Classical Quarterly 60.2 470–485 (2010) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838810000170

MAXIMA ROMA IN PROPERTIUS, VIRGIL AND GALLUS*

I. INTRODUCTION: ELEGIAC, PASTORAL AND EPIC POETICS IN PROPERTIUS 4.1

From its *incipit*, Propertius 4 constructs itself as an anomaly in the corpus of Roman love-elegy:

> Hoc quodcumque uides, hospes, qua maxima Roma est,
> ante Phrygem Aenean collis et herba fuit,
> atque ubi Nauali stant sacra Palatia Phoebo,
> Euandri profugae concubuere boues. (Propertius 4.1.1–4)[1]
>
> Whatever you see here, stranger, where Rome the greatest is,
> was hill and grass before Phrygian Aeneas,
> and where the Palatine sacred to Phoebus of our Navy stands,
> Evander's fugitive cattle bedded together.[2]

Rather than putting Cynthia *prima*, as the *Monobiblos* so self-consciously does,[3] Propertius 4 here turns its back on *amor* to pronounce newfound interest in *Roma*.[4] With the conventional polarity of elegy thus reversed in favour of the epic themes hitherto presented as anathema to (Propertian) elegy, the ensuing lines make free with the subject matter of Virgil's *Aeneid*, the *nescioquid maius … Iliade* ('something greater than the *Iliad*') famously anticipated at Propertius 2.34.66 having now been in circulation for upwards of three years.[5] This article is concerned with how

* Preliminary research for this paper was supported by a postgraduate scholarship from the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (IRCHSS); I am grateful also to M.R. Gale, F. Mac Góráin, and the *CQ* anonymous reader for advice at various stages.

[1] Citations from Propertius are taken from S.J. Heyworth, *Sexti Properti Elegi* (Oxford, 2007).

[2] The translations in this article (in some sense original, though familiarity with/consultation of existing models may have led to some duplication) attempt to parallel in English the lexical sharing relevant to this discussion.

[3] See D.F. Kennedy, *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy* (Cambridge, 1993), 83.

[4] For similar reflections on the opening hexameter, see J.B. DeBrohun, *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy* (Michigan, 2003), 37. For the sustained pretence of heroic diction and metrics until the *et* (the metrical 'point of recognition') in the pentameter, see L. Morgan, 'Getting the measure of heroes: the dactylic hexameter and its detractors', in M.R. Gale (ed.), *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality* (Swansea, 2004), 1–26, at 6, in an article which shows how non-heroic genres (including those written in dactylic hexameter) use metre self-consciously to construct themselves as not-epic; more generally on the same topic, see J.P. Sullivan, 'Form opposed: elegy, epigram, and satire', in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Roman Epic* (London, 1993), 143–61.

[5] Virgil having died in 19 B.C., and a *terminus post quem* of 16 B.C. for the publication of Propertius 4 being recommended by internal evidence at 4.1.95–6, 4.6.77–8, and 4.11.65–6: on

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

echoes of Virgil and Gallus (for those who detect them)[6] in these opening lines might push the book's generic identity 'upwards' to and/or 'downwards' from the epic magnitude sounded by the phrase *maxima Roma* (4.1.1).

It has been recognized that Propertius' sequence of temporal 'Pendelschwung' back and forth from Augustan Rome to the city's pre-Trojan rusticity (there are up to twenty such 'swings', implicit or explicit, in the first 38 lines) is in dialogue with (and probably also mediated by Tibullus' response to)[7] Aeneas' pastoral

the date of Propertius 4, see G.O. Hutchinson, *Propertius, Elegies Book IV* (Cambridge, 2006), 2–3, with 7 n. 10 on the limits of Propertius' reception of Virgil in Book 4; Propertius' independence from Virgil is emphasized by W.A. Camps, *Propertius. Elegies, Book IV* (Cambridge, 1965), 5; P. White, *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 186, adjudges the chronology too tight to have allowed for any significant flow of influence from the *Aeneid* to either Propertius or Tibullus. See, however, E. Reisch, 'Properz-Studien', *WS* 9 (1887), 94–150 (esp. 139–42), for the use of Virgilian 'Sprachschatz' (140) in the dating of Propertius 4; this evidence is accepted (cautiously) by M. Rothstein, 'Properz und Virgil', *Hermes* 24 (1889), 1–34 (esp. 30), and (unreservedly) by H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 57. On the more obvious cases of Virgil reception in 4.1, 4.6 and 4.9, see A. La Penna, 'Properzio e i poeti dell' età aurea', *Maia* 3 (1950), 209–336 and *Maia* 4 (1951), 43–69; V. Gigante Lanzara, 'Virgilio e Properzio', in M. Gigante (ed.), *Virgilio e gli Augustei* (Naples, 1990), 111–76; R. Dimundo, 'Properzio e gli Augustei', in G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (edd.), *Properzio alle soglie del 2000: un bilancio di fine secolo* (Assisi, 2002), 295–318; C. Becker, 'Die Späten Elegien des Properz', *Hermes* 99 (1971), 449–80, for whom Propertius 4 would not have been possible without the *Aeneid* (477). Similarly, M. Robinson, 'Augustan responses to the *Aeneid*', in M.J. Clarke, B.G.F. Currie and R.O.A.M. Lyne (edd.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition* (Oxford, 2006), 185–216, at 203–8, reads Propertius 4 as 'a direct response to the *Aeneid*' (208). For other affirmative positions on Virgil reception in Propertius 4, see DeBrohun (n. 4), 37–9; R. Jenkyns, *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places* (Oxford, 1998), 606–14; P. Fedeli, *Properzio, Elegie*: Traduzione di L. Canali, Introduzione di P. Fedeli, Commento di R. Scarcia (BUR: Milan, 1989), 28–32; K. Weeber, 'Properz IV 1, 1–70 und das 8. Buch der *Aeneis*', *Latomus* 37 (1978), 489–506; L. Alfonsi, 'Properzio e Virgilio', *RIL* 77 (1943–4), 459–70.

[6] And/or for those who find the 'story' here told about them compelling: see D.P. Fowler, 'On the shoulders of giants: intertextuality and classical studies', *MD* 39 (1997), 13–34, at 20 (= id., *Roman Constructions* [Oxford, 2000], 115–37, at 122–3): 'a very obvious parallel will be accepted even if we cannot for the moment think of what to say about it, and a good story will make us sensitive to smaller correspondences which we might otherwise think lost in background noise.' On the generation of an allusion by 'sympathetic vibration' in both the poet's and reader's 'poetic memories' of the literary tradition, see G.B. Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Vergil and Other Latin Poets*, tr. C.P. Segal (Ithaca and London, 1986), 32–9. On intentionality and interpretability, see S.E. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), 17–51, with a solution to the critical impasse at p. 49.

