astronomy, eschatology

or divine law (51 ff.), questions with which Lynceus had earlier been involved. The stern philosopher must now look at Propertius and learn from him:

aspice me, cui parva domi fortuna relicta est
nullus et antiquo Marte triumphus avi,
ut regnem mixtas inter conviva puellas
hoc ego. quo tibi nunc elevor, ingenio.

The elegist establishes his own Lebensform; he represents himself as neither possessing wealth (the characteristic aim of the ordo equester, to which Propertius in fact belonged) nor an atrium lined with distinguished imagines (like a noble senator) - but he has a regnum among the girls, at the banquet.[73] The verb is not without irony; while rejecting the Roman career, Propertius has not failed to attain a domination, indeed a despotism, in his own chosen provincia. And as a final irony he asserts that he gained this through ingenium, which Lynceus scorned and denied. The verb elevor takes us back to Ponticus whose pride in his own work was of no avail when love struck him down and when he was forced to admire and bow to the humilis poeta whom he had previously slighted. Lynceus, like Ponticus, had been disposed to deny Propertius ingenium, the possession of poets in the greater genres. Now Propertius is able to turn the tables and make a humorous but justifiable claim to it. It was an ingenium that produced results: even the durus poeta must recognise that.

At this point Lynceus ceases to play any further part in the poem. He has served his purpose. A single couplet bridges, perhaps rather tenuously,[74] the first part and the second. In itself it is revealing, double-edged.

mi lubet hesternis posito languere corollis
quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus. (59-60)

These lines, which recall common motifs in symposiastic epigram, can be understood fully only by considering their dual purpose. They continue the thought of 57-58, but they also serve to introduce the laudation of Virgil. Propertius expresses his contentment with his own way of life; but he has no alternative, for the god has "stricken [him] with aim unerring even to the bone."[75] But, as we have seen, the elegist objectifies literary concepts by the language of love. Bound to his own proper regnum among the girls, Propertius is bound also to the lesser genre, to the Callimachean viewpoint. I see in the words hesternis ... corollis more than a simple, if not trite, referende to night-long revelry; Propertius' life-style and its literary counterpart, so forcibly expounded to Ponticus and Lynceus, is now a thing of yesterday. Propertius knows this, but he cannot escape, for he has no talent and no inclination to change. The god has struck him once and for all. The reason why the elegist is forced to make this volte-face is revealed in 61 ff., in which Virgil enters the scene, compelling Propertius to a modification and re-alignment of prior arguments. He does not reject them in toto, for they still possess a substantial measure of validity, but they cannot be expressed in the absolute terms previously applicable. It is not inappropriate for Lynceus to vanish at this point. His position has been destroyed by Propertius'

arguments, and Virgil's new achievement makes any counterdefence impossible.

In lines 60-66, Propertius salutes enthusiastically the birth of the Aeneid. The first two distichs specify something of the content of the new epic:

> Actia Vergilio custodis litora Phoebi
> Caesaris et fortes dicere posse rates,
> qui nunc Aeneas Troiani suscitat arma
> iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus.

