

1

In Medias Res

Non ego nunc Hadriae uereor mare noscere tecum,
 Tulle, neque Aegaeo ducere uela salo,
 cum quo Rhipaeos possim conscendere montis
 ulteriusque domos uadere Memnonias;
 5 sed me complexae remorantur uerba puellae,
 mutatoque graues saepe colore preces.
 illa mihi totis argutat noctibus ignis,
 et queritur nullos esse relictos deos;
 illa meam mihi iam se denegat, illa minatur,
 10 quae solet irato tristis amica uiro.
 his ego non horam possum durare querelis:
 a pereat, si quis lentus amare potest!
 an mihi sit tanti doctas cognoscere Athenas
 atque Asiae ueteres cernere diuitias,
 15 ut mihi deducta faciat conuicia puppi
 Cynthia et insanis ora notet manibus,
 osculaque opposito dicat sibi debita uento,
 et nihil infido durius esse uiro?
 tu patrum meritis conare anteire securis,
 20 et uetera oblitis iura refer sociis.
 nam tua non aetas umquam cessauit amori,
 semper at armatae cura fuit patriae;
 et tibi non unquam nostros puer iste labores
 afferat et lacrimis omnia nota meis!
 25 me sine, quem semper uoluit fortuna iacere,
 hanc animam extremae reddere nequitiae.
 multi longinquo periire in amore libenter,
 in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat.
 non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis:
 30 hanc me militiam fata subire uolunt.
 at tu seu mollis qua tendit Ionia, seu qua
 Lydia Pactoli tingit arata liquor;
 seu pedibus terras seu pontum carpere remis

CAIRNS

ibis, et accepti pars eris imperii:
 35 tum tibi si qua mei ueniet non immemor hora,
 uiuere me duro sidere certus eris.
 Propertius 1 6

In this, the sixth elegy of his first published book, Propertius addresses the man who is both his patron and the book's dedicatee, the young nobleman L. Volcaci^{us} Tullus.¹ The occasion of the address is Tullus' imminent departure from Rome to take up an official post in the province of Asia. It cannot be doubted that Propertius meant his farewell to Tullus to be friendly and complimentary. But a critical reader may well feel that some of what Propertius says is not easily reconcilable with this view.

At the beginning of the elegy Propertius employs the classical commonplace that willingness to go anywhere with a person is a sign of one's friendship for that person.² He does so in order to make a strong declaration of his friendship for Tullus (1-4). Propertius then immediately refuses to go with Tullus to Asia. He produces as the main reason for his refusal to do so the fact that his mistress Cynthia is putting pressure on him. This takes the form of changes of complexion, nagging, and threats directed at Propertius because he plans to accompany Tullus (5-18).

It is clear from this abrupt juxtaposition that Propertius intended his readers to be struck by the contrast between these protestations of friendship for Tullus and his reason for refusing to go with Tullus. Propertius has intensified the contrast in two ways: he has ruled out fear on his own part as a motive for refusal (1-2), and he has used the commonplace about friendship in a novel and extended form (3-4). Normally the commonplace goes something like 'x would accompany y to the ends of the earth therefore x is a friend to y'. Propertius says 'I would accompany you to and beyond the ends of the earth'.³

On one side, therefore, Propertius places his great friendship for Tullus, a friendship which is more than personal and includes his poet-patron relationship with Tullus; on the other side Propertius places Cynthia's threats, and he submits to the latter. In ancient literature it is impossible that a poem addressed to a patron-cum-dedicatee should be uncomplimentary. Despite appearances, therefore, this contrast cannot be uncomplimentary to Tullus. How then can we explain it? We might suggest that in elegiac poetry there is a convention by which the enamoured elegiac poet prefers his mistress's love to everything, including

the needs of friend and patron; but this is not in fact true. Tibullus in 1 3 describes how he was in the same position as Propertius is in 1 6. Unlike Propertius, Tibullus left his mistress Delia to go abroad with his friend, patron and dedicatee, Messalla, despite Delia's attempts to restrain him.⁴ Nevertheless, the amorous character of the elegiac poet may to some extent soften Propertius' decision. A second suggestion would be more helpful: Propertius' seeming insult to Tullus may be indirectly encomiastic to Tullus because it is part of the character contrast which Propertius constructs throughout the poem between Tullus the man of war, proof against love and devoted to the service of his country (cp. 19ff.), and Propertius the worthless lover, suffering from moral blemishes that have been specifically chosen to high-light the opposite virtues in Tullus.

These two suggestions would probably constitute an adequate if not complete explanation and justification of the contrast between 1-4 and 5-18, if the poem did not contain another similar and apparently un-encomiastic contrast to which this sort of explanation is inapplicable. From 19 on Propertius compliments Tullus as a soldier and contrasts Tullus in this role with himself, the weak poet-lover; but at 31 a startling reversal of these compliments seems to occur. The language of this and the following lines is carefully chosen to suggest the luxury and wealth of Asia with its irrigated cornland watered by the gold-bearing Pactolus (31-2), and to imply the ease with which Tullus will travel (33) and the security of Tullus' position (34), all of which⁵ contrast with Propertius' own hard life (36, where *duro* contrasts with *mollis*, 31). This contrast is also without doubt intentional and again seems at first sight highly unflattering to Tullus. The man who at 19ff. was a tough soldier is now said, or so it appears, to have an easy life in store for him. Such an interpretation must again be wrong, but this time no elegiac conventions or easy theories of indirect encomium are available to explain how this section of the poem can be reconciled with Tullus' role as a man of war. The fact that this problem does not yield to conventional approaches strengthens any residual doubts about the satisfactoriness of the conventional explanations of the contrast between 1-4 and 5-18.