[7] There has been considerable debate as to whether the 'now-versus-then' topos is of Virgilian or Tibullan priority: the pendulum image is that of W. Wimmel, 'Tibull II 5 und das elegische Rombild', in *Gedenkschrift G. Rhode* (Tübingen, 1961), 239, who locates the origin of the topos in Tibullus 2.5, a view challenged by K. Weeber (n. 5), for whom the numerous echoes of *Aeneid* 8 (see n. 8 below) show that 'Properz macht gleich zu Beginn der Elegie die Situation deutlich' (490); for an agnostic position on the extent of Virgilian priority, see F. Cairns, *Tibullus* (Cambridge, 1979), 68. White (n. 5), 186, takes the (less usual) view that 'there is little sign that the elegists borrowed anything from Vergil's picture of early Rome', and suggests (less unusually) that the catalyst for the topos was, 'at least proximately', Augustus' urban renewal; on the topographical and political stimuli, see also C. Edwards, *Writing Rome. Textual Approaches to the City* (Cambridge, 1996), 3, 19, 31–2, 41–3. Varro and Livy also loom large in this context: see again Edwards, 82–5 and E. Fantham, 'Images of the city: Propertius' new-old Rome', in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro (edd.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge, 1997), 122–35, esp. 124 and 129–32. Whatever its origin, it need not be doubted that the topos had been appro-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interlude on the future site of Rome in *Aeneid* 8, where anachronistic 'voice-overs' make similar past–present juxtapositions from the inverse temporal perspective (cf. *Aen*. 8.98–100, 330–2, 338–9, 347–8, 361).[8] It has been suggested elsewhere that in focussing here and in two further elegies (4.6 and 4.9) on *Aeneid* 8, the most aetiological book of an aetiological epic,[9] Propertius has shown where the Roman Homer is most akin to the Roman Callimachus.[10] That Propertius 4 is a notional 'Roman *Aetia*' certainly offers one solution to the book's generic conundrum, yet the presence of epic material in an elegiac context remains an incursion that cannot be explained away. Recent studies of Propertius 4 have explored the dynamic ways in which, on the level of metanarrative, the traditionally elegiac agenda and newly epic ambition of the book jostle for supremacy.[11] In its own way, this incursion of Virgilian epic into Propertian elegy is equivalent to the incursions of epic into pastoral in *Eclogue* 4 and, inversely, of pastoral into epic in *Aeneid* 8:[12] the *Aeneid* documents how the business of *arma* spills mercilessly on to the *pascua* and *rura* of pristine Italy, relentlessly reclaiming the epic as a martial text, or converting it

priated by Virgil by the time it reached Propertius 4.1, as vv. 1–4 make clear (see n. 8 below): on the Tibullan and Virgilian content of 4.1, see J. van Sickle, 'Propertius (*vates*): Augustan ideology, topography, and poetics in eleg. IV, 1', *Dial. di Arch*. 8 (1974–5), 116–45, esp. 125–6; V. Ciaffi, 'La 1a Elegia del IV libro di Properzio e l'ordinamento del libro', *Scritti Indetti o Rari* (1978), 147–60, at 153–4; K.S. Rothwell, 'Propertius on the site of Rome', *Latomus* 55 (1996), 829–54; R. Maltby, 'Tibullus 2.5 and the early history of Rome (a comparison of Tibullus 2.5, Virgil's *Aeneid*, and Propertius 3.9 and 4.1)', *Kleos* 7 (2002), 291–304; G.O. Hutchinson (n. 5), 60 and ad loc.; J.A. Rea, *Legendary Rome: Myths, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline* (London, 2007), 85–123.

[8] On 'time and tense in the *Aeneid*', see S. Mack, *Patterns of Time in Vergil* (Hamden, CT, 1978), 33–54, with pp. 49–54 on the past–present juxtapositions in *Aeneid* 8 as 'occasions when, momentarily, the poet drops his mask of anonymity and speaks as an Augustan Roman' (49). Aside from the past–present juxtapositions, 4.1.1–4 adduce other essentials of *Aeneid* 8: guest-friendship (*hospes*, 4.1.1; cf. *Aen*. 8.188, 364, 436, 532); the rusticity of the site as Aeneas found it (4.1.1–2; cf. e.g. *Aen*. 8.176, 348); Evander, resident on the Palatine (4.1.2–3; cf. *Aen*. 9.9) and an exile like Aeneas (4.1.4; cf. *Aen*. 8.51–4, 118–9); proto-Roman cattle occupying Roman landmarks (4.1.4; cf. *Aen*. 8.360–1). For assessments of these Virgilian echoes, see n. 7 above and (in isolation of Tibullus) DeBrohun (n. 4), 37–9, and (albeit rather unfavourably) Jenkyns (n. 5), 610–11.

[9] See E.V. George, Aeneid *VIII and the* Aetia *of Callimachus* (Leiden, 1974); M. A. Tueller, 'Well-read heroes: quoting the *Aetia* in *Aeneid* 8', *HSPh* 100 (2000), 361–80. See more generally P. Fedeli, 'Aition', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* vol. 1 (Rome, 1984), 73–4; B. Franchi, 'L'epos virgiliano e l'eziologia', *MD* 34 (1995), 95–106; D.P. Nelis, *Vergil's* Aeneid *and the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* (Leeds, 2001), 62–4, 382–402.

[10] It is for this feature, in particular, that Alfonsi (n. 5), 469, adjudged Propertius 4 'il libro che ben possiamo dire virgiliano dell'opera properziana'; J.F. Miller, 'Callimachus and the Augustan aetiological elegy', *ANRW* 2.30.1 (1982), 371–417, at 382–3, argues that Propertius challenged Virgilian aetiology by confining it to a smaller scale; see also La Penna, *L'Integrazione Difficile – Un Profilo di Properzio* (Turin, 1977), 51, 86, and 120; Fedeli (n. 5), 31; Jenkyns (n. 5), 606–7.

[11] See especially DeBrohun (n. 4); M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress* (Oxford, 2002), 78–114; G.B. Conte, *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, tr. G.W. Most (Baltimore and London, 1994), 122–3; J. Warden, 'Epic into elegy: Propertius 4.9.70ff.', *Hermes* 110 (1982), 228–42.

[12] See P.R. Hardie, *Virgil* (*G&R* New Surveys in the Classics 28: Oxford, 1998), 60–1. On the presence of (Lucretian) epic in the *Eclogues*, see P.R. Hardie, 'Cultural and historical narratives in Virgil's *Eclogues* and Lucretius', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden and Boston, 2006), 275–300.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

into one.[13] However, the presence of (Virgilian) epic in (Propertian) elegy, as in Propertius 4.1, constitutes an even greater generic infraction than that of pastoral in the epic of *arma uirumque*, for pastoral, unlike elegy, is already a 'lower' register of epos and can be defined as a derivative, or 'subset', of (Homeric) epic.[14]

With this in view, the evocation of *Aeneid* 8 in Propertius 4.1 might be said to go further than a mere signal of generic ambition: rather than simply flagging Virgilio-Callimachean pretensions, Propertius identifies (with) precisely that part of the *Aeneid* where Virgil's own generic ascent is clearly on display, such that the encapsulation of *Aeneas*, *collis* ('hill'), and *herba* ('grass') in 4.1.2 looks ever more like a variant of the *pascua rura duces* ('pastures, countryside, and leaders', from Virgil's epitaph) or *Tityrus et fruges Aeneiaque arma* ('Tityrus and crops and Aeneas' arms', Ovid, *Am*. 1.15.25) which elsewhere denote the three phases of the Virgilian career.[15]

Moreover, in so far as elegy finds its nearest hexametric counterpart in the erotic exploits of pastoral courtship, Propertius 4.1 might be said to have identified in *Aeneid* 8 a *locus* of Virgilian epic germane to the elegiac genre's obsession with *amor* as well as to its aforementioned aetiological and epic aspirations. While it is the distinction between requited pastoral *amor* (however elusive in practice) and unrequited elegiac *amor* that enables a coherent reading of Virgilian pastoral itself,[16] the shared erotic interests of each genre nonetheless suggest a further reason why Paul Veyne's conception of elegy as 'pastoral in city clothes' has much to commend it.[17] Such 'intergeneric' affinity may have encouraged pastoral colouring in Gallus' elegy no less than in Tibullus',[18] and is entertained by Propertius at

[13] On this and related ideas in the Virgilian corpus, see E. Theodorakopoulos, 'Closure: the book of Virgil', in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge, 1997), 155–65.

[14] On pastoral/bucolic as a derivative and (therefore) subset of (ultimately Homeric) epic, see D.M. Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (Yale, 1983), 161–89 and 217–48. See R. Hunter, *Theocritus, A Selection* (Cambridge, 1999), 21–2, on the linguistic style bequeathed by Homer to all hexameter poets. On the upward migration of pastoral into Virgilian epic, see D.M. Rosenberg, *Oaten Reeds and Pastoral Trumpets. Pastoral and Epic in Virgil, Spenser, and Milton* (London and Toronto, 1981), 20–43 and 53 for the conclusion that pastoral 'consistently implies the heroic'. See also Theodorakopoulos (n. 13) and W.S. Anderson, '*Pastor Aeneas*: on pastoral themes in the *Aeneid*', *TAPhA* 99 (1968), 1–17.

