

TWO UNIDENTIFIED *KOMOI* OF PROPERTIUS I 3 AND II 29¹

In section I an attempt is made to show that in the *komos* admission of the lover, although less frequent than exclusion, is not confined to the dramatic tradition, as F. O. Copley thought, but occurs in other types of poetry. Section II identifies Propertius I 3 as a *komos* in which Propertius is admitted to Cynthia's house, and analyses it in terms of the *topoi* of the genre. Section III argues in favour of the unity of Propertius II 29, which is also identified as a *komos*. This argument is carried further in Section IV which discusses Propertius II 29 as a variation on the theme of Propertius I 3 and treats the textual problem at Propertius II 29, 41 in the light of the genre. Section V deals with some of the literary conclusions which can be drawn from the preceding examination of the two elegies. Section VI treats the *exempla* of lines 1ff.

I. THE KOMOS OF THE ADMISSUS AMATOR

The genre *komos*, often termed inaccurately *paraclausithyron*², is one of the commonest in ancient poetry. It is also the subject of an important and famous monograph by F. O. Copley — *Exclusus Amator*³. Copley's title reveals his conviction that exclusion is an essential component of the genre. He does not attempt to deny that komastic admission sometimes occurs. But he tries to restrict it to drama and real life:

In the dramatic tradition, and presumably also in real life, the lover's plea was not always refused: he was sometimes admitted and sometimes not, in accordance with the circumstances of the moment or the requirements of the plot. In the non-dramatic tradition, he is never admitted (p. 17).

¹ An early account of my views on Propertius I 3 was given as a public lecture at Edinburgh in 1967 and a later version at Liverpool in 1974. I am indebted to Mr. Ian Duquesnay, Prof. Tilman Krischer, Prof. R. G. M. Nisbet and Prof. David West for their advice on various drafts of this paper. Naturally it should not be assumed that they assent to all its conclusions.

² Plut., *Mor.* 753 B.

³ Philological Monographs Published by the American Philological Association, No. XVII, 1956, henceforth referred to as Copley, with page numbers.

Since both the Propertian poems discussed in this paper (I 3 and II 29) involve scenes inside the house of the beloved, it would seem, by Copley's criterion, that they cannot be *komoi*. In this section I shall accumulate enough examples of komastic admission in the non-dramatic tradition of ancient literature to show that Copley's restriction of admission to drama is incorrect. Komastic admission can occur in any type of literature; exclusion and admission are in theory equally likely alternatives within the framework of events which constitutes a *komos*. That exclusion appears more frequently in practice is merely due to the greater scope it offers for literary ingenuity than admission.

References to or descriptions of successful *komoi* of entry involving violence occur at Herodas 2; Tibullus I 1, 73; Ovid, *Amores* I 9, 20; *Ars Amatoria* III 71; 567; Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* IV 17, 3f. In addition there are threats of violent entry or attempts at this at e.g. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 585 A and Aelian, *Varia Historia* XIII 1. Such violent entries are not irrelevant to the matter on hand because there is no clear dividing line between the peaceful and the violent *komos*. Rather there is a gradation from the utterly resigned and passive komast through the one who only threatens force to the one who resorts to actual violence.

Moreover there are a number of *komoi* in nondramatic literature which do not involve violence but are successful and where success is achieved through the entry of the komast. To begin with there are three prose descriptions of *komoi* of peaceful entrance. Lucian, *Bis Accusatus* 31 is the complaint of a cuckolded husband against his wife. He tells how komasts, so called, nightly came knocking on his door. Some, he says, ventured to force their way in, a reference to the violent variant of the genre. But then he goes on to speak of non-violent entry:

αὐτὴ δὲ ἐγέλα καὶ ἦδετο τοῖς δρωμένοις καὶ τὰ
πολλὰ ἢ παρέκλυπτεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέγους ᾄδόντων
ἀκούουσα τραχέα τῇ φωνῇ ὥδ' αὖ τις ἐρωτικᾶς
ἢ καὶ παρανοίγουσα τὰς θυρίδας ἐμὲ οἰομένη λαν-
θάνειν ἢ σέλγαινε καὶ ἐμοιχεύετο πρὸς αὐτῶν.

Similarly Alciphron, *Epistles* I 6 speaks of a courtesan admitting a lover who came on a *komos* to her; and Aristaeetus, *Epistles* II 19 tells of a young man who comes in the garb and manner of a komast and is received. In neither case is there any trace of violence.

In addition to these passages there are four pre-Propertian poetic *komoi* where success by admission is either positively envisaged by the

komast or where it is treated as an equally probable, or more probable, alternative to exclusion. The first is Theocritus, *Idyll* II 118f¹. Simaetha has sent for her lover. When he comes he tells her that, if she had not sent for him, he would have come to her as a komast. He would have had some commonplace accoutrements — friends², apples³ and garlands⁴. He envisages only that he would have gained entry, either by peaceful means or by violent ones. The reader knows that, had he come, he would certainly have been admitted peacefully because, as it happens, Simaetha made the first approach to him.

In the other three examples admission is an alternative rather than a certainty. The first is by Posidippus:

Πυθιάς εἰ μὲν ἔχει τιν' ἀπέρχομαι· εἰ δὲ καθεύδει
 ὧδε μόνῃ μικρὸν πρὸς Διὸς εἰσκαλέσσαι.
 Εἰπέ δὲ σημεῖον, μεθύων ὅτι καὶ διὰ κλωπῶν
 ἦλθον Ἐρωτὶ θρασεῖ χρώμενος ἡγεμόνι.

AP V 213

Here the komast faces two possible situations. Either the girl already has another lover with her, in which case the komast will go away. Or she is alone, in which case he asks and clearly expects to be admitted. Each alternative is seen as equally possible and in fact the komast foresees no other possible obstacle to his admission than prior possession of the girl by someone else. The tone and content of the epigram accords with the fact that it is addressed not to the girl but to her *leno*. The poet clearly hopes and perhaps expects that the girl will be free, an aspiration reflected in the placing of this alternative in the second and final position and the allotment to it of three and one third lines of a four line epigram.

¹ Copley describes this example as exceptional and considers the admission «the result of the influence of the dramatic tradition on this mime-like *Idyll*» (p. 149, n. 32). Such special pleading is unnecessary.

² Cp. e.g. J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, p. 181 f; Plut., *Mor.* 772 F-773 A; Aristaen., *Ep.* II 19 and see Headlam-Knox on Herodas II 34-37.

³ Cp. e.g. Theocr., *Id.* II 120; III 10; VI 6 f. For apples as love-gifts see: A. Wlosok «Die Dritte Cynthia-Elegie des Propertius (Prop. I 3)», *Hermes* 95, 1967, p. 345, n. 1 and the works cited there, to which may be added B. O. Forster, «The Symbolism of the Apple in Classical Antiquity», *HSCP* 10, 1899, p. 39 ff.

⁴ See e.g. Headlam-Knox *l. c.*; Copley, p. 154, n. 18.

The other two examples are Meleagrian:

ὦ Νύξ, ὦ φιλάγρυπνος ἔμοι πόθος Ἥλιοδώρας
καὶ ἱσκολιῶν ὀρθρωνῆ κνίσματα δακρυχαρῆ,
ἄρα μένει στοργῆς ἐμὰ λείψανα, καὶ τι φίλημα
μνημόσυνον ψυχρᾷ θάλπετ' ἐνὶ κλισίᾳ;
5 Ἄρα γ' ἔχει σύγκοιτα τὰ δάκρυα, κάμὸν ὄνειρον
ψυχαπάτην στέρνοις ἀμφιβαλοῦσα φιλεῖ;
Ἦ νέος ἄλλος ἔρως, νέα παίγνια; Μήποτε, λύχνε,
ταῦτ' ἐσίδης, εἴης δ' ἤς παρέδωκα φύλαξ.

AP V 166

Ἄστρα καὶ ἡ φιλέρωσι καλὸν φαίνουσα Σελήνη
καὶ Νύξ καὶ κώμων σύμπλανον ὄργάνιον,
ἀρά γε τὴν φιλάσωντον ἔτ' ἐν κοίταισιν ἀθρήσω
ἄγρυπνον λύχνῳ πόλλ' ἱάποδαομένην;
5 ἢ τιν' ἔχει σύγκοιτον; Ἐπὶ προθύροισι μαρανθεῖς
δάκρυσιν ἐκδήσω τοὺς ἱκέτας στεφάνους
ἐν τόδ' ἐπιγράψας «Κύπρι, σοὶ Μελέαγρος ὁ μύστης
σῶν κώμων στοργᾷ σκυῖλα τάδ' ἐκρέμασε».

