Notes

Introduction

1. I use Barber’s 1960 (1953) Oxford text with my own translations, unless otherwise noted.

2. “The Organization of Opinion” is chapter 30 of Syme’s 1939 book, reissued in 1960. The fact that he devotes only one chapter to literary and visual propaganda in no way diminishes his achievement; we are still trying today to answer the questions Syme asked.

3. See also Kennedy 1992, who demonstrates that the concept “Augustan” was under negotiation then as much as it still is today.

4. Barchiesi 2002: 4, and see also Spencer 2001: 265 for a similar statement. Barchiesi is here discussing Ovid’s Fasti, a text that has a head start over Propertian scholarship in this direction; in addition to Barchiesi 2002, see Newlands 1995, Barchiesi 1997a, and Hinds 1992a and 1992b. A similar dialogue is emerging in our understanding of the relationship between Ovid’s written landscapes and the painted landscapes of Pompeii; see Hinds 2002 for an exploration of this exchange. Barchiesi 2003 goes a long way in articulating the broader opportunities and dilemmas posed by examining “. . . how texts and images cooperated in a Roman discourse about the paradoxes of the new state of things” (11); his discussion ranges over a variety of poetic texts from the Augustan age.

5. So too White 1993: 182–90. In discussing the proliferation of written Romes in the early Augustan years, White argues “. . . that the catalyst in this case was Augustus himself, and that he influenced the poets not by any direct approach to them, but by a campaign of public works which was steadily transforming the appearance of the city” (187).


10. Hardie 1993 discusses the ways Horace uses the visual arts as a parallel to poetry, in that there is “... a shared vocabulary of symbols and images which may be realized either in poetry or in sculpture and painting” (124).


13. Fowler 1996: 73. Laird 1993 also discusses the difference between ekphrasis of real objects and ekphrasis of imagined objects.


17. P. A. Miller 2003: 23. Miller’s book argues for the interdependence of Latin love elegy and the upheavals of the changing political and social order in this period (see also Dufalo 2003 for a specific instance of this interdependence in elegy’s transformation of a Republican oratorical trope). Janan 2001: 7, arguing against Veyne’s approach to elegy’s contradictions as a game (Veyne 1988), makes a similar appeal to elegy’s socio-historical context as the framework within which to understand the genre. D’Elia 1981: 74–75 sees two necessary conditions for the appearance of Latin love elegy: the particular forms of elite values and status that emerged in the Augustan age, and the youth of the poets themselves.

18. Cornelius Balbus was the last man outside the imperial family to celebrate a triumph, for a victory over the Garamantes in 19 BCE (Velleius Paterculus 2.51.3). See Syme 1960 (1939): 402–5 and Severy 2003: 80–81 for the general accumulation of military commands within the imperial family.

19. For example, Suetonius emphasizes in the last sentence of his biography (Aug. 101.4) that Augustus left public finances in the hands of his slaves and freedmen; see Severy’s discussion of the role of the emperor’s freedmen and slaves in administering the state (Severy 2003: 144–52). See also Syme 1960 (1939): 353–55.


23. For topographical analyses of individual poems in Book 4, see, e.g., O’Neill 2000 on elegy 4.2 and Spencer 2001 on elegy 4.9.


25. Vasaly 1993: 41. Similar treatments exist for other Roman authors; see, for example, Dyson and Prior 1995 on Roman verse satire; Jaeger 1995 on topography in the Carmina of Horace; and Scott 1997 on images of Rome in Vergil’s Aeneid.


27. D’Ambra 1998: 13 discusses “... the construction of social identity by external forces that dominate individual choices and freedoms.” Kennedy 1993: 36 offers
"... the ideology of the individual ... is a theory, an ideology, of personality which is not uncontested, and is always open to the argument that personality is not an essence which pre-exists experience, but is actively being constructed and re-constructed within the discourses in which people operate." So, for example, "Tibullus" is neither the lover nor the soldier nor the poet, but the incongruity among these three enacted roles (17). See also Elsner 1995: 125.

28. Both P. A. Miller’s and Janan’s titles encapsulate the negotiation between self and society.

29. Such studies are particularly rich for the early Roman Republic and for the Second Sophistic. See Cornell and Lomas 1997 for the Republic, and the collection of essays in Goldhill 2001 (mostly literary) and Laurence and Berry 1998 (mostly archaeological) for the Second Sophistic.


32. The epigrams of Callimachus are the closest Greek model for Latin love elegy; lyric poets also employed the elegiac meter, but without the thematic or stylistic cohesion that could constitute a genre. Propertius’ fourth book, in contrast, draws on Callimachus’ *Aitia*, itself an experimental use of the elegiac couplet.

33. See, respectively, Hallett 1973; Wyke 1987b and 1989; Greene 1995; and Sharrock 2000 for these positions.

34. This dynamic is discussed by Clausen 1964 and Cameron 1995: 454–84; DeBrohun 2003: 3–9 treats Callimacheanism in Propertius’ poetry. The numerous studies pertaining to the Callimachean program of Propertius’ fourth book will be cited in the context of the discussions below.

35. Cynthia’s social class and marital status resist easy categorization; even when she functions as a courtesan (as she perhaps does in elegies 1.3 and 2.7; see James 2003: 36–41), the poet treats his affair with her as illicit and stuck in irresolvable tensions. D’Elia 1981: 75–77 argues that in this respect the poet is on fresh ground for elegiac verse. As he points out, the disparity of Cynthia’s status and her lover’s finds no precise analogue in Callimachean love poetry; rather, this socioeconomic pairing finds its model in Roman comedy. Veyne 1988: 67–84 discusses the sort of woman the elegiac mistress could be, if real, then (85–100) posits that her specific status doesn’t really matter and need not remain consistent; for elegy’s generic game, she need only be unattainable. See Gold 1993 and P. A. Miller 2003: 7 and 61–73 for discussions of her discursive variability and the ways this variability challenges any stable categorization of the poet’s own role.


38. DeBrohun 2003 offers a sustained meditation on how “Callimachus” changes as a discursive force in Book 4’s new project.

39. The speaking door in elegy 1.16 and Gallus in elegy 1.21 perform a similar, though more limited, role in Book 1.

40. Boyle 2003.


42. Alfonsi 1979 (1945): 73–74. The other reason is that, after the Aeneid, such an undertaking would have been inopportune.
Chapter One

1. Though some critics (notably Murgia 1989) read the Propertius-Horos pair as two discrete poems, scholarly consensus overwhelmingly supports one complex poem rather than two discrete poems. I agree with the consensus; too many correspondences of theme and language link the two parts for them to be separable. See most recently P. A. Miller 2003: 186 for a compelling advocacy of unity.

2. Octavian dedicated the temple of Palatine Apollo in 28 BCE, and made his home on the Palatine in a house without pretense; thundering Jupiter alludes to the temple of Jupiter Tonans, dedicated in 22 BCE after the Princeps’ escape from a lightning strike; in 16 BCE Augustus and his stepsons Tiberius and Drusus restored the temple of Quirinus, here called the Domus Remi; and Propertius mentions the Curia, whose restoration Octavian completed in 29 BCE (it had been begun by Caesar in 44 BCE). Propertius’ reference to the Domus Remi is somewhat hard to pin down; because of the high steps it cannot refer to the Casa Romuli, which was at any rate never expanded into something grand and so would not fit the “then and now” scheme of his opening lines. Two problems with identifying it as the Temple of Quirinus are easily explained: Remi is substitution for the metrically impossible Romuli, and the speaker seems to address his hospes from a vantage point on the Palatine (ista implies some distance).


4. Weeber’s 1978 treatment of these lines argues that they stave off the demand for epic by incorporating something of Vergil’s great poem.

5. In contrast, Tibullus’ paean to the humble old village on the Tiber leads up to his fervent prayer for a new Golden Age that will restore the lifestyle of the rustic—and romanticized—past (Tibullus 2.5, and see Rothwell 1996: 829–32), while Ovid decidedly prefers Rome’s modern comforts to her ancient simplicity (Ars am. 3.115–28).


7. See Janan 2001: 134 and MacLeod 1983: 142 for this sense of estrangement. As we shall see below, in addition to its comment on Roman temporal identity, the image of the Romanus alumnus also speaks to Roman cultural identity.

8. DeBrohun 2003: 51–67. The answer Propertius provides, she argues, is that it grew through arma, a notion that casts a shadow both on the growth of the city and the parallel expansion of Propertius’ own poetry.

9. See Bing 1988: 7 and note 34.

10. See also G. Zanker 1987: 120–21, who summarizes the phenomenon thus: “aetiology was capable of being used as a vehicle for providing a much-needed sense of cultural continuity for the Greek intelligentsia resident in the newly founded city of Alexandria in the first half of the third century BC . . . this . . . will have helped alleviate the problem of cultural identity experienced by early Alexandrian Greeks.”


12. Callimachus Aet. 1.20: βρονταν οὐκ ἵμων, ἀλλὰ Διός; see below for the generic implications of this passage.

13. Boucher 1965: 124 draws attention to this allusion as one of Propertius’ strategies for rejecting a political life. Though he does not discuss it per se, the Epicurean resonance of the Vergilian passage adds fascinating depth and irony to the astrologer Horos’ advice.
14. At 4.1.55, the wolf is similarly called the best foster mother (*optima nutricum*).


16. *TLL* s.v. *alumnus* 1796.52: *alumnus ad terras, regiones, urbes, sim.* See Propertius 2.33.15 (*fuscis Aegyptus alumnis, Egypt with its dark nurslings*), 4.1.37 (*nil patrium nisi nomen Romanus habet alumnus, the Roman foster child has nothing of his ancestors except the name*), 4.2.9 (*ille [sc. Tiberis] suis tantum concessit alumnis, the Tiber granted so much land to his foster children*), and 4.3.67 (*domitis Parthae telluris alumnis, when the foster children of Parthia have been defeated*).


18. *OLD* s.v. *disponere* 1a., and see also *TLL* s.v. *disponere* 1422.44, referring specifically to architectural layout.

19. MacLeod 1983: 143–44 also points out the poet-as-founder and sees the omen-taking at 4.1.68 as part of the ritual of foundation performed by the *ktistes*. DeBrohun 2003: 42 offers another, complementary interpretation of the parallel between city-building and poetry-writing. The growth of Rome from small simple town to grand expansive city, she argues, mirrors the poet’s proposed expansion of his work from small and (relatively) simple elegy to grander and more complex etiology. She deftly adduces, among other things, the poem’s opening line, in which *hoc quocumque vides* evokes both the cityscape and the poetry scroll as it is unrolled (36).


21. For *opus* as a poetic word, see *OLD* s.v. *opus* 3a (genre) and 9c (a work of literature). For *surgo* as an architectural word, see *OLD* s.v. *surgo* 7a.