[15] For this suggestion (without the comparands), see DeBrohun (n. 4), 39 n. 14. At any rate, we may agree with C. Becker (n. 5), 453, that the reference to Aeneas at 4.1.2 can be read as a 'Quellenangabe'; some may object that *collis et herba* maps less neatly on to the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* than either *pascua [et] rura* or *Tityrus et fruges* (all the more so if Naugerius' *segetes* (cf. *Geo*. 1.1) is correct; in favour of the MSS *fruges*, however, see F. Cairns, 'Ovid *Amores* 1.15 and the problematic *fruges* of line 25', *Ovid. Werk und Wirkung* (Frankfurt, 1998), 85–93 (= F. Cairns, *Papers on Roman Elegy 1969–2003* [Bologna, 2007], 414–22).

[16] See Conte (n. 6), 100–29; the distinction between bucolic (happy) and non-bucolic (unhappy, tormented) love is also apparent in pre-Virgilian pastoral, perhaps as early as Theocritus: see M. Fantuzzi and R.L. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2004), 170–90, esp. at 176.

[17] P. Veyne, *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry and the West*, tr. D. Pellauer (Chicago and London, 1988), 101–15, argues that elegy no less than pastoral requires its reader to recognize its artificiality. For a critique of some aspects of Veyne's approach, see Kennedy (n. 3), 91–100.

[18] On Tibullus' feeling for the country, see G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* (London, 1959), 71–2, 76–8 and 123; see further n. 68 below. On the question of whether or not Gallus wrote pastoral elegies, see (*pro*) D.O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975), 71–4, 82, 85–6, 89, and (*contra*) R. Whitaker, 'Did Gallus write pastoral

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.34.67–94,[19] where the idea of classing Virgil's *Eclogues* with Propertian elegy is at least countenanced.[20] It might be objected here that there is not a lot of *amor* in *Aeneid* 8, however pastoral it is, with which Propertius 4 might identify;[21] but the same is true also of Propertius 4.1.1–70, such that 'pastoral' can be seen as a territory, *mollior* ('softer') than epic but *durior* ('harder') than elegy, where the two genres can meet halfway. In sum, pastoral constitutes for Propertian elegy both an access point to Virgilian epos and a precedent for ascent within a single genre from *amor* to *Roma*. Put differently, pastoral is a 'neutral' genre which mediates between the warring poles of Propertius 4. The following two sections of this discussion will explore the extent to which one or other of these poles gains the upper hand when epic and elegiac precedents specifically for the phrase *maxima Roma* come to the fore.

II. *MAXIMA ROMA* IN PROPERTIUS AND VIRGIL

In the opening hexameter of Propertius 4, the reader, as much as the *hospes*, is invited to look upon *maxima Roma*.[22] This phrase is attested previously only in Virgil, once at *Aen*. 5.600–1 (where *maxima Roma* preserves the antique *lusus*

elegies?', *CQ* 38.2 (1988), 454–8. Pre-Roman pastoral elegy has also been hypothesized by M. Fantuzzi, 'Pastoral love and "elegiac" love, from Greece to Rome', *LICS* 2.3 (2003), at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/classics/lics>; see also Fantuzzi and Hunter (n. 16), 170–90. On the literary continuum from Theocritus to Virgil to Propertius, see R.F. Thomas, 'Genre through intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius', *Hellenistica Groningana* 2 (1996), 227–44.

[19] Potentially with greater emphasis for those who with Heyworth's OCT transpose 2.34.77–80 (on the *Georgics*) to precede vv. 67ff. (on the *Eclogues*); the distich of vv. 83–4, a *locus ualde uexatus*, is isolated by Heyworth from the text.

[20] This is one of the few points on which L. Alfonsi, 'Il giudizio di Properzio sulla poesia vergiliana', *Aevum* 28.3 (1954), 205–21, at 209, and E. Paratore, 'De Propertio Vergiliani carminis iudice', *Miscellanea Properziana: Atti dell'Accademia Properziana del Subasio*, Serie 5 (Assisi, 1957), 71–82, at 79–82, see eye to eye. See J.P. Boucher, *Études sur Properce: Problèmes d'inspiration et d'art* (Paris, 1965), 286–91, for what he terms a 'résumé incomplet' of the *Eclogues* at Propertius 2.34.67–76 designed '[p]our souligner la parenté de la Bucolique et de l'Élégie et rendre homage à Virgile' (287); see, not dissimilarly, J. Farrell, *Vergil's 'Georgics' and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (Oxford, 1991), 335–7, and C. Fantazzi, 'Virgilian pastoral and Roman love poetry', *AJPh* 87.2 (1966), 171–91, on the *Eclogues* as 'a species of love poetry' (171) from the same neoteric provenance; see also E.J. Kenney, 'Virgil and the elegiac sensibility', *ICS* 8 (1983), 44–59. Thomas (n. 18), 241–4, demonstrates the intertextual and stichometric accuracy of Propertius' preferential treatment of the *Eclogues*. Also on the broadly positive evaluation of the *Eclogues* in Propertius 2.34, see Robinson (n. 5), 201–2; H.-P. Stahl, *Propertius: "Love" and "War". Individual and State under Augustus* (Berkeley, 1985), 181–3; P.E. Knox, 'Propertius and the neoterics', in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Propertius* (Leiden and Boston, 2006), 127–41, at 137–41; P. Fedeli, *Properzio, Elegie Libro II* (Leeds, 2005), 992–1004 ad loc., esp. p. 994; Fantuzzi (n. 18), 2–3; van Sickle (n. 7), 117–19. With somewhat different emphasis, see F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius, the Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge, 2006), 301–2, 313–4. See also A.A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love Elegy* (Oxford, 1938), 80–4, for a still useful demonstration of Virgil's monopolization of pastoral language in Propertius and Tibullus.

[21] On the erotic charge to Aeneas' relations with Pallas, however, see M.C.J. Putnam, *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence* (Chapel Hill and London, 1995), 27–49, and E. Oliensis, 'Sons and lovers: sexuality and gender in Virgil's poetry', in Martindale (ed.) (n. 13), 294–311, at 309.

[22] *uides* would thus constitute a bookishly *visual* instance of 'self-reflexive annotation' (a.k.a. the 'Alexandrian footnote'), for which technique see Hinds (n. 6), 1–16, and J. Wills, *Repetition*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Troiae – 'game of Troy' – introduced to Latium by Ascanius) and once more at *Aen*. 7.602–3 (where *maxima Roma* keeps the ancient Latin custom of the Gates of War).[23] Occurring at almost the same line number in two separate books of the *Aeneid*, with *maxima* falling in the same *sedes* and with *Roma* in each case enjambed, and in both passages in connection with a pre-Roman institution renovated by Augustus,[24] the previously unattested *maxima Roma* brings to the *incipit* of Propertius' 'Roman *Aetia*' (where the superlative again falls in the same *sedes*) appropriately Virgilian and Roman aetiological associations. It also widens the intertextual focus of Propertius 4 beyond the single book of the *Aeneid* on which most scholars have concentrated. From the viewpoint of 4.1.1, the second Virgilian iteration of *maxima Roma* seems especially marked, not only as a repetition of the earlier phrase, but also because it too coincides with a beginning of sorts: the Gates of War that Virgil's ecphrasis here describes are about to be opened by Juno on behalf of the indigenous Latins, as later by the Romans, in symbolic enactment of the 'opening' of hostilities:

> Mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes
> Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc ***maxima** rerum
> **Roma** colit, cum prima mouent in proelia Martem,
> siue Getis inferre manu lacrimabile bellum
> Hyrcanisue Arabisue parant, seu tendere ad Indos
> Auroramque sequi Parthosque reposcere signa:
> sunt geminae Belli portae (sic nomine dicunt)
> religione sacrae et saeui formidine Martis; (Virgil, *Aen*. 7.601–8)[25]
>
> There was a tradition in Hesperian Latium which ever after
> the Alban cities practised, which now **Rome, the greatest** of states,
> practises, when they urge Mars into the battle's opening,
> be they preparing to carry tearful war in their hands against Getae
> or Hyrcanians or Arabians, or to march out to the Indians
> and pursue the Dawn and reclaim their standards from the Parthians:
> there are twin Gates of War (so they name them)
> hallowed with reverence and the dread of savage Mars.

in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion (Oxford, 1996), 30 (with n. 47 for further bibliography), where the example of *Aen*. 4.416–17 might offer a precedent for a self-reflexive use of *uides*.