AP V 191

The first of these is revealed as a *komos* only by comparison with the second and by its occurrence in the Anthology within a group of *komoi* (V 164-168). Both epigrams seem to involve the same alternative. Either the girl will be alone and the *komast*, one presumes, admitted, or she will be with another lover and the *komast* excluded. In the first the poet seems to be hoping that the girl will prove to be alone. In the second he seems to be more resigned to finding that another lover will have taken his place. In both cases the girls' imagined condition and viewpoint are given prominent treatment. The girls are imagined as lying in bed (166, 4 f., 191, 3 ff.), and as weeping, one certainly (166, 5), the other probably (191, 4). One is sleepless (191, 4); the other is dreaming about the poet, her absent lover (166, 5 f.).

There are details in these four poetic passages which bring Propertius I 3 vividly to mind:

1) *Idyll* II 120, cp. Propertius I 3, 23 ff. — the apples in Cynthia's bosom.

2) The weeping of the girls in Meleager, cp. Propertius I 3, 43; 46 — the weeping and complaints of Cynthia.

3) The sleeplessness of one of Meleager's girls (*AP* V 191, 4), cp. Propertius I 3, 41 ff. — Cynthia's long wakefulness.

4) The dream of Meleager's other girl (*AP* V 166, 5f.), cp. Propertius I 3, 29 f. — Cynthia's suspected dream.

The coincidences with Meleager are of particular interest because Propertius began his programmatic first elegy of the *Monobiblos* with an adaptation of another epigram of Meleager (*AP* XII 101, 1 ff.), thereby proclaiming literary affinity with and indebtedness to Meleager.

On the basis of these examples¹ we can conclude that although most literary *komoi* are indeed unsuccessful, literary lovers do sometimes succeed, and not only in drama. There is one form of successful *komos* which, for purely technical reasons, is particularly associated with drama. If a dramatist wants to portray komastic success but wishes the action to continue on stage without a break and without a change of characters, then he must make the beloved come out of the house rather than have the lover go in. But even this is not exclusive to drama. Egress is mentioned in Theocritus, *Idyll* II, 63 and Aristae-netus, *Epistles* II, 4, and it was obviously a feature of real life. Cf.

Τὰ Στησιχόρου τε καὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος Σιμωνίδου τε
ἀρχαῖον αἰδεῖν· ὁ δὲ Γνήσιππος ἔστιν ἀκούειν.
Κείνος νυκτερὶν' εὔρε μοιχοῖς αἰίσματ' ἐκκαλεῖσθαι
γυναικας ἔχοντας λαμβύκην τε καὶ τρίγωνον.

Eupolis, *Fr.* 139 K

A final point to be added is that Propertius elsewhere reveals quite clearly that he considered komastic admission to be part of the topical content of his elegy:

sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina
et furtim misero ianua aperta mihi,
te nihil in uita nobis acceptius umquam.

Propertius II 9, 41 ff.

Here he calls as witnesses to his love the stars and the frost which were

¹ A post-Propertian example may be added to these for completeness — *AP*, XII 252 (Strato) — where peaceful *komoi* of admission are envisaged (l. 4).

present and the door which opened to admit him to Cynthia's love. These references, especially to the *ianna*, are an unmistakable indication of the komastic context of his admission¹.

II. PROPERTIUS I 3

There has been considerable scholarly interest in this poem in the last fifteen years². The results have been the elucidation of several of the traditional problems of the elegy and a better understanding of its place in the Monobiblos. However, there has been no discussion of the elegy in terms of its genre. Propertius I 3 is a *komos*: this is clear from a number of obvious komastic elements in the first half of the elegy. Propertius is out at night, the normal time for *komoi*³. Like the usual komast he has been to a dinner or drinking-party, where he has been given that standard feature of the komast's equipment, garlands⁴ (21 f.), which he wears on his head after the evening's potations. The apples which he, like some other komasts, carries (24)⁵ are probably *apophoreta* from the banquet. Propertius is dragging his footsteps (9). This not only tells the reader that he is drunk (see below) but refers to the processional element of the *komos* — from symposium to beloved⁶.

¹ For stars cp. e.g. *AP* V 191, 1 (Meleager); Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 177, 1, 11; Prop. I 16, 23. Inclement weather of all kinds is a common komastic discomfort. For cold, rain, hail, snow, thunder and lightning alone or in combination see e.g. *AP* V 23, 2 (Callim.); 64, 1, ff. (Asclep.); 167, 1; 5 (Asclep.); XII 115, 3 f. (Anon.); Tib. I, 2, 7 f.; Hor., *Od.* III 10, 1-8; Ov., *Am.* I 9, 15 f. Close to the overall picture of Prop. II, 9, 41, ff. is Ov., *Am.* I 6, 55 (dew); 65 f. (frost of dawn). Even closer is part of another Propertian *komos* (see above):

me mediae noctes, me sidera plena iacentem
frigidaque Eoo me dolet aura gelu

(I 16, 23 f. cp. 45 f.).

² Most of the bibliography can be found conveniently collected by W. Hering, 'Propertius I 3', *WS* 85, 1972, pp. 45 ff. Other contributions are: R. O. A. M. Lyne, *PCPhS* 16, 1970, pp. 60 ff.; P. Fedeli, *Mus. Helv.* 31, 1974, pp. 23 ff.; G. Giangrande, *EMERITA* 42, 1974, pp. 29 ff.; D. P. Harmon, *TAPhA* 104, 1974, pp. 151 ff.

³ So much so that the very occasional daylight *komos* — e.g. Theocr., *Id.* III — is intended to strike a reader as extraordinary and in need of explanation.

⁴ See p. 327, n. 1.

⁵ See p. 325, n. 3.

⁶ See e.g. Copley, pp. 2 ff.; 154, n. 16; 155, n. 2.

Like some other komasts, Propertius is attended by slaves¹ who carry another komastic accoutrement, torches (10)². Like many komasts, Propertius has been drinking (9, 11, 13)³. Like some, he considers himself to be under duress from love and/or wine⁴. Although the notion that the lover is under such duress is not confined to the *komos*, it is particularly interesting that the nearest earlier surviving parallel to the concept of Propertius I 3, 13 f.

et quamuis duplici correptum ardore iuberent
hac Amor hac Liber, durus uterque deus

is the second couplet of a *komos* of Callimachus:

*Ακρητος καὶ ἔρωσ μ' ἠνάγκασαν, ὦν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν
εἶλεν, ὁ δ' οὐκ εἶα τὴν προπέτειαν ἔαν·

AP XII 118, 3 f.

The coincidence is not only interesting in view of Propertius' claim in his later books of elegies to be the disciple and Roman analogue to Callimachus — an influence already visible in the *Monobiblos*⁵ — but also because of the known popularity of this epigram at Rome, where a version of it was found written on a house-wall on the Esquiline⁶.

These then are the most obvious komastic features of the elegy, seen as a whole. Ancient readers were of course far more sensitive to generic matters than we are; and the commoner the genre, the greater their sensitivity. The *komos* is one of the most frequently exemplified genres and this is reflected in the tenuousness of the hints which Hellenistic epigrammatists thought sufficient to allow their contemporary audience to recognise an example of it. Propertius I 3 can be approached

¹ Cp. e.g. Xen., *Symp.* II 1; P. *Teb.* 2 (d); Plaut., *Circ.* 1-16 and — for flute-girls, also slaves, accompanying the komast — Headlam-Knox, *l. c.*

² See Headlam-Knox, *l. c.*

³ Cp. e.g. Anacr., *Fr.* 69 D.; Eur., *Cycl.* 495 ff.; AP V 167 (Asclep.); 213 (Posid.); XII 118 (Callim.); Plaut., *Circ.* 1-164; Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, pp. 181 f.; P. *Teb.* 2 (d); Copley, p. 154, n. 17.

⁴ See e.g. Copley, pp. 19; 149, n. 48.

⁵ See P. Cairns, *CR N. S.* 20, 1969, pp. 131 ff.

⁶ See Pfeiffer, *ad loc.* The motif is of course found more widely than in these two passages. Cp. e.g. Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 182, ll. 15 f. and Prop. II 29 A (see below).

profitably from the point of view of an ancient reader. We can ask at what point he was meant to recognise that it was a *komos* and what other aspects of the elegy, besides the fairly obvious komastic commonplaces noted above, would have struck him as significant in the light of the genre.