The detailed arguments regarding these lines I leave aside. The essential meaning is clear enough. Virgil is working on an epic in which the present is linked with the past, Caesar Augustus' victory at Actium with the arrival of Trojan Aeneas in Italy.(76) The point is important, and to appreciate it we must glance briefly back to the recusatio, with which Propertius commenced the book. There the elegist, in terms familiar enough to us, maintained his own inadequacy to handle epic themes. Had he been capable of it, he assures Maecenas, his subject would - hardly surpisingly - have been the achievements of Augustus, in which his patron's name would necessarily have been prominent. In 19 ff., Propertius catalogues certain themes that would not have been his choice even if he had been an epic writer: the War of the Titans comes first,(77) then Thebes - both subjects of ancient epics; then comes the Fall of Troy, which is Homer's glory; Propertius adds Xerxes' expedition against Greece,(78) which had been the subject of the Persica of Choerilus of Samos. After these Greek topics, the elegist adds certain events from Roman legend and history, recalling the epics of Naevius and Ennius and their successors.(79) In this comprehensive disclaimer, Propertius is of course adhering to Callimachean ideas - the themes are those which the Alexandrians had rejected as tedious and outworn; as for the Roman subjects, such epics had been completely spurned by the novi poetae, whose heir Propertius claimed to be. All these, then, are conventionally rejected; but Propertius, in theory, envisages an epic which would be suitable for his time, even if he was not the man to compose it - an epic that would recount the deeds and wars of Augustus, culminating with the battle of Actium (25 ff.). Propertius' own Muse is too slight, he is too much of a Callimachean to attempt such a task, to seek to trace Caesar's name back to his Trojan ancestors (39 ff.). In this section of the recusatio, the elegist gives a comprehensive survey of the principal types of epic before his time. First there is the ancient mythological epos, represented by the Cyclic Poets, by Homer and their successors (including Antimachus); second, the historical epic, inaugurated by Choerilus of Samos. On the Roman side there are the annalistic and patriotic works of Ennius and Naevius. Condemning these, Propertius seems to imply that the kind of epic that is required is one that combines history and panegyric - but the precedents for such an undertaking were discouraging. The attempt of the other Choerilus, of Iasos, to eulogise Alexander's achievements in epic verse had been a notorious failure.(80) No Callimachean, no doctus poeta in the tradition of Catullus and Calvus, could seriously see any future in such a task. That is how the matter stands in 2.1. Maecenas' desires are paid lip-service, but Propertius holds fast to his literary faith.

But in 2.34 a different picture emerges with the mention of Virgil.

Virgil has, Propertius implies, found a formula which solves the problem posed in the first poem of the book. His epic, now in construction, combines all previous forms. It will recount the triumphs of Augustus, and trace his name back to his Phrygios avos. But it stands also on the Homeric tradition, for its central subject is taken from legend, indeed is linked with the Trojan story itself. It is also the heir, obviously and completely, of the moral and patriotic epic of Rome, of Naevius and Ennius. The subject is complete, drawing within itself all the various forms of epic which, since Homer, had so signally failed and which were vigorously condemned by Callimachus. The new epic fulfils a need of the time, but it does more than that: it is a supreme work of art, and re-establishes the greatest of all the poetic genres as a valid possibility.

In 65-66, Propertius inserts a couplet which is the first instance of an idea that became a topos. The lines, cast in the form that Curtius has called the Überbietungsformel, (81) are truly memorable and were quoted in isolation in later anthologies. (82) But to remove them from their context is to strip them of their real significance and to transform them into a piece of vapid flattery, unworthy of Propertius and of Virgil.

cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai.
nescioquid maius nascitur Iliade.

Familiarity should not breed indifference to the complex ideas that have led up to this exclamation of approval, this tribute to Virgil's greatness. The linking of Virgil with Homer only later became a convention, virtually without significance, and we should not allow what was to come to blind us to what the elegist is really saying. Virgil's Aeneid is to rival and perhaps replace Homer's Iliad as the best of epics; Rome has at last produced a poem that merits the first place in the canon. All other writers are left far behind, for it is with Homer, primus Homerus, that Virgil is contending.

The distich contains a dual comparison. Virgil is contrasted with both Lynceus and with Propertius himself. Lynceus and Ponticus, the heirs of Antimachus, Panyassis and the like, have failed utterly: they can be exposed on Callimachean principles; Propertius himself had already done so. But the conclusion to be drawn from Propertius' strictures on Ponticus and Lynceus was that there could be no future for the greater genres and that the only feasible path was that taken by the elegist himself, the humilis poeta, the successor of Mimnermus, Philitas, Callimachus. The Aeneid has first of all demonstrated that the epic has its place in contemporary literature and, in addition, has finally discredited previous attempts to revive it; but its advent also necessitates a restatement of Propertius' own position, a rethinking of his most deeply-felt principles. How could this situation arise? The arguments of Callimachus, as expressed in the Aetia-prologue, were sound and unanswerable; Propertius was in no doubt about that. And yet he was faced by the fact that a friend and confrère in the Maecenas coterie was engaged in writing a μέγα βιβλίον. Lines 67 ff. explain and rationalise the phenomenon.