[23] Allowing for a maximum interval of nine words in a search of the LLT-A (accessed via <http://www.brepolis.net> on 9.7.2009), *maxima Roma* turns out to be a rare and loaded phrase in antiquity: the next occurrences after Propertius 4.1.1 are Manilius, *Astron*. 4.694 (on the Virgilian dimension of which, see P.R. Hardie, *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Cosmos and Imperium* [Oxford, 1986], 380), Sil. *Pun*. 3.584–5, and Mart. 7.96.2 and 10.58.6 (on the Virgilian dimension of which, see V. Rimell, *Martial's Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram* [Cambridge, 2008], 89). There is a suspicion of the phrase at Ov. *Pont.* 1.2.81–2 (***maxima** pars hominum nec te, pulcherrima, curat,* | ***Roma**, nec Ausonii militis arma timet*) and ironic wordplay may be afoot at Luc. 2.227–8 (***maxima** merces* | ***Roma** recepta fuit*) and 2.655–6 (*ipsa, caput mundi, bellorum **maxima** merces,* | ***Roma** capi facilis*), and at Sil. *Pun*. 15.547–8 (***maxima Romae** | spes Nero*). However, Cic. *Mur*. 31.17.7 (*maximum bellum populum Romanum cum Antiocho gessisse uideo*) and Livy 4.2.3 (*maximum Romae praemium seditionum esse*) seem more like chance echoes.

[24] The *lusus Troiae* was celebrated by Julius Caesar (Suet., *Iul*. 39.2) and revived by Augustus (*Aug*. 43.2); see W.A. Camps, *An Introduction to Virgil's* Aeneid (Oxford, 1969), 101 and 138. On the Gates of War, see conveniently C.J. Fordyce, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos, Libri VII–VIII* (Oxford, 1977), 171.

[25] Citations from Virgil are taken from R.A.B. Mynors (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1969). An asterisk in the text denotes a word which occurs in the same *sedes* in Propertius 4.1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although not marking the opening of a book, Virgil's Gates of War signal an 'apertural' moment nonetheless, and one which, like Propertius 4.1, establishes an aetiological (dis)connection[26] between the *maxima Roma* of the Augustan age and its aboriginal prehistory.[27] As Philip Hardie remarks on these lines, 'literary openings and closings here enter the world of history',[28] for these are the selfsame Gates of War which (as the Virgilian 'voice-over' conspicuously fails to mention) Augustus symbolically *closed* after his victory at Actium (as *Nauali … Phoebo* at Propertius 4.1.3 might tacitly remind the reader). In the *Aeneid*, this is the point at which the Latin war is officially declared, thereby clearing the way for the catalogue of Italian forces with which the book culminates, and instigating the demise of the pastoral world glimpsed in its twilight in the following book and already in decline in this one.[29] It seems appropriate, given the new, more epic beginning made by Propertius 4, and the evocation in its first poem of the doomed Arcadia visited by Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8, that it too should open with (an allusion to) the opening of the Gates of War in *Aeneid* 7.

Propertius' incorporation into 4.1 of Virgil's imploding pastoral world to signal his own explosion of elegy is not confined to a general evocation of *Aeneid* 8, therefore, and begins perhaps sooner than the more obvious signal in the first pentameter. The reciprocity of intertextuality is such that the incorporation of *Aeneid* 7 into Propertius 4.1 is also a move which throws the elegiac spotlight back on to the former as much as it highlights the epic ambition of the latter. There is indeed much in the *Aeneid* to hold the attention of an elegiac reader, and not just in Book 4.[30] Not for nothing does Virgil invoke the aid of Erato (*Aen*. 7.37) when he turns to the *maius opus* ('greater work') of *Aeneid* 7–12, for the war which dominates this 'Iliadic' hexad turns out to have a variety of 'erotic' catalysts: Turnus' *amor* for Lavinia (*Aen*. 7.56–7) becomes his *amor ferri* ('love of the steel sword', *Aen*. 7.461, a neat inversion of elegiac *militia amoris*), his cause is espoused by a would-be mother-in-law with a thematically apposite name, Amata (see *Aen*. 7.581), and *amor laudis* ('love of praise', *Aen*. 7.496) leads Ascanius inadvertently to enrage the locals; it is also a war which sees the simple love of country life perverted into bloodlust (*omnis aratri | cessit amor*, 'all love for the plough was gone', *Aen*. 7.635–6; cf. *Aen*. 7.550–1).[31] If pastoral can be said to offer Propertian elegy an access point to epic themes (see § I above), the *incipit* of Propertius 4 might be said to have situated itself aptly in a book of the *Aeneid* in which pastoral is corrupted by *amor* into martial epic. Like *Aeneid* 7, Propertius 4 effects a transformation of *amor* potentially erotic and elegiac (Turnus' for

[26] On continuity and discontinuity as an underlying theme of Propertius 4, see Hutchinson (n. 5), 1–21. On this aspect of Hellenistic aetiology, see P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (*Hypomnemata* 90: Göttingen, 1988).

[27] The comment ad loc. by N.M. Horsfall, *Virgil*, Aeneid *7. A Commentary* (Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1999) on *coluere … coluit* (vv. 602–3) is equally applicable to the *est … fuit* polyptoton in Propertius 4.1.1–2: 'Repetition of the verb in altered tenses embodies linguistically the temporal continuity, laying marked emphasis on the present validity of an ancient usage'; Propertius 4.1.1 is also cited under the same lemma as a parallel for the phrase *maxima … Roma*.

[28] Hardie (1998: n. 12), 73.

[29] See especially *Aen*. 7.513, 519–27, and n. 33 below.

[30] On Dido as an elegiac lover, see F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge, 1989), 129–50.

[31] On the significance of Virgil's appeal to Erato and on the erotic content of *Aen*. 7–12, see Nelis (n. 9), 267–9 (with extensive bibliography at nn. 5–6).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lavinia, Propertius' for Cynthia) into *amor* martial and epic (devotion to *maxima Roma*).[32]

As well as pointing to an affinity between the two texts, the connection between Propertius 4.1 and *Aeneid* 7 brings with it the possibility for antagonism too. Virgil records that the Gates of War were an institution indigenous to Latium, one among several indications of the martial temperament of the Latin natives.[33] By contrast, Propertius 4.1.1–38 (cf. esp. vv. 1–18 and 27–8) emphasizes that no martial institutions existed amid the *collis et herba* ('hill and grass', 4.1.2) before the advent of Aeneas, a pivotal moment postponed until 4.1.39 (*huc melius profugos misisti, Troia, Penates*, 'hither for the better, Troy, did you send your fugitive Penates') and then held accountable for the *Deci Brutique secures* ('axes of Decius and Brutus', 4.1.45) and *Caesaris arma* ('Caesar's weapon's', 4.1.46). The arrival of the Trojans in Italy is consequently an event of dubious moral value for readers less prepared to accept Propertius' celebration of Trojan *arma* at face value.[34] Confronted with the allusion in 4.1 to the Gates of War in *Aeneid* 7, such a reader might go on to say that Propertius is implicitly correcting Virgil, given that in the *Aeneid* the Trojan arrival provokes a *re*opening of *pre*-existing Gates of War which owe their origin not to immigrant Trojans but to Latin natives among whom the martial impulse was already latent (as the acrostic lurking in vv. 601–4 might be taken to hint).[35] In contrast to Virgil, therefore, Propertius seems to ascribe anti-pastoral bellicosity exclusively to Trojan influence. Accordingly, when Propertius' primitive soldier is said to lack shiny weaponry (nec *rudis infestis miles* ***radiabat*** *in* ***armis***, 4.1.27), it is in precise inversion of the resplendent equipment brought by Venus to Aeneas (***arma*** *sub aduersa posuit* ***radiantia*** *quercu*, *Aen*. 8.616); *radiare* ('to gleam') is all the more conspicuous in that it occurs only here in Propertius and just once elsewhere in Virgil (*Aen*. 8.23). Again, the implication is that *arma* were introduced to Italy by the Trojans.