These two difficulties presented by Propertius 1 6 are characteristic of a whole class of difficulties in classical literature. Often the logic of a classical poem or speech appears to be intentionally incomplete or inconsistent. The overall solution to such difficulties which this book sets out to explore is one that involves an acceptance of the validity and

meaningfulness of these difficulties. This solution is that the poems and speeches of classical antiquity are not internally complete, individual works but are members of classes of literature known in antiquity as γένη or εἶδη, which will be described in this book as *genres*. Genres in this sense are not classifications of literature in terms of form as are epic, lyric, elegy, or epistle, but classifications in terms of content; for example *propemptikon* (the farewell to the departing traveller), and *komos*, often incorrectly termed *paraclausithyron*⁶ (the song and actions of a lover who is usually excluded⁷). It may be felt that it is confusing to call classifications in terms of content genres (although this is commonly done) since classifications in terms of form are also commonly called genres. On the other hand it can be argued that an already established term, for all its potential ambiguity, is preferable to a new coinage since the ambiguity can be removed by definition.

For the purposes of analysis every genre can be thought of as having a set of primary or logically necessary elements which in combination distinguish that genre from every other genre. For example, the primary elements of the *propemptikon* are in these terms someone departing, another person bidding him farewell, and a relationship of affection between the two, plus an appropriate setting. The primary elements of the *komos* are a lover, a beloved, and the lover's attempts to come to the beloved, plus an appropriate setting. These primary elements will be present in every example of the genre, either explicitly or implicitly, with those exceptions discussed in Chapter 5. This is because it is only by recognizing these primary elements that an ancient audience could know to which genre a poem or speech belonged.

As well as containing the primary elements of its genre every generic example contains some secondary elements (*topoi*). These *topoi* are the smallest divisions of the material of any genre useful for analytic purposes. Their usefulness lies in the fact that they are the commonplaces which recur in different forms in different examples of the same genre. They help, in combination with the primary elements, to identify a generic example. But the primary elements are the only final arbiters of generic identity since any particular individual *topos* (secondary element) can be found in several different genres.

The logical incompleteness and apparent internal inconsistencies of many ancient writings are a consequence of their non-individual character, that is, their membership of genres in the sense defined. These writings assume in the reader a knowledge of the circumstances and

content of the particular genre to which they belong, and they exploit this knowledge to allow logical connexions and distinctions to remain implicit or be omitted altogether. In ages and civilizations where, as is the case today, writer and audience do not share a common body of knowledge and expectation, such features of literary works may well be faults of composition. But in situations where, as in classical antiquity, writer and audience do have this common background, they can be part of a greater sophistication in the conveying of information.

Propertius 1 6 belongs to the genre *propemptikon*.⁸ It is not a *propemptikon* of the best known variety, that is, it does not contain *schetliastos*. A *schetliastic propemptikon* is one in which the speaker attempts by complaints and protests to persuade the traveller who is intending to depart not to do so but rather to stay behind. Most of the *propemptika* which have been recognized and discussed by scholars are *schetliastic*, and it is this type of *propemptikon* which is fully exemplified in one of the two important works on epideictic genres attributed to Menander the Rhetor, a writer of the third century AD. But although Propertius 1 6 is not a *schetliastic propemptikon* it is nevertheless a *propemptikon*, as Felix Jacoby first noted⁹ without further comment; and as Propertian scholars have not realized, it exemplifies another variety of *propemptikon* mentioned but not elaborated upon by Menander.

The section of his treatise in which Menander discusses the varieties of the single genre *propemptikon* is worth quoting at this point for three reasons. First, it is relevant to Propertius 1 6; second, it will provide the basis for important distinctions made in Chapter 9; and third, it will exemplify the kind of thinking which is valid in generic studies in general.

πολλοὶ δὲ τῆς προπεμπτικῆς τρόποι. εἰς μὲν ὁ δυνάμενος συμβουλεύειν κατὰ μέρος δέξασθαι τῶν λοιπῶν μερῶν δεχομένων καὶ ἐγκώμια καὶ λόγους ἐρωτικούς, εἰ βούλεται προστιθέναι καὶ ταῦτα ὁ λέγων· δύναται δὲ συμβουλήν ἐπιδέξασθαι, ὅταν ὁ πολλῶ κρείττων προπέμπη τὸν ἥττονα, ὡς ὅταν ὁ παιδευτῆς προπέμπη τὸν ἀκροατὴν· δίδωσι γὰρ αὐτῷ συμβουλευτικὸν ἦθος τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀξίωμα. ἕτερος δὲ τρόπος ἂν γένοιτο, ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεται τις ἐνδείξασθαι ἦθος ἐρωτικὸν καὶ διάπυρον περὶ τὸν προπεμπόμενον συμβουλήν μὴ καταμιγνύς τῆς ἀξίας ὑπαρχούσης ἐφαμίλλου καὶ τῆς δόξης ἴσης τῷ προπέμποντι καὶ