Propertius moves straight from the Aeneid to the Bucolics. Virgil had commenced his artistic career with the lesser genres, in fact, with poems written in imitation of Theocritus, whose allegiance was with the Callimachean school. It is notorious that Propertius' references to the content of the Bucolics are not strictly accurate;[83] but there is reason and method in the apparent incoherence. Propertius views and describes the bucolic poems of Virgil entirely as poems of love, expressing, in pastoral form, the same themes that the elegist used in his own writings. Propertius has stressed to Ponticus and Lynceus that amatory poetry, mollia carmina, must henceforward be their concern; it alone possesses relevance and validity; they are compelled to recognise the truth of his statement when they are struck down by passion. Bound to their moral austerity and high-flown literary aims, they have been humiliated by a power greater than themselves. Virgil, however, did not fall into the same error. He commenced with the poetry of love and only later turned to epic. Expressed in another way, Virgil started his career as an orthodox and committed Callimachean, dealing in the lesser genres, accepting the importance of amor; only after that beginning, did he graduate on to something larger. In consequence, he did not fall into the trap in which Propertius, triumphantly, had seen the proud Ponticus, the arrogant Lynceus enmeshed. It was only through the acceptance of criteria close to Propertius' own that Virgil had been able to contemplate an Aeneid.

After the Bucolics, the Georgics: Propertius devotes to them a single distich, in which he identifies Virgil as the heir of Hesiod, echoing Virgil's own words (77-78; cf. Georg.2.176). In undertaking such a task, Virgil had not stepped outside Callimachean territory. Hesiod was held in the highest esteem by the learned Alexandrians,[84] and Battiades himself had enthusiastically hailed the didactic poem of Aratus.[85] Further, Propertius' own love-poems had a didactic aspect. But the Georgics stood in direct contrast to the pompous philosophical and cosmological poems that Propertius had attributed to Lynceus. Didactic poetry was, no doubt, a higher genre than elegy or bucolic, but it could still be undertaken without abandoning basic poetic ideals, without becoming a durus poeta. Propertius concludes the section with two lines that make the point absolutely clear:

> tale facis carmen docta testudine quale
> Cynthius impositis temperat articulis. (79-80)

The epithet doctus asserts Virgil's connexion with a party, a creed. Under no circumstances could it be applied to Ponticus or Lynceus. It places Virgil in the tradition of the novi poetae, of the Roman Alexandrians. Virgil's position is validated by his unimpeachable background, his doctrinal soundness. The Aeneid had been commenced only after its author had established himself as a doctus poeta in the lesser genres.

But what of Propertius himself? How is his position affected by the birth of the Aeneid? He has successfully authenticated Virgil's past credentials, linking him, by origin and principle, with the school of Callimachus. Lines 81-84 are redolent with difficulties and commentators have disagreed radically on their proper interpretation.[86] It would be rash

to sail lightly on troubled waters or to believe that a personal view can escape the rocks on which other, and stronger, vessels have foundered. To state my own opinion briefly, and without over-confidence, it appears to me that in 81, Propertius turns from Virgil back to himself, asserting that love-elegy has still a defensible place in Roman literature.

> non tamen haec ulli venient ingrata legenti,
> sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit ...

Tamen implies a contrast, a change of subject; surely haec applies not to Virgil's works, but to the elegies of Propertius himself? In addressing Lynceus, immediately before the Virgil passage, Propertius had indicated his value as a praeceptor amoris, and, at the same time, as a teacher of style and genre. This position he still keeps. Love-elegy can co-exist with epic; it is still needed, on exactly the same basis that Propertius had previously used to justify it. He caps this claim with a distich, complex and debatable, best, perhaps, avoided by all but the most audacious.(87) It calls to mind Virgil's own lines in the Ninth Bucolic (35-36), contrasting swan and goose, poet and poet:

> †nec minor his animis, ut sim minor ore,† canorus
> anseris indocto carmine cessit olor. (83-4)

This much can be said. The reference to indoctum carmen is to verse not founded on Callimachean theories, the sort of poetry, in fact, which Lynceus had been writing. Propertius, I believe, confidently asserts that the validation of the epic by Virgil certainly does not compel him to retract the literary views he has expressed to Lynceus. Far from it. They are confirmed. Virgil is a doctus poeta: the writing of an epic does not link him to the duri poetae - nor does a recognition of the virtues of his work force Propertius to abrogate his own ideals.