22. The famous story of Romulus’ birds is told at Livy 1.6–7.

23. See P. A. Miller 2003: 187: “The poems in Book 4 ultimately represent a crisis in naming.” By this he is referring to Propertius’ habit of exploiting the full spectrum of meanings possible in elegy’s syntax and diction, but the crisis in naming extends to the ways monuments’ names call into question other ways of understanding their meaning.

24. Though not poetic catchphrases *per se*, these images all suggest a departure from neoteric delicacy. See MacLeod 1983: 144–45. Most suggestive is the chariot, which comes from Vergil *Georgics* 2.542.


26. Richardson 1977 *ad* 4.1.134 draws attention to Propertius’ probable education for a career in politics.

27. “Matrix” is the word used throughout Conte 1986 for the horizon of expectations on the part of the reader that arise from a text’s genre, against which the features of the text may be measured.

28. Richardson 1977 *ad* 4.1.45 reads Brutus the founder, especially given the *securis*, which evoke the consulate; Camps 1965 *ad* 4.1.45 sees the tyrannicide also. The catalogue of men appears *passim* in 4.1.2–50.

29. See DeBrohun 2003: 75 n.75. The five women of the first half appear scattered through the catalogue of men, more specifically, from 4.1.21–51.


31. Wyke 1987a explores how elegy 4.1’s split-gender program manifests itself
in the multiple female perspectives—Arethusa’s, Tarpeia’s, Cynthia’s, and Cornelia’s—that follow in the rest of the book.

32. Recent examinations of the dual program of the introductory poem include Hutchinson 1984, who sees a juxtaposition of old and new that plays throughout the book; Warden 1980, who reads in the introduction and the other poems in Book 4 an alternation of aetiological and amatory poetry; Wyke 1987a, for whom gender is the shifting focus in 4.1 and throughout the book; and Stahl 1985: 255–79, for whom “war” (= Augustan) and “love” (= anti-Augustan) are the operative poles of interpretation. For J. F. Miller 1982: 381–82 with n.46, MacLeod 1983, and DeBrohun 2003: 33–85, the two halves of the poem indicate one complex rather than two discrete perspectives.

33. Perhaps Horos believes the omens failed because men have abused the gods for gain (nunc pretium fecere deos, 4.1.81); it is tempting, if fanciful, to see this accusation’s applicability to Roman temples, built to the benefit of Rome or its citizens.

34. The mention of Conon brings Callimachus directly into the poem yet again, and with him Catullus. Conon had advised the royal court that a new constellation appeared in the sky; it came to be known as the Lock of Berenice and was celebrated in Callimachus’s famous poem of that name, and in Catullus’s reworking of Callimachus’s poem (poem 66). Archytas, a mathematician, also theorized about the infinity of the universe; Horace Carm. 1.28 celebrates him. Horos’ name also links him with the sun god and master of Hellenistic poetry par excellence—Apollo—through his namesake Horos, Egyptian sun god; see DeBrohun 2003: 19–20.

35. See MacLeod 1983: 149: “The implication is that in dealing with Rome’s past Propertius would have to be a prophet of gloom as well as of gladness, to reveal how Cassandra was raped as well as what she foretold, to report impious words and deeds as well as pious ones. . . .”

36. Murgia 1989, believing that this sentiment makes no sense in Horos’ mouth, transposes this couplet to 4.1’s first half so that Cassandra utters it after 4.1.52. This transposition is not necessary: Horos speaks cryptically throughout, he responds explicitly and subtly to Propertius’ aims and claims in 4.1’s first half (contra Murgia 1989: 261: “Horos’ monologue in 71–150 can reflect no knowledge of the poem which is 1.1–70”); and Ovid’s evocation of the passage need not situate it in 4.1’s first half (again, contra Murgia 1989: 261–62).

Chapter Two

1. Indeed, elegy 2.1.5–16 employs very similar language to demonstrate the poet’s flexibility. DeBrohun 1994 reads Vertumnus’ multiformal persona as a signal of elegy’s new indecorous, amalgamated identity in Book 4. Dee 1974 sees the poikilia manifested by the god as a testament to Propertius’ self-proclaimed status as the Roman Callimachus in 4.1.69. For Shea 1988, 4.2 is a continuation of the program set out in 4.1 that elaborates on the multiple forms of the elegies that are to follow; Janan 2001: 15 and Newman 1997: 275–77 also treat the poem as programmatic. Finally, O’Neill 2000 provocatively reads Vertumnus’ urban location in Rome’s “red-light district” as a function of the poem’s—and the book’s—amatory undertones.

3. The mirror is reproduced in Marquis 1974: 498, with bibliography.

4. The consonant cluster -lt- easily shifted to -rt-. For the connection to uertere see, for example, Propertius 4.2.47, Ovid Fast. 6.409–410, and Porphyrio ad Hor. Epist. 1.20.1.


6. Colonna 1987 examines Etruscan precedents for the vocal patterns of Vertumnus’ name, but Prosdocimi and Morandi, both responding to his arguments in the same volume (68–69), see Indo-European roots for the name. Prosdocimi suggests -votos- (year) at play in the name and connects Vertumnus to the changing of the year, while Morandi sees the various meanings of the cluster -urt- (to turn, change, mix), indicating Vertumnus as a god of movement (vascolare is the word Morandi uses) and distribution (mestolo).

7. Porphyrio mentions the sacellum (ad Hor. Epist. 1.20.1).


9. Colonna 1987: 61 and figure 1; Coarelli 1992 (1983): 229–30; and see also Putnam 1967 for a precise description of the whereabouts of the monument. Cristofani, responding to Colonna 1987 in the same volume (68), argues that this dating is improbable because there was nothing in that urban sector before the Cloaca; he prefers a third-century BCE date for the signum Vortumni. Nevertheless, the bend of the canal around the monument is quite convincing. The signum’s location within the pomerium (Colonna 1981: 163) also indicates the monument’s antiquity in Rome.


11. Varro Ling. 5.46; Propertius 4.2.51. Varro’s Etruscans fought under Caele Vibenna; Propertius’ under Lycomedius (= Lucumo).


14. Cornell 1995: 156–59 demonstrates a strong Etruscan presence in (but not conquest of) Rome even before the Tarquins, and the existence of a cultural koine that allows for the horizontal mobility of Etruscans from Etruria to positions and ranks of similar prestige in Rome. His conclusions lend weight to Varro’s and Propertius’ early placement of Vertumnus in the city.

15. The goods traded on the Vicus Tuscus are too many to name here; see Aronsen in Steinby 1993–2000 s.v. Vicus Tuscus for details.


20. Fulvius Flaccus’ triumph in 264 BCE is recorded in the triumphal Fasti (Inscr. It. 13.2 547). Festus 228L tells of the painting of Fulvius Flaccus in the temple.

21. For Beard, North, and Price 1998: 132–34, Vertumnus’ arrival is a clear case of *euocatio*, and reveals an interesting shift in perspective on the practice: Vertumnus’ would be the last known *euocatio* to result in a temple in Rome itself. After 264 BCE, conquered gods might be given a temple within Roman territory, if not Rome itself, marking a shift in the definition of “Roman”; whereas for Volsciini “Roman” meant “in Rome,” afterward “Roman” meant “under Roman purview.” Orlin 1997: 15, however, cautions against overstating the occurrence of *euocatio*, and later suggests (61–63) that foreign gods almost always came to Rome via the official channels of the Senate in consultation with the Sibylline books. Orlin doesn’t consider Vertumnus’ case explicitly, but his discussion of Camillus’ dedication to Juno Regina through *euocatio* (the only case of the practice of *euocatio* explicitly stated in the sources) reveals many similarities between the two cases: both generals defeated Etruscan strongholds, both relied on key Etruscan gods already present in Rome, and both dedicated Aventine temples to these gods. Indeed, Flaccus’ act may even suggest imitation of Camillus.

22. See Haynes 2000: 328–29 and Harris 1971: 115–18 for a discussion of Rome’s political motives in 264 BCE. For the statues and their propaganda, see Pinotti 1983: 79; Gruen 1992 is an invaluable resource for the broader dynamics of cultural change in the third century. Haynes 2000: 330 records that two bases bearing Flaccus’ name and traces of bronze statues have been found in the Forum Boarium.

23. Orlin 2002 discusses the Aventine, which lies between the Pomerium and the city walls, as a liminal space that marks the transition of foreign cults into Roman ideology.


26. Plebeian secession to the Aventine is noted by Livy at 2.32 and 3.50. For the *lex Icilia* see Dionysius of Halicarnassus 10.31–32 and Livy 3.31.1.

27. Livy 1.45. Dionysius of Halicarnassus 10.32 reveals that the plebs kept their treasury in the *aedes Dianae*, making it doubly marginalized as a plebeian and foreign place. For Diana’s *dies natalis*, see Degrassi 1963: 494–96.


30. Clothing given to the Manneken Pis, often bestowed upon it by visiting dignitaries, is kept by the state. We do not know what became of clothing and offerings left at Vertumnus’ statue.


32. Umbria had long ago been absorbed into Etruscan territory, and Propertius himself seems to consider Umbria and Tuscany interchangeable; see, e.g., 1.22.6 (*Etrusca*) and 1.22.9 (*Umbria*).

33. Wyke 1987a: 156. Elegy 3.2.9 names both gods as Propertius’ inspiration, and he writes hymns to each as well: 3.17 celebrates Bacchus, while 4.6 sings of Apollo.

