

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/79201>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2019-04-19 and may be subject to change.

LIPSIUS AND THE SPLITTING OF PROPERTIUS 1, 8

Marc VAN DER POEL

Many editors divide Propertius' elegy 1, 8 in two parts (8A, comprising lines 1-26, and 8B, comprising lines 27-46) and mention Justus Lipsius as the originator of this division. In the last decades, we find this to be the case for instance in the editions of Richardson (1976, reprinted 2006), Goold (1990, revised ed. 1999), Baker (1990, reprinted 2000), Mojsisch, Schwarz and Tautz (1993), Giardina (2005) and Heyworth (2007). Only a minority of editors print the elegy without a division, as it is transmitted in all the manuscripts. In recent decades, this is the case in the editions of Hodge and Buttimore (1977), Fedeli's Teubner (1984, revised ed. 1994) and Viarre (2005). As Butrica has remarked,¹ Lipsius' short notice on the poem was probably read for the last time by Karl Lachmann, who, in his first edition of Propertius (1816), based himself on Lipsius to edit 1, 8 as two entirely separate poems, each with its own numbering of lines, namely poem 8, comprising verses 1-26 and poem 9, comprising verses 27-46, numbered as 1-20. In recent times, however, no interpreter of Propertius maintains, with Lachmann, that poem 1, 8 are really two independent poems. To the contrary, it is usually argued in commentaries and studies that the poem does form some sort of unity. Thus, it seems peculiar that most editors follow Lipsius in printing the elegy in two separate parts, while at the same time using continuous line numbering.

Taking this observation as my starting point, I will first recall Lipsius's arguments for his division, then give a brief record of the editors and commentators until the present who did or did not follow Lipsius' division of the poem, and finally I will present a few notes on my own reading of the poem, so as to stress its unity and argue for its being printed as it is transmitted in the manuscripts.

Let us begin with a brief and factual summary of the content of the poem; I follow the text of the Oxford edition by E.A Barber (second

¹ J.L. Butrica, 'Two two-part poems in Propertius Book 1 (1.8; 1.11 and 12)', in Francis Cairns – Malcolm Heath (eds.), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, 9, Arca, 34 (Leeds: F. Cairns, 1996), pp. 83-91 (p. 83).

edition, 1960), who separates the elegy with Lipsius. The poet speaks in his mind to his mistress Cynthia. In an irritable tone he expresses his frustration that she is going to leave by ship (or has already left) to join the poet's unnamed rival in Illyria (v. 1-8). The poet wishes that the journey be postponed (v. 9-16), but then his tone changes and he wishes her a safe journey (v. 17-20); he declares that there will not be another woman in his life; he will never stop asking sailors where his girl is detained, and affirm that wherever she is, she will (in the end) be his (v. 21-26). In verse 27 there is another remarkable change of tone: the poet exclaims (by repeating 'hic' twice and by jumping — in Barber's edition — from the future tense 'erit' to the present 'manet') that Cynthia will indeed be here, in Rome, that she is staying as she had sworn, and that he has won: she could not withstand his (former) prayers (v. 27-28). She is said to have declared that she prefers to be with her poet, in Rome, most dear to her because of him, and share his bed, however narrow it is, rather than visit the kingdom of Hippodamia and the wealth of Elis (v. 29-36). In an exultant mood the poet voices the supposition that his rival has promised her large fortunes, but states that his sweet poems have prevailed; thus, the Muses help a lover: Cynthia is his, no rival will take away his love (v. 37-46).

All the extant manuscripts present this poem as a unity, but Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), in his early work *Variarum lectionum libri tres* (1569), book II, 18, was of the opinion that the train of thought takes such a different course after verse 27, that in fact an entirely new elegy begins there:

Propertii elegia VIII e primo libro opinor est, quae adhuc quidem sub uno titulo pro una eademque constanter lecta est, sed quae mihi tamen pro rei et argumenti diversitate in duas easque disiunctas elegias videatur distinguenda. Initium elegiae quam dico hoc est,

'Tune igitur demens? Nec te mea cura moratur?

An tibi sum gelida villior Illyria?'

Quam ego continenter legi volo ad hunc locum:

'Hic erit, hic iurata manet, rumpantur iniqui,

Vicimus, assiduas non tulit illa minas.'

Ex hoc autem loco et in his ipsis versibus initium novae elegiae et distinctae a superiori illa faciendum existimo. Quod quidem et ordo et argumentum Propertii aperte indicant. Nam cum illa elegia, 'tune igitur demens?' de discessu Cynthiae dolenter lamentaretur, quae cum² nescio quo praetore in

² 'Cum' is wrong here, because the poet does not say that Cynthia is leaving to Illyria in the company of his rival, but that she is leaving to join him in Illyria.

Illyriam, relicto Propertio, navigare volebat, nunc hac Elegia ‘Hic erit, hic iurata manet’ mutata iam mente Cynthiae vehementer gaudet et exsultat poeta, se tantum precibus et lacrimis³ apud Cynthiam valuisse, ut cum magna ei et multa a praetore illo promitterentur, desiterit tamen a navigatione, et Propertii amorem omnibus divitiis eius et pollicitationibus praeposuerit. Absurdum autem valde et mea sententia ineptum fuerit res tam diversas⁴ una et eadem elegia velle includere, iisdemque versibus et lamentari atque deplorare Cynthiae discessum, et iterum gloriari atque exsultare de mansionem et profectionem ommissa. Libenter ibit in sententiam meam qui elegiam totam et argumentum attentius consideraverit.⁵

Lipsius’ statement concerning Cynthia’s change of mind in verse 27 implies that he believes elegy 8 is a conflation of two separate elegies, one in which the poet laments for Cynthia’s departure for Illyria, and one in which he rejoices at her decision not to leave, but to stay in Rome. If he had realized that the mood swing from ‘lamentari atque deplorare’ to ‘gloriari atque exsultare’ can perfectly well be the subject of one poem, one wonders if he would still have proposed the separation. Be this as it may, Lipsius fails to explain his view and to offer an interpretation of the two poems resulting from the separation at line 27. One is especially curious to know what Lipsius’ interpretation may have been of the second poem (‘8 B’, verses 27-46). In these verses the poet presents himself as a triumphant, boastful winner, but the reader cannot understand his exultant mood without the information that his lover had been about to run to somebody else in a far away place, then changed her mind. If Lipsius really believed that these verses 27-46 can stand on their own, one would like to know in what manner he considered it a meaningful poem by itself and in the sequence of the other poems of book 1. He also seems to have failed to notice that I, 8 is as much a poem about poetry as it is about the poet’s infatuation for Cynthia. Thus, he mentions that the poet’s ‘tears and prayers’ (which must refer to ‘assiduas preces’ — namely poems — in line 28, although the source which he cites has the reading ‘minas’; see note 3) counted so much for his mistress that she abandoned her journey, but fails to observe that the elegy ends with the poet’s proud claim that his poems have proved stronger than riches, which amounts to

³ The ‘preces et lacrimae’ are not mentioned in I, 8, 1-26, and so must have preceded 1, 8. It is curious that Lipsius does not comment on his reading ‘minas’ instead of ‘preces’ in verse 27.

⁴ Lipsius apparently did not realize that lines 27-30 presuppose a planned or already effectuated departure.

⁵ Quoted from J. Lipsius, *Opera omnia* (Wesel, 1675), I, 254.

saying that he is assured of Cynthia's everlasting love *in his poetry*. All in all, it seems fair to say that Lipsius has read I, 8 quite superficially and solely as a kind of biographical report of two separate moments in the poet's life, not as the expression of the poet's emotions and reflections on his attachment to his mistress, and that he shows no awareness of the poetical quality of the elegy.

Thus, Lipsius' case for the separation is not very strong, and it does not come as a surprise that for a long time editors and commentators have paid virtually no attention to his proposal. I have consulted several editions which were in their time well-known and widely used, published between 1569 (the year of Lipsius' *Variae lectiones*) and 1816 (the year of Lachmann's first edition of Propertius).⁶ They all print I, 8 following the manuscripts, as an uninterrupted unity: the editions of J.J. Scaliger (1577)⁷ and Dousa filius (1588; second edition 1592),⁸ the edition of Passerat (1608; see note 14), the Elzevier-edition published in Amsterdam 1651,⁹ the editions of Broukhusius (Amsterdam 1702),¹⁰ Vulpius (1755),¹¹ Barthius (Leipzig 1777),¹² and Burmannus (Utrecht 1780)¹³.

During this period of almost two and a half centuries, only three commentators took notice of Lipsius' proposal, and each of them rejected it. Jean Passerat, whose commentary from 1608 is commended by the most

⁶ For the following survey of editions from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries I have used as lead the bibliographies of F.L.A. Schweiger (*Handbuch der klassischen Bibliographie, II: Lateinische Schriftsteller*, 2 vols [Leipzig, 1834 = Amsterdam, 1962], W. Engelmann and E. Preuss (*Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum, II: Scriptores Latini*, eighth edition, comprising the literature from 1700 to 1878 [Leipzig, 1882]), and the relevant section in H. Harrauer, *A Bibliography to Propertius* (Hildesheim, 1973), pp. 18-27. I have confined my selection to editions with the complete poems of Propertius and only discuss editions which I have seen myself.

⁷ See F. Plessis, *Etudes critiques sur Properce et ses éloges* (Paris, 1884), pp. 54-59. I have consulted the printings of Antwerp 1582 and Heidelberg 1600.

⁸ See Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, p. 59. I have consulted the second edition (Leiden, 1592).

⁹ This edition also contains the text of Catullus, Tibullus and the elegies of Maximianus, which were attributed to Cornelius Gallus. Cp. A. Willems, *Les Elzevier. Histoire et annales typographiques* (Brussels, 1880 = Nieuwkoop, 1962), nr. 1122.

¹⁰ See Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, p. 62.

¹¹ See Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, pp. 63-4.

¹² See Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, pp. 64-65.

¹³ See Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, pp. 65-67. I have also seen the Bipontine edition (Zweibrücken, 1783; 1794) which reproduces the text of Burman's edition; see Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, pp. 65-67.

recent editor S.J. Heyworth¹⁴, records that Lipsius starts a new elegy at line 27, but states simply: 'sed errat'.¹⁵ Broukhusius rejects Lipsius' proposal in a similar way by calling it 'minus recte'.¹⁶ The Italian scholar Giannantonio Volpi (J.A. Vulpius, 1686-1766), in his 1755 edition which also contains the commentary of Passerat and a selection of Broukhusius' notes, is the only commentator I found who briefly explained why he rejects Lipsius' division of our poem in two distinct poems. In his note to verses 27-28, he writes, after quoting Passerat's observation on Lipsius, that the poet here does not begin a new poem, but becomes elated with joy because his girlfriend has abandoned her plan to leave:

Non aliam elegiam orditur poeta, sed novam affectionem inducit et argumentum triste exhilarat, quod ipse videlicet, significando animi dolore ac blande conquerendo, Cynthia prope diem discessuram flexerit atque exoraverit.¹⁷

With this observation, Vulpius means to stress the unity of the poem as an expression of the poet's changing emotions, against Lipsius' opinion that v. 1-26 and v. 27-46 are separate poems.

Christian Theophilus Kuinoel (1768-1841) and Karl Lachmann (1793-1851) were the first who adopted Lipsius' division in their editions of 1805 and 1816 respectively. But their typographical arrangement of the text is different, and this may be considered an indication that their interpretation of the poem was not the same. Karl Lachmann, in his first edition of Propertius from 1816, in which the text is accompanied by a commentary,¹⁸ follows Lipsius closely, in that he presents v. 27-46 as a separate and

¹⁴ S.J. Heyworth (ed.), *Sexti Propertii elegos* (Oxford, 2007), preface, p. lx: 'it (i.e. Passerat's commentary) is large-scale and very detailed.' According to Plessis, Passerat's edition 'est une des plus considérables parmi les éditions de Properce, une des meilleures. Il est juste de dire qu'elle tire sa valeur des commentaires' (*Etudes critiques*, p. 60). I have consulted this commentary in *Ioannis Passeratii... Commentarii in C. Val. Catullum, Albi Tibullum, et Sex. Aur. Propertium (...)* (Paris, 1608). The notes on Propertius bear the separate title *Praelectiones sollennes in Propertium* and comprise pp. 135 ff.; the edition also includes the text of the three love poets. Passerat's notes are also printed in the edition of Vulpius, for which see below note 17.

¹⁵ Ed. 1608 (n. 14), p. 178: 'Lipsius cap. 18. lib. 2 Var. ab hoc versu (i.e. v. 27) facit initium alterius elegiae. Sed errat.'

¹⁶ *Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum libri IV... accedunt notae, & terni indices (...)* (Amsterdam: brothers Wetstein, 1702), p. 31: 'Novam ab hoc versu (i.e. v. 27) elegiam facit Lipsius l. 2 Var. Lect. c. 18: minus recte.'

¹⁷ *Sex. Aurelius Propertius Umber... Joannis Antonii Vulpii animadversiones perpetuae... omnia accurata ejusdem Vulpii recensione*, 2 vols. (Padua, 1755).

¹⁸ *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina, emendavit ad codicum meliorum fidem et annotavit Carolus Lachmannus* (Leipzig, 1816 = Hildesheim – New York, 1973).

independent poem with its own heading (poem IX) and numbering of lines (v. 1-20).¹⁹ He thus presents the two poems as two entirely separate, detached entities. Lachmann mentions in his commentary that Passerat, Broukhusius and Vulpius have opposed Lipsius' view, but he does not present any argument in defense of Lipsius' view other than Lipsius' own authority.²⁰ Since he does not say anything in his commentary on the interpretation of the poem, one may suppose that, in accordance with the typographical presentation in his edition, he did indeed believe that each of the two poems should be read independently. I have seen only one other edition which follows this division into two completely separate poems, each with its own line numbering, namely G.E. Weber's *Corpus poetarum Latinorum uno volumine absolutum* (...) (Frankfurt a.M., 1833), p. 281.

Although Kuinoel adopted Lipsius' division of 1, 8, his typographical arrangement shows that he considered the poem still as a unity: the lines of the poem are printed continuously from 1 to 46 and Lipsius' division is only marked by an extra space with three dots in the middle between lines 26 and 27. Thus, the division only serves to mark a turning point in the mood of the poet, when he exclaims with joy that his mistress stays in Rome. In the *argumentum* preceding the poem Kuinoel summarizes the poem as a unity, repeats an — incidentally not very pertinent — observation made earlier by Barth in his edition of 1777, that the poem illustrates the *inconstantia amatoris*, and yet also states: 'Assentior tamen Lipsio, qui Varr. lect. II.18 inde a vv. 27 novam elegiam orditur'. All editions adopting Lipsius' division which I have seen print the text as Kuinoel did, with continuous line numbering and a typographical break after line 26. Starting with the edition by M. Haupt (Leipzig, 1853)²¹ it became customary for editors who adopt Lipsius' division to provide the two parts of the poem with separate headings ('8' and '8A' in the case of Haupt, later usually '8A' and '8B'), but, again, with continuous line numbering. One may thus assume that these editors do not consider the two halves of the poem as completely separate entities, but as two parts

¹⁹ Thus, book I counts 23 poems in Lachmann's edition.

²⁰ In his note to verse 27 Lachmann writes: 'Hos qui sequuntur versus, in libris scriptis editisque junctos praecedentibus, separatim ponendos esse tam egregie, ut melius fieri non possit, Lipsius docuit Var. Lect. II.18. Passeratio errare eum pronuncianti, Broukhusio minus recte facere censenti, Vulpio denique novam tantum affectionem induci et argumentum triste exhilarari nuncianti quod opponam nihil habeo, praeter ipsam disputationem Lipsii attentis lectoribus satisfacturam' (pp. 44-45).

²¹ Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, *Carmina* (Leipzig, 1851). I have consulted the second edition (Leipzig, 1861).

of one poem. Hence, it seems fair to conclude that all these editors are, in fact, halfhearted followers of Lipsius, who adopt his division of the poem, but nevertheless consider it, if one may rely on their typographical presentation of the poem, to be a unity in two parts.²²

After Kuinoel's and Lachmann's first edition a number of scholars published editions in which our poem is printed following the manuscripts, that is without a division of any kind after line 26. Quite remarkably, the first editor in this list is Lachmann himself in his second edition of 1829. This edition lacks the numerous editorial interventions which characterize Lachmann's first edition, but it does not offer an explanation of this radically different approach from his first edition, nor does it contain a commentary.²³ I have seen ten editions of this kind between 1843 and 2005.²⁴

²² I have seen the following nineteenth-century editions which present the poem in the manner of Kuinoel and Haupt: ed. H. Paldamus (Halle, 1827, with reference to Lachmann and Lipsius); the Lemaire-edition of 1832 by Pierre-Auguste Lemaire (with a reference to Kuinoel, Lachmann and Lipsius; in the *argumentum* preceding the poem, it is discussed as a unity); ed. W. Hertzberg, vol. 2 (Halle, 1844); ed. F.A. Paley (London, 1853) (this edition prints the poem following the manuscripts, but there is a dash after the last word of v. 26 and a note (p. 23) referring to Lachmann); the Teubner edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius by L. Müller (Leipzig, 1870); the Teubner edition by Aem. Baehrens (Leipzig, 1880) (with a reference to Lipsius); the edition of M. Rothstein (first ed. 1898, second ed. 1920). Since 1900, the following editors adopt Lipsius' division, but with continuous numbering of the verses: the Teubner edition of C. Hosius, 1911; the edition of H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber (Oxford, 1933) (first edition by H.E. Butler, 1905; the editors write in their commentary that it is best to consider the second part as a separate poem); the Loeb edition by H.E. Butler, 1912; ed. P.J. Enk, 1946 (In his 1911 dissertation *Ad Propertii carmina commentarius criticus*, p.11, Enk had explicitly endorsed Lipsius' division: "in altera parte elegiae quam recte divisit Lipsius..."); the edition in the series Oxford Classical Texts by E.A. Barber, 1953; ed. W.A. Camps, 1961; the Tusculum edition of G. Luck (1964; with Tibullus); ed. R. Helm, 1965; ed. L. Richardson, 1977 (this edition has only an extra space between lines 26 and 27); the Teubner edition by R. Hanslik, 1979 (this edition has only a dash at the end of line 26); Fedeli's edition of book 1 with commentary, 1980; the Loeb edition by G.P. Goold (1990, revised ed. 1999); ed. R.J. Baker, 1990; ed. B. Mojsisch, H.-H. Schwarz, I.J. Tautz, 1993; ed. G. Giardina, 2005; the edition in the series Oxford Classical Texts by S.J. Heyworth, 2007.

²³ Compared with the first edition, Lachmann's second edition is a volte-face for which there is no explanation. See Plessis, *Etudes critiques*, pp. 72-74 and cf. J. Butrica, 'Two two-part poems', p. 89, note 3.

²⁴ The Tauchnitz edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, edited by C.H. Weise, second edition, 1843; the Teubner edition of Propertius by H. Keil (Leipzig, 1850); a French edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, with the translation from the Collection Panckoucke, edited by A. Valatour (Paris, 1860); the edition in the series Oxford Classical Texts by J.S. Phillimore, 1901 (second edition 1907); the Budé edition by D. Paganelli, 1929; the Teubner edition by M. Schuster, 1954 (second edition by F. Dornseiff, 1958); the Tusculum edition by W. Willige (second ed., 1960), the edition of the *Monobilios* by R. Hodge and R. Buttmore (Cambridge, 1977); the Teubner edition by P. Fedeli (1984; revised ed., 1994, reprint, 2006); the Budé edition by S. Viarre, 2005.

In sum, only Lachmann in his first edition literally adopted the view Lipsius has formulated in his *Variae lectiones*, that the two halves which result from the division after line 26 constitute complete and independent poems. To my knowledge, there is in recent and present day scholarship nobody who endorses Lipsius' and Lachmann's view, and all the editions I have seen present 1, 8 as one poem or a two-part poem ('8A' and '8B') with the verses numbered 1 to 46, and so present it as a poetic unity. Hence, it is strictly speaking inaccurate that editors who divide the poem in two parts marked '8A' and '8B' mention Lipsius as the originator of this division; they are, as I suggested above, halfhearted followers of Lipsius.

If Lipsius' view that 1, 8 is an erroneous conflation in the manuscripts of two entirely separate poems has not found acclaim, it did stimulate debate on the question in what way the poem forms a simple or a two-part unity. Following the tradition which adopts Lipsius' division, many scholars have argued that the poem constitutes a unity in two parts. From the end of the nineteenth century, beginning with Plessis in the 1880's,²⁵ there are scholars who, while stressing the thematic unity of the poem, mark Lipsius' division at verse 26 not as the beginning of a new poem, but as the introduction of a new situation within the poem. Noticing the striking change in tone, they state that it is caused by an extra-textual fact: the poet is informed of a message or a rumor that Cynthia has not left (if one reads 'erat' in line 27)²⁶ or that she has interrupted her journey and will be back in Rome (if one reads 'erit' in line 27). Both readings are possible if we suppose that there is a kind of turn in v. 27 prompted by an extra-textual

²⁵ See, e.g., P.J. Enk, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos)* (Leiden, 1946), p. 74, who quotes F. Plessis: "L'élegie 8 nous fait passer par trois moments très différents; du vers 1 au vers 26, Properce croit que Cynthia partira; entre le v. 26 et le v. 27, il s'est écoulé du temps plus ou moins long pendant lequel il l'a cru partie; à partir du v. 27, il sait ['il croit savoir' would have been better, MvdP], qu'elle est restée à Rome (Plessis read *hic erat* with N) et qu'elle y restera." So the elegy is a 'sorte de petit drame, en deux actes, ayant sa parfaite unité' (*Bulletin Mensuel de la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers*, 4, 1, [no year mentioned], 22-3). Already in 1843, Hertzberg observed that 1, 8 consists of two elegies interspersed with a fictitious interval, but belonging so closely together, that the second elegy, which can hardly stand on its own, seems to have been written solely to complete the first (*Quaestionum Propertianarum liber secundus*, cap. V, in his edition of Propertius, vol. 1 (Halle, 1843), p. 89).

²⁶ 'Hic erat' is the reading adopted by a minority of the editions which I have seen: ed. M. Rothstein, 1898 and 1920; the Oxford edition by J.S. Phillimore, 1901; the Loeb-edition by H.E. Butler, 1912; the Budé edition by D. Paganelli, 1929; ed. R. Helm, 1965; ed. L. Richardson, 1977; the Teubner edition by R. Hanslik, 1979; ed. R.J. Baker, 1990; ed. G. Giardina, 2005. All the other editions read 'Hic erit'.

fact, and hence a certain, unspecified time-gap, but, to my mind, 'erat' fits better in this interpretation of the poem. No matter which reading we choose, the poet takes the message or the rumor as an indication that Cynthia has changed her mind about him and that she is willing to comply with the requests enclosed in his poems preceding 1, 8, and therefore his mood is suddenly jubilant. These interpreters see I, 8 as, in the words of Plessis, a kind of drama in two acts, with a tight structure.²⁷

Others claim that the poem must have been conceived as a two-part poem on account of a supposed harmony in the structure of the elegies 6-14 of the Monobiblos.²⁸ Within this structure, it is argued, '8A' and '8B' form a pair with 11 and 12 if one assumes that the main theme of '8A' and 11 (both addressed to Cynthia) is '*perfidia* threatened', while the main theme of '8B' and 12 (both without an addressee) is '*perfidia* averted' and '*perfidia* realized' respectively. This thematic arrangement and the entire framework of which it is part may seem attractive at first sight, but the argument on the parallelism between '8A'/'8B' and 11/12 is not convincing, because poem 12 can be read independently from 11, but '8B' needs '8A' to be understood. Moreover, one can argue that the neat balance of the outer arrangement of this series of poems does not equal out the psychological movement and tight inner structure which may be observed in the poem itself.

For there is a third way to look at the poem, which shows its organic unity without calling for a break after line 26. I will attempt to show in what follows that the poem can be recognized as one continuous whole if we interpret it as a kind of inner soliloquy expressing the poet's passionate, changing emotions for Cynthia and his reflections on his attachment to her, occasioned by her plan to leave Rome and go to a wealthy rival in Illyria. If it is read in this manner, it illustrates the *furor* which keeps the poet in its grip since he has known Cynthia (see 1, 1, 7-8).

The poet first addresses himself in his mind to his mistress, full of anger, because she is leaving him: are you really leaving me for this what's-his-name in Illyria and planning to sail without me? May you be delayed by bad wintry weather, and may I witness, as long as I stand on the empty beach and call after you, cruel woman, how bad storms strike

²⁷ See Plessis as quoted by Enk in note 25 above and, e.g., R.E. White, 'Dramatic Unity in Propertius 1.8, 2.29, 2.33', *Classical Philology*, 56 (1961), 217-222.

²⁸ J.T. Davis, *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid* (Bern-Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 27-29, and cf. the older literature cited pp. 27-28, note 2, especially O. Skutch, 'The Structure of the Propertian Monobiblos', *Classical Philology*, 58 (1963), 238-239.

your ship (v. 1-16). Then, suddenly but understandably because the poet is madly infatuated, his tone changes: in spite of everything, I wish you a prosperous journey and, my sweetheart, I will stay as your supplicant on your doorstep (v. 17-22). Then, in self-delusion, he addresses himself: I will ask seamen where my girl is, and, although I will hear that she is on Atrax's shores or with the Hyllei, I will say to them: she will — in the end — be mine' (v. 23-26). It is noteworthy that at the end of this address, the poet, in his self-delusion, persuades himself to believe what goes against the facts as he imagines they will be stated by the sailors (*illa futura mea est*, v. 26, against the notice that she is on Atrax's shores or with the Hyllei). This statement forms the beginning of an upward movement of self-delusion which reaches its climax in verse 27ff.

So in this interpretation, there is no break due to an external factor in verse 27, as many scholars from the nineteenth century onward felt, but rather a continuation of the poet's inner reflection. The poet now seems to be completely enveloped in his self-delusion, when his tone changes again in v. 27 — the first change of tone occurred in v. 17 — and he exclaims with joy, against reason, that she will be here in Rome ('hic erit'), having sworn to stay. Although in this interpretation the reading 'hic erat' in v. 27 is by no means impossible,²⁹ the reading 'erit' is, in my view, to be preferred, because the future tense links v. 27 closer to the preceding verse, which also ends with a future ('futura est'), and hence stresses that the poem continues without interruption. The following present tense ('hic iurata manet'), far from producing an ineffective succession of tenses, as R. White has claimed,³⁰ is highly to the point within the 'logic' created by the poet in his self-delusion: 'she will — in the end — be mine (v. 26), she will be here (in Rome), she — in fact — stays here, as she had sworn (v. 27)'. The repetition of 'hic' (here, in Rome) serves to underscore once again that the poet is speaking in total self-delusion, because Cynthia has in fact decided to go to his wealthy rival in Illyria. The outburst continues with a flush of victory: may those who hate me be damned, I have won! She has listened to my

²⁹ One could argue in favour of 'erat' by assuming that the poet, blinded by his passionate love for Cynthia, puts it into his own head that she did not leave Rome because of her love for him. In that case, one must also assume either an extra-textual fact (a message or a rumor about Cynthia not having left at all) or a reminiscence which urges itself upon his mind with such force that it seemingly becomes a real fact.

³⁰ White, 'Dramatic Unity in Propertius', p. 221.

prayers, let no one who, full of spite against me, desires her, have false hope: she has ceased to sail for a new destination (v. 27-30).

At line 31, the poet's excitement is past its peak. The verb 'dicitur' seems to introduce a touch of sobriety, but the poet is still speaking in self-delusion: he reports what is said about Cynthia: that she loves him, that she loves Rome because of him, that she would turn down a kingdom without him (v. 31-32). In lines 33-40, the poet dwells on the many gifts he supposes were promised to her in vain by his rival (v. 37), stressing at the beginning of this elaboration that she prefers to be with him on any terms and share his bed (v. 33-34), and finishing it with the observation that he has prevailed over his rival with his attractive poems (v. 39-40).

The mentioning of the 'blandum carmen' introduces the last part of the poem (v. 41-46), in which the poet's earlier claim that even if Cynthia will be far away, she will still be his ('illa futura mea est', v. 26) and the notion of victory ('vicimus', v. 28) are picked up once more. Now, it appears that the poet's irrational claim was sensible after all: it is thanks to his poems that the poet is victorious; in the writing of poems, no rival can threaten him. The poet's outburst in v. 45 proves not to be the rambling of a pitiable erotomaniac, but a proud statement of a love poet who knows that his poems are unsurpassable. Thus, in the concluding verses the poet and the passionate lover reach out to each other. The final verses take their expressiveness from the first half of the poem, for it is now clear that the lover's desperation and his loss of status are fully compensated by the writing of love poetry.

In sum, 1, 8 is a passionate love poem and a proud proclamation of the value of love poetry, and, despite Lipsius, it forms a complete and harmonious unity, whether we conceive it to be, with Plessis and his followers, a kind of drama in two acts, or a simple unity showing the poet's continuous self-delusion. And no matter which interpretation one finds more convincing, it is unnecessary to print the poem in two parts, following Lipsius' ill-founded division.³¹

AFDELING GRIEKSE EN LATIJNSE TAAL EN CULTUUR

RADBOD UNIVERSITEIT NIJMEGEN

Pb. 9103

NL – 6500 HD Nijmegen

m.v.d.poel@let.ru.nl

³¹ I thank dr. P. Tuijnman and dr. B. Breij for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.