On the other hand, as J. O'Hara has shown, Virgil's presentation of the arrival of the Trojans in Italy is itself not closed to competing interpretations:[36] while some

[32] For Propertius reading Amata's passion as erotic in elegy 4.4, see R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid (Oxford, 1987), 16 n. 31.

[33] *Aen*. 7.628–30 pointedly inverts the description of the Saturnian Age at *Geo*. 2.538–40 (when the clarion had not yet sounded nor the sword rung on the anvil), while *Aen*. 7.636 (where the Latins need merely retemper *patrios enses* in their furnaces) modifies that of the civil war combatants at *Geo*. 1.506–8 (where pruning hooks are *refashioned* into swords); see also *Aen*. 7.162–5 (where the young Latins exercise in quasi-military fashion) with Horsfall (n. 27) ad loc., and 7.182–6 (where effigies of war heroes, weapons and spoils are on display in Latinus' palace) with Horsfall (n. 27) ad v. 183.

[34] A similarly abrupt transition from pre- to post-Trojan history occurs at a corresponding juncture in Tibullus 2.5 (intriguingly also at v. 39), on which R. Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Leeds, 2002) ad loc. comments 'the effect may be to suggest the disturbance of the pastoral idyll caused by Aeneas' arrival'; for similar readings of Propertius 4.1, see DeBrohun (n. 4), 33–117, and Fantham (n. 7), esp. 135. Less sceptical of Propertius' sincerity are van Sickle (n. 7), 125 and 130, and White (n. 5), 189.

[35] For a brief history of this acrostic with bibliography, see Horsfall (n. 27), ad loc.; in this journal, see D.P. Fowler, 'An acrostic in Vergil (*Aeneid* 7. 601–604)?', *CQ* 33 (1983), 298; D. Feeney and D. Nelis, 'Two Virgilian acrostics: *certissima signa*?', *CQ* 55 (2005), 644–6.

[36] Reconciling the opposing interpretations, J. O'Hara, 'They might be giants: inconsistency and indeterminacy in Vergil's war in Italy', *Colby Quarterly* 30 (1994), 206–26, argues that Virgil's presentation of pre-Roman Italy is intentionally (or 'functionally', if intentionalist discourse is to be avoided) indeterminate 'in a way that is not surprising, given the strong likelihood that Romans of Vergil's day may have been deeply ambivalent about the many changes

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have followed the text's implication that Italian innocence was already compromised before Trojan immigration, others have sympathized with a native Latin focalization, most vociferously articulated by Numanus Remulus at *Aen*. 9.598–620, which sees Italy's Arcadian innocence as threatened and ultimately contaminated by a Phrygian invasion.[37] A reader of this latter persuasion, then, might just as easily contend that the more clear-cut disjunction between pre- and post-Trojan Italy in Propertius 4.1 actually serves to endorse and amplify a reading of the *Aeneid* that is consistent with the dissident stance of (Propertian) elegy.[38]

Given the potential for competing readings of this Virgilian intertext, Propertius 4 can be seen to exploit what O'Hara terms the 'functional indeterminacy' of Virgil's *Aeneid*. For readers who prefer to see this ambivalence, or 'openness', as a key dynamic also of the elegiac genre, Virgil's Gates of War will make for a particularly apposite intertext in so far as they have been highlighted by no less a reader than Don Fowler as an example of a monument, like any of stone or text, that cannot shut out competing readings.[39] By extension, readers of the previous paragraphs may or may not find that to reclaim the dissident Propertius of, for example, H.-P. Stahl, a 'deep tissue' and fairly wilful (mis)reading of Propertius 4.1 and/or *Aeneid* 7 is required. Others again may prefer not to politicize their discussion of Propertius' generic negotiations, although they must contend with the fact that Propertius' oscillation between epic and elegiac poetics was already politicized by the poet himself (as, for example, in the *recusatio* of 2.1). Ambivalent and open, therefore, is Propertius' engagement with the *Aeneid* at the point where it formally renounces pastoral for epic (a form of epic, nevertheless, with erotic credentials, as shown), just as, at a similarly apertural moment, Propertius renounces *amor* for *Roma* (though, for their part, the Roman elegies do not – or cannot – ultimately exclude erotic themes either).[40] Inescapably, it is all a question of what one sees (*quodcumque uides*).

III. *MAXIMA ROMA* IN PROPERTIUS AND GALLUS

The degree to which Propertius 4 is thought to invert the conventional love–war polarity of Roman erotic elegy will depend not only on the extent to which its

of their own recent past' (226, with a survey of the debate at pp. 206–7); see now J. O'Hara, *Inconsistency in Roman Epic* (Cambridge, 2007), 96–8.

[37] On the ethnocentric Italian view of the Trojans, see R.F. Thomas, *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition* (Cambridge, 1982), 91–107, esp. at 99 for Numanus' point of view.

[38] See the comparison (without discussion of the Gates of War) of the Propertian and Virgilian (and Tibullan) proto-Romes by Rothwell (n. 7), esp. 839: 'Propertius has magnified the unhappy consequences of Aeneas' visit in ways that Virgil only hinted at in *Aeneid* 8, for pastoral Rome was lost as soon as the Trojans arrived.'

[39] D.P. Fowler, 'Opening the gates of war: *Aeneid* 7.601–640', in H.-P. Stahl (ed.) *Vergil's* Aeneid*: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (London 1998), 155–74 (= Fowler [2000: n. 6], 173–92; see also 193–217).

[40] See DeBrohun (n. 4), 22–4, on the collapse of aetiological and erotic categories, and *passim* for the combination/competition of these poles for 'thirds' such as *arma*, the *patria*, the *limen*, clothing/props and Actium. See also Wyke (n. 11), 83: 'cross-references and overlaps abound'; G.P. Goold, *Propertius. Elegies* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1990), 307; J. Butrica, 'The *Amores* of Propertius: unity and structure in books 2–4', *ICS* 21 (1996), 87–158, at 146–7, 152, 156–7; Hutchinson (n. 5), 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elegies are felt to adhere to the project and ideology announced in 4.1.1–70, but more fundamentally on the extent to which the interests of *Roma* are thought to be anathema to the genre in the first place. Against the view of elegy as a dissident, protofeminist movement, it has stood accused of deploying a variety of stratagems which ultimately endorse the mainstream patriarchal ideology from which it hails.[41] While ambivalence such as this can be ascribed to the imperatives of reader-reception theory, it has also been seen as a quality intrinsic to, and exploited by, the elegiac genre itself.[42] Despite the paucity of his extant work, it is perhaps unsurprising that the same sociopolitical ambivalence operates in (our readings of) Cornelius Gallus, the canonical 'founder' of Roman elegy (cf. Ovid, *Tr*. 4.10.51–4, 2.445–68; Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.93). Interpretation of the so-called 'New Gallus Fragment' unearthed at Qaşr Ibrīm in 1978 has presented the familiar ideological spectrum. Substantial lexical similarities between the Gallus fragment and Propertius 3.4, in which the poet sits with his mistress on the sidelines of an envisaged Parthian triumph, suggested to the papyrus' first publishers and commentators that Gallus too had a Parthian triumph in view (under Julius Caesar rather than Augustus).[43] For Michael Putnam, Gallus' lines offer a less politically controversial take on this *historia* than the Propertian poem which reworks it.[44] Francis Cairns has shown that Ovid's *propemptikon* for Gaius Caesar's Armenian/Parthian expedition at *Ars amatoria* 1.177–228, which is dependent on Propertius 3.4,[45] also contains traces of the Gallus fragment, such that the latter may itself have been a military *propemptikon*.[46] Conversely, its similarities to Propertius 2.1 have suggested to other scholars that the fragment comes from a Gallan *recusatio*.[47] These theories may or may not be as irreconcilable (sociopolitically or otherwise)