Propertius' belief that he has still a defensible position in literature is further justified in the lines that end the poem. They are cast in the σφραγίς - form, in which the poet is named, sealing the authenticity and provenance of his work. Propertius lists his predecessors in the poetry of love and proudly claims his place in a well-developed and organic tradition. Varro of Atax, after completing his translation of Apollonius (an occupation, perhaps, which was a little suspect) redeemed himself by turning to erotic subjects; Catullus too has reached the heights of fame; doctus Calvus could hardly be omitted; Gallus takes his place with his elegies of love (85 ff.). Each poet is named, and with them the object of their love. To all these poets, Propertius stands as heir:

> Cynthia quin etiam versu laudata Properti -
> hos inter si me ponere Fama volet.

The catalogue is, of course, that of the Roman Alexandrians; Propertius wishes to be enrolled inter hos, that is, to find his place in what is now a Roman canon, fit to be matched with the Greek. Virgil has rivalled Homer: but in love-poetry too Rome may claim a tradition to match that of Greece. This bold assertion is developed by Propertius in books 3 and 4. In the

first and third poems of book 3, Propertius identifies himself so closely with Philitas and Callimachus that it comes as no surprise to find in book 4 that he, when expressing his intention to produce Roman Aetia, uncompromisingly assumes the title Romanus Callimachus.(89) In the third and fourth books, Propertius has lost all his diffidence, not hesitating to speak of his own ingenium, envisaging himself not as a follower but as an equal to Philitas and to Callimachus.

3.1 deserves what must be a cursory and partial glance. The poem contains, in ideas and imagery, many echoes of Callimachus' prologue to the Aetia.(90) Invoking Callimachus and Philitas in sacral language, Propertius presents himself as more than merely an heir:

> primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
> Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros. (3-4)

The elegist asserts his claim to be regarded as primus, that is as of the Roman elegy founded on Callimachean principles, and, no less, as εὑρετής first in the Roman canon, which now stands weighed against the Greek and not found wanting.(91) Echoing an image of Callimachus himself, Propertius adds:

> quo me Fama levat terra sublimis et a me
> nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis,
> et mecum in curru parvi vectantur Amores,
> scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas. (9 ff.)

The occurrence here of the noun scriptores should not pass unnoticed: only in 2.34 and in this passage does Propertius use the word. As Virgil in the epic, so Propertius in elegy outstrips all rivals. Scriptores, Roman and Greek, yield place to Virgil - not less do they follow Propertius' triumphal car.(92) The elegist specifies the reward that he is to receive:

> mollia Pegasides date vestro serta poetae:
> non faciet capiti dura corona meo. (19-20)

Once again the now familiar antithesis of mollis and durus. Propertius' garland is that suited to the author of mollia carmina: the dura corona he leaves to others. Finally, he does not scruple to draw a comparison between himself and Homer:

> nec non ille tui casus memorator Homerus
> posteritate suum crescere sensit opus:
> meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes:
> illum post cineres auguror ipse diem. (33 ff.)

The claim is audacious. Propertius, the 'Homer' (or auctor) of Roman elegy, will one day enjoy a fame no less than his. Rome has achieved its own literary triumphs; Virgil has rivalled, even excelled, Homer in epic, Propertius has established and perfected the Callimachean elegy in Rome. The two claims are not in contradiction but in counterpoise. What Virgil has done for epic, Propertius has achieved for the lesser genre. It is a double validation of a personal and a national achievement.

We have travelled far from the studied diffidence of the Ponticus elegies, even from the bolder assertions in 2.34. The belief that Rome had produced a poet not inferior to Homer perhaps increased Propertius' self-confidence, his belief that it was possible for his countrymen to shed any sense of inequality with the Hellenic literary tradition. To take up such an assertive stance was to reflect, if not to support, in literature, the aspirations of Augustus and Maecenas, the programme of the Restored Republic.