34. Shea 1988 catalogues the poem’s self-conscious literary puns, as Vertumnus speaks of his forms (characters, 4.2.1) and body (of work, 4.2.1), his signs (seals, 4.2.2), index (summary, 4.2.19), and figures (of rhetoric, 4.2.21).
35. Dee 1974. Other hallmarks of Callimacheanism appear in the poem, such as the epigrammatic trope of addressing a passerby and, of course, etymologies.
37. Wyke 1987a: 156–57 and DeBrohun 1994: 53–56. Both scholars use the word "bipolar," though to different ends. For Wyke Vertumnus contributes to "a bipolar poetics, a programme comprising surprising and sometimes playful transformations of narrative voice and a range of elegiac tones" (157). For DeBrohun, Vertumnus seems to model the "bipolar poetics of Book IV" (54) in that his "wardrobe changes serve as an enabling strategy that allows the wearer to change from one identity to another, even its polar opposite" (55). In DeBrohun’s reading, this bipolarity heralds not a new blended decorum for elegy but rather a meeting place between two usually incompatible poetic ideals (62, expanded in DeBrohun 2003: 172–75).
40. Marquis 1974 and Pinotti 1983 both stress the god’s diverse ethnic heritage, as I do, and discuss some of the same passages in the poem as hallmarks of this diversity. Marquis’ primary interest is in the diversity of Roman religious practices, not in Vertumnus’ monument. Pinotti reads the poem as a paean to Rome’s assimilation of other people that treads a delicate line between conformity with Augustan ideals and anti-conformity. It will be apparent from my notes the debt I owe to these two articles.
41. Propertius’ language in this poem lends support to the theory, discussed above, that Vertumnus’ official arrival resulted from an euocatio: Vertumnus’ language at 4.2.4 recalls the ritualistic formula for euocatio as found in Macrobius Sat. 3.9.7–8. The resonance is discussed in Pinotti 1983: 79.
42. For Suits 1969: 486, the nuance is somewhat different: Vertumnus is proud to have an older Roman connection than his Aventine counterpart, and proud not to have deserted his original fatherland. Marquis 1974: 493–94 likewise reads this episode somewhat differently; Vertumnus had been in Rome so long that he had become naturalized by 264 BCE and did not mind becoming officially Roman at that time. To Pinotti 1983, Vertumnus’ preference for a statue rather than an ivory temple straddles the delicate line of conformity; by rejecting the ivory triumphal temple Vertumnus avoids celebrating the achievements of the gens Fulvia, so recently connected to Antony; yet he simultaneously shows distaste for the splendid new Augustan monuments, such as the temple of Palatine Apollo. Boucher 1965: 147–48 explains the poet’s choice of Vicus Tuscus Vertumnus over Aventine Vertumnus in terms of its resonance with daily rather than public life; the statue’s antiquity lends it an accessible “charme particulier” (148).
43. Propertius probably leaned heavily on the Varronian tradition, but it is important to recall that Propertius’ poem is a construction whose truth need not trade in factual accuracy; see Feeney 1998: 176. Interestingly, Varro adds a different Sabine element to the story, saying he was introduced to Rome by Titus Tatius, who built his first altar there: et aerae Sabinum linguam olent, quae Tati Regis uoto sunt Romae dedicatae; nam, ut annales dicunt, novit Opi, Florae, Veiiovi Saturnoique . . . idem Larundae, Termino, Quirino, Vertumno (and the altars indicate the language of the Sabines, altars that were dedicated at Rome in fulfillment of a vow of Titus Tatius when he was king; as the annals say, he dedicated to Ops, Flora, Veiovis and
Saturn, Larunda, Terminus, Quirinus, Vertumnus; Ling. 5.74).

44. For Marquis 1974: 494 n. 14, these lines evoke 4.1.31, where Propertius counts as the three original elements of Rome the Sabines, the Romans, and the Etruscans.

45. Here I accept Postgate’s emendation credis id along with Camps 1965 and Fedeli 1984, rather than Barber’s 1960 (1953) credidit (accepted also by Richardson 1977), which, though attested in the best manuscripts, necessitates a lacuna. Credis preserves the epigrammatic feeling of the poem, with Vertumnus continuing to address passersby, and I find seu an unproblematic conjunction since it connects two etymologies in 4.2.9–10 and 11–12.


49. Hardie 1998: 34. For Thomas 1982: 36–51, this passage emphasizes the costs of Roman expansion to Italy or, as he puts it in his commentary on the laudes (1988 ad 2.136–76), the result of “civilized man imposing his will on a natural, innocent or unwarlike world.” Similarly Ross 1987: 215–19 sees the Italian Golden Age as a fiction. On the other side, Miles 1980: 119–29 and Gale 2000: 214–19 see the exaggerated praise of Italy as encomiastic or, at least, as a fantasy that encourages a sense of wonder. Still others refuse to choose between Vergil’s celebration of Italy and the imperialism so closely connected with it (Perkell 1989: 100–7; Boyle 1986: 83–84).

50. See above for a discussion of Vertumnus’ name; Devoto 1940 is especially helpful.

51. Cicero Leg. 1.5: Ego mehercule et illi et omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram ciuitatis (I believe, by god, that he—and all citizens—have two fatherlands: one is the fatherland of their birth, the other is the land of their citizenship). Set in the countryside near Arpinum, this dialogue between Cicero, Atticus, and Quintus dramatizes the combination of Roman and municipal identity.

52. Johnson 2001: 7. The converse to the ambivalent émigré is the non-Roman who wants to be fully Roman—a phenomenon that is patently Roman in its perspective, given our sources. “Sidonian Dido” as examined by Hexter 1992 explores how easy it is for the Roman or Romanized reader to read Vergil’s Dido as one such eager proto-Roman, while reading her as such ignores Vergil’s hints and teasers about her Tyrian roots.

53. Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus is a perfect example of the blending of natal and adopted identity.


55. For signa as a poetic plural for signum Vortumni see Marquis 1974: 492 (along with acerbic note 6) and Rothstein 1898 ad 4.2.2. For signa as indicia, see Suits 1969: 381 and Camps 1965 ad 4.2.2.


57. See Varro Ling. 6.78: fictor cum dicit “fingo,” figuram imponit (when a designer says “I shape” he imposes a shape).

58. See Suits 1969 for the Priapea as a background text for this poem.


60. Hardie 1992: 75.
Chapter Three

1. Varro Ling. 5.41; Livy 1.10; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2.38ff. (who cites Fabius Pictor [fr. 8P] and Cincius [fr. 5P]); Ovid Fast. 1.260–61 and Met. 14.776–77; Valerius Maximus 9.6.1; and Plutarch Rom. 17 (citing Antigonus, FGrH 816 F2) all support the traditional version. The traditional version also appears in a relief sculpture from the Basilica Aemilia, and on two coins: a Republican denarius from the Social War (RRC 244.2a–c with plate 45.7), and another denarius from the Augustan age (BMCRE 1.29–31 with plate 1.16).

2. See Richardson 1992 s.v. Tarpeia Rupes for a list of ancient sources that mention this feature of the rock.

3. A systematic discussion of the growth and use of Tarpeia’s legend is much needed. Two such studies have appeared but are outdated and narrowly focused (Dumézil 1947 and Gansiniec 1949). A better model is Wiseman 1995.

4. Calpurnius Piso apud Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2.40, the first source to mention her veneration, puzzles over it. In order to explain the discrepancy between Tarpeia’s treason and her veneration at Rome, Piso exonerates Tarpeia by making her a double agent. Also, Festus 496L mentions a statue to Tarpeia in the vicinity of the Temple to Jupiter Stator, but no vestiges of this remain and its date is unknown; Festus’ statue also indicates a version of the myth that does not condemn Tarpeia.

5. Varro Ling. 5.41.

6. Plutarch Rom. 17 offers this option without attributing it to anyone in particular.

7. Simylus’ elegy is quoted in Plutarch Rom. 17.5.

8. The “betrayal-for-love” motif, analogous as it is to many Greek myths, seems older than the “betrayal-for-greed” motif found in the traditional Roman version, and perhaps indicates Greek origins for Tarpeia’s myth. See Hubbard 1975: 119–21 and Bremmer and Horsfall 1987: 68–70. As Bremmer and Horsfall suggest, Simylus’ amorous Tarpeia and the contextualization of her treason during the Gallic sack may indicate that his elegy preserves an earlier version of her myth than that found in other sources. This version was then supplanted by the story of Manlius and the geese, and the myth of Tarpeia was retrojected to the Sabine wars. As Bremmer and Horsfall note, however, this reconstruction must remain conjecture and does not in any case, require Simylus’ elegy to predate Propertius’.

9. RRC 244/2a–c with plate 45.7.

10. For a renewed Sabine synoikism, see Morel 1962: 36. For a call to Sabine nationalism, see Gansiniec 1949: 25. In both cases Titurius’ cognomen Sabinus seems to indicate Sabine sympathy. For a pro-Roman interpretation of the coin, see Evans 1992: 124–25.

11. See Cicero Att. 4.16.8 for the elder Aemilius’ restoration; Plutarch Caesar 29 mentions Caesar’s involvement; and Cassius Dio 49.42 covers the dedication by the younger Aemilius.

12. A full description of all parts of the frieze is given in Carettoni 1961. Most scholars date the frieze to the Julio/Aemilian restoration of 55–34 BCE; others see the frieze as a new creation of the Augustan age. For the earlier dating, see Carettoni 1961: 65; Arya 1996; and Albertson 1990. For the Augustan date, see

13. Grimal 1951: 212–14 and 1953: 26–27. He sees this connection operative in Propertius’ poem and reads the poem as laudatory of Augustus, but the Sabine-Numa connection is more applicable to the Julian use of the legend. As Albertson 1990 notes, the frieze as a whole seems to celebrate not only Romulus as an ideal king, but also Rome’s evolving calendar—both themes that were pertinent to Caesar’s rule.

14. BMCRE 1.29–31 with plate 1.16. Turpilianus’ coin is clearly modeled on the earlier denarius by L. Titurius Sabinus.

15. See Morel 1962: 38 for Turpilianus’ Sabine roots. The pun may be at work in Propertius’ elegy, 4.4.1, Tarpeium nemus et Tarpeiae turpe sepulchrum (I shall tell of] Tarpeia’s grove and Tarpeia’s shameful grave). More on this pun later.


18. See Kampen 1991b: 455–58, who includes the frieze as an Augustan innovation.


20. The Ara Pacis is the other conspicuous example of monumental women in Rome; this coincidence lends some support to Kampen’s dating of the fragments to the Augustan rather than Julian period (Kampen 1991b: 450). See also Kleiner 1978, who argues that the women on the Ara Pacis are represented in their traditional, familial roles. They would thus also reinforce the marriage legislation.


23. For the gendered ambiguity of the erotic gaze see especially Kampen 1996b: 20–21.


25. The message about the danger of unregulated female conduct was all the more emphatic in the context of the Basilica’s other decorations. The Basilica had already been adorned with metal shields by Lepidus, its restorer in 78 BCE (for which see Favro 1996: 189). Given the prevailing explanation for Tarpeia’s death (namely, that she was crushed by the shields of Tatius’ troops) and the ideological association of the Cliqueus Virtutis or Shield of Virtue, with Augustus after 27 BCE (Res Gestae 4.2), Tarpeia’s resonance was complex: the Princeps, with his shield of Roman morality, would crush any such threat to Rome’s greatness.


27. Warden 1980: 108–9 links the reader’s sympathy for Tarpeia and understanding of her dilemma with the shift of focalization the poem offers. Readers understand, in the frame of the poem, that Tarpeia’s love constitutes sacrilege, but through her monologue they come to “experience the vitality of Tarpeia’s love” (109).

28. Here I disagree with Tissol 1997: 149, who sees Propertius’ Tarpeia as a naïve girl who deceives herself by ignoring Scylla’s punishment, though she acknowledges her illicit love.
29. *Amor* and *Roma* are common terms in Propertian scholarship, generally applied to elegiac values or themes (*Amor*) and patriotic values or themes, including aetiology (*Roma*). See, for example, Wyke 1987a and DeBrohun 2003: 22–24 for the ways these two forms of discourse meet within poems.

30. Perrone 1991 defends persuasively the emendation of the manuscripts’ *esse* to *ora* in 4.4.34, citing comparanda, paleographic plausibility, and the good sense required by the text (*esse* would render the couplet repetitive of the one before).