The opening sentence of the poem is mainly devoted to describing the sleeping Cynthia by means of three mythical *exempla* (1-8): it is only in the final couplet of the sentence that an added temporal clause (9 f.) gives the details which identify the poem as a *komos* (drunkenness, night-time, procession, slaves, torch). An ancient reader could not have identified the genre of the poem from its first eight lines; and this delaying tactic serves to sharpen expectations of an announcement of generic identity¹ while at the same time increasing sensitivity to the contents of lines 1-8. Delay in generic identification is a common technique in *komoi*².

Once the reader is told in 9 f. that the poem is a *komos*, he can recognise in retrospect the relationship of the mythical *exempla* of lines 1-8 not only to the scene that meets Propertius' eyes but also to the *komos*. The meaning of the myths in general terms has been thoroughly explored by scholars. Their connections with the *komos* are as follows³. The first and third are both Dionysiac, the former being set in the context of Dionysus' life on earth, the latter at a Dionysiac festival. Dionysus has strong links with *komoi* in the broader sense of processions or routs of any kind. He is called *komastes*, his following is called a *komos* and the festivals in his honour are frequently called *komoi*. In addition Dionysus is the god of wine and he is also the wine itself, which inspires and compels the lover on his *komos*. It is as a komast that Dionysus comes to Ariadne in the first *exemplum* and in the third the Maenad is one of the revellers in a Dionysiac *komos*. The second *exemplum*, that of Perseus and Andromeda, does not seem to have a komastic connection. I shall explain its presence in § IV.

Lines 1-8 then establish that Propertius is inside Cynthia's house, and lines 9f. that he has gained entry as a result of his *komos* to her. The ancient reader would therefore have concluded that the less fre-

¹ Cp. also the delayed identification of Cynthia (7).

² E.g. Theocr., *Id.* VI 6-41; XI 19-78; Tib. I 2; Hor., *Od.* III 7. See F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh 1972, (henceforth referred to as *GC*), Ch. 6.

³ For a full discussion of earlier views see Wlosok, *op. cit.*, pp. 334 ff. On the links between Dionysus and the *komos* see R-L s. u. *komos*.

quently exemplified form of *komos*, that of the admitted lover, was in progress. In what follows, he would not have been surprised to find *topoi* analogous to those of the *komos* of the *exclusus* but consonant with the fact that Propertius is inside the house¹.

This is indeed what he found. But in each case there is an oddness about the *topos* which was designed to create a sense of foreboding in a sensitive reader about whether Propertius was really as secure in his admission as he thought. Lines 13-18 describe how Propertius is tempted to make love to the sleeping Cynthia. But he does not dare disturb her sleep — *expertae meluens iurgia saeuitiae* (18). This passage hints at two aspects of the genre. Violent *komoi* aim at admission and the forcible possession of the beloved². But peaceful *komasts* fear their mistress and those excluded have a particular dread of the cruelty of the beloved³. Propertius is creating an emotionally exciting synthesis of the two sets of circumstances and their underlying motivations.

In lines 21-26 Propertius does three things which are standard signs of affection in ancient life and literature. He transfers the garlands from his own head to that of Cynthia, he plays with her hair and he offers her apples⁴. Two of these actions, the giving of garlands and the offering of apples, also reflect *komastic topoi*. In the *komos* of the excluded lover the beloved is obdurate, the garlands are hung upon her door and the apples are offered to her in vain. Propertius contrives in spite of being inside Cynthia's house to retain the pattern of such offerings. He does so by substituting a sleeping mistress, whose sleep makes her unable to respond, for the waking and willing mistress the reader would expect in a *komos* of admission. He then alters the commonplaces in two other ways⁵. The garlands are hung not on the door but on the beloved. Similarly the apples are not rejected by a mistress awake and excluding her lover but roll off a sleeping one⁶.

¹ Clear generic announcements often precede such alterations. Cp. e.g. Theocr., *Id.* XII (see *GC*, p. 17 ff.); Prop. II 16 (see *GC*, pp. 204 ff.).

² On *komoi* involving violence see Copley, pp. 13 f.; 40 ff.; 57f. and nn.

³ Copley, pp. 149, nn. 44 ff.; 154 f., nn. 25 ff.

⁴ *Garlands*: cp. e.g. Aristoph., *Thesm.* 400f.; Laevius, *Fr.* 4 (Morel); Lucian, *Tox.* 13; 15; *AP* V 288 (Paul. Silent.); *Hair*: cp. e.g. Plat., *Phaed.* 89 B; Xen., *Apol.* 28; Ter., *H. T.* 761 f.; *Apples*: see p. 325 n. 3.

⁵ Although the garlanding of the beloved is, from the point of view of the *komos* of the excluded lover, a variant, it may in fact be one of the objects of the *komos* of the admission. Cp. Plat., *Symp.* 212 E. On this level the unusual factor is the beloved's sleep.

⁶ Propertius places the apples in Cynthia's bosom not only to suggest the commonplace *mala* = breasts, but also to signify his hope that Cynthia welco-

Two words in particular in these lines signal that Propertius is aiming at something more subtle than a simple representation of himself as an admitted lover. The two words are *furtiva* (24) and *ingrato* (25). Many *komoi* make much of the *furtivus amor* theme and of the caution and care which the lover must exercise to reach a mistress who has a jealous *uir*¹. Propertius is cautious for entirely different reasons in his approach to Cynthia; but an allusion is clearly intended to the other circumstance. Similarly *ingrato* alludes indirectly to one of the standard reproaches the excluded lover makes to his mistress, that of ingratitude for his services and gifts to her². Thus Propertius is acting like an *exclusus amator* towards an unwilling mistress despite the fact that he is inside Cynthia's house.

At lines 27-30 more hints at the *komos* of the excluded lover can be found. Propertius looks at Cynthia and notices her occasional stirring and sighing. The thought enters his mind that perhaps she is dreaming of being raped by someone other than himself. Propertius' concern for the omen (*auspicium* 28) of Cynthia's sighs is a reminiscence of the commonplace concern of the *exclusus* for omens³. His fear of a rival is again reminiscent of the concern and fear which many excluded *komasts* demonstrate for rivals real or imaginary⁴. The description of the dream-rival as a rapist, as well as rounding off lines 11-30 in a simple ring-compositional way by referring back to the similar thoughts of rape in 11 ff., is yet another allusion to the *komos* of the lover who resists exclusion with violence.

All these many pointers to the *komos* of exclusion have a semantic role. Cynthia is about to wake up. Her behaviour will justify all Propertius' fears and make him, although *admissus* to her house, *exclusus* from her love. Lines 11-30 hint with their forebodings at this outcome and the reader is intended to appreciate fully their role in the elegy once he has seen what the outcome is.

mes his affection. A woman who placed an apple given to her by a man in her bosom thereby accepted his advances — cp. e.g. Cat. 65, 19⁷ff.; Lucian, *Dial. Mer.* 311 f. The fact that in this case the apples given by Propertius roll off naturally augurs ill for Propertius, as does his garlanding of a sleeping woman — see p. 327, n. 2.

¹ See Copley, pp. 36 ff.; 99 ff.; 156, nn. 47 ff.

² See Copley, pp. 70 f., n. 21.

³ Cp. e.g. Theocr., *Id.* III 37 ff.; Ov., *Am.* I 6, 49 ff.

⁴ See Copley, pp. 53 f.; 60 f.; 91 ff.; 159, n. 29. Copley's unwillingness to accept the rival as a full-blown *komastic* element is, in the light of the evidence he collects, not justified.

The moon is sometimes found just as a komastic stage-prop¹. Here in lines 31-33 the moon plays an active role and wakes up Cynthia. In Cynthia's speech Propertius continues his subtle use of komastic notions. Cynthia's first words take the form of a reproach: she assumes that Propertius must have been on an unsuccessful *komos* elsewhere, only finally coming to her as a last resort (35-8). Then she tells of how she has spent the night; and the self-portrait of the «fanciulla abbandonata» painted by her is constructed so as to echo some of the characteristic words and actions of an excluded lover. She tells Propertius that she has been weeping- as excluded lovers sometimes do (46)². She has complained and lamented to herself as all excluded lovers do (43). She has been playing the lyre as some excluded lovers play a musical instrument; and like some she has been singing (42)³. Cynthia also shows the excluded lover's fear and jealousy of a rival (35-38)⁴. She upbraids Propertius as *improbis*, a reproach which recalls the accusations of cruelty hurled by the *exclusus amator*⁵. She exaggerates and says that dawn has come, thus introducing the time when the excluded lover's misery sometimes reaches its peak⁶. When Cynthia, like the typical excluded lover⁷, turns to threats, she employs a standard threat made by excluded lovers, the threat of reversal of the situations of the lover and the beloved. She imagines Propertius spending nights of misery similar to those which he inflicts upon her. Another *komos* may be compared⁸:

Οὕτως ὑπνώσῃς, Κωνώπιον, ὡς ἐμὲ ποιεῖς
κοιμᾶσθαι ψυχροῖς τοῖσδε παρὰ προθύροις·
οὕτως ὑπνώσῃς, ἀδικωτάτῃ, ὡς τὸν ἐραστὴν
κοιμίζεις, ἑλέου δ' οὐδ' ὄναρ ἡντίασα.
5 Γείτονες οἰκτεῖρουσι, σὺ δ' οὐδ' ὄναρ ἢ πολλὴ δέ
αὐτίκ' ἀναμήσει ταῦτά σε πάντα κόμη.

AP V 23 (Callimachus)

¹ For heavenly bodies in general see p. 329, n. 1. For the moon in particular cp. e.g. AP V 191, 1 (Meleager).

² See Copley, pp. 149, n. 38; 154, n. 23; 170, n. 20.

³ *Musical Instruments*: see Copley, pp. 145, n. 10; *Singing*: see Copley, pp. 5 f.; 145, nn. 7 ff.

⁴ See p. 333, n. 4.

⁵ See Copley, pp. 149, nn. 44 ff.; 154, n. 25.

⁶ E.g. Prop. I 16, 23 f.; 45 f.; Ov., *Am.* I 6, 65 f.

⁷ See Copley, pp. 150, nn. 52f.; 155, n. 33.

⁸ Cp. also AP V 164 (Asclep.); Ps-Theocr., *Id.* XXIII 33 f.; Hor., *Od.* I 25, 9 ff.

Finally Cynthia describes herself as falling asleep on her bed, just as the *exclusus amator* often falls asleep on the doorway with the same pathetic concluding effect¹.

Cynthia is of course in no sense an excluded lover; she is the deserted beloved. But her application to herself of topoi associated with the *exclusus amator* forms within her speech a wry parallel to the unsuccessful *komos* which she imagines Propertius to have conducted earlier that night; and in the overall context of the poem, the topoi she uses contrast with Propertius' earlier condition, that of *admissus amator*. But her speech leaves us in no doubt that Propertius is the real *komast* and her emphasis on his exclusion (36) is ominous. Cynthia not only assumes from his exhaustion (*languidus*, 30), from his accoutrements, from his drunkenness and from the time of night, that he has been excluded elsewhere; but she also wishes on him loveless nights (39 f.). This emphasis on his exclusion contrasts strongly with Propertius' own assumptions that he is an *admissus* and prefigures what the elegy eventually implies, namely that he is excluded by Cynthia herself.

In I 3 Propertius offers various unusual combinations of the alternatives possible in a *komos*. 1) Propertius is *admissus* to Cynthia's house, but behaves within it in ways analogous to those of the *exclusus amator*. 2) Cynthia assumes that he has been *exclusus* elsewhere before giving up and coming to her, one possible reaction of a *komast* who is excluded (Cf. Theocritus *Idyll* XI 76 ff.). 3) Cynthia herself, the deserted beloved, speaks of herself to some extent in terms appropriate to an *exclusus amator*. 4) Finally Propertius, although *admissus* in this *komos*, has not yet succeeded in his ultimate aim.

The way in which the poet resolves the question of admission/exclusion is of interest. In the *komos* of the excluded lover the *komast* comes to his beloved's house, finds his suit rejected and laments his fate. In a few cases however the normal contents are extended in a way which can be paralleled in other genres *i.e.* by the «reaction» of the speaker or addressee to what happens within the normal contents of the genre². The speaker «reacts» in *komoi* of exclusion either by giving up the whole venture as a waste of time and going away³ or by killing himself in despair⁴. When the addressee, that is the beloved, «reacts» in a *komos*, this reaction usually takes one of two forms, depend-

¹ Cp. e.g. Plat., *Symp.* 183 A; Aristoph., *Eccl.* 962; *P. Teb.* 2 (d); *AP* XII 72 (Meleager); Copley, p. 154, n. 19.

² See *GC*, Ch. 6.

³ E.g. Theocr., *Id.* VII 96 ff. (see *GC*, pp. 201 ff.); *Id.* XI (see *GC*, pp. 143 ff.).

⁴ E.g. Ps-Theocr., *Id.* XXIII; Ov., *Met.* XIV 698ff.

ing on whether or not the *komos* is successful. Either the beloved accedes to the komast's suit and then lets him in or comes out to him¹. Or the beloved refuses the komast's advances in an explicit form. In the latter case the beloved states her refusal instead of simply leaving the door shut².

What happens in Propertius I 3 is similar to the last «reaction» described, although there is a difference which increases the element of surprise. Propertius has no difficulty in entering Cynthia's house since he is an expected and invited lover. But when he already seems to be an *admissus amator* whose success is assured, the tables suddenly turn on him. Cynthia «reacts» to his lateness by speaking in a querulous and hostile tone. The implication is clear: Propertius will be rejected by Cynthia. He will be an *exclusus amator* after all; and admission is only being used as a foil for exclusion.

III. THE UNITY OF PROPERTIUS II 29

II 29 has usually been divided by editors at line 22 into two separate elegies. In this section I will argue that the elegy is a single unified poem, and in § IV I will discuss the elegy as a *komos*. Since some of the arguments for the unity of II 29 are based on its resemblances to I 3, this section cannot abstain completely from implications about the genre of II 29, although discussion of this will as far as possible be kept for § IV. Naturally the two sections are mutually supportive. If II 29 is a unity, then it is easier to identify as a *komos*; if it is a *komos*, then its unity is all the clearer.

The following arguments for dividing Propertius II 29 after line 22 have been, or could be, made:

1) The action of A (1-22) takes place at night (*nocte*, 1; *noctes*, 22) whereas the action of B (23-42) takes place in the morning (*mane erat*, 23).

2) In A Propertius speaks of «last night» (*hesterna nocte*, 1) whereas in B, in all modern texts, he says «from that time I have never spent a night with Cynthia» (*ex illo felix nox mihi nulla fuit*, 42). The implication of this latter statement is that the action of B took place at least two nights before Propertius narrates it. This would tell against A

¹ See above pp. 326 ff.

² E.g. Theocr., *Id.* VI 21 ff.; Aristaen., *Ep.* II 20 (see GC, p. 152).

and B being continuous because in A Propertius is relating what happened «last night».

3) In A Propertius addresses Cynthia (1). In B he speaks of Cynthia in the third person.

4) In A Propertius addresses Cynthia as *mea lux* (1) when he recount his adventure with the Cupids. These words are a term of endearment. But at the end of B (42) Propertius says that Cynthia is estranged from him.

5) In A the Cupids claim that Cynthia hired them to bring Propertius to her (20) and that she is ready to welcome him to her favours (15 ff.). But in B Cynthia reacts in a most unfriendly fashion to Propertius' arrival (31 ff.) and ends by rejecting him.

6) In A we are given no hint that Propertius is not completely confident in Cynthia's affection for him. But B begins with Propertius «spying» on her and wondering if she has been unfaithful to him (23 f.).

7) In B (23 f.) Propertius seems to be stating as the reason for his entering Cynthia's house that he «wanted to go and see if she was sleeping alone» (*et nolui, si sola quiesceret illa, / uisere*). But the whole tenor of A is that Propertius is an invited and expected komast. The further reason given in 23f. appears unnecessary and even incompatible with the first reason given in A, no matter on what literal or metaphorical level these reasons should be understood.

8) In A Propertius is a *fugitivus* (cf. § IV *ad init.*). In B there is no trace of this role.

Against these arguments the following considerations may be adduced.

1) The order in which night and morning come in A and B is the natural one. There is no inconsistency if it is assumed that the Cupids catch Propertius at night but take some time to bring him to Cynthia's house, which they reach just as morning comes. In I 3 something similar happens. Propertius is out late at night (10) and gets back late to Cynthia (35, 37). It is still night — or at any rate the moon is still prominent (31 ff.) — but a little later Cynthia claims that the stars have set (38). She may be exaggerating, but the trend of her remark is clear. II 29 simply contains an extended use of the same «night into day» commonplace. This is both a symposiastic motif¹ and a *homos topos* (see below § IV) and its presence in II 29 is no argument against the unity of that elegy.