In 2.34, Propertius reveals his concern with the notion of literary canons.(93) The Alexandrian grammarians had established them for Greek literature. But, to the Romans, the question naturally followed: was it possible for their own literature to produce works of art that would stand comparison with, and even improve upon, the finest that Greece could offer? The Romans admittedly 'imitated' the Greeks, but it is basic to a true understanding and practice of *imitatio* that the imitator should seek to improve upon his model. Quintilian succinctly expresses the notion: one should, he asserts, through *imitatio*, seek *priores superasse, posteros docuisse*.(94) It was as if Rome had received a challenge from Greece; author would be set against author and, after a judicious weighing of the evidence, the better would achieve the palm. We are familiar enough with the concept of a competitive *agon* among individual authors,(95) but it was also felt collectively to exist betweeh Roman literature and Greek. Quintilian, for example, was to make this idea the basis of his comparative survey of literature, in which he balanced the achievements of his own people against those of Hellas.(96) In 2.34 Propertius makes a proud claim, and one that attunes well with the confident, almost euphoric, atmosphere of the early principate. Virgil, he says, is producing an epic which is *maius* than the *Ilias*. The two epics are placed beside each other. Virgil has met the challenge and, Propertius maintains, he will be found the better. He will henceforward stand first in the epic canon, that is in the canon of the greatest of all literary genres. It was a triumph for Rome - and more, for the Rome of Augustus, for the coterie of Maecenas.

As I have already remarked, the comparison which Propertius makes became a commonplace - and one that lived on long after Rome itself had fallen. It was to be universally accepted that Homer and Virgil stood on a parity as first in the epic canons of their languages. Out of the many instances of the idea, I select one on which to close: it is taken from the *Laus Pisonis*, 230 ff., a passage in which the Maecenas circle is commemorated and praised. The author of the panegyric refers to Virgil in the following words:

> *ipse per Ausonias Aeneia carmina gentes*
> *qui sonat, ingenti qui nomine pulsat Olympum*
> *Maeoniumque senem Romano provocat ore* ....

It is difficult to believe that the eulogist did not have the words of Propertius in mind. *Romano provocat ore*: the notion of the racial emerges clearly from the phrase. The same thought had prompted Propertius' salutation of the *Aeneid*. Virgil alone had challenged Homer. Epic was no longer *in aeterno situ*, for it had been reborn - but not as Ponticus and

Lynceus had sought to resuscitate it. The idea that Ponticus might challenge the primacy of Homer could only be expressed humorously, as a warning. But now, a poet was writing an epic which could, without irony, be measured against Homer. It was an epic acceptable on Callimachean hypotheses, for it had grown from them. It was far divorced from the discredited failure of Antimachus of Colophon and his successors, whose placing in the canon indicated their distance from, rather than their closeness to, the master. Propertius makes his tribute as a friend and as a colleague. To himself, he reserved a position in a lesser genre. Balanced against each other, he saw Virgil and Homer, Callimachus and Propertius. Roman literature was vindicated and fulfilled.

NOTES

1. Juvenal 6.436-7.

2. The literature on all these questions is extensive; I refer only to the most recent and, to me, most useful studies. On the references to Virgil's works at 68-76, see L.Alfonsi, 'Properzio e Virgilio', RIL 77 (1943/4), 459 ff.; H.Paratore, 'De Propertio Vergiliani carminis iudice', Miscellanea Properziana (Att. dell. Acc. Prop. del Sub.-As. 5.5.[1957]), pp. 71 ff.; J.P.Boucher, Etudes sur Properce (Paris,1965), pp. 279 ff.

3. On the question of the unity of 34a and 34b, see note 49 below. On Lynceus and Varius Rufus, F.Nencini, 'Properzio e Vario Rufo', MC (1935), 119-20; J.P.Boucher, 'L'oeuvre de L.Varius Rufus d'après Properce 2.34', REA 60 (1958), 307-22 (and Étude, pp. 298 ff.); L.Alfonsi, 'La elegia 34a del II libro di Properzio e il poeta Lynceo', Maia 15 (1963), 270-77, presents a judicious summary.

4. W.Wimmel, Kallimachos in Rom (Hermes, Einzelschriften, Heft 16 [Wiesbaden, 1960]), pp. 202 ff.

5. Wimmel, loc.cit., p.203.

6. On the structure of book 1, see O.Skutsch, 'The Structure of the Propertian Monobiblos', CP 58 (1963), 238-9; B.Otis, 'Properius' single book', HSCP 70 (1965), 1-44.

7. Ponticus is mentioned by Ovid, Tristia 4.10.27, but clearly with Propertius 1.7 and 9 in mind. Cf. H.Bardon, La Littérature latine inconnue 2 (Paris, 1956), pp. 26, 28; Boucher, op.cit., pp.271-2.