31. I prefer Camps’ emendation of *nuptae* to *nupta* at 4.4.59 and his revised punctuation; the meaning remains the same, while the grammar is decidedly less awkward (Camps 1965 ad 4.4.59–60).

32. As DeBrohun 2003: 194 points out, Tarpeia’s elision of her wedding clothes with her Vestal costume illuminates her own precarious situation and the uneasy mingling of *Amor* and *Roma* in Book 4 generally. In her reading, *molliet* adds an elegiac touch to martial Tatius.

33. Miles 1995: 211–19 discusses how the Roman myth of the Sabine women and the marriage legislation of Augustus promote marriage as an institution with greater societal than personal impact. See also Treggiari 1991: 90–94 for a more concrete expression of this desire.


35. Propertius 2.7 is the most explicit statement of this disdain.

36. Livy 1.4.

37. Ovid *Fast.* 3.11–24 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.77.1.

38. Richardson 1977; Goold 1990.

39. Richardson 1977 ad 4.4.69–70.

40. So too is Tarpeia’s broken water jar, according to Janan 2001: 74. Like the water that slips out of the broken jar, Tarpeia’s sexuality escapes the confines of her priesthood. For Stahl 1985: 283, the tension is best expressed in Propertius’ description of Tarpeia as a *mala puella* 4.4.17. The elegiac *puella* (as opposed to a *uirgo*) has sexual potential that she devotes to her lover. Were Tarpeia to break faith with the goddess she serves, she would be a bad (i.e., disobedient) mistress. Reading *mala puella* another way, unable to fulfill this sexual potential, Tarpeia is a bad (i.e., unaccomplished) mistress.


42. Miller and Platter 1999: 453.


44. Richardson 1977 ad 4.4.3–14.

45. Livy 1.55.5 gives as an etymology for the Capitol an actual head found there. Edwards 1996: 69–95, in her chapter “The City of Empire,” discusses the religious and military messages the hill delivered to Romans, their subjects, their clients, and their enemies. See also Jaeger 1993 for the continued symbolic importance of the Capitol in Livy’s day.

46. Though the Gauls had come close to occupying it, the Capitol had never been occupied by enemies (Livy 5.33ff.). Horace even describes eternity in terms of this hill in his famous *Carm.* 3.30, *usque ego postera / crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium // scandet cum tacita uirgine pontifex* (I shall grow fresh with future praise, as long as the Pontifex with the silent Vestal Virgin climbs the Capitol).

47. For this phenomenon, see Stambaugh 1988: 243–86. Cosa boasts an *arx*-style
Capitol; Timgad, a flat version.

48. Stehle 1989 discusses the “triumphal” arrival of two goddesses, Venus Erycina and Cybele, into Rome. The symbolic procession of these goddesses into the city to the location of their new Roman sanctuaries—in Venus’ case, on the Capitol—resembled the triumphal ceremony in form and purpose. Tarpeia’s journey down the Capitol reverses that procedure.

49. There may be multiple puns in this first line. Boyd 1984 sees se-pulchrum as its own play on turpe, with the privative se- commenting on Tarpeia’s shameful situation. Tarpeiae turpe sepulchrum may also joke at the moneyer Turpilianus’ name. Wallace-Hadrill 1986: 77 sees the pun operating in the other direction: Tarpeia’s appearance on his coin puns Turpilianus’ own name. However this pun operates, such multivalent play on names recalls, again, Vertumnus in elegy 4.2.

50. Tatius’ camp encloses either the Lacus Iuturnus or the Tullian Spring. Camps 1965 ad 4.4.14 seems to opt for the former, while Richardson 1977 ad 4.1.3–14 clearly opts for the latter. Richardson’s reasons are more compelling; it would be easy to encircle the Tullian Spring within a camp at the site of the future Curia.

51. Camps 1965 and Goold 1990 both print scelus.

52. Stahl 1985: 282–83. He finds the same contrast between “(Julian) arms and (pastoral) lover” in 2.34, a poem that values Vergil’s Eclogues higher than his Aeneid (283).

53. See chapter 1 above for a discussion of the old-and-new Rome in elegy 4.1. Specific military and political monuments are situated in the proto-Roman pastoral landscape: the temple of Palatine Apollo (4.1.3), the Curia (4.1.11–12), and the house of Romulus (4.1.9–10). As noted in chapter 2 above, the characters that appear in 4.1’s first half are, by and large, male figures from Roman history or women serving masculine interests. Even Tarpeia occurs in masculine form as Tarpeiusque pater (4.1.7), a name for Jupiter.


55. Suetonius Aug. 29.2.


57. OLD s.v. proludere 1a.

58. For ludere as an erotic and poetic word, see, for example, Catullus 50.2. If Grimal 1951: 208 is correct that Propertius’ readers would understand sporting Tatius as a prototype for Caesar’s equestrian statue, then Tarpeia’s interpretation of Tatius’ activity is all the more misguided.

59. As O’Neill 1995 has shown, Tarpeia’s urn acts as a metaphor for the more onerous, patriotic poetry Propertius eschewed in Books 1–3. When Tarpeia drops the urn, she rejects (consciously or not) her role as subject in such weighty nationalistic discourse and becomes the lover she wants to be.

60. In elegy 1.3, the lover adorns the sleeping Cynthia so as to create an erotic tableau that matches his feelings. He, like Tarpeia, is transfixed by his gaze upon the tableau. See Valladares 2001.

61. See above, note 31, for the textual emendation.


63. For Boucher 1965: 148, Tarpeia’s punishment keeps the myth’s moral intact, despite the elegiac focus on her amorous intentions.
64. From the Capitol: 4.4.29–30: ab arce . . . uicino . . . Ioui. To the Forum: hinc, 4.4.15.
65. The reader recalls that Ariadne, too, would be abandoned by the lover she helped. This is nowhere explicit in Tarpeia’s mention of Ariadne, but as Whitaker 1983: 164 notes in summarizing the use of myth in Propertius (he does not discuss Tarpeia), “ . . . we expect to find, and frequently do in fact find, other subtle and allusive links between the two.”
66. murus erant montes (4.4.13) suggests the flatness of the valley where Tatius is encamped, and patriamque iacentem 4.4.87 hints at the flatness of the Capitol where the Romans are encamped.
67. Stahl 1985: 285 says this of Tarpeia’s urban incongruity: “Tarpeia’s thoughts are not at home in her country, but in an apolitical, individual, lyrical and pastoral world of her wishes.” Janan 2001: 78 discusses the contribution the Maenad/Amazon simile (4.4.71–72) makes to the poem’s surreal landscape. Why, Janan wonders, is a woman from Strymon running along the banks of the Thermodon? “Always, before thought can overtake it in this poem, the feminine is already elsewhere” (78). Warden 1978 also sees a spatial dimension to this simile, for the Maenad “bursts forth from her house out into the streets, the movement expressing as it were the making public of private emotions” (181). In her urban incongruity Tarpeia is like the women of the second half of poem 4.1 (see chapter 1 above), who find themselves in a poem whose climax and primary message is “Avoid the Forum” (4.1.134).
70. She cites Ariadne and Scylla, blending variants of Scylla’s myths to suit her amatory purposes. Her frequently shifting thoughts and her abrupt transitions are the effects of her heightened emotion and the tensions of her situation.
71. Her path is narrow and difficult, and she pursues trickling, not gushing, water; cf. Callimachus Hymn 2.108–12. For a fuller discussion of these nuances, see King 1990.
72. Other models include Ariadne’s extended complaint in Catullus 64 and some of Dido’s speeches in the Aeneid (such as Aen. 4.590–629). Indeed, Tarpeia’s mention of Ariadne may be an allusion to Catullus’ poem. Boyd 1984: 86 with note 6; Tissot 1997: 143–53; and Wyke 1987a: 163 all discuss the literary pedigree of the Tarpeia elegy.

Chapter Four

3. See Barchiesi 2003: 2 for a discussion of this unique opportunity presented in our sources; he offers by way of example the different pictures Propertius and Ovid present for the Danaid portico, even though they mention the same decorative features (Danaids, Danaus, columns, etc.).
4. The vow at Naulochus is common tradition, found in Velleius 2.81.3 and Cassius Dio 49.15.5. Several Fasti attest its dedication date (CIL 1.316, 325 and 329 = the Fasti Praenestini, Amiterni, and Antiates, respectively).

5. For citations about all aspects of the temple, see Gros in Steinby 1993–2000 s.v. Apollo Palatinus.


8. See Galinsky’s discussion of this dimension of the complex (Galinsky 1996: 219–20).

9. For the Danaid-portico, see Propertius 2.31.4; Ovid Am. 2.2.3–4, Tr. 3.1.60–62; Ovid Ars am. 1.73–74. In the latter two texts Ovid also mentions Danaus with unsheathed sword. Their husbands, the sons of Aegyptus, are attested by the scholiast for Perseus 2.55–56, cited in Bo’s 1969 edition ad loc. The altar group is mentioned in Propertius 2.31.7–8; Pliny HN 34.17 alludes indirectly to the altar group, mentioning a heifer of Myron that was celebrated in familiar poetry.

10. Suetonius Aug. 29.3 and Cassius Dio 53.1.3 tell us about the library; Porphyry ad Horace Epist. 2.1.214–18 attests to the statues of authors displayed there.

11. For the ramp to Augustus’ house, see Carettoni 1988: 264 with figures 154–55. The park is attested by Solinus 1.18 (silua quae est in area Apollinis) and may or may not be part of the original complex.

12. P. Zanker 1983: 23–24. Vermeule 1977: 50 also sees this architecture as a transition piece between the Hellenistic complexes and later imperial complexes, such as Athens’ Hadrianic Olympieion.

13. Late sources even mention a statue of Augustus with the attributes of Apollo in the context of the library. Camps 1967 ad 2.31.5–6 cites the scholiast for Horace Epist. 1.3.17: sibi posuerat effigiem habitu ac statura Apollinis (he had erected here a likeness of himself in the dress and posture of Apollo). See also Servius on Ecl. 4.10 (Vergil: tuus iam regnat Apollo; Servius: et tangit Augustum, cui simulacrum factum est cum Apollinis cunctis imaginibus [Vergil: your Apollo already reigns; Servius: And here he means Augustus, whose portrait was made with all the features of Apollo]).

14. Octavian’s other early building projects assert the same theme. Octavian’s mausoleum, built by 28 BCE, for example, attests his desire for burial in Rome (tradition) and evokes Hellenistic mausolea (innovation), such as the famous eponymous tomb of Mausolus at Halicarnassus. See P. Zanker 1983: 24–25 for the Roman context of the temple.

15. Candilio in Anderson, Giuliano, and Nista 1989: 85 discusses the stylistic resonance of the Danaid type and its analogue, the bronze Herculaneum dancers.