τῷ προπεμπομένῳ, ὅταν ἑταῖρος ἑταῖρον προπέμπῃ· καὶ γὰρ εἰ βελτίων εἴη ὁ προπέμπων ἐνταῦθα τοῦ ἀπαίροντος, ἀλλ' οὖν ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τὸ ἀμφοτέρους εἶναι φίλους ἀφαιρεῖται τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς συμβουλῆς τὸν λέγοντα. γένοιτο δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλος τρόπος πλείονα διατριβὴν ἔχων περὶ τὰ ἐγκώμια μᾶλλον, σχεδὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν μικροῦ σύμπασαν, ὅταν ἐθέλῃ προῖστασθαι τῷ μὲν δοκεῖν προπεμπτικὸν λόγον, τῇ δ' ἀληθείᾳ ἐγκώμιον. ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ μέλλοιμεν προπέμπειν ἄρχοντα ἢ τῆς ἀρχῆς πεπαυμένον ἢ ἀφ' ἑτέρας εἰς ἑτέραν πόλιν μέλλοντα ἀπιέναι. λέγω δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀποστερῶν οὐδένα τῶν προειρημένων τρόπων τῆς προπεμπτικῆς τῶν ἐρωτικῶν παθῶν· χαίρει γὰρ ἡ προπεμπτικὴ πανταχοῦ τούτοις, ἀλλ' ἐνδεικνύμενος ὅτι ὅπου μὲν μᾶλλον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ καταχρησθῆναι, ὅπου δὲ ἐπ' ἔλαττον. παραλήψῃ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος καὶ πόθον πόλεων ὀλοκλήρων περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἔρωτας.

Menander 395 4-32

There are many sorts of propemptikon.

One sort can be made up partly of advice and partly of encomium and affectionate addresses, should the speaker wish to add these latter too. Advice can be included when someone of a much higher status is bidding farewell to someone of inferior status, for example, a teacher saying goodbye to a pupil, since in such a case the teacher's status allows him to display the character of a counsellor.

The second sort is when the speaker can display a burning feeling of affection for the person to whom he is bidding farewell, without including advice. In this case the pair will be of equal standing and reputation, two friends for example; and their friendship and their common right to the name "friend" deprives the speaker of any right to give advice, even if the friend saying goodbye should be superior in status to the friend going away.

A third sort is much more, or rather, almost totally concerned with praise, when the speaker's intent is to produce an encomium in the guise of a propemptic speech; for example, if we were going to bid farewell to a governor laying down office or leaving one city for another.

In saying all this I do not mean to exclude from any of the sorts of propemptikon mentioned the expression of feelings of affection. For the propemptikon universally revels in them. I am only pointing out that in some cases they are to be used more than in others. When a

governor is the addressee you will bring in the unanimous love of the cities for him and how much they will miss him.'

Menander distinguishes between three sorts of propemptikon. Since his rambling style does not make for clarity, it may be worth while to summarize the three categories:

1. The propemptikon of superior to inferior which has advice as its distinguishing characteristic, e.g. teacher's propemptikon to pupil.
2. The propemptikon of equal to equal which has affection as its distinguishing characteristic, e.g. friend's propemptikon to friend.
3. The propemptikon of inferior to superior which has encomium as its distinguishing characteristic, e.g. orator's propemptikon to governor.

When Menander goes on to give detailed instructions for the composition of a propemptikon, these instructions are for an example of the second sort, that of equal to equal. This example is schetliastic and in this respect resembles the majority of known propemptika. This does not mean, of course, that all propemptika of equal to equal are necessarily schetliastic,¹⁰ or even that all schetliastic propemptika are those of equal to equal.¹¹ That Menander should thus have chosen to exemplify the second sort of propemptikon and not the third is somewhat surprising. In the case of other genres with variant types, it is always those addressed to officials and cities to which he devotes most of his space, his purpose being to give tuition in public oratory. Hence we might have expected that the third type of propemptikon, that addressed to a governor, would be the one exemplified in full. The primary reason why Menander chose to exemplify the second sort is probably that he was very concerned to impress on his readers the intimate connexion between all sorts of propemptika and expressions of affection. He may have felt that the best way to drive home this lesson was to exemplify the sort of propemptikon characterized principally by such expressions. Some of the details of Menander's example of the propemptikon of equal to equal hint at a secondary reason. These details make it clear that the imagined circumstances of delivery are that one pupil of a rhetorical school is going home after completing his rhetorical studies and that he is being addressed by a fellow-pupil who is staying behind at the school.¹² This suggests that Menander, and doubtless other teachers of rhetoric, exploited the departures of pupils who had completed their courses as occasions to exer-

cise their remaining pupils in the delivery of this kind of speech, and therefore that the prescription by Menander of the equal to equal variant was meant to help his pupils to compose propemptika in these circumstances. This suggestion is confirmed by another detail of Menander's account. He gives as an example of the superior to inferior type the propemptikon delivered by a teacher saying goodbye to his pupil.¹³ Doubtless, when a pupil departed, the teacher of rhetoric led off or crowned the propemptic efforts of his remaining pupils towards their departing comrade.

The choice by Menander of the propemptikon of equal to equal for full exemplification does not mean that the contents of the other two sorts must remain unknown to us. They can be derived partly from literary examples¹⁴ and partly from the prescription for the second sort. For although variants of the same genre differ in content to some extent, they very often have much in common, and this is the case with the propemptikon.