8. Mollis is in fact a favourite word of Propertius; it occurs at the following places, in a variety of senses: 1.3.7, 12, 34; 5.8; 6.31; 7.4, 19; 11.14; 14.1; 17.22; 20.22; 2.1.2; 3.48; 4.11, 22; 12.24; 19.23; 22.5, 13, 23; 26.6; 28.16; 33.40; 34.42; 3. 3.1, 18; 9.57; 10.6; 11.20; 15.14, 29; 17.33; 4. 3.44; 6.5, 71; 7.52, 80; 9.49; 11.18. Cf., out of many examples, Horace, S.1.10.45; Ovid, Trist.2.307; Statius, Silv.1.5.29 and see R.Pichon, De sermone amatorio apud Romanos elegiarum scriptores (diss. Paris, 1902), p.6 and s.v. mollis.

9. For the fragments of Antimachus, see B.Wyss, Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae (Berlin, 1936).

10. Heracl. Pontic., fr. 91 Voss, ap. Procl. in Plat. Tim.1.21c (1.90.20 Diehl) = Wyss, test. 1.

11. ibid.: Callim., fr.589 Pf.; Duris, fr. 83 Jacoby.

12. Wyss, op.cit., pp. xl-xli.

13. Cicero, Brutus 51.

14. Plutarch , Cons. ad Apoll. 9.106b.

15. Cf., e.g., A.Couat, Alexandrian Poetry under the first three Ptolemies (trans. J.Loeb [London 1931]), pp. 66 ff.

16. G.Luck, The Latin Love Elegy (London, 1959), p.25, rightly remarks: "It seems that [Antimachus] actually created this particular kind of narrative elegy." E.F.M.Benecke, in his unfinished work, Antimachus of Colophon and the position of women in Greek poetry (London, 1896), though over-imaginative, is still in some respects useful. Cf. also, C.Sessi, 'Antimaco e sua Lide', CN 7 (1911), 125-132; U.v.Wilamowitz, Hellenistische Dichtung (Berlin, 1924), I, pp. 101 ff.; T.Sinko, Antymach z Kolofonu jako prekursor uczonej poezji hellenistycznej (Sprawozdania Polsk. Akad. Um. Krakow, 46.6 1945).

17. See further note 38 below.

18. Callim., fr. 398 Pf. = Wyss, test. 6.

19. See R.Pfeiffer, 'Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos', Hermes 46 (1928), 302 ff.; A.Barigazzi, 'Mimnermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel proemio degli Aitia di Callimaco', Hermes 84 (1956), 162-182; M.Puelma, 'Kallimachos-Interpretationen', Philologus 51 (1957), 90-100, 247-268.

20. Hermesianax, fr.2, 41-2 Diehl = Athenaeus, 13.519a.

21. Asclep., AP 9.63 = Wyss, test. 14.

22. Poseidipp., AP 12.168 = Wyss, test.15. Cf. T.B.L.Webster, Hellenistic Poetry and Art (London, 1964), pp. 56 ff.

23. Catullus 95, 9-10: the end of 9 is missing, and a variety of supplements have been suggested, of which I have, with Kroll, but without conviction, selected the Aldine (sodalis = Cinna): cf. C.Fordyce, Catullus: A Commentary(Oxford, 1961), p.385. There is no need to separate these lines from the rest of the poem.

24. Callim., fr. 465 Pf.

25. Callim., AP 12.43: see L.P.Wilkinson, CR n.s.17 (1967), 5-6.

26. ibid., 4.

27. The influence and effect of this controversy have been well discussed by B.Otis, Virgil: A Study in Civlised Ppetry(Oxford, 1964), pp.2-40; 396-405. (For a critical view of Otis, however, cf. J.K.Newman, Augustus and the New Poetry Brussels, 1967 , pp.261 ff.).

28. See Wyss, op.cit., pp. xlviii-il; the notion that Apollonius wrote a formal treatise on Antimachus (see `Wyss, fr. 158) must be abandoned: see R.Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship (Oxford, 1968), p.146.