[41] Dissidence in Propertius: Stahl (n. 20); La Penna (n. 10); M. Janan, *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV* (Berkeley, 2001); T.S. Welch, *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments* (Ohio, 2005); R.A. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of War* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1995). Protofeminism in Propertius: J.P. Hallett, 'The role of women in Roman elegy: counter-cultural feminism', *Arethusa* 6 (1973), 103–24; S.L. James, *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion* (Berkeley, 2003); B.L. Flaschenriem, 'Speaking of women: "female voice" in Propertius', *Helios*, 25/1 (1998), 49–64. Patriarchalism in Propertius: T. Habinek *The Politics of Latin Literature*: *Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome* (Princeton, 1998), 122–36; Cairns (n. 20), 250–403. Propertius' womanizing: E. Greene, *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore, 1998), 37–66; Kennedy (n. 3), 70–5. For a lucid discussion of the gender sympathy/identity of elegy (as ultimately more feminine than masculine), see Wyke (n. 11), 155–91, at 185–8 on Propertius; for a variety of perspectives, see R. Ancona and E. Greene (edd.), *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore, 2005).

[42] On the ironies intrinsic to the elegiac genre, see M.R. Gale, 'Propertius 2.7: *Militia amoris* and the ironies of elegy', *JRS* 87 (1997), 77–91. On the construction of elegiac sociopolitics at the point of reception, see Kennedy (n. 3), 35–7. On Propertius' femininity as an expression of dislocation from contemporary sociopolitical discourse, see P.A. Miller, *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real* (Princeton and Oxford, 2004), 130–59.

[43] R.D. Anderson, P.J. Parsons and R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim', *JRS* 69 (1979), 125–55, at 152. For a brief overview of the parallels with Propertius 3.4, see E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), 265, and (more exhaustively) Cairns (n. 20), 86 and 406–12. With emphasis on pointed differences, see M.C.J. Putnam, 'Propertius and the new Gallus fragment', *ZPE* 39 (1980), 49–56.

[44] Putnam (n. 43).

[45] See A.S. Hollis, *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book I* (Oxford 1977), 65–82 ad loc.; Cairns (n. 20), 417–20.

[46] Cairns (n. 20), 420–34, 439–40.

[47] See J.F. Miller, '*Propertius* 2.1 and the new *Gallus* papyrus', *ZPE* 44 (1981), 173–6, expanding on J.K. Newman, 'De novo Galli fragmento in Nubia eruto', *Latinitas* 28.2 (1980), 83–94.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as they seem, and cautious comparison with surviving literature still seems the most viable way of contemplating what has been lost.[48]

According to D.O. Ross' ambitious reconstruction (before the discovery at Qaṣr Ibrīm), Gallan elegy was receptive to non-erotic themes (hence, perhaps, Quintilian's *durior Gallus*, 'Gallus was hardier', i.e. less *mollis* ('soft') than his successors), at first encompassing, within a subjective Gallus–Lycoris framework, diverse poetic traditions such as aetiological and mythological narratives in a pastoral setting (glimpsed perhaps at *Ecl*. 6.64–73 where Virgil has Gallus invested on Helicon with Hesiodic/Orphic reeds on which to sing the *Grynei nemoris … origo*, 'origin of the Grynean Grove'), and only latterly subordinating the mythological content to the Gallus–Lycoris framework that became the conventional form of subjective love elegy espoused by Propertius in the *Monobiblos*.[49] On this view, elegy, as Propertius knew it, 'afforded a means to integrate various poetic traditions and purposes' and Propertius 4 represents not a generic anomaly but 'a return to the spirit and manner of Gallan elegy'.[50] This narrative so neatly parallels Virgil's 'return' in the *Aeneid* to a grander, more encompassing form of hexameter poetry (heroic epos being the 'superset' of pastoral/bucolic epos)[51] that it is tempting to see in Propertius' corresponding elegiac *nostos* to *maxima Roma* (4.1.1) an allusion to the third line of the Gallus fragment from Qaṣr Ibrīm:[52]

> fata mihi, Caesar, tum erunt mea dulcia quom tu
> **maxima Roma**nae pars eris historiae,
> postque tuum reditum multorum templa deorum
> fixa legam spolieis deiuitiora tueis. (Gallus fr. 2.2–5 Courtney)
>
> Then will my fate, Caesar, be sweet to me, when you are
> of the history **of Rome the greatest** part,
> and after your return I read of the many gods' temples
> more richly hung with your trophies.

That the lexical sharing between Propertius 4.1.1 and Gallus fr. 2.3 does not extend to strict grammatical similitude need not diminish their capacity to recall

[48] *Pace* N. Holzberg, *CR* 57 (2007), 398–400, reviewing Cairns (n. 20): 'Intertextuality is only of any use when we can explore the original context of the "quotation", but in Gallus' case that is impossible' (399).

[49] Ross (n. 18). Against Ross' view that Gallus wrote elegiacs only, see J.E.G. Zetzel, 'Gallus, elegy, and Ross', *CPh* 72 (1977), 249–60. The (arguably more reasonable) hypothesis that Gallus' poem on the Grynean Grove was a hexameter epyllion need not imply that his elegies were devoid of pastoral colouring or aetiological content; see R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge, 2006), 32 n. 76, on the bucolic-pastoral imagery and allusion to the *Eclogues* in the sacred groves of Propertius' poetic investiture as evidence that 'metre is not the most important criterion for the mode of poetry in which Propertius sites himself'.

[50] Ross (n. 18), 109 and 130.

[51] See n. 14 above.

[52] The arguments and conclusions of this article should still be partially if not universally relevant, *mutatis mutandis*, to adherents to the minority views that the Qaṣr Ibrīm papyrus is a forgery or does not preserve elegiacs by Gallus: the question is tackled head-on by J. Blänsdorf, 'Der Gallus-Papyrus – eine Fälschung?', *ZPE* 67 (1987), 43–57, with bibliography against and for the motion at nn. 3 and 4 respectively, and favouring authenticity on grounds of orthography, style and intertextuality; see also A.S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford, 2007), 241–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one another.[53] Nor would 4.1 represent the earliest elegy by Propertius thought to allude to the poem from which this fragment comes, as the above-mentioned cases of Propertius 2.1 and 3.4 already attest.[54] While '[m]indful of our limited access to the corpus of Gallus', Jeffrey Wills has proposed an even more intricate nexus of allusion whereby Gallus' use of the form *maximus* is recalled at both Propertius 2.34.86 (… *Varro* | *Varro Leucadiae* ***maxima*** *flamma suae*, '… Varro, | Varro the mighty flame of his Leucadia') and *Ecl*. 10.72 (*Pierides: uos haec facietis* ***maxima*** Gallo, | *Gallo* … 'Daughters of Piereus, you will make these [verses] mighty for Gallus, | Gallus …'), which recall each other through 'expanded gemination of nominal forms';[55] the fact that this superlative makes its appearance only here in the *Eclogues*, occurs next to the name of Gallus and occupies the same *sedes* as in Propertius 4.1.1 raises intriguing possibilities for the even closer verbal fit of Propertius' *maxima Roma*. If ignorance of what precisely the Qaṣr Ibrīm papyrus has preserved can be offset by familiarity with poems which may have responded to it, then it can be observed that, of the theories which have emerged, those which take the Gallan verses as individual epigrams or as a catalogue of the beginnings of several longer poems[56] (they are interspersed at intervals of four lines by generous interstices and marginal *H*-symbols),[57] or alternatively as the ending of a single poem or collection of epigrams,[58] are lent support by the possibility of an echo at a parallel or inverse structural point in Propertius 4.[59] On the basis of scrappy evidence and a hypothesized Gallus one cannot safely speculate, but it may be that an echo in 4.1.1 of a more expansive form of elegy either accomplished or envisaged (as the papyrus' future-tense verbs might suggest) by Gallus signals

[53] As Wills (n. 22), 19, notes in example (iv) of his discussion of 'phonetic and phonological marking' (sound allusion), an entire shift in lexeme need not counteract an allusion activated by sound; compare also the cases studied by Hinds (n. 6), 26–31. The collocation of *maximus* and *Roma* in any inflection(s) is rare: see n. 23 above for Livy 4.2.3 (probably insignificant) and Sil. *Pun*. 15.547 (possibly significant). For *templa deorum* (v. 4), cf. *deis … templa* (Prop. 4.1.5).