Propertius 1 6 is a propemptikon of Menander's third sort. Tullus, the addressee, is a governor in the broad sense of the word.¹⁵ There are two small differences between the situation in Propertius and that envisaged by Menander. Menander imagines his third sort of propemptikon as being directed by a public orator speaking on behalf of a city or cities towards a governor either demitting office and going home or leaving one city in his province for another. However, in 1 6, Propertius speaks as a private individual not as a public representative, and he addresses Tullus when Tullus is leaving Rome to take up his appointment and not when he is leaving his province or moving about within it. But differences of these two kinds, although they are of some interest and will be treated later in this book,¹⁶ do not affect the generic assignment of Propertius 1 6.

Menander's third type of propemptikon is characterized by encomium. Thus the generic assignment of Propertius 1 6 confirms the common-sense view of the elegy in terms of Propertius' attitude to Tullus. However odd Propertius' remarks at the two places discussed above may seem, they must be intended to be encomiastic. Lines 1-4 can easily be understood in terms of the emotions which characterize the genre in general and Menander's third type of the genre in particular. Propertius' affection for Tullus is expressed in his strong declaration of friendship in these lines. Some compliment to Tullus is implied in 1-2: Propertius makes it clear that the Adriatic and Aegean, traditionally

dangerous seas, might terrify some sailors, but not himself or Tullus, and only Tullus will be sailing them! What then of the excuses of 5-18? One might assume that other surviving examples of type 3 propemptika would help with this problem since some of them also contain reasons or excuses for the speaker's inability to accompany a departing official. In fact the frequency of such reasons or excuses suggests that they sometimes play the same role in type 3 propemptika as schetliamos sometimes plays in type 2, namely that, whereas the equal speaker may reproach the addressee, the inferior speaker may excuse himself to the addressee. However, just as all type 2 propemptika are not schetliastic, so all type 3 propemptika are not necessarily excusatory.

Excusatory sections of three other surviving type 3 excusatory propemptika and one type 2 excusatory propemptikon are:

me tenet ignotis aegrum Phaeacia terris:
abstineas auidas Mors modo nigra manus.
Tibullus 1 3 3-4

utrumne iussi persequemur otium,
non dulce, ni tecum simul.
Horace *Epode* 1 7-8

cur nobis ignauus amor? sed pectore fido
numquam abero longisque sequar tua carbasa uotis.
Statius *Siluae* 3 2 99-100

sed licet teneamur aegri
corporis nexu, tamen euolamus
mentibus post te, Dominoque tecum
dicimus hymnos.
Paulinus *Carmina* 17 93-6

The excuses are of different sorts; illness in Tibullus 1 3; the orders of Maecenas in Horace *Epode* 1;¹⁷ faint-heartedness in love in *Siluae* 3 2. In *Siluae* 3 2 Statius employs the preceding imaginary pictures of all the things he might have done abroad with Maecius Celer (90-5) to reinforce his lame excuse for refusing to accompany Celer in real life. Statius then goes on to declare that he will be with Celer in mind. This elaboration gives Statius' handling of the idea that he might go abroad with his addressee a more conventional air than that of Tibullus and Horace. In Paulinus *Carmina* 17 the excuse is rather a statement of fact, namely that Paulinus is mortal and so can only be in one place at a time.

This implies that he himself has a diocese to look after just as Nicetas has. Paulinus goes on to employ the same notion as Statius uses, when he says that he will be with Nicetas in spirit. In spite of their differences, none of these excuses could be misread as insults to the addressee. The encomiastic sense is manifest. An examination of these other examples of the same topos in the same variant of the same genre is therefore unhelpful for Propertius 1.6.

The excuse offered at Propertius 1.6.5-18 can be considered generically in the following way. Propertius' excuse for not accompanying Tullus in a type 3 excusatory propemptikon is that Cynthia, when told by Propertius that he intends to accompany Tullus, has been expressing her disapproval in various ways. The report of this in 5-18 is an example of a type 2 schetliastic propemptikon in which Cynthia is the speaker and Propertius the addressee. The principle which allows this narration of Cynthia's behaviour to be considered a propemptikon is one which is valid for all genres and will recur in this book.¹⁸ It is that, although surviving rhetorical prescriptions for genres are naturally prescriptions for direct first-person speeches, nevertheless literary examples of genres can just as well consist of narrated speeches, either accompanied or unaccompanied by descriptions of related relevant actions; or they can even consist simply of narrations of relevant actions. Cynthia's narrated and imagined speeches, and her related actions of 5-18, are the schetliastos of a schetliastic propemptikon. The pleas and threats and reproaches of these lines are characteristic of propemptic schetliastmoi and, as though to confirm this, Propertius uses the verb *queror* (8) and the noun *querelae* (11), which appear to be the Latin renderings of the Greek *σχετλιάζω*, *σχετλιασμός*.¹⁹ Other propemptic topoi which may be noted in these lines are:

(i) The accusation of breach of faith. There is a hint of this topos in 8 where the gods concerned must, because of the proximity of *ignis* in 7, be those by whom their mutual oaths of love have been sworn. The topos occurs openly in 18.²⁰

(ii) Reproaches of hardness of heart, etc. (10, 18).²¹

(iii) Reflections on Propertius' motives for departure, summed up in touristic language as a desire to visit those resorts of learning and wealth, Athens and the famous cities of Asia (13-14).²²