16. Apollo with his lyre may recall Euphranor’s fourth-century BCE sculpture from the Metron in Athens.

17. Gros in Steinby 1993–2000 s.v. Apollo Palatinus. Standing behind Apollo on the Sorrento base is the Sibyl, handing over her books into his keeping. The Sibyline books were kept in the temple sometime after 12 BCE (Suetonius Aug. 31.4).

18. Barchiesi 2003: 5–6 draws attention to the additional polysemy inherent in the use of—and more importantly, the description of the use of—Greek artworks in Rome.

and Horace *Ars poetica* to illuminate the confluence of literary, ethical, and visual values in the Augustan age. I would add Vitruvius' *De architectura* to his list.

20. His use of obelisks, especially the use of one as the gnomon of his famous and complicated solarium, inserts the Princeps into Roman space and time and likens his own role to that of the Hellenistic ruler-king. See, for example, P. Zanker 1988: 184.


22. Kellum 1993 (1986): 80–81 discusses this resonance; the Danaids and their fiancés are Greeks living in Egypt, like Cleopatra, and some ancient sources give Cleopatra as the name of one of the Danaids. According to Vermeule 1977: 49, Lanciani, collecting evidence for these decorations, confirmed the presence of columns of *giallo antico* and of the group of the Danaids; around three centuries earlier, some twenty Danaid torsos had been found on the spot but were mistaken for Amazons, who would ironically have fit just as well with the decorative scheme of the complex.

23. The waterbearers in *nero antico* currently in the Antiquario Palatino may be these Danaids, or may be replicas of a slightly later Julio-Claudian date. See P. Zanker 1983: 27 and Candilio in Anderson, Giuliano, and Nista 1989: 85–90.

24. This is the interpretation of LeFèvre 1989: 24 and later of Spence 1991: 14. Fowler 1991: 30 points out one serious problem with this interpretation—namely, that it is difficult to separate the Danaids from their guilt, even in (especially in) Augustan literature.

25. P. Zanker 1983: 30 posits this interpretation, and cf. Kellum 1993 (1986): 81: “In broader terms, however, these statues in the temple portico served not only as Cleopatra surrogates, but as an ultimate symbol of fratricide and civil war.”


27. *BMCRE* 1.95 with plate 3.15. Slightly later coins from the imperial mint at Lugdunum seem to depict the same Apollo, though he lacks the platform with rostra; see *BMCRE* 1.459–62 with plate 11.7–9, and 478–86 with plate 12.1, 3–8. The reverse of both coins boasts Apollo *citharoedus* with plectrum and lyre and the legend ACT below.

28. P. Zanker 1983: 31. Alternately, as Kellum 1993 (1986): 82 believes, the coin could depict the cult image within the temple, which Propertius also describes in process of song. To Gros in Steinby 1993–2000 s.v. Apollo Palatinus, the coin more likely represents the victory monument at Nicopolis.

29. Gurval 1995: 279–91 argues against the identification of Apollo on Antistius Vetus’ coin as the courtyard’s god based on the incongruities between it and Propertius’ description.

30. See, for example, Kellum 1993 (1986): 77–79.

31. While she admits their Actian evocation, Strazzulla 1990 is cautious about reading the temple’s terracottas as unequivocally Actian. For additional resonance of the gorgoneion, for example, see Strazzula 1990: 30.


34. Boucher 1965: 49 rightly notes that the semi-religious, ideal tone of Horace’s poem befits his lyric genre, while Propertius’ elegy effaces the fact that the place is, indeed, a temple.
35. Though Cynthia’s name is not mentioned, she may be assumed to be the addressee. The fact that she is addressed in the last line of elegy 2.30 reinforces the impression.

36. See Fowler 1991 for a discussion on the ways ekphrasis intersects with narratology, and see the discussion of focalization in the introductory chapter above.

37. Richardson 1977: *ad* 2.31, introductory note.

38. Cf. Vergil *G.* 3.16, which accomplishes the same thing: *in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit* (in the middle will be my Caesar and he will inhabit the temple) holds Caesar in the middle of the line as he will be in the temple.


40. See, above, note 13.

41. Ovid calls them an *agmen* at *Am.* 2.2.4; the two elegists’ passages together suggest they perhaps overwhelmed the courtyard.

42. Richardson 1977 *ad* 2.31.4.

43. Richardson 1977 *ad* 2.31.7, citing Pliny *HN* 34.57 and Petronius 88.

44. Though Vergil’s temple is surely a metaphor for the epic poem he has in mind (Thomas 1988 *ad* 3.34), several details of the description evoke the Augustan building program. Barchiesi 1997b: 273 and Spence 1991: 14 both read the poem to *Georgics* 3 as a text in part about Apollo’s new temple, then under construction.


46. As Gurval 1995: 130–31 points out, only here does Propertius evoke victory and defeat, and only to lament the vanquished.

47. Indeed, Apollo has replaced Cynthia as a source of inspiration. See 2.1.3–4: *non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo. / ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit* (Calliope doesn’t sing these things to me, nor does Apollo. My girlfriend creates all my inspiration).

48. Camps and Richardson 1977, for example, both in their introductory notes to 2.32, transpose something to smooth the transition (Camps delays 2.32.1–2 until after 2.32.9–10 and divides the poem; Richardson advances 2.32.7–8 to the beginning of the poem but retains the poem’s unity).

49. Barchiesi 2003: 2 advises that “when we use Propertius to reconstruct the figurative program we should also pay attention to allusion and intertextuality.” He goes on to discuss the complex reworking of Niobe drawn from Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo* and Propertius elegy 2.31.

50. The poet’s earlier scorn for Actian themes is most explicit in elegy 2.1; P. A. Miller 2003: 203–4 sees this detail as an indication of the contrast between the approach of the subjective elegist in 2.1 and that of the displaced subject in 4.6.

51. See the critical treatments mentioned in note 1, above, with the exception of those of Cairns, Grimal, and Fedeli. Miller 2003: 204–5 explores the limitations of applying the terms “patriotic” or “unpatriotic” to this poem.

52. This is the sustained argument of Gurval’s 1995 book *Actium and Augustus*: that Actium was not necessarily the turning point, nor was it immediately understood as such, but that in the decades following the battle it took on new meaning as a crux between the old order and the new.

53. Arkins 1989: 248 draws attention to the ways this line defamiliarizes language, thus also defamiliarizing the battle of Actium which had become, as Arkins asserts, yesterday’s news (246–47).

54. This monument, described by Strabo 7.7.6, burned soon after it was erected;
Strabo’s report relies on hearsay.
56. Mader 1990 passim.
57. For DeBrohun 2003: 222–23, loose-tressed Apollo calls to mind the Apollo who fosters elegiac poetry, in contrast to fierce-faced Apollo of epic poetry. Boucher 1965: 52–53, noting the existence of warrior Apollos in Greek art, proposes the possibility that a real artwork lay behind elegy 4.6’s fierce Apollo.
58. Mader 1990: 325 mistakenly suggests that both Apollos, doctus and heroicus, were present in the complex (doctus outside, heroicus inside).
59. Barber 1960 (1953) does not capitalize this word, but, as described above, I believe it must in this context evoke the official title of Rome’s first man.
60. See P. A. Miller 2003: 205–7 for an interesting discussion about the problems that arise from Propertius’ backward-flowing consequentiality in this poem.
61. This is a common interpretation of the name change of 27 BCE. See, for example, Syme 1960 (1939): 313.
62. See 4.1.9.
64. In light of the poem’s two puns on the name “Remus,” the repeat reader might see disturbing humor also in the poem’s programmatic statement, Musa, Palatini referens Apollinis aedem (4.6.11).
65. The word moritura also links Cleopatra with Dido; it is almost Dido’s epithet in Aen. 4, appearing four times in the same form: 4.308, 4.415, 4.519, and 4.664.
66. Richardson 1977 ad 4.6.67 notes the confusion, but no one has made much of Propertius’ periphrasis.
68. These are catalogued by J. F. Miller 1982. Miller is more cautious than I about the relationship between the poems: “We cannot insist on these ‘echoes’ too strongly, but it is still reasonable to say, in light of the other parallels between the two works, that Propertius probably used hy. 2 as a precedent for his poetic proclamation in a ritual context” (395).
69. See Haslam 1993 on Hymn 2.
72. See, for example, elegy 2.10.10, where Propertius had called the cithara his own instrument.
73. See also DeBrohun 2003: 220–25 and 233, who sees in the exchange of costume a comment on the new habit of elegy in Book 4; in her reading, even with his bow set down the god is still Apollo victor, a symbol of elegy’s uncomfortable adjustment to grander themes.
74. Most MSS read perque, but the emendation seems necessary and felicitous. See Richardson 1977 ad 4.6.74.
75. Calame 1993: 51 notes these instances, calling them the “musical isopy.” Calame’s words on these correspondences are suitable to Propertius’ poem, mutatis mutandis: “So the celebrated programmatic scene where, kicking Phthonos back, Apollo opposes the river-song to the poetic drops of water from a pure source is equally an echo of the killing of the monster plaguing the site of the future sanctuary at Delphi.”
Notes to Chapter Five

76. Fedeli 1984 *ad loc.* emends to *tu deus,* against the manuscript tradition, and is supported by Lentano 2002, who argues that the line reveals a cultural anxiety over paternity and identity. Propertius’ playfulness and tongue-in-cheek attitude toward the powers that be lend support, in my mind, to the manuscript tradition. P. A. Miller 2003: 207–8 discusses the ideological reasons for emendation.

77. This word rings loudly against the erotic *fides* expressed by Cynthia at 4.7.53; for the contrast, see Janan 2001: 101.

**Chapter Five**

4. This date is attested in the Fasti Amiterni (*CIL* 1.244):

   HERCVLI · INVICTO · AD · CIRCVM · MAXIM

   Rites to Hercules Invictus at his sanctuary next to the Circus Maximus.

5. For the triple triumph see the Fasti Antiati (*CIL* 12.248):

   AVGST[VS] · TRIVMP[HAVIT]

   Augustus celebrated a triumph,

   and the Tabula Barberiniana (*CIL* 1.77):

   IMP · CAESAR · DE · DALMA[TI]S · EID · SEX
   TRIVMPH · PALMAM · DEDIT
   IMP · CAESAR · [EX · AEGY]PTO · XIIX · K · SEPT
   TRIVMP[H]AVIT

   Imperator Caesar celebrated a triumph over the Dalmatians on the Ides of Sextilis (August). He offered the palm branch. On the 18th day before the Kalends of September Imperator Caesar celebrated a triumph over Egypt.

6. Triumphators even clothed one of the Forum Boarium’s many statues of Hercules in triumphal garb for the procession, and victors sometimes dedicated new statues or altars to the god. See Coarelli 1988: 165 for a discussion of the role of Hercules in the triumphal celebration, and Fox 1998 for a discussion of Hercules as a model imperialist.

8. See P. Zanker 1988: 44–45 and Gurval 1995: 92–93 for a collection and discussion of the sources for this association. The connection between Antony and Hercules appears in ancient literary sources (Appian B. Civ. 3.16–19 and Plutarch Ant., passim), on coinage (RRC 494/2a with plate 58.23, with Antony on the obverse and Anton on the reverse), and in sculpture (preserved in a carved ring from Pompeii and perhaps at play in the lost De Antoniis status of Messala Corvinus, partisan of Octavian in the thirties; see P. Zanker 1988: 58). Though Gurval argues that the connection was within the bounds of Roman tradition and need not imply any political aims, I agree with Zanker that the cultivation of the association, particularly its Alexandrian precedent, was politically motivated.

9. See chapter 4, above, for the Actian nuances of the temple complex.

10. Thus Galinsky 1996: 222–24. I am grateful to John Pollini for pointing out to me that previous representations of this episode show the demigod running away with the tripod, such as is seen on the red figure vase from Vulci by the Berlin painter, or on the relief from the Siphnian treasury at Delphi. See Flacelière and Devambez 1966: 93–95 with figs. XI (1) and XI (2). Hercules’ revised pose and calm stance in these reliefs suggest reconciliation rather than opposition.

11. It is even possible that the Princeps restored the Ara Maxima in the early 20s BCE among the 80-odd other unnamed shrines he mentions restoring in Res Gestae 20.4. For a contrasting view, see Huttner 1997, who denies any official or deliberate connection between the Princeps and Hercules.


13. At [Aurelius Victor] Origo gentis Romanæ 8.5, the exclusion of women from worship at the Ara Maxima is coextensive with its control by the patrician Potitii and Pinarii. According to this source, Appius Claudius Caecus used bribery to change both restrictions. This account suggests that at some time the stricture against women was lifted. See Schultz 2000: 296 with note 23, and see also Mueller 2002 for a discussion of the mythic dimensions of the cultic changes in 312 BCE as the product of Augustan-age concerns over the extinction of gentes.

14. See most recently Fredrick 2002 about the connection between masculinity and nationalism in Augustan images. For another version, see Kellum 1997.

15. Janan 1998 demonstrates this connection in Vergil’s action of the Ara Maxima, and see also Fox 1998 for the linkage of Hercules with masculinity and imperialism in other Augustan sources.


17. Galinsky 1972: 241 mentions this relationship in the reverse order: “it is hardly accidental that Octavian scheduled his great triple triumph on the day of the official annual festival of Hercules at the Ara Maxima... it is exactly on this day that Vergil has his Aeneas arrive at the site of Rome and, on that occasion, he develops most extensively the analogies between his own hero and the greatest hero of the Greeks.”

19. Ampliorem also signals the possible origins of Augustus’ name from augeo.

20. Brouwer 1989 is a convenient collection of all the sources regarding this goddess and her worship.


22. Flory 1984: 318 n. 29 suggests that the women had to be *uniuirae,* but this is unlikely. Livia, for example, would thus be excluded.

23. Social status may also have motivated Clodius’ intrusion; he may have wished to assert his rights as a patrician (which he still was), or to curry favor among plebeians. See Brouwer 1989: 263; Tatum 1999: 85–86; and Fox 1998: 15 for speculation as to Clodius’ motives. Tatum’s discussion leaves in no doubt how serious Clodius’ offense was.

24. Cicero speaks publicly against Clodius for his sacrilege throughout *De Domo sua,* *De haruspicium responso,* *In Pisonem,* and *Pro Milone.* For Caesar’s divorce as connected to the scandal, see, e.g., Cicero *Att.* 1.13.3; Brouwer 1989: 365 n. 318 posits Pompeia’s childlessness as the real reason for the divorce.


26. At Rome her primary sanctuary was restricted to women, as was the official nocturnal celebration, but elsewhere it was not. Roman literary sources therefore reflect the Bona Dea’s official Roman rites rather than her broader, unregulated worship. See Brouwer 1989: 257–58 for this explanation.

27. For Cicero, according to Brouwer, the Bona Dea is guarantor of all that is holy and right about Roman tradition—all that Clodius violated—while the dedicants of inscriptions were concerned not with the goddess as a political symbol, but with her ability to help and protect individuals. See Brouwer 1989: 260 for Cicero’s influence and 396 for nonpolitical responses to the goddess. Leach 2001 adds to Brouwer’s conclusions the Roman cultural primacy of the masculine; Cicero used Clodius’ cross-dressing as a way to effeminize his opponent, and thus devalue his political authority.

28. For Bömer 1957 *ad* 5.147, the discrepancy between the archaeological sources and literary sources results from a transition in the goddess’s worship in the first century BCE from a strict, aristocratic, and gender-specific following to one that was gender inclusive and socially diverse. It is possible that the impetus for such an expansion of the goddess’s appeal was perhaps the influx of foreign religious beliefs and practices in the first century BCE.

29. Cicero’s strongest vitriol against Clodius comes in his *De haruspicium responso.* See, for example, *Har. resp.* 44: *P. Clodius a crocata, a mitra, a muliebribus soleis purpureisque fasceolis, a strophio, a psalterio, a flagitio, a stupro est factus repente popularis* (Clodius has cast off his yellow robe, his headband, his delicate sandals and his violet stockings, his breastband, his harp, his debaucheries, his adultery, and he has suddenly become a man of the people). Similar strong language is used in the fragments from *In Clodium et Curionem,* particularly fragments 5 and 23 with Crawford’s 1994 commentary *ad loc.*

30. The shift from political to personal responsibility is marked at the end of the Republic, accompanied by a shift in the semantic range of words and ideas such as
concordia, libertas, and amicitia. For Concordia/concordia see Flory 1984: 315; for libertas and amicitia see DuQuesney 1984 and Kennedy 1992; and for the general trend of semantic and moral transition, see Wallace-Hadrill 1997.

31. The force and focus of Livia’s urban activity is well discussed by Kleiner 1996 and Flory 1984. Livia restored the shrines of Pudicitia Patricia and Pudicitia Plebeia (28 BCE), Fortuna Muliebris (7 BCE), and Concordia (15–7 BCE); the last is linked by its date of dedication to Mater Matuta, Fortuna Virgo, and the Matralia festival for married women and uniuirae.

32. To be sure, one inscription even attests that the women of Forum Clodi took Livia’s sponsorship of family values so seriously that they celebrated her birthday at the sanctuary of the Bona Dea. See Brouwer 1989: 104–5 (= CIL 11.3303) and Flory 1984: 320. See also Purcell 1986.

33. Kleiner 1996, but see Flory 1984 for a different view.

34. See Syme 1960 (1939): 229 for Livia’s social status and Octavian’s marriage to her as a felicitous means of social climbing.

35. The shrines to Pudicitia Patricia and Pudicitia Plebeia speak clearly to this aim. So, too, the porticus to Concordia. Livia dedicated this porticus in 7 BCE on the site of the extravagant villa of Vedius Pollio, willed to Augustus in 15 BCE. The return of this land to public use was a marked political statement against the excesses of the late Republican aristocracy. Her dedication thus complemented Augustus’ Lex Iulia de modo aedificiorum urbis, a law with practical and sumptuary overtones passed around 7 BCE (it restricted the size of buildings in Rome). The portico was dedicated on the heels of Tiberius’ victorious return from Germany; it is possible that he co-sponsored the dedication (Dio 55.8.1). Livia’s sponsorship of this site, therefore, reinforced traditional social roles, traditional gender roles, and Augustan dynastic succession. Kleiner 1996: 32 and Flory 1984: 329 discuss such other possible motives for her dedication.

36. Whatever Clodius’ motive had been in 62 BCE (for which see above, note 23), Livia’s attention to the cult repopulated it with the better sort of Claudian devotee.

37. See Kleiner 1978 for this dynamic on the Ara Pacis panels. Kleiner argues that the Ara Pacis casts women in traditional female roles, i.e., wives and mothers. Kampen discusses the same message as seen in Severan art and other Augustan art (Kampen 1988 and 1991a).

38. Pinotti 1977 discusses these details. Add to Pinotti’s list an allusion to the etymology of the Aventine from adventus (Varro Ling. 5.43) at 4.9.3 (uenit ad . . . montes). Invictos in 4.9.3 is attested in late manuscripts; the line is corrupt.

39. Anderson 1992: 101–2 draws attention to the humor, even absurdity, of the toponography in this poem, as a hallmark of the poem’s playful rather than cultic tone. For Spencer 2001: 264–65, such details emphasize the reader’s perceptual reality only to destabilize it.

40. Rawson 1985: 236: “it is always at least worth inquiring whether a Roman antiquarian has political views.” See also Wallace-Hadrill 1997. For a less charged interpretation of Propertius’ antiquarianism, see Feeney 1998: 117 (“the category of ‘ritual’ does not constitute a focus of enquiry for him as it does for us: he has his eye on gender and genre, and is making these cults and myths work within that frame”). Still further away from politically motivated antiquarianism is Cairns 1992: 66 (“Propertius 4.9 is an elegy, not a piece of scholarship”); for Cairns the poem’s literary, unresearched, even fictional content nevertheless serves real devotional contexts.
42. Anderson 1964.
43. The celebrants are called \textit{puellae} by the poet at 4.9.23, by the priestess at 4.9.59, and by the hero at 4.9.69. Everyone involved agrees on who they are. Anderson 1964 discusses the effect of the \textit{paraklausithyron} on the characters of the poem but not on its places; DeBrohun 2003: 134–43 expands Anderson's treatment and examines the ways the religious \textit{limen} and the lover's \textit{limen} overlap to redefine hero Hercules as an elegiac lover, albeit a nontraditional one who refuses to follow elegiac convention by breaking through the closed door. For DeBrohun, Hercules' action is symbolic of the ways Propertian elegy in Book 4 similarly occupies a new poetic space.
44. Corbeill (2005), and note the \textit{corollae} and \textit{faces} that adorn the temple door at 1.16.7–8.
45. Shades of adultery color the other mention of the Bona Dea's rites in the Tibullan corpus. Though nominally acquitting himself of sacrilege on the eve of his death, at 3.5.7–8, the dying Lygdamus contrasts himself to friends who sport at Baiae (notorious as a place for liaisons) and then protests that he has not revealed the Bona Dea's secrets—i.e., he has been discreet about affairs.
47. I read the adjective with concessive force in the ambiguous line 50. The contrast with \textit{mollis} in line 49 points to such a reading.
48. Plutarch \textit{Antony} may exaggerate Antony's Herculean affinity (see Gurval 1995: 92 n. 14), but the abundance of detail bids for some truth. \textit{Ant.} 4 tells us that Antony enhanced his natural physical resemblance to the hero by dressing in a low-belted tunic with a heavy cloak, and by swaggering; at \textit{Ant.} 36 Antony uses Hercules' polygamous example to defend his own promiscuity; and at \textit{Ant.} 60 the destruction of a temple of Hercules by lightning was considered a prodigy against Antony.
49. Kampen 1996a and P. Zanker 1988: 58–59. Since Roman ideology posited a connection between Roman success and Roman morality (i.e., behavior appropriate to one's gender and social status), sexual deviance and political instability formed a mutually reinforcing set of ideas. See generally Edwards 1993 for the best expression of this connection. Kampen 1996a demonstrates that after the Augustan age, as the East began to lose its negative resonance, Omphale and Hercules underwent a gradual shift toward respectability, appearing in funerary sculpture and on coins.
50. Both passages mention the specific feminine duties Hercules performed while in service to Omphale. The coincidence of the words \textit{mollia}, \textit{dura}, and \textit{pensa} in each passage, combined in one sentence, with the hands being \textit{durus} in both cases, cements the allusion. As DeBrohun 2003: 159 n.10 points out, \textit{idem ego} signals "a sort of Alexandrian footnote" to the earlier poem.
51. Though Antony's name is left unspoken in 3.11, I disagree with Gurval 1995: 195 that his example does not figure prominently in Propertius' poem. To be sure, Propertius' focus in 3.11 is the power of women and not the defeat of men. Nevertheless, Antony's subjugation is hinted at in 3.11.29: \textit{quid, modo quae nostris opprobria uexerit armis} (what about the woman who recently brought such shame upon our weapons?), and he is unmistakably evoked at 3.11.31–32: \textit{contingii obsceni
pretium Romana poposcit / moenia (she demanded the city of Rome as the fee for her unclean marriage).

52. Griffin 1977 suggests this, but Gurval’s 1995 argument to the contrary convinces me. See also Tränkle 1983, who sees Propertius’ position toward the new regime as consciously aloof but not, nevertheless, Antonian or Republican.

53. This is the thesis of Stahl 1985: 234–47.

54. Plutarch Ant. 2.4 and cf. Cicero Phil. 2.44–45. Krostenko 2001: 293–96 discusses the political importance of Antony’s display.

55. See above, note 21, for sources. It is tempting also to see an allusion to Appius Claudius Caecus, the censor linked with the history of the cult of Hercules at the Ara Maxima: he transferred jurisdiction over this cult from the patrician Potitii and Pinarri to the state. He also built Rome’s first aqueduct, called the Aqua Appia. Perhaps non clausisset aquas in 4.9.43 hints at this public work.

56. See Spencer 2001: 273–75 for more embarrassments to Livia from the tradition of the Bona Dea.

57. Though his emphasis is not on the poem’s monuments, Fox 1998: 15–16 reaches the same conclusion in his study of Hercules’ transvestism. Touching upon Livia’s restoration of the sanctuary, he writes: “Such an aggressive display of gender disorder is out of accord with the emphasis on harmonious state and family relationships to which Livia’s proximity to the poem appeals. . . . Hercules here is acting as a symbol of resistance to any kind of ritually enforced socio-sexual order.”

58. Miller and Platter 1999: 453–54 note how elegy draws attention to tensions and anxieties in Roman beliefs and behaviors as one of its primary generic strategies: “Augustan elegy, therefore, is an oppositional discourse, not so much because it represents a determined univocal opposition to a given set of values—Augustan or otherwise—but rather in the sense that it is constructed out of values whose inherent contradictions make conflict between elegy and Roman ideology a necessary condition of the genre’s existence.” For elegy’s most pervasive aporetic notion, i.e., gender roles (which are not simply inverted but rather are hybridized or otherwise made ambiguous), see Greene 1995, and Wyke 1987b and 1989.

59. For Lindheim 1998, Hercules’ and the priestess’s differing views of how to define gender constitutes another layer of this elegy’s aporia. It asks whether gender is constructed (i.e., defined by behavior and appearance—this is Hercules’ method), or essential (defined by anatomy, the priestess’s method). A similar aporia is posed by Janan 1998 and 2001, in whose reading Hercules’ indeterminate gender confounds binary gender categories (and other binary categories) themselves.

60. Haslam 1993: 124 with note 28 suggests that the topos may have originally been assigned to Artemis. See also O’Hara 1996: 175 with note 4, who notes Artemis’ humiliation as late as Eustathius.


62. In the context of Hercules’ transgendered experience, the name Tiresias also recalls an older version of his myth, from pseudo-Hesiod’s Melampodia. Ovid preserves the tale at Met. 3.316–38. Tiresias, experienced as both a man and as a woman, was punished for his extra knowledge. To be specific, Hera blinded Tiresias for asserting the supremacy of women in attaining sexual pleasure. In the Hesiodic version, the gendered implications of Tiresias’ punishment are even stronger: not only has the seer blurred the boundary between male and female—a threat to discrete gender roles—but he has also valued the female over the male.
experience, upsetting the hierarchy normally resident in the binary system. See Janan 2001: 143–45 for discussion of the ways Tiresias’ presence in elegy 4.9 unsettles traditional gender identifications. Similar gender upsets befall Tiresias in a lost poem of unknown date, assigned by O’Hara 1996 to the Catullan era. Though O’Hara, too, connects Tiresias’ sex changes to elegy’s tendency to meddle with traditional gender roles, he admits how dangerous it is to express certainty (179 and 215).

63. Sitis appears with a sexual connotation at Ovid Rem. an. 247; for aestus see, e.g., Propertius 2.33.43. See Anderson 1964: 12 with notes 26–27 for this and further erotic nuances in Hercules’ actions, and cf. Warden 1982: 239 n.30.

64. For Cyrino 1998, this emergence is the purpose of the transvestism. Hercules’ transvestism is an experiment that, functioning like a carnivalesque diversion, confirms the re-emergent masculinity of the hero. Such diversions, popular in Roman rituals and discourse, release the tensions that build up in Rome’s highly stratified daily life. Cyrino discusses both Achilles’ and Hercules’ cross-dressing myths in detail and concludes that only the manliest of men could dress in female clothes and remain masculine: the transvestism of each hero “. . . serves primarily a conservative function: to reaffirm his high-octane sexuality” (217).

65. Ovid’s Hercules does the same. At Fast. 1.581, Hercules himself founds the Ara Maxima, thus styling himself a divinity. As this action immediately precedes Augustus’ appearance in the Fasti, Barchiesi 1997a: 97 finds Hercules’ proactivity pointedly ironic.

66. I follow Barber’s 1960 (1953) rearrangement of the last four lines of the poem; transposing the couplets prevents the jerkiness of address to reader then poet then reader and ends the poem with a prayer to the god (Camps 1965 ad 4.9.73ff., contra Richardson 1977 ad 4.9.73–74, who retains the MSS order and believes that 4.9.73–74 is an aside to explain Hercules’ epithet). I reject the emendations Sancum for Sanctum in 4.9.74 and Sance for Sancte in 4.9.71 as unnecessary; the repetition of forms of sanct- is at home in an aetiological elegy.


68. P. A. Miller 2001 and see also Kampen 1996b: 20–21.

Chapter Six

1. Flower 2000 discusses the formation of this tradition in clear detail. She argues that the tradition of spolia opima arose with Marcellus’ desire for extraordinary honors, and that Romulus’ and Cossus’ dedications were invented to provide a precedent.

2. RRC 439/1 with plate 52.18. The moneyer is probably P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus, quaestor of 48 BCE. Marcellinus was surely trying to capitalize on the clout of the Marcellus name; see below.

3. See generally the comments in Horsfall 1989.

Zanker 1988: 103 posits that Atticus’ suggestion was itself politically motivated (i.e., not neutral). It need not have been for Octavian to use it to his advantage, but overt partisanship on Atticus’ part would explain Antony’s interest in cultivating Atticus’ friendship.

5. Specifically, ran the legend, he saw an omen of twelve birds as justification of his participation in a civil war. Suétionius Aug. 95.2 and Dio Cassius 46.46.2–3 duly record the event; cf. Wiseman 1995: 144. For Romulus’ role in the propaganda of Caesar’s heir, see Gagé 1930: esp. 140–45.

6. Livy 1.33.9 reports that Ancus Marcus had enlarged the temple to commemorate new military victories.

7. Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2.72. Livy attributes the creation of the college to Ancus Marcus (1.32) and describes their rites in detail under his kingship, but the rites appear earlier when Tullus Hostilius uses them (1.24).

8. Livy 1.24 and 32 offers the fullest discussion of their rites and duties, but see Wiedemann 1986 for a discussion of the problems with the sources and the evolution of the rites.

9. Paulus ex Festus 92 = p. 81 Lindsay: *Feretrius Iuppiter* . . . *ex cuius templo sumebant sceptrum per quod iurarent et lapidem silicem quo foedus ferirent* (Jupiter Feretrius . . . from whose temple they took the scepter by which they swore and the silex stone by which they struck their treaty).

10. As Wiedemann 1986 suggests, Octavian might have introduced the act of throwing the spear into symbolically foreign territory in Rome (instead of into actual enemy territory) as part of the ritual Fetal activity. He adds (482), “of course, once that had been done, it became an age-old tradition forthwith.” Wiedemann suggests that justification for the spear throwing might have been found in Varro’s *Calenus*; as for the location in Rome (482–83), the (new) location for this sort of ritual within Rome demonstrates more its propagandistic value than its sacramental significance; it was as important for Romans to see the ritual as it was for the gods to see it.

11. Dio Cassius 44.4.3. Some take Dio’s reference as anachronistic, and the honor as given to Octavian instead (Platner and Ashby 1929 s.v. Iuppiter Feretrius, *aedes* and Syme 1959: 44 n. 85); but the coin of Marcellinus from 44 BCE (*RRC* 439/1 with plate 52.18) suggests the topic was in the air, and the arguments of Harrison 1989: 408–9 are compelling.

12. Rich 1996 argues that Crassus never requested the honor of dedicating *spolia opima*. I am inclined to disagree, but in any case he may have been forestalled.

13. Gallus and Crassus were connected in other ways as well. Syme 1960 (1939): 310 brings to attention *CIL* 6.21308, which shows a Licinia, daughter of Paullus and wife of Gallus, buried in the tomb of the Crassi.

14. Recent opinion has separated the Crassus affair from the settlement, arguing that the settlement must have been well under way when Crassus became (in)eligible for his claim (see Flower 2000: 50). Crassus may not have caused the settlement, but it is difficult to separate the potential embarrassment his situation created from the terms that precluded the possibility of its being repeated; see Syme 1960 (1939): 309ff. for the still compelling arguments.

15. Levick 1975: 158–59 suspects his presence behind the trial of Primus in 23 BCE.

16. Members of the imperial family may have been exempt from the stricture:
Rich 1999 plausibly suggests that Drusus hoped to dedicate spolia opima and that this would have been acceptable to the Princeps.

17. *BMCRE* 1.315 with plate 5.20, 1.366–75 with plates 7.18–20 and 8.1–5, and 1.704 with plate 17.2 all show a round temple with the legend Mars Ultor(r), with the legend *signis receptis* on the reverse. P. Zanker 1988: 186–87 and Cassola 1970: 25–26 (following Platner and Ashby 1927 among others) believe the Capitoline temple of Mars Ultor was actually built, but Simpson 1977 makes strong arguments against the existence of this temple. Reusser in Steinby 1993–2000 s.v. Mars Ultor (Capitolium) discusses the controversy that arises from the coins, but declines to vote. As for the temporary storage of the standards in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, Horace *Carm.* 4.15.6 speaks of the standards as a benefit to our Jove (*nostro Iovi*); of course, there were three temples to Jupiter on the Capitol at the time, but the special nature of these spoils to me admits the possibility that *nostro Iovi* refers to Feretrius.


20. Other military honors and functions were transferred to the new temple of Mars Ultor; see Kockel in Steinby 1993–2000 s.v. Forum Augustum.

21. M. Varro *ait opima spolia esse, etiam si manipularis miles detraxerit, dummodo duci hostium* (M. Varro says that they are still *spolia opima*, even if a common soldier has taken them, provided he has taken them from the leader of the enemy).

22. As Rich 1999 demonstrates, Drusus may have aspired to dedicate *spolia opima* had he not died prematurely; in honor of Drusus’ curtailed potential, Augustus dedicated the laurels from his fasces to Jupiter Feretrius rather than to Jupiter Optimus Maximus just after Drusus’ death (Dio Cassius 55.5.1, and see Rich 1999: 354).


24. Livy calls him Augustus in this chapter, which must therefore have been written after January 27 BCE.

25. No need to recreate the complete roster of cynics collected by Flower 2000: 53 and note 105 (and cf. 44 and note 55), to which I would add now Forsythe 1999: 63–64 with note 22 who, though he believes the passage is not a later interpolation, nevertheless sees Livy’s preference for his own annalistic evidence.


29. To wet: *OLD* s.v. *imbuo* 1a (to wet), 1b (to stain), and 1c (to stain with blood).

30. Richardson 1977 ad 4.10.6.

31. See *OLD* s.v. *occupo* 11b for the violent connotations of this word. *Occusat* also appears at 4.4.84, in which either Tarpeia or Tatius silences the Capitol’s watchdog—presumably by slitting its throat.

32. Richardson 1977 ad 4.10.15, responding to Camps 1965 ad 4.10.15; the latter believes that “nothing can be gained from analysis in such a case.”

33. Camps 1965 ad 4.10.21 reads *neque as common to fulgebatis* and *picta*, because the passage stresses the austerity of Romulus’ equipment. Even a painted shield would be ostentatious.

34. At 4.1.61 this adjective describes Emnius’ shaggy crown (as opposed to Bacchus’ soft ivy garland), and at 4.4.28 bristly brambles damage Tarpeia in her
quest for love. At 4.9.49 Hercules contrasts the soft bra he wore in the service of Omphale with the shaggy breast it (surely unsuccessfully) tried to conceal.

35. Rothstein 1898 ad 4.10.13. *redis* at 4.1.6 supports Rothstein’s sequence.
36. Similarly Romulus fights with a crude *parma*, while Aeneas bears the grand *clipeus*.

37. The presence of Roman horses—even the notion of cavalry (Acron’s horse at 4.10.8 suggests the existence of mounted fighters)—need not indicate that Cossus was *magister equitum*, as Richardson 1977 suggests *ad 4.10.38*; nor need they be the horses of the triumphal chariot, a possibility that Camps 1965 *ad 4.10.38* puts forward (albeit skeptically).

38. Fantham 1997: 132: “... the elegy depends for its effect as much on spatial as on temporal advance, from the first defence of the original city to the victory that ensured the safety of Italy itself from the barbarian.”

39. As Richardson 1977 points out *ad 4.10.25–26*, Veii “was Rome’s first serious invasion of Etruscan territory.” Camps 1965 *ad 4.10.25* also retains the original manuscript order, arguing that it heightens the pathos of Veii’s fall.

42. Parker 1992 traces the image of agricultural fertility through human death back to Archilochus.

43. Umbria had long been part of Etruscan territory when Propertius was writing; see Richardson 1977 *ad 1.21.9–10*. See also Newman 1997: 54 n. 1 for a collection of sources about Propertius’ Etrurian heritage, to whose bibliography should be added Guarducci 1986.

44. Nethercut 1983: 1839. On that same page Nethercut broadly connects elegies 4.10 with 1.21 and 1.22 through their “review of Rome’s contacts with her neighbors in the peninsula." This connection and the book’s ending on the death of a loved one and the solitude of the bereaved demonstrate the culmination in the fourth book of themes introduced earlier: “to set the rhythms of love—of desire, of possession, separation and death—with the context of life itself, the lives of other men and women, the life of Italy.”

45. For example, in 1.7 Propertius refuses to campaign abroad with Tullus so that he can remain in Rome under Cynthia’s thumb. Newman 1997: 68 n. 26 interprets the *sphragis* poems differently: Propertius is trying to curry favor with Etruscan Maecenas, and places responsibility for his kinsman’s loss in the war on bandits, not Caesar. While Newman is here right that “at least two soldiers escaped with their lives, and perhaps more,” words such as *dolor* and *miser* suggest a darker tone. In this interpretation he stands against Putnam 1976, Stahl 1985: 99–129, and others who see the *sphragis* poems as condemnatory.


47. The siege at Perusia is referred to in Appian *B Civ.* 5.5.49, Dio Cassius 48.14.3, Suetonius *Aug.* 15, Velleius 2.74.4, and Seneca *Clem.* 1.11.1.

48. See Gabba 1986 for land encroachment as the cause of the war.

49. See Syme 1960 (1939): 212 for the circulation of the legend of the *arae Perusinae*—an exaggeration of accounts of what Syme terms a few “judicial murders.” Or, the legend may stem from a hostile (Italian or even Perusine) perspective on the incident.
50. The arch of the gate is Etruscan; the superstructure on the arch is Roman, of Augustan date. See Scullard 1967: 159–60 with plate 78.

51. See Janan 2001: 197–98 n. 13, following Weeber’s 1977 dissertation. On Aeneas’ shield (Aen. 8.659–62), the Gauls wear striped cloaks and golden necklaces (to match their gold hair and clothes). Oddly, they carry the scutum, which would not make such a striking contrast with their large bodies as does Propertius’ parma.


53. Rich 1999 examines in great detail Drusus’ intention to dedicate spolia opima from his German campaign, and the Princeps’ corresponding attention to Jupiter Feretrius. See also Flower 2000.

54. Causa would soon be used by Ovid in marking out Callimachean territory as well (Fast. 1.1).

55. Pentad, if we include the allusion to Cicero, who had translated Aratus’ text into Latin, and the Alexandrian, antiquarian Varro; as Newman points out (1997: 124–25), Cicero had eulogized Varro with the phrase causas aperuisti (Acad. 1.3). See J. F. Miller 1982: 385.

56. Camps 1965 and Richardson 1977, both ad 4.10.4, emphasize the difficulty.

57. For a sound overview, see J. F. Miller 1982. Redefinition of Callimacheanism in Book 4 is one of the theses of DeBrohun 2003 (see, e.g., 3).


59. The elegist’s approach toward and access to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius is all the more striking given that it was probably not open to the public; recall its caved-in roof before Augustus’ restoration, and the fact that Livy did not see the spoils themselves but relied on Augustus’ description of them. See Càssola 1977: 26–27, who speaks about the sanctity of armor dedicated to the gods, but cf. Rawson 1991 on the pervasive presence and importance of spoils in the city. Miles 1995: 45–47 offers a different, more cynical explanation for Livy’s apparent lack of acquaintance with the spoils: whether he saw them or not, Livy deliberately effaces his own certainty about them in order to cast doubt on Augustus’ certainty. Versnel 1970: 311–13, discussing the difference between the triumphal ceremony, Etruscan in origin, and the very Roman spolia opima, posits a different reason for the inaccessibility of the spolia opima once dedicated: they were trophies containing magical power; therefore, they were to be treated with caution as well as respect. It is also for this reason that they are so rare, to Versnel.

60. Galinsky 1969: 91. He catalogues the triumphal imagery in Arethusa’s poem, in Cynthia’s return from Lanuvium, and in Cornelia’s praise for her husband. To these I would add the triumphal imagery in Tarpeia’s poem, in which the troubled girl paces the triumphal route, and 4.2, in which Vertumnus watches from the sidelines.

61. Livy suggests ferre (1.10.5), Servius and Plutarch ferire (ad Aen. 8.641, Marcellus 8.4); Festus offers both (81L), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus posits the Greek υπερφερετις (2.34.4), meaning “preeminent,” from φερω.

62. There is an embedded third option: Feretrius from feretrum, bier. Richardson 1977 ad 4.10.45–46 sees this etymology at work, as a result of which he does not capitalize feretri at 4.10.45. I subordinate this option because of its obvious connection to ferre, and because of the grammatical difficulties that must accompany a lowercase feretri.

63. Janan 2001: 197–98 n. 13 draws attention to the sure omen and to the poet’s
silence about the gods' approval—or lack thereof—for the second etymology. For Janan, the rival etymologies resist masculine closure on the topic and betray instead the poet's persistent feminine—i.e., open—logic.

64. Richardson 1977 points to these and other playful clusters in his introductory note to poem 4.10.
66. Other such titles were floating around as well; Ennius had called Romulus *custos patriae* (*Ann.* 108–9); Livy had called him *parens urbis Romae* (1.16). As Favro 1996: 225–26 points out, the abundance of images of the Princeps himself that adorned the city reminded those who moved through it that Augustus was the *pater urbis* as well as the *pater patriae*. Horace C. 3.24.27–29 connects the phrase with urban adornment and with a clear allusion to Augustus: *si quaeret pater urbius subscribi status, indomitam audeat refrenare licentiam* (if the patron of the cities seeks to be commemorated with statues, let him be bold enough to rein in unbridled excess).
67. Putnam 1985: 239 n.10 discusses Romulus' title as parent of the city in the context of Vergil *Aen.* 6.777–808, connecting Romulus to Augustus as renewer of the city and of virtue.

**Epilogue**

1. Tränkle 1983: 161 similarly contrasts the lively warmth of elegy 4.2 with the distant chill of elegy 4.10 to demonstrate that the poet's celebration of Roman rites, days, and places retains a certain aloofness vis-à-vis affairs of the state that his earlier poetry had expressed outright. Indeed, for Tränkle, elegy 4.2's appeal lies to a great extent in the fact that Vertumnus' monument lacks an ideological program.
3. See also Hardie 1992 on the poetic mutability of Rome in the Augustan age.
4. Janan 2001: 198 n. 13 takes the broadest view of the power of this pairing, as a comment on “the vicissitudes of fortune” in general. Rothwell 1996: 850 sees the pairing as proof of the inevitable triumph of nature over constructed culture. See also Newman 1997: 67–68, who draws no conclusions.