[54] See Cairns (n. 20), 84, for allusion in 2.1.16 (***maxima*** *de nihilo nascitur* ***historia***) and several other Propertian passages to the Qaṣr Ibrīm fragment; see ibid. 83–103 for further similarities in several other Latin poets; see also S.E. Hinds, '*Carmina digna*: Gallus *P. Qasr Ibrim* 6–7 metamorphosed', *PLLS* 4 (1983), 43–54.

[55] Wills (n. 22), 147–8, goes on to postulate that *Ecl*. 10.72–3 is recalled also at Propertius 4.9.67–8, and that *maxima* may have been a word 'personalised' by Gallus. See also Cairns (n. 20), 84 n. 64, on *Ecl*. 10.72 proving that *maximus* is 'meaningfully Gallan'.

[56] Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet (n. 43), 140–9, took the verses to be epigrams; so (tentatively) Hollis (n. 52), 250–1; see Putnam (n. 43) for vv. 2–5 of the fragment interpreted as a complete poem. Courtney (n. 43), 264 and 267 on vv. 8–9, views the four-line sections as (part of) an anthology of excerpts; so also S.J. Heyworth, 'A note on the Gallus fragment', *LCM* 10 (1984), 63–4. For 'unitarian' views of the fragment, see Cairns (n. 20), 404–40; J. Fairweather, 'The "Gallus papyrus": a new interpretation', *CQ* 34 (1984), 167–74 (viewing the verses as part of an amoebaean exchange); Miller (n. 47).

[57] Reproduced and discussed in Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet (n. 43), 129–31, with plates IV–VI; on the marginal symbols of the Gallus papyrus and on poem-division in general, see S.J. Heyworth, 'Dividing poems', in O. Pecere and M.D. Reeve (edd.), *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1995), 117–48, esp. 121–2.

[58] See Hollis (n. 52), 250–1, for judicious evaluation of Nisbet's suggestion that vv. 6–9 come from the end of such a collection.

[59] On endings as well as beginnings as *loci* of heightened intertextual activity, see D.P. Fowler, 'Second thoughts on closure', in D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn and D.P. Fowler (edd.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton, 1997), 3–22, at 20 (= Fowler [2000: n. 6], 284–307, at 305).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Propertius' (re-)engagement with the origins of Roman elegy at the very moment when (to us) he appears to be moving his furthest from it.

IV. *MAXIMA ROMA* IN PROPERTIUS, VIRGIL AND GALLUS

There now arises the risk of overloading the opening of Propertius 4 with allusive possibilities, given the Virgilian resonance with which the phrase *maxima Roma* has already been charged in this discussion. Not all readers, however, will deem it necessary to choose between intertexts; those who do will need first to dismiss the possibility of Gallan 'interference' in the Virgilian passage against a backdrop of other established Virgilio-Gallan 'window allusions' in Propertius.[60] Hence, in support of the view that Propertius 4.1.1 converses with Virgil's conversation with Gallus, and not just with Virgil and/or Gallus independently, it can be noted, firstly, that both the Gallus fragment and the Gates of War ecphrasis in *Aeneid* 7 concern temples of war and allude to the involvement of a Caesar in Roman history. Secondly, a Parthian expedition mentioned by Virgil (v. 606) is also thought to be the subject of the Gallus fragment, while Propertius 3.4, the elegy by which this hypothesis is all but confirmed (see n. 43 above), exhibits lexical similarities not only to the Gallus fragment but also to the opening of the Gates of War in Virgil. This last point is instructive, for if Propertius 3.4 and *Aen*. 7.601 ff. allude (independently?) to Gallus, then they should be (incidentally?) similar to one another as well:[61] thus *Arma … meditatur* ****ad Indos*** (3.4.1) and ***parat*** *ultima terra triumphos* (3.4.3) ~ ***parant*** *… tendere* ****ad Indos*** (*Aen*. 7.605); ***Ausoni****is* (3.4.5) ~ ***Ausoni****a* (*Aen*. 7.623); ***Latio*** (3.4.6) ~ ***Latio*** (*Aen*. 7.601); ***Parth****a* (3.4.6) ~ ***Parth****os* (*Aen*. 7.606); ***Mars*** (3.4.11) ~ ***Martis*** (*Aen*. 7.608); the preoccupation with Mars in both the Virgilian and (to a lesser extent) Propertian passages strikes a suspiciously Gallan note (cf. Gallus' lament in *Ecl*. 10.44–5: *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis* | *… detenet*, 'now a crazed love for harsh Mars keeps me in arms'), while the East–West compass of Rome's embrace in *Aeneid* 7 (vv.

[60] See G. D'Anna, 'Cornelio Gallo, Virgilio e Properzio', *Athenaeum* 59 (1981), 284–98; J. Hubeaux, 'Parthenius. Gallus. Virgile. Properce.', *Miscellanea Properziana: Atti dell'Accademia Properziana del Subasio*, Serie 5 (Assisi, 1957), 31–8; Ross (n. 18), 34–6, 68–73, 121–2; Knox (n. 20), 139–40; Alfonsi (n. 5), 459–61, traces Virgil's and Propertius' spiritual affinity through their shared literary heritage (accessed in each case via Gallus) and experience of contemporary history.

[61] By the same logic, consideration is due also to parallels with Ovid's *propemptikon* at *Ars am.* 1.177–228, argued by Cairns to allude to Gallus via Propertius 3.4 (see n. 46 above): hence, less incidental might seem the bellicose use of *parare* in the context of reclaiming the Parthian standards: *ecce,* ***parat*** *Caesar, domito quod defuit orbi,* | *addere: nunc,* Oriens *ultime, noster eris.* | ***Parthe****, dabis poenas; Crassi gaudete sepulti* | ***signa****que barbaricas non bene passa* ***manus*** (*Ars am.* 1.177–80) ~ *siue Getis inferre* ***manu*** *lacrimabile bellum* | *Hyrcanisue Arabisue* ***parant****, seu tendere ad Indos* | Auroram*que sequi* ***Parthos****que reposcere* ***signa*** (*Aen*. 7.604–6); similarly, the use of Latium as a compass point in the East–West topos: *uincuntur causa* ***Parthi****, uincantur et armis:* | Eoas ***Latio*** *dux meus addat opes.* | ***Mars****que pater Caesarque pater* (*Ars am*. 1.201–3) ~ *mos erat Hesperio in* ***Latio*** (*Aen*. 7.601; see the previous and following quotations for the other parallels here); compare also arma ***mouebis*** (*Ars am*. 1.191) ~ ***mouent*** *in proelia* ***Martem*** (*Aen*. 7.603); pulcherrime ****rerum*** (*Ars am*. 1.213; cf. *Pont.* 1.2.81–2 in n. 23 above) ~ maxima ****rerum*** (*Aen*. 7.602). Among the other similarities in Latin poetry to the Gallus fragment compiled by Cairns (n. 20), 83–103, noteworthy similarity to *Aen*. 7.601–2 is borne by Sulpicius, *Epigramma* ap. *VSD* 38.II.3–4: *tu* ***maxime*** *Caesar* | *non sinis et* ***Latiae*** *consulis historiae*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

601–6: *Mos erat Hesperio in Latio … Auroramque sequi*, 'There was a tradition in Hesperian Latium … and pursue the Dawn') and Propertius 3.4 (vv.5–6: *sera, sed Ausoniis ueniet prouincia uirgis; | assuescent Latio Partha tropaea Ioui*, 'Though late, she will become a province under Ausonian *fasces*: | the Parthian trophies will grow accustomed to Latin Jupiter') is a topos thought to have been extended by Gallus (cf. esp. Ovid, *Am*. 1.15.29: *Gallus et Hesperiis et Gallus notus Eois*, 'famed is Gallus in the West, and famed is Gallus in the East'; cf. *Ars am*. 3.537; *Met*. 5.440–1; *Tr*. 4.9.22; Prop. 2.3.43–4; *Ciris* 352).[62]

It does not seem necessary to suggest that Propertius 3.4 is functionally conversant with Virgil's ecphrasis of the Gates of War for the similarities between the two texts to be ascribed to their respective engagement with a celebrated elegy by Gallus.[63] Propertius 4.1, on the other hand, does (as argued in §§ II and III above) have the chronological means and thematic motive to allude both to the Gallus fragment and to *Aeneid* 7, and is therefore likely to be au fait also with Virgil's dialogue with the same Gallan passage. Once again, the possibility that the relevant lines of the Gallus fragment represent the beginning or end of a poem makes it as conspicuous a target for allusion in Virgil's symbolic opening of the Latin war as it does for Propertius' opening of a new, somewhat more martial poetry collection. Moreover, Francis Cairns' hypothesis that the Gallus fragment is part of a *propemptikon* for a Parthian expedition suggests that the *Aeneid* passage is cast (intertextually rather than rhetorically) in the same form – perhaps even with a 'schetliastic' dimension as far as the peaceable Latinus is concerned (cf. *Aen*. 7.616–19)[64] – as a prelude to the mobilizing Latin forces whose catalogue requires of Virgil yet another invocation of the muses (*Aen*. 7.641–6) before he himself can get going. If this be so, the Gallan *propemptikon* was converted by Virgil into a literal and literary send-off[65] before being restored by Propertius 4.1 to a form of elegy that, for its part, was now less (typically?) Gallan and more Virgilian than, say, Propertius 1.1.

V. CONCLUSIONS

§§ II and III above need not necessarily be contingent on one other, and independently they offer suggestions about the direction taken by Propertian elegy in its final phase: it seems plausible that the less erotic, more martial Propertius 4 should begin with an allusion to the passage in the *Aeneid* where the war that dominates its second hexad is ceremonially opened, and/or it seems plausible that Propertius 4 should begin with an allusion to Gallus, though whether to underline a departure from the founder of Roman elegy, or a return to his style, cannot be

[62] See Cairns (n. 20), 97–9.

[63] However, in addition to its similarities to Virgil's opening of the Gates of War, Propertius 3.4 also opens with an allusion to the opening of *Aeneid* 1 (***Arma*** deus *Caesar*, 3.4.1 ~ ***Arma*** uirum*que*, *Aen*. 1.1), and specifically mentions Aeneas at 3.4.20: see F. Cairns, 'Propertius and the *Aeneid* incipit', *CQ* 53 (2003), 309–11 (= Cairns [2007: n. 15], 212–13).

[64] On the *schetliasmos*, see F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), 12–13 and index s.v., with 131–5 on Dido's *schetliasmos* at *Aen*. 4.305–85.

[65] The *locus classicus* for the literary *propemptikon* is Hor. *Od*. 1.3, on which see R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (London and New Haven, 1995), 79–81, with bibliography and further examples in the Augustan poets.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

determined on the evidence available. Nevertheless, the 'existence' of the two-tier Virgilio-Gallan 'window allusion' in the opening of Propertius 4, as suggested in § IV, raises interesting possibilities too, constituting as it would a contemporary commentary on Virgil's own intertextual reception of a poet whose verse, aside from a few meagre fragments, is sorely missing from our understanding of Latin elegy. As suggested above, it is plausible that Virgil should engage with a Gallan *propemptikon* when sending his Latin troops to war (especially to a war triggered by a series of erotic catalysts). Moreover, if the Gallan passage were (also) a *recusatio*, as some have argued,[66] then it is pointedly overturned by the *reges et proelia* now accepted (though in a manner no less incompatible with the Callimachean aesthetic) as Virgil's theme.

Perhaps more speculatively, the marked pastoral atmosphere common to Propertius 4.1 and its associate passages in *Aeneid* 7 and 8 would be consistent also with a Gallan intertext, were the latter securely established as a class of pastoral elegy.[67] Georg Luck saw that Tibullus' 'blend of the pastoral and elegiac romance' stands half-way between Propertian erotic elegy and Virgilian bucolic;[68] were this descriptive also of Gallan elegy, then Propertius 4.1 suggests all the more precisely how the elegiac genre might replicate Virgil's ascent from pastoral/erotic to patriotic poetry. Hence, just as Propertius 1.1 positions the poet of *amor* outside *Roma* by invoking a version of the myth of Atalanta and Meleager likely to have been translated (via Callimachus and possibly Philetas) into an Arcadian setting by Gallus,[69] so now at the opposite end of the Propertian corpus a Gallan intertext repositions Propertius at the heart of *Roma*, but not necessarily in a way that reneges on the original (pastoral and aetiological, as well as erotic) concerns of the genre.

If the Qaşr Ibrīm papyrus has preserved a poem in which Gallus espoused the ideals of *Roma* (whether in pastoral terms or otherwise), then its combination in 4.1 with Virgilian epic might be taken to remind the reader that elegy was always equally capable of 'serving the fatherland', as Propertius promises to do at 4.1.59–60. Alternatively, if that poem was one in which Gallus conceded to *amor*, then its combination in 4.1 with Virgilian epic produces an intertextual antagonism which anticipates the 'bipolar' poetics of the book as a whole. Ultimately, though, the sociopolitical valency of Gallan (as of Propertian) elegy cannot have been so dichotomous. Above all, therefore, the Virgilio-Gallan 'window allusion' of Propertius 4.1.1 exposes Virgil at his most elegiac (that is not to say anti-Augustan): what Virgil introduces at *Aen*. 7.604 is not *bellum*, after all, but *lacrimabile bellum*, a Latinized Homericism (as Servius spotted) which, through a Propertian lens, cannot but associate Virgil's principal theme with the quintessential marker of the elegiac genre (cf. Horace, *Ars P.* 75; Ovid, *Am.* 3.9.1–6). Therefore, more than suggesting the inflation of Propertian *amor* with Virgilian *Roma* and/or the

[66] See n. 47 above.

[67] See n. 18 above; see also Cairns (n. 20), 127–40, on the prevalence of caves, glades, groves and wild surrounds in Latin poetry connected with Gallus.

[68] Luck (n. 18), 72; see ibid. 76–7: 'With Propertius he [*sc*. Tibullus] shares some typical erotic motifs; | with Vergil he shares the feeling for nature and country life. But his love-experience is not that of Propertius, and his bucolic themes are not those of Vergil.'

[69] See Tränkle (n. 5), 12–17; Ross (n. 18), 60–4; F. Cairns, 'The Milanion/Atalanta *exemplum* in Propertius, 1,1,1: *uidere feras* (12) and Greek models', in *Hommages à Jozef Veremans* (Coll. Latomus 193, Brussels, 1986), 29–38 (= Cairns [2007: n. 15], 27–34).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reciprocal deflation of Virgilian *Roma* by Propertian *amor*, as scholars attentive to Propertius' reception of Virgil have tended to emphasize, Propertius 4.1.1 points to (or constructs) via Gallus the spiritual affinity of Virgilian epic with elegy, such that it might be wondered, however incidentally, whether the words *Aeneas*, *collis* and *herba* (4.1.2) might not expose (or impose) Virgil's *cognomen* in the previously Gallan *maxiMA ROma* with which this conspicuously Virgilian collection of elegies opens.

Trinity College, Dublin DONNCHA O'ROURKE
donncha.orourke@tcd.ie

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000170 Published online by Cambridge University Press