(iv) The prayers of Cynthia that Propertius' ship will be held up (17).²³ The propemptikon of Cynthia to Propertius consists of schetliastos and nothing more. It can nevertheless be considered a member of the genre

propemptikon in spite of the absence of the normal second section. Such omissions of material from generic examples without destruction of their generic identity will be discussed in Chapter 5.²⁴

Propertius then in 1.6 has yielded to Cynthia's schetliastic propemptikon to him. A parallel for this is Cynthia's yielding to Propertius' schetliastic propemptikon to her in Propertius 1.8. In 1.6 Propertius uses Cynthia's type 2 schetliastic propemptikon to himself in his type 3 excusatory propemptikon to Tullus as his own main excuse for not going to Asia with Tullus. The literary procedure involved here, namely the inclusion within one example of a genre of an example of another variant of the same genre, will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 7 and will be exemplified there and elsewhere. Inclusion was familiar to Propertius' audience, so that to the non-generic explanations of the significance of the contrast between 1-4 and 5-18 can now be added the generic explanation that the contrast was devised by Propertius so that he could demonstrate his skill and originality by using this striking and sophisticated device. In other words the audience, knowing that 1.6 was a propemptikon, would not have expected internal logical completeness in this striking generic innovation, would have accepted 1-18 without asking overprecise questions about internal consistency, and would have understood them in the encomiastic spirit in which they were written. Characteristically what would in a non-generic poem have been a hiatus of thought is not so within this generic elegy. This is because the generic formula and the principle of inclusion are, in a sense, as much parts of the elegy as the elegy itself in as much as the reader would approach the elegy with a prior knowledge of them. This poem is therefore, like all generic works, not a thing in itself. It exists against the background of the reader's generic expectation which it uses as its starting-point.

In the second part of the included propemptikon (13-18), Propertius adds to the description of Cynthia's actual schetliastos to him in the past (5-12) an anticipation of her future schetliastic activity should he fail to yield to her pleas. This section also paves the way for the contrast between Propertius as poet-lover and Tullus as man of war that will follow in 19-30. The anticipation occurs in 13-14, in which Propertius imagines his own residence abroad not in terms of 1-4 where, in conjunction with Tullus, he was bravely facing the sea-storms, but rather in terms of solitary touring of those standard places of resort in antiquity, Athens with its university and Asia with its wealthy cities. With this prospect he contrasts the further potential propemptic activity on

Cynthia's part – Cynthia on the sea-shore shouting at his departing ship, tearing her face, hoping the winds will be contrary to him and attacking his harshness and lack of fidelity. Thus 13-18 are also a thematic repetition-cum-variation of 1-12.²⁵

At line 19 the second half of the propemptikon to Tullus and with it pure encomium of Tullus begins. The first section of this encomium, in which the *persona* of Tullus as a man of war is contrasted with the *persona* of Propertius (19-30), can be interestingly paralleled from Menander's prescription for the type 2 schetliastic propemptikon. Menander recommends that the speaker, while praising the good looks of the traveller, should guard against any impression that the traveller's morals may consequently be faulty by stressing his integrity.²⁶

ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν συντελεῖ καὶ σώματος κάλλος, γράψον καὶ τὸν νεανίαν, οἷος μὲν ἰδεῖν, οἷος δ' ὀφθῆναι. ἐν ᾧ διαγράψεις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰουλον καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ κόμην καὶ τὰ λοιπά. ἵνα δὲ τὸν λόγον σεμνὸν ποιῆς τὸν περὶ τῆς γραφῆς καὶ τὴν διαβολὴν ἐκφύγῃς τὴν ἐκ τοῦ κάλλους, ἀπέργασαι τὸ ἦθος σεμνότερον, λέγων ὅτι κοσμεῖ δὲ τὸ εἶδος τῆ τῶν ἡθῶν ἐγκρατεία, καὶ τῶ μὴ πολλοῖς ῥαδίως ἑαυτὸν ἐκδιδόναι, ἀλλὰ μόνον συνεῖναι τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῖς ἀρίστοις καὶ λόγοις καὶ βιβλίοις.

Menander 398 14-23

'Since physical beauty makes up part of general well-being, describe the young man, how he looks at people and what he is like to look at. Describe in this section his first growth of beard, his eyes, his hair, etc. But in order to make your description serious and to shield him from the kind of insinuations which beauty attracts, you must give some seriousness to his character. Say that his physical attributes are disciplined by his strict morals, by his aversion to associating with the common herd and by his habit of communing only with the best men, speeches and books.'

Propertius does not go into detailed rhapsodies over Tullus' beauty, but he does specify that Tullus is a young man,²⁷ and immediately goes on to picture him as an anti-love soldier.²⁸ All this simply intensifies the problem of 31-6. Propertius has been openly laudatory in the previous lines. How then do 31-6 continue this encomium in spite of seeming to be unflattering? This problem, unlike the first, can be solved by direct reference to the generic formula. It is caused simply by the occurrence of a topos at the place specified for it by the generic formula. Since the

topos so occurs the author is excused from producing explicit links with its context because these links already exist in the generic formula known to both author and audience.

The topos is described by Menander in the post-encomiastic part of his instructions for the propemptikon as follows:

κἂν μὲν πεζεύειν μέλλῃ, διάγραφε τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν δι' ἧς πορεύεται, οἷος μὲν ἔσται, ἐὰν οὕτω τύχῃ διὰ τῆς Θράκης διῶν, ἐπαινούμενος καὶ προπεμπόμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις, θαυμαζόμενος δὲ διὰ Λυδίας καὶ Φρυγίας.

Menander 398 29-399 1

'And if he is going to journey by land, describe the route and the land he will journey through and what sort of traveller he will be, praising and escorting him in your speech (?) if, for example, he is going by land through Thrace, congratulating him if he is going through Lydia and Phrygia.'

What this amounts to is that if the traveller's road is through rough terrain, he is to be praised for his endurance; if it is through a pleasant country, he is to be congratulated on his good fortune. Tullus does in fact pass through Lydia, one of Menander's two examples of pleasant terrain (32). Ionia, the other place he is said to be visiting, is adjacent to and shares the characteristics of Lydia and Phrygia. Hence Propertius lays emphasis on the luxuriousness of Lydia and Ionia, and on the ease of Tullus' passage through and residence in them as a form of laudatory congratulation of Tullus. In doing so, and in placing the topos at this point, Propertius is conforming with the precepts of the rhetorical schools. The general position of the topos in Propertius 1 6 as well as the content of the topos conforms with the generic formula. In Propertius 1 6 as in Menander's prescription (397 21ff.) it is part of the encomium section of the propemptikon. Moreover, in Propertius 1 6 it is followed by the propemptic 'remember me' topos (35-6), a topos which in Menander's prescription immediately precedes in the same sentence the instructions to describe the traveller in accordance with the nature of the terrain he is to traverse (398 26-9).²⁹

Two more aspects of the second half of Propertius 1 6 are worth mentioning. Lines 19-36, as well as contrasting Propertius and Tullus to the latter's advantage, also add, by implication for the most part but sometimes openly (e.g. 29-30), to the excusatory tendencies of the first half. Their message is that Propertius is an unwarlike person suited by

fate and by his bad character only to the warfare of love. In representing himself in this way, Propertius is producing, as well as the unusual excuse of 5-18, another type of excuse familiar in the context of excusatory propemptika. When Statius in *Silvae* 3 2, in similar circumstances, pleads faint-heartedness as his excuse, he has previously explained that he is militarily useless (94-8). Horace, when in *Epode* 1 he considers the possibility of excusing himself and then decides to go with Maecenas after all, is careful to point out that the decision to go is made in spite of the fact that he is a military nonentity (15-16).

The second aspect of 19-36 is characteristic of the generic practice of ancient poets, who love to disappoint their audiences' expectations on one level and at the same time fulfil them on another level. There is no explicit schetliasmios addressed to Tullus in Propertius 1 6; but in 19-36 Propertius manages to portray himself as a lonely, wretched character strongly reminiscent of the speaker of a schetliastic propemptikon – tearful, woeful, dying. Naturally Propertius nowhere says or implies that his miserable condition has anything to do with Tullus' absence, for to suggest this would be an insult to Tullus' performance of his duty to the state. Propertius blames it all on the fact that he himself is a lover. We might easily believe that the resemblance between this self-portrait and that of the schetliastic speaker was accidental, if the same sort of thing did not happen in other non-schetliastic propemptika.³⁰ These examples indicate that when ancient poets wrote a non-schetliastic propemptikon they often compensated for the lack of an explicit schetliasmios by some such device.

The choice of Propertius 1 6 as a first example of the usefulness of generic studies was, paradoxically, dictated by the relatively unproblematic nature of the elegy. The two problems of the poem which have been discussed above have never troubled scholars. Moreover, the generic solution to the first of them must be supplemented by conventional approaches. The point of choosing an example of this kind was to avoid suggesting that generic studies are a panacea, that they are in conflict with other branches of classical studies, or that they are worthy of attention only because they solve problems. Their value is that they yield understanding of the compositional methods and intents of ancient writers. This is not to say that they cannot sometimes solve very difficult problems which have long baffled conventional scholarship.

The second example of the utility of generic studies concerns a poem

which has puzzled its two most distinguished commentators in the last hundred years.

- Ἴλιυθες, ὦ φίλε κούρε· τρίτη σὺν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡοῖ
 ἦλυθες· οἱ δὲ ποθεῦντες ἐν ἡματι γηράσκουσιν.
 ὅσσον ἔαρ χειμῶνος, ὅσον μῆλον βραβίλιο
 ἦδιον, ὅσσον ὅς σφετέρης λασιωτέρη ἀρνός,
 5 ὅσσον παρθενικὴ προφέρει τριγάμοιο γυναικός,
 ὅσσον ἐλαφροτέρη μόσχου νεβρός, ὅσσον ἀηδῶν
 συμπάντων λιγύφωνος ἀοιδοτάτη πετεηνῶν,
 τόσσον ἔμ' εὐφρηνας σὺ φανείς, σκιερὴν δ' ὑπὸ φηγόν
 ἡελίου φρύγοντος ὄδοιπόρος ἔδραμον ὡς τις.
 10 εἶθ' ὄμαλοι πνεύσειαν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισιν Ἔρωτες
 νῶν, ἐπεσσομένοις δὲ γενοίμεθα πᾶσιν ἀοιδῆ·
 'δίω δὴ τινε τῷδε μετὰ προτέροισι γενέσθην
 φῶθ', ὃ μὲν εἴσπνηλος, φαίη χ' Ὀμυκλαϊάζων,
 τὸν δ' ἕτερον πάλιν, ὡς κεν ὁ Θεσσαλὸς εἴποι, αἴτην.
 15 ἀλλήλους δ' ἐφίλησαν ἴσω ζυγῶ. ἦ ῥα τότε ἦσαν
 χρύσειοι πάλιν ἄνδρες, ὅτ' ἀντεφίλησ' ὁ φιληθείς.
 εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο, πάτερ Κρονίδη, πέλοι, εἰ γάρ, ἀγήρως
 ἀθάνατοι, γενεῆς δὲ διηκοσίησιν ἔπειτα
 ἀγγείλειεν ἐμοὶ τις ἀνέξοδον εἰς Ἀχέροντα·
 20 ἦ σὴ νῦν φιλότης καὶ τοῦ χαρίεντος αἴτεω
 πᾶσι διὰ στόματος, μετὰ δ' ἠθέοισι μάλιστα.
 ἀλλ' ἦτοι τούτων μὲν ὑπέρτεροι Οὐρανίωνες·
 ἔσσεται ὡς ἐθέλουσιν. ἐγὼ δέ σε τὸν καλὸν αἰνέων
 ψεύδεα ῥινὸς ὑπερθεν ἀραιῆς οὐκ ἀναφύσω.
 25 ἦν γὰρ καὶ τι δάκης, τὸ μὲν ἀβλαβὲς εὐθύς ἔθηκας,
 διπλάσιον δ' ὤνησας, ἔχων δ' ἐπίμετρον ἀπήλθον.
 Νισαῖοι Μεγαρήες, ἀριστεύοντες ἑρετμοῖς,
 ὄλβιοι οἰκείοιτε, τὸν Ἀττικὸν ὡς περίαλλα
 ζεῖνον ἐτιμήσασθε, Διοκλέα τὸν φιλόπαιδα.
 30 αἰεὶ οἱ περὶ τύμβον ἀολλέες εἶαρι πρώτω
 κούροι ἐριδμαίνουσι φιλήματος ἄκρα φέρεσθαι·
 ὃς δέ κε προσμάξῃ γλυκερώτερα χεῖλεσι χεῖλη,
 βριθόμενος στεφάνοισιν ἔην ἐς μητέρ' ἀπήλθεν.
 ὄλβιος ὅστις παισὶ φιλήματα κεῖνα διαιτᾷ·
 35 ἦ που τὸν χαροπὸν Γανυμήδεα πόλλ' ἐπιβῶται
 Λυδίῃ ἴσον ἔχειν πέτρη στόμα, χρυσὸν ὀπίη

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Book titles are given in full except in the case of commentaries and standard reference works.

CHAPTER ONE

1. The first book of Propertius' elegies is dedicated to Tullus by the apostrophe at 1.1.9. For similar Propertian and contemporary dedications cp., e.g. Prop. 2.1.17, Tib. 1.1.53, Hor. O. 1.1.11; 2.1.14.
2. For this topos see p. 99.
3. See also pp. 123 f.
4. Cp. also Tib. 1.7.9 ff. and 1.10.
5. This and other details of interpretation in Prop. 1.6 will be treated elsewhere.
6. See Copley 145, n. 6.
7. I intend to treat the question of exclusion in a future work.
8. For the propemptikon see Jäger and N-HI, 40 ff. with the works cited there.
9. 'Tibullus erste Elegie' (11) *RhM* 65 (1910) 24. Jäger (21) does not appreciate the value of the assignment.
10. E.g. Paulin. *Carm.* 17 is type 2 and non-schetliastic. See pp. 11 f., 155 ff.
11. E.g. Hor. O. 1.14 is type 3 but schetliastic. See pp. 219 ff.
12. 396 26 ff.; 397 21 ff.
13. 395 8-10.
14. See, e.g. pp. 236 ff., for a type 1 literary propemptikon.
15. See above, n. 5.
16. See pp. 38 f., 41 ff., 61 ff., 71, 73 f., 116 f., 134, 180 ff., 185 ff.
17. The 'excuse' in Hor. *Epod.* 1.7-8 is expressed in a more sophisticated fashion than in the others. See pp. 141 f.
18. See pp. 127 f.
19. Cp. also St. *Sil.* 3.2.78, 90.
20. See p. 57.
21. Cp., e.g. Prop. 1.8.15, Virg. *Aen.* 4.365 ff.
22. For motives for departure cp., e.g. love: Prop. 1.8; Hor. O. 3.27; Himer. *Or.* 12.53 (negated); friendship: e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 1; home: e.g. Hom. *Od.* 5.203 ff.; Paulin. *Carm.* 17.5-6; Menander 396 8 ff.; money (negated): Hor. *Epod.* 1; Prop. 1.8; cultured tourism: Himer. *Or.* 12.33; 13.4(?); Cinna (*F.P.L.* ed. Morel, pp. 87 f.) (negated).
23. Cp. Prop. 1.8.8-9 and see F. Cairns 'Notes on Propertius 1.8' (forthcoming).
24. pp. 128 f.
25. For such macrologia see pp. 119 f.
26. This part of Menander's type 2 prescription can be used to illustrate Propertius' type 3 example, since both variants contain eulogy at this point.
27. See D. R. Shackleton Bailey *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1956) p. 271 on *tua aetas* (21).
28. Menander in this section of his propemptikon prescription recommends praise of the addressee in terms of the standard four-virtue division (397 21 ff.). We might be tempted to understand Prop. 1.6.20 as an oblique reference to justice, 1.6.21 to self-control, and 1.6.22 to bravery (see also 1.6.1), were it not hard to see wisdom in 1.6.19 and were this approach not in any case probably over-mechanical.
29. For the 'remember me' topos cp., e.g. Sapph. *Fr.* 94 (LP) 7 f.; Tib. 1.3.2; Hor. O. 3.27.14; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.37; Paulin. *Carm.* 17.9; Menander 398 26 ff. It is not, of course, necessary that topoi should occur in examples in the same order as in the generic formula (see pp. 40, 108 f., 113 ff.), although such conformity is of interest when found.
30. E.g. Sapph. *Fr.* 94 (LP); Hor. O. 1.3; 3.27; St. *Sil.* 3.2.
31. *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin 1906) p. 171. The present work was in press when G. Giangrande's article 'Theocritus' Twelfth and Fourth Idylls: a study in Hellenistic irony' *Quad. Urbin.* 12 (1971) 95 ff., was published. This valuable paper expounds *Idyll* 12 as an 'epibaterion'.
32. Introduction to *Id.* 12 (vol. II, p. 221).
33. E.g. Libanius' Proshonetikos to Julian (*Or.* 13) and *Err.* 13, 33 (Foerster); Menander 414-18.
34. E.g. Doxopater, ed. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* vol. II, 415 5; Ps.-Dion. Hal., ed. Usener-Radermacher, vol. VI², pp. 272 ff.
35. Menander 378 ff.
36. Cp. also Cat. 9.1 f, a variant of this topos.
37. See p. 164.
38. In accordance with the principle of addressee-variation (see pp. 218 ff.) and a 'formal' sophistication (see pp. 127 f.).
39. Cp., e.g. the announcement of impending departure or injunction to go in the propemptikon, and the door or threshold in the komos.
40. 16.23; 17.41.
41. See Fraenkel on *Ag.* 899 ff.
42. *Ag.* p. 410.
43. Pp. 127 f.
44. E.g. Theogn. 1.691 f.; Arist. *Eq.* 498 ff.; Hor. O. 1.3.1 ff.; 3.27.13 ff.; Prop. 1.8.19 ff.; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.34.
45. See, e.g. on Lacedaemon, Leutsch-Schneidewin *C.P.G.* vol. II p. 479; on Thessaly, e.g. Athen. *Dcip.* 418 D; on Amyclae, Otto *Sprichwörter*, s.v.
46. See Otto *Sprichwörter*, s.v. *Sparta*.

CHAPTER TWO

1. See G. Kennedy 'The ancient dispute over rhetoric in Homer' *AJPh* 78 (1957) 23 ff.
2. *Artium Scriptores* (Vienna 1951) A 2-4, pp. 3-10.
3. See W. Arend *Die Typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Problemata 7 Berlin 1933).
4. See pp. 38 ff. and below, n. 27.
5. See Burgess, *passim*, and esp. 92 f., 166 ff.
6. Hom. *Od.* 13.38 ff.
7. Hom. *Il.* 24.725 ff. Priam is a slip on Menander's part: in fact Andromache, Hecuba and Helen utter the laments.
8. 5.
9. See, e.g. Menander 333 9 ff., 334 28 ff., 336 11 f., 437 20 f.
10. The following further syntaktika will not be analysed in the present discussion, although the commonplace nature of the generic topoi is sometimes confirmed by reference to them: Eur. *Hec.* 445-83; *Phoen.* 625-35; Prop. 3.21; Virg. *Aen.* 4.333-61. I hope to treat of some of these in a future work.
11. E.g. Greg. Naz. *Or.* 42.
12. See pp. 40 f. and below, n. 27.
13. On combination of topoi see ch. 4.
14. But see Cat. 4.6, treated on pp. 44 f.
15. See, e.g. Thuc. 7.77.
16. Cp., e.g. Hom. *Od.* 13.39; Solon *Fr.* 7 (19) D 3 f., 5.
17. *As an excuse for going home*: e.g. Hom. *Od.* 13.42 f.; *as left behind*: e.g. Eur. *Phoen.* 632; Cat. 4.6 9 ff.; Prop. 3.21.15; *as accompanying*: Prop. 3.21.11.
18. E.g. Eur. *Phoen.* 630; *Hec.* 448 f.; Tib. 1.10.13; Virg. *Aen.* 4.340 ff.; Prop. 3.21.1.
19. See N-HI on O. 1.4, and pp. 244 f. on Hor. O. 4.12.
20. The adaptation of topoi to individual addressees is prescribed by Menander (*passim*) and practised in all branches of ancient literature.
21. See above, n. 18.
22. See, e.g. Plaut. *Merc.* 865; Tib. 1.3.33 f.; Liv. 40.52.4; and see G. Radke *Die Götter Altitaliens* (Münster 1965) s.v. *Lares*.
23. Cp. Theoc. *Id.* 10, discussed on p. 175.
24. See also pp. 129 ff.
25. Cp. Menander 431.25 f. But the propemptic speaker can equally