¹ See G. Giangrande, *Entretiens Hardt* XIV, pp. 132 ff.

2) There are two possible approaches to this problem, if the unity of the elegy is to be upheld. Neither is without its difficulties but both are worth considering. The first is to take *hesterna nocte* as «the previous night» i.e. the night before the morning of line 23. This would mean that the elegy would present us with three different times: 1) the night before (sc. the morning on which Cynthia rejected Propertius); 2) the morning on which the rejection took place; 3) a later time at which Propertius is looking back at 1) and 2) and relating what happened then. In this case *felix nox* could be defended (in spite of other difficulties attaching to it — see below) and the elegy in this way could be seen as a unity.

Unfortunately, it is not easy to translate *hesterna nocte* as «the previous night». *hesternus* can undoubtedly sometimes refer broadly to past time (TLL sv. II). But the phrase *hesterna nocte* always seems to mean «last night» in Roman elegy: and because it stands in initial position in Propertius II 29 and so lacks a context with contrary implications, it could not easily have conveyed anything else to Propertius' readers.

The other approach, which on the whole I consider preferable, is to challenge the humanist emendation of *non* to *nox* in line 42, an emendation which causes the problem in the first place. This emendation seems at first sight easy and attractive; and the combination *felix nox* appears acceptable Latin. But such a phrase would be out of context here. The adjective *felix* applied to periods of time denotes sacral periods, times of public rather than of private significance (TLL sv. II A 1 b β; III C 2 b α). An argument could be made that *felix nox*, with its sacral associations, picks up the religious allusion of *sanctus amor* in line 41. Propertius could be wittily applying a term normally used of public religious observances to his own private love-affair. But *felix* is never applied to a night of love in elegy: it is applied to the lover who wins his beloved or to the girl who is «complaisant». Propertius uses the word in this latter meaning in I 13 35: *quae tibi sit felix quoniam nouus incidit error*¹ «since you are falling in love again, may the girl yields to you». It is worth emphasising that this line offers the same syntactical unit *felix mihi/tibi esse* as is found in the MSS version of Propertius II 29, 42: *ex illo felix non mihi nulla fuit*. If *nox* is accepted instead of the MSS *non*, then *felix* is doubly distorted: first it is misapplied to a private amatory situation; second, its normal elegiac usage to qualify a person is being overthrown. The phrase *felix nox* then,

¹ See Eink, *ad loc.*

which pleased humanist taste, might well have seemed odd rather than apt to an ancient reader.

The problem with the MSS reading *non* is that two negatives, in normal Latin usage, cancel each other to produce an emphatic positive statement. Line 42 has two negatives, *non* and *nulla*: when they cancel each other out, the line can be rendered «from that time she has yielded to me» (*ex illo felix mihi fuit*). This is clearly the direct opposite of what we expect Propertius to say. Neither of the negatives is obviously out of place and either of them would negate the sentiment adequately; *non* needs no comment in this respect; as for *nulla*, Propertius, along with other Latin writers¹, sometimes substitutes various parts of *nullus* for *non* in order to make a negative stronger or more ornamental². In such cases *nullus* means no more than *non*. There is however a Latin idiom found infrequently but attested beyond doubt. This is the use of a double negative to represent an emphatic negation. This idiom is accepted by the standard grammatical reference works, whose views I have summarised elsewhere³ in arguing that such a double negative occurs at Propertius II 19, 32:

absenti nemo non nocuisse uelit.

If II 19, 32 does indeed contain this idiom, then its presence there is a confirmatory argument for its occurrence in II 29, 42. Both are the final lines of an elegy, and it may be supposed that Propertius found emphatic double negative a suitably imposing way of ending a poem. Moreover, emphatic double negatives are sometimes found in legal or religious contexts⁴. It is then the MSS *non* which in double negation along with *nulla* echoes in line 42 the religious overtones of *sanctus amor* in line 41.

I conclude therefore that on grounds both of Latinity and of internal cohesion within the elegy the emendation *nox* should be rejected in favour of the MSS reading *non*. It may be argued that Propertius is being wildly melodramatic and is exaggerating his problems when he says within twenty-four hours of his rejection: «since then she has not yielded to me». But two considerations should be kept in mind.

¹ See K-S I, pp. 236 (b); 824, n. 5.

² E.g. Prop. I 9, 23; II 22, 28; II 25, 9.

³ See F. Cairns, «Propertius II 19, 32» in *Daube Noster*, ed. A. Watson, Edinburgh 1974, pp. 49 ff. To the works cited there (p. 51, n. 9) should be added L-II-S II, pp. 803 ff.

⁴ E.g. Cat. 76, 3 f.; Virg., *Georg.* IV 453; Livy XI,III 13.

The first is that this mode of expression «since then ...» seems to have been a standard way in which ancient poets protested against what they considered an injustice or hard lot¹. The second is that it is an ancient commonplace that for a lover separated from his love a very short time seems long. Cp. Theocritus, *Idyll* XII 1 f.²:

ἦλυθες, ὦ φίλε κοῦρε· τρίτη σὺν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡοῖ
ἦλυθες· οἱ δὲ ποθεῦντες ἐν ἡματι γηράσκουσιν.

3) Propertius transfers from second to third person and back again frequently and without warning³. Propertius II 28 also contains such changes of person which have caused unwarranted distress to scholars. It is interesting in this connection to note that at Propertius I 3, 27 all our MSS offer *duxit*. Some editors have changed this to *duxti* because of second person verbs in 21f. and 29 f. But I 3 is highly inconsistent in its use of persons. Lines 1-20 and 36 employ third person and there is no real reason why 27 should not do so also. In Propertius II 29 there is only the one change of person — at line 23. To modern readers with the text before their eyes this change may seem stark. But ancient poets think in oral terms; and line 23 is a long way from line 1.

4) This argument only holds good if the address *mea lux* is an indication of mutual affection. But in all three Propertian uses of the phrase, here, II 14, 29 and II 28, 59, only Propertius' feelings are indicated. In none can Propertius be anything more than hopeful about Cynthia's feelings. In all three cases Propertius intends a measure of word play in the address. At II 28, 59 *lux* contrasts with *mors* in II 28, 58; at II 14, 29 it contrasts with *mortuus* in II 14, 32; here *lux* is set against *nocte* in the same line. In Propertius II 29 the initial address to Cynthia in this form has another function. It warns the reader that Cynthia comes into the poem and so enables him to identify her as the *mulier* referred to in lines 9 and 13.

5) It is natural that the Cupids who are the love which brings Propertius to Cynthia will give Propertius hope of success. But the Cupids' words are biased not factual. Moreover they are part of the praise of Cynthia. The true situation is analogous to what happens in I 3.

¹ See Enk, *ad loc.* and *AP* IX 305 (Antipater).

² Cp. e.g. *AP* XII 171, 3 (Dioscorides); Virg., *Ecl.* VII 43; Ov., *Her.* XVIII 25.

³ For a discussion of this question with reference to Prop. II 29 see R. E. White, *CPh* 56, 1961, pp. 233 ff. This sensitive article argues for its conclusions persuasively and it is regrettable that it has not influenced subsequent commentators.

If Propertius had come sooner in each case, he might have found the welcome which the Cupids speak of. But his lateness in each case angers Cynthia. In I 3 her rejection of Propertius is implicit whereas in II 29 it is made quite explicit. But the reproaches of Propertius in the two poems are to a degree similar. In both he is attacked for latecoming. In both he is accused of immorality (I 3, 35 f.; II 29, 32, cf. 14). There is therefore no real inconsistency between A and B in this respect. All that has happened is that the lover's high hopes have turned sour.

6) Propertius' confidence in A has several sources: he is drunk, Cynthia expects him, the Cupids, who are love itself, assure him that Cynthia is eager to welcome him. But such confidence can be misplaced. A similar self — assurance on Propertius' part weakens in I 3. There Propertius has already entered Cynthia's house before he begins to have misgivings. Here, perhaps taught by such experiences as that of I 3, he begins to have doubts before he enters Cynthia's house. This interpretation is specifically confirmed by the komastic nature of the elegy (see below § IV).

7) A similar approach can be taken to the problem of Propertius' reason for entering Cynthia's house. He is indeed originally an invited komast. But on arriving at the house, he suddenly wonders if in fact Cynthia is really still alone and expecting him. Other komasts in ancient poetry were invited and found themselves locked out (*AP* V 164; Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 505 f.). In such cases there is an implicit presumption that the girl has in fact admitted someone else (see below § IV). So Propertius «decides» to go and see if she is sleeping alone. *uolui* means «I decided» rather than «I wished»: cf. Propertius IV, 8, 28 and *uoluit*, Propertius I 6, 25; IV 4, 18. Of course *uolui* = «I decided» still conveys the immediate motivation of Propertius' entry to the house, but it signifies the proximate cause, not the ultimate cause, which remains his invitation to come on a komos to Cynthia.

8) On the level of common sense, the fact that Propertius is a *fugitivus* in A but not in B is hardly surprising: a runaway slave who has been caught and taken back to his owner is no longer a runaway. On a literary level the abandonment of the *fugitivus* role in B can be considered in two ways. Sometimes an ancient poet takes on himself a role associated with public speaking in order to represent what he says as said for or on behalf of the state¹. On some of these occasions the poet can withdraw from his public role and revert to his normal poetic *persona*

¹ See *GC*, pp. 179 ff.

before the end of the poem¹. The purpose of the withdrawal is to show that the poet's public pronouncements are sincere because they affect him in his private capacity. It might be possible to regard the withdrawal of Propertius from his role of *fugitivus* in II 29 as a parallel withdrawal, but one which involves a return to his usual private elegiac *persona* from another private role. In this case the sincerity of Propertius' oath of fidelity taken while he was a drunken *fugitivus* (19) is confirmed by his praise of Cynthia and his general behaviour when he resumes his sobriety and his normal *persona* in B. In addition Cynthia's reproaches and rejection of Propertius would seem more reasonable since they affect not a helpless prisoner but someone now fully responsible for his own actions.

On the other hand it may be that the slavery metaphor is so much a literary game that Propertius drops it in B without really thinking about the matter: there are no reminders of free status in B to draw the reader's attention to the change. Whether the dropping of the role has semantic value or is casual, it is no objection to the unity of the elegy.

Some positive arguments in favour of keeping Propertius II 29 as a single poem may be added to those which have emerged from rebuttal of the arguments for dividing it. First, the encomium of Cynthia by Propertius in B echoes that of Cynthia by the Cupids in A (13 ff. = 25 ff.). Second, the statement of the Cupids in A that Cynthia is awaiting Propertius is confirmed by the fact that Propertius finds Cynthia alone in B (13 ff. = 24). Third, the resemblances between II 29 and I 3, the latter undoubtedly a single poem, argue that II 29 is also a unity. The general pattern of events is the same, and Cynthia's attitude too is the same: in both poems Propertius is first encouraged to hope for success and then spurned. As in I 3, this is not unheralded in II 29. The misgivings of Propertius in II 29, 23 about Cynthia's fidelity, misgivings which Cynthia is aware of (31 ff.) and which, in a pathetic paradox, she advances as her reason for rejecting Propertius, sound the same warning of the fall of Propertius from favour as did the panoply of fears and imaginings which precede the similar train of events in I 3.

Some of this and some further indications of the unity of II 29 can be summed up economically in the following ring-compositional analysis of the elegy:

A1 1- 4 Propertius is confronted by the Cupids (= his love for Cynthia).

¹ See GC, pp. 182 ff.

- B1 5-14 Propertius the gadabout is seized by the Cupids and reproached by them. They are *fugitivarii*¹ acting on behalf of Cynthia who is waiting faithfully at home.
- C1 15-18 Praise of Cynthia's beauty by the Cupids.
- D1 19-20 Propertius swears his love and they reach Cynthia's house.
- E 21-22 The Cupids tell Propertius to stay at home at night.
- D2 23-24 Propertius feels jealous and enters Cynthia's house.
- C2 25-30 Praise of Cynthia's beauty by Propertius.
- B2 31-38 Cynthia accuses Propertius of being an unfaithful gadabout and produces proof of her own fidelity.
- A2 39-42 Propertius' love for Cynthia is rebuffed and he is rejected.

In addition the symmetry in positioning of the main speech of the Cupids (11-20) and of the speech of Cynthia (31-38) may be noted.

IV. THE GENRE OF PROPERTIUS II 29

II 29 is another *komos* which reworks the thematic material of I 3. I have dealt elsewhere with the imagery of II 29 A, arguing that Propertius is employing an extended metaphor with many legal ramifications through which he represents himself as a *fugitivus* and the Cupids as *fugitivarii*². The imagery of II 29 A is vitally relevant to the question of the generic identity of II 29. Propertius' representation of himself as a runaway slave captured by the Loves is not just another example of the *amor* = *servitium* equivalence so common in ancient poetry. It is also an image closely associated with the *komos*. The komast appears several times as a slave. In addition the komast is seen frequently as the suppliant prisoner of love³. One important occurrence of *servitium* in a *komos* from the point of view of II 29 is of course its appearance in Propertius I 3, 17.

In II 29 A Propertius, drunkenly wandering about alone at night, is haled off by the Cupids to Cynthia's house. The komastic compulsion of wine and love found here is very similar to what was found in Pro-

¹ See § IV *ad init.*

² *CQ* 21, 1971, pp. 455 ff. Subsequently W. J. Slater, *BICS* 21, 1974, pp. 133 ff. has most usefully explained the social background of the poem.

³ *As slave*: e.g. Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 178, ll. 27 f.; Tib. I 2, 97 f.; I 5, 5 f.; 61 ff.; Ov., *Am.* I 6, 45 ff.; *As suppliant prisoner*: e.g. *AP* V 191, 5 f.; XII 23, 119 (Meleager); Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 177, ll. 11 ff.; Hor., *Od.* III 10, 16 f.; Tib. I 2, 13 f.; 85 f.; Prop. I 16, 13 f.; 37 ff.; Ov., *AA* II 527; *Met.* XIV 702.

perius I 3, 9 ff. Apart from the general similarity of setting and events, there are several points of detailed resemblance between the two elegies which also have a generic significance. At II 19, 2 Propertius proclaims that he was not escorted by a band of slaves on the night in question. 'This line is partly intended to clear the way for Propertius' adoption of the role of *fugilius*. Otherwise the reader might well have assumed that Propertius would have been escorted by slaves, as he was in I 3, 10. But it is a frequent feature of *komoi* that the lover is accompanied by friends or slaves, so that when Propertius specifically designates himself as a solitary lover the komastic commonplace is brought to the forefront of the reader's mind by its very negation¹. The reason why Propertius wants this to happen is made clear at line 5. There we learn that the Loves carry torches and arrows. This equipment is of course intended to identify them as Cupids. But the torches have another function, to make the reader think of the normal komastic escort of torch-bearing slaves as found in I 3. So instead of being escorted in one way to his mistress's house by torch-carrying *pueri* in the sense of slaves, Propertius is actually being escorted in a quite different way by torch-bearing *pueri* (3) who are the Loves themselves.

Five further themes link II 29 A both to I 3 and to the komos. Firstly at II 29, 9 the Cupids say that Cynthia is angry because Propertius has not yet come to her. This may be compared with the savage temper anticipated and shown in I 3, 17 f. and I 3, 35 ff. and with the harshness attributed to the typical komastic beloved. Secondly, both elegies treat Cynthia's attractions with enthusiasm (I 3, 1 ff., 19 f.; II 29, 13 ff.). The komast naturally may mention his beloved's beauty in the hope that this will speed his admission². Thirdly the lapse of time, which might be used to argue against the unity of II 29 (see above) and which occurred also in I 3, is a komastic commonplace³. Moreover although night is the standard time for *komoi*, dawn is when many *komoi* come to their climax⁴. Fourthly, the apparent discrepancy between Propertius' initial confidence in II 29 and his later unconfident

¹ See p. 325, n. 3. A parallel situation where the komast speaks of not having a torch-bearing slave is: *διὰ τί νῦν μὴ κωμάσω/ἀνευ λυχνούχου πρὸς τὸ τηλικούτο φῶς*; Alexis, *Fr.* 244 K ll. 5 f.

² E.g. *AP* V 167, 3 (Asclep.); Theocr., *Id.* III 6; 18 ff.; XI 19 ff.; Tib. I 5, 43 f.; Ov., *Am.* I 6, 63.

³ Cp. e. g. Theocr., *Id.* 3; Tib. I 2; Ov., *Am.* I 6. Such lapses of time occur readily because the *komos* may describe or represent a series of events over a length of time including dramatic interplay between the komast and the beloved.

⁴ See p. 331, n. 6.

spying on Cynthia and fears of her infidelity — a change of mood found in I 3 too (see above) — also relates to the conventions of the *komos*. It was perfectly possible for a komast who had been invited to his mistress's house on the promise of a night of love with her to find on his arrival that he was excluded. Cf.:

dixerit ut uenias: pacta tibi nocte uenito
ueneris, et fuerit ianua clausa tibi.

Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 505 f.¹

A standard reason for the exclusion of one lover was that the beloved already had another lover with her². In three of the *komoi* discussed above in which admission is treated as a likely outcome the prior entry of a rival is mentioned as a possible cause of exclusion³. In I 3 Propertius was already within Cynthia's house at the beginning of the elegy and could see that she was alone. So the question of a rival's prior presence could not arise. Instead the rival motif was introduced later in an indirect fashion (see above). In II 29 however Propertius does not enter Cynthia's house until line 24. He has time therefore to ask himself, as a typical komast may, whether his mistress is alone or not. Finally, II 29 and I 3 both contain «reactions» on Cynthia's part. These are identical in the two poems and they relate, in the complex ways described above in connection with I 3, to the standard reactions found in the genre.

These generic considerations naturally strengthen the case for the unity of II 29. The best evidence we can have for the unity of one ancient poem is the existence of another which is both an analogue and indisputably a unity. The fact that I 3 and II 29 belong to the same genre naturally helps the case for regarding them as analogues.

The identification of II 29 as a *komos* throws light on a difficult textual problem in line 40. N's text is:

sic ego tam sancti custode reludor amoris⁴.

¹ Cp. e.g. *AP* V 164, 3 (Asclep.); *Ov.*, *AA* II 523.

² In addition to *AP* V 213 (Posidippus) and *AP* V 166; 191 (Meleager) cp. e.g. *Tib.* I 2; 5, 17 f.; *Hor.*, *Od.* III 10, 15 f.; Copley pp. 52 ff.

³ See above § I.

⁴ Enk, who inspected N personally, reports its reading of the penultimate word as *reludor* N (l. corr.). No correction is visible on a photograph of N, but there is no reason to doubt Enk's report. Where N and the Δ group diverge, N's reading is more frequently preferable. But the correction in N throws doubt on the status of its reading and facilitates its rejection.

Δ offers *custos recludor*, Γ *custodis rector*, I, P *custode rector*. Various emendations have been advanced. These frequently propose that *custos* in the nominative case be read along with the first person present passive of verbs like *deludor* in place of the forms offered by the MSS after *custode*. There seems to be a general feeling that some form of *custos* is required. Instead of beginning by asking what form, it might be better to ask who this *custos* is. The controlling factors are the conventions of Roman elegy and the commonplaces of the genre *komos* operating within the contextual framework of this particular poem. In terms of the poem there are three possible identifications of the *custos*:

- 1) Cynthia.
- 2) Propertius.
- 3) A doorkeeper-guardian employed by Cynthia or by her *uir*, if Cynthia has a *uir* in this elegy.

The genre *komos* offers no immediate help here since any of these identifications would constitute a satisfactory allusion to the concept of a *custos* which is sometimes found in the genre. The last identification would of course be a straight reference. The conventions of elegy are the decisive factor. There seems to be no parallel for the concept that the elegiac mistress is her own *custos*. In fact the only place where an elegiac mistress is any kind of *custos* is Propertius III 16 24 where Cynthia is imagined as the future *custos* of Propertius' tomb. So it is most improbable that II 29, 41 could be describing Cynthia as the *custos* of her own *sanctus amor* and identification 1) may be ruled out.

There are some traces of the notion that the elegiac poet is his mistress's *custos* in Roman elegy. At Tibullus I 6, 23 f. Tibullus asks Delia's *coniunx* to entrust her to his care. But the actual word *custos* is not used; and in any case the request is unusual and ironic. The word *custos* is found applied to Ovid in *Amores* III 11, 18. But it simply refers to Ovid acting as his mistress's protector in the street. One couplet of Propertius might at first seem to be representing the poet as his mistress' *custos* in the sense which the word has in komastic contexts—but only if the reading of the less reliable MSS is accepted. Cynthia is away from Rome and Propertius. He reflects:

ut solet amoto labi custode puella
perfida communis nec meminisse deos

I 11, 15 f.

amoto is the reading of manuscripts generally inferior while the reading of the manuscripts usually found more reliable is *amota* — which makes

Propertius refer to a female *duenna*. Even if *amoto* were the correct reading Propertius would not necessarily be referring to himself as Cynthia's *custos*. The couplet might simply be a general reflection: «girls unguarded (*i.e.* because away from home) tend to misbehave». We can therefore eliminate the second possibility, that Propertius is the *custos*.

Only one possibility remains—that the *custos* is the guardian-doorkeeper of the house at which Cynthia is living. Such functionaries were an absolutely standard feature of ancient life and they appear regularly in the komastic situation. Such a *custos* could be mentioned without introduction or explanation. The literary source of Propertius II 29, 41f. may well be Tibullus I 3, 83 f.:

at tu casta precor maneat, sanctique pudoris
adsideat custos sedula semper anus.

Here, as probably in Propertius I 11, 15 f., the *custos* is an old *duenna* guarding Delia to keep her chaste. Propertius speaks of Cynthia's *sanctus amor* which amounts to much the same thing as Delia's *sanctus pudor*. His *custos* may be male or female.

If this is the case then we can reason as follows about lines 41 f.: in 41 something is going on between Propertius and a *custos* guarding Cynthia's house which results in what we are told in 42:

ex illo felix non mihi nulla fuit

What must be happening is that the *custos*, under instructions from Cynthia, is refusing to admit Propertius to her house. In this way the *custos* is ensuring that Cynthia's resolve will maintain its strength and that she will continue to refuse Propertius' advances. For this reason it is probable that the combination of a first person present passive verb with the ablative of *custos*, the combination presented by NLPΔ is what is required. It tells us that something is happening to Propertius and that it is being done to him by the *custos*, the ablative of agent without *a* with a passive verb being of course the normal construction in poetry. Of the appropriate verb forms offered by the MSS one- FLP's *reclor*-is meaningless and can be ruled out immediately. The real choice is between the reading of N, *reludor*, and the reading of the Δ tradition — *recludor* — which although found in that tradition combined with the unacceptable *custos* need not for that reason be rejected out of hand. *Reludor* would seem to mean that Propertius is being mocked by

the *custos*. This would certainly involve his being excluded. But it is hard to see why the *custos*, proably a slave, would dare to mock the poet. It is certainly true that the komast's behaviour can be a source of merriment to a spectator. In Tibullus I 2, 87 ff. the poet as komast rounds on a scoffer. But this scoffer is a passer-by and it does not seem to be a commonplace in the *komos* that the *custos* should mock the excluded lover. It might be argued that *reludor* here has the attenuated sense «I am disappointed by». But I know of no evidence for this view and the fact that the verb *recludo* does not occur in Roman elegy may be another argument against its being the correct reading here. Another is the fact that there is an erasure in the text of N at this point¹.

Δ's *recludor* remains. The verb *recludo* is certainly found in elegy²; but the sense in which it is found is the complete opposite to the sense required in Propertius II 29, 41. The usual elegiac and indeed universal meaning of *recludere* is «to open». In Propertius II 29, 41 it would have to mean «shut out». The prefix *re-* can simply add the notions of iteration or fittingness to the verb to which it is prefixed. In theory then the verb *recludere* ought to be able to mean «shut again» or «shut suitably». I can find no evidence that it ever has this meaning in Latin poetry. Even if it could have this meaning, it is still doubtful that *recludor* could equal *excludor*. In these circumstances Heinsius' emendation *excludor* must be preferred.

This *komos* therefore concludes typically with «So I am now excluded by the guardian of so sacred a love; and from that time she has not favoured me in the least».

V. LITERARY CONSIDERATIONS

Propertius' elegiac predecessor Tibullus had explored with great fullness and sophistication the possibilities of the *komos* of the *exclusus amator* (I 2; I 5)³. In the *Monobiblos* Propertius himself attempted a novel example of the straight *komos* of the excluded lover in I 16. I 3 shows Propertius exploring in a different direction. He composes a *komos* which exploits something Tibullus neglected — the theme of admission. Although I 3 is, when all is said and done, a *komos* of exclusion,

¹ See p. 346, n. 4.

² The word is not found in Tibullus. In Prop. III 19, 24 and Ov., *Her.* VIII 17 it means «to open».

³ See Copley, pp. 91 ff.

it contrives to cover the other variant of the genre as well as introducing a «reaction» of great literary interest. Propertius employs only two characters, himself and Cynthia, whereas Tibullus is more variegated in the personalities he includes in his two *komoi*. In his generic twists Propertius is compensating for his paucity of characters and is challenging Tibullus in a different field.

What Propertius achieves in this area is however more than a tour de force. To begin with, it was necessary for Propertius to accommodate each of the elegies of the Monobiblos to the programmatic image of himself which he presents in I 1. But if he had made every elegy a repetition of I 1 in its portrayal of himself as a frenzied, desperate and unsuccessful lover-madman dominated by a cruel and uncomplaisant mistress, then his book would have been monotonous and uninteresting. What in fact Propertius does is this: he sets each elegy at a different point in the relationship where the balance of power between himself and Cynthia is or seems different from that prevailing at other points. He then contrives to show that, notwithstanding these outward appearances, he is still in reality the uncertain and terrified suitor of I 1. This can be clearly seen for example in I 2. At its beginning Propertius appears in the guise of a confident *magister amoris* who is taking it upon himself to give Cynthia advice about her behaviour, dress and appearance. But towards the end of the elegy the advice modulates into praise. In combination with various hints in the earlier part, this reveals that Propertius' only real concern is to ensure Cynthia's continued fidelity to himself and that, far from being confident in his power over her, he is in fact fearful of losing her, his protreptic being nothing more than a symptom and disguise for this fear. Even so, in I 3, Propertius starts off drunkenly confident and so much in command of the situation that he can afford to keep Cynthia waiting up half the night for him. When he actually sees her, this confidence gives way to awe and then to fearful misgivings. When she awakens, her words suggest that his status is very far from what he thought and that the *persona* of I 1 lurks very near the surface.

A second consideration in this area is that the *exclusus amator* is one of the dominant and recurrent symbols of and in, not only Propertian elegy, but Roman elegy as a whole. It crops up in many poems not themselves *komoi* as the most economical way of referring to the whole complex of erotic suffering, deprivation and domination which is the subject matter of Roman elegy¹. By composing an elegy showing

¹ See Copley, p. 70 ff.

that most cruel of disappointments — the transformation of the lover's peak of bliss, the *komos* of admission, into his depth of misery, the *komos* of exclusion — Propertius is reinforcing this symbol in a particularly effective way and in fact is claiming it as his own individual trademark.

The Alexandrianism of Propertius in I 3 can be seen in its generic ingenuity and novelty, as in its eroticism and strong visual interest. But perhaps it comes out most clearly in the vivid portrayal of the conflicting but equally defensible emotions of Propertius and Cynthia, a representation to which all the other sophistications of the poem are subservient. On one hand we have the aggressively masculine and self-important confidence of Propertius, reinforced by drink, which by contrast also makes him stagger through the streets. Then comes Propertius' drunken amazement at the actual sight of Cynthia and his foolish meddling with her sleeping figure. The beginnings of sobriety cut through the wine, when he remembers how fearsome she can be in her anger. Then with awakening comes the reversal: Cynthia displays her femininity in a speech both pathetic and resentful. Wronged by Propertius she responds with an anger which brooks no answer: the fact that Propertius half deserves her anger only makes it the more terrible. The disappointment of Propertius is thus set in an emotional context in which the reader is invited to see both sides of the problem simultaneously. That there are two sides and that misunderstanding is compounded by folly deepens the tragic pathos of Propertius' final condition.

Much of what has been said about the emotional and literary interest of I 3 can also be applied to II 29. Many details of Propertius' self-imitation have been indicated already. More important than all the details is the overall tendency of this study: generic analysis can reveal otherwise unnoticed or neglected cases of large scale reworking by a poet of his own earlier compositions. A single case cannot yield useful generalisations about this process. But the importance of the activity and its implications for the nature of Hellenistic and Augustan poetry are considerable. Further investigation is needed to produce a framework within which Hellenistic and Augustan self-imitation and imitation of others can be discussed in an objective manner.

VI. APPENDIX: THE *EXEMPLA* OF LINES IFF.

I noted above that the Ariadne *exemplum* in Propertius I 3 did not seem to have any komastic associations. I end with some further remarks

on this subject and on the source of the paradigmatic group (I 3, 1 ff.).

The Ariadne *exemplum* is inconsistent with the other two in one further way. Whereas the sleeping Ariadne appears in literature and is a common subject for painters and sculptors and the sleeping Maenad also appears both in literature and art, the sleeping Andromeda appears in neither. The explanation is, I believe, simple but useful in the overall interpretation of Propertius' use of mythological material: Propertius wished to employ three examples of weary, sleeping women who were about to be approached by their lovers, examples which would at least not be discordant with the genre of the elegy. Ariadne and a Maenad, probably about to be approached by a Satyr were the nearest examples he could think of. In the first case, the fact Ariadne had been abandoned by Theseus added to the *exemplum* an extra dimension which chimed in with Cynthia's fantasies and self-presentation in lines 35 ff. But Propertius wanted three myths to make up the standard Alexandrian pattern. So he devised a third *exemplum*, that of Andromeda, which was in strict terms inadequate in comparison with the other two but which he placed between the other two in order to disguise its inadequacy¹. The weariness of Andromeda and the eventual approach to her of Perseus were already part of the myth. Propertius invented her sleep and did not trouble himself about the lack of a link with the *komos*.

This is not a criticism of Propertius. The mythological resources available to any ancient writer were limited and great ingenuity was required to stretch them to the needs of particular situations. Propertius' use of this device in I 3, 1 ff., is not unique in his work. For example in III 2, 1 ff. something similar occurs. The theme of this passage is the value of poetry as an aid to love and as a means of making the poet popular with girls. Propertius wants three mythical poets whose powers illustrate this theme. The poet mentioned first is Orpheus, who immediately calls to the reader's mind Euridyce, whom Propertius does not even have to name. The third *exemplum* is that of a successful Polyphemus; and Galatea and his success with her are specifically introduced to make it clear that Propertius is referring to this variant of the Polyphemus legend. The central *exemplum* is that of Amphion. But mention of Amphion brings no woman to mind; and in fact he is a weaker illustration of Propertius' contention than the other two, and it is for this reason that he is placed between the stronger pair. It is for

¹ For this organisational principle (*Ilomerica dispositio*) cf. Quint., *Inst. Or.* V 12, 14.

the same sort of purpose, namely to make Amphion fit the bill better, that the power explicitly attributed to Orpheus is not his success in love, which every reader would think of anyhow, but ability to control beasts and rivers, a capacity very similar to those of Amphion.

The source of Propertius' paradeigmata in I 3, 1 ff. is generally said by scholars to be visual art. I would not reject the notion that visual art may have partly inspired Propertius in these lines, although the absence from ancient art of sleeping Andromedas might tell a little against it. Whatever the case, it is worthwhile to draw attention to a possible source of Propertius' inspiration which helps to close the hiatus between the second *exemplum* and the other two. This is pantomime, which enjoyed a notable revival in the Augustan age. The characters and subjects of the three *exempla* can all be shown to have been represented in pantomime. Dionysus with his *komos* of Maenads was a stock character and was sometimes found in combination with Ariadne¹. Elsewhere Propertius speaks of Cynthia dancing the pantomime part of Ariadne (II 3, 17 ff.) and cleverly underlines Ariadne's link with Bacchus in an indirect way. Perseus' adventures were a stock pantomime subject and among them were the rescue and winning of Andromeda². There is no evidence that the particular scenes described by Propertius were part of these pantomimes. But given the lascivious and erotic bias of pantomime, it is by no means unlikely that they were and that some reminiscence of them influenced Propertius.

FRANCIS CAIRNS

University of Liverpool

¹ For Dionysus and his following in pantomime see O. Weinreich, *Epigramm und Pantomimus*, Heidelberg 1948, pp. 54 ff., 125; for Ariadne see Lucian, *De Salt.* 49; for the pair together Weinreich, *op. cit.*, pp. 128 ff., on which also Wlosok, *op. cit.*, p. 342, n. 1.

² On Perseus and Andromeda see Weinreich, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 ff.; Sidon. Apollin., *Carm.* XXIII 296. On the general character of pantomime see Weinreich, *op. cit.*, *passim* and R. E. s. u. *Pantomimus*. A mimetic representation of a komast, although not described as pantomimic, is found at Athen., *Deip.* 621 C.