29. Dion. Hal., de imit. 2.2 = Wyss, test.25.

30. Dion. Hal., de comp.verb., 22 = `Wyss, test. 24.

31. Plutarch, Tim. 36 = Wyss, test. 29.

32. Antipater, AP 7.409 = Wyss, test. 27.

33. Quintilian, Inst.Or. 10.1.53.

34. Cf. J.Cousin, 'Etudes sur Quintilien I (Amsterdam, 1967, repr.), p.551.

35. Cf. also, Proclus, in Plat. Tim.1.19e = Wyss, test. 37.

36. See, on this, especially, M.Puelma, 'Die Vorbilder der Elegiendichtung in Alexandrien und Rom', MH 11 (1954), 101-116.

37. Horace, AP, 77.

38. Cf. Newman, op.cit., p.373.

39. Callimachus' attack on the Lyde does not imply that he denied all importance to it in the development of narrative elegy - in fact, his remark indicates that there was a general recognition of its position. T.B.L.Webster, op.cit., p.59, brings out the partisan nature of Callimachus' viewpoint: "... why did Kallimachos attack the Lyde, which seems to have been revered by Philitas and Hermesianax as well as by Asclepiades and Poseidippos? He regarded it as long and obscure rather than short and fine. A possible reason is that Apollonius wrote on Antimachus" but see n.28 above "and based Argonautika to some extent on the Lyde" stylistically his epic was influenced rather by the Thebaid, although the Argonautic legend figured in the Lyde: Wyss, fr. 58 "Kallimachos decided to exclude Antimachos from the roll of short and fine poets." Cf. also Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.96: "If anyone can be regarded as a precursor of the poets and scholars of the years of transition to the Alexandrian age, it is Antimachus of Colophon."

40. Cf., Newman, op.cit., p.375.

41. Callim., Aetia 1.24 Pf.: see on λεπτός E.Reitzenstein, 'Die Entwicklung des Wortes λεπτός zur Stilbezeichnung der Alexandriner', Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos, Festschrift R.Reitzenstein (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931), esp. pp. 36 ff.

42. Callim., Aetia 1.17 Pf.

43. Ovid, Amores 1.15.13.

44. Martial 8.73.6: cf. Luck, op.cit. pp. 43-44.

45. See F.Solmsen, 'On Propertius 1.7', AJP (196), pp.83-4.

46. ibid., 82.

47. Horace, AP 408 ff.

48. Spart., Vit. Hadr., 16 = Wyss, test. 32; Dio. Cass., Exc. Xiphil., 69.4 = Wyss, test. 31.

49. Wimmel, op.cit., pp. 202 ff.; cf. also, P.J.Enk, Sex.Propertii Elegiarum Liber II (Leyden, 1962), II.433 ff.; R.E.White, 'The Unity of Propertius 2.34 and 3.20', Laudatores Temporis Acti: Studies in Memory of W.E.Caldwell (ed. M.F.Gyles and E.W.Davis, Chapel Hill, 1964), pp. 63 ff. : contra, esp., P.W.Damon and W.C.Helmbold, 'The Structure of Propertius, Book 2', UCSCP 14.6 (1952), 238 ff.

50. Enk, op.cit., p.440.

51. See Enk, op.cit., pp.440-1.

52. Plato, Republic 329b ff.

53. On love as madness in Roman elegy, see, inter al., A.W.Allen, 'Elegy and the classical attitude towards love', YCS 11 (1950), 253 ff.

54. The text here is highly unsatisfactory; see Enk. op.cit., pp.442-444.

55. On the elegiac canon, cf. G.Luck, 'Scriptor Classicus', Comp.Lit. 10 (1958), 150-58.

56. See Aetia 1, fr.2 Pf.

57. See Boucher, op.cit., pp. 173 ff.

58. Cf. Otis, op.cit., pp. 26 ff.

59. D.R.Shackleton-Bailey, Propertiana (Cambridge, 1956), p.133; Boucher, REA, 1958, 310.

60. Propertius 4.9.45 ff.: cf. E.Lefèvre, Propertius Ludibundus (Heidelberg, 1966), pp. 92-94; W.S.Anderson, 'Hercules Exclusus', AJP 85 (1964), 1-12; H.E.Pillinger, 'Callimachean Influences on Propertius Book 4', HSCP 73 (1969), 171-199, at 182 ff.

61. H.E.Butler and E.A.Barber, The Elegies of Propertius (Oxford, 1933) p.258.

62. Statius, Silv. 2.7.51: cf. Callim., Aetia 1. fr. 27-8 Pf. and Lucretius 4.1.

63. Cf. J.K.Newman, The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry (Brussels, 1967), pp. 86-7.

64. On this sense of durus, see Pichon, op.cit., p.136.

65. Plato, Republic 398a.

66. Cf. also 3.1.19-20.

67. Cf. J. van Ijzeren, 'Vindiciae Antimacheae', Mnem. 56 (1928), 281-2.

68. See Quintilian 10.1.54,

69. For such fragments as we have, see G.Kinkel, Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I (Leipzig, 1877), pp. 253 ff.

70. G.Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis (London, 1969), p.187.

71. Cf. Aristotle, Rhet.3.6.1408a; Wyss, op.cit. p.ix and frgs. 2-9.

72. Cf. A.L.Wheeler, 'Propertius as praeceptor amoris', CP 5 (1910), 30 ff.; E.Burck, 'Römische Wesenzüge der Augusteischen Liebeselegie' Hermes 80 (1952), 186-7.

73. On this idea in 1.1, cf., esp. J.Fontenrose, 'Propertius and the Roman career', UCSCP 13.11(1949), 371-378.

74. The text is clearly disturbed; I have adopted Housman's convincing emendation.

75. The translation of H.E.Butler in the Loeb edition.

76. Cf. L.Alfonsi, 'Di Properzio II, 34 e della protasi dell'Eneide' RFIC 73 (1944), 127.

77. On the Gigantomachia, cf. Callim., Aetia 1 fr.1.20 Pf. and Boucher, op.cit., pp.305-6.

78. On this, see Enk, op.cit., p.20.

79. ibid., p.21.

80. Cf. the remarks of Otis, op.cit., pp. 16-18, 396-7.

81. E.R.Curtius, Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter (Bern, 1948), pp. 169 ff.

82. See Buecheler/Riese, Anthol. Lat. 1.i.no.265.

83. See the discussion in Boucher, op.cit., pp. 280 ff.

84. Cf. Couat, op.cit. pp.96-7.

85. Callim., AP 9.507 (= Ep. 27 Pf.).

86. For a review of scholarly opinion, see Enk. op.cit., pp. 460 ff.

87. Cf. Wimmel, op.cit., p.212 and Enk, op.cit., pp. 461-3; Enk's criticisms of Wimmel are sound enough but his own view is hardly more convincing. The text is hopelessly corrupt; for an attempt to defend the MS reading, see Alfonsi, RIL 1943/4, 7-8. Boucher, REA 1958 attempts an explanation on the basis that Lynceus = Varius Rufus (cf. also, E.Bickel, Symb.Osl. 28 [1950] , 17 ff.; F.Nencini, 'Properzio e Vario Rufo', MC 1935, 119-20). Certainty is not possible, but I am guided by two convictions: (1) Tamen in 81 must mean that here Propertius reverts to speaking about his own work, after the Virgil passage (cf. the remarks of Wheeler, CP 1910, 31): (2) Propertius is re-affirming his own poetic viewpoint and again rejecting the work of such authors as Lynceus, who is not a doctus poeta. Thus olor = Propertius; anser = Lynceus; indocto carmine = the poetry of such as Lynceus. Damon and Helmbold, loc.cit., 240, wrote: 'It is difficult not to believe that the whole quartrain is interpolated." But, assuming the unity of 24b, a bridge passage is certainly required here.

88. Damon and Helmbold, loc.cit. p.238: lines 59-94 are "a σφραγίς-poem advertising in a very unusual way, the author and his connexions with the literary world."

89. Propertius 4.1.64; for an excellent investigation of the significance of this claim, see the paper of Pillinger (note 60 above).

90. See, e.g., Boucher, op.cit., pp. 170 ff.

91. Callim., Aetia 1.25 ff. Pf.

92. We do not fail to notice the appearance of the epithet sublimis, with its literary connotations: the opposite to humilis.

93. On the concept of canons, cf., e.g., J.D.Claussen, Quaestiones Quintilianae (Fleckeisen Jahrb.Suppl. 1873), pp. 339 ff.: