The Johns Hopkins University Press

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Georg Luck, Editor

The oldest classical journal in America, *AJP* has served as a forum for international philological research since 1880. Its renowned contributors examine the range of subjects pertinent to classical studies including Greek and Latin antiquity, epigraphy, philosophy, and textual analysis.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY
March, June, September, December

Please enter my one-year subscription:
☐ Individuals $21.00 ☐ Institutions $54.00

Payment:
☐ Check or money order enclosed ☐ Visa ☐ MasterCard

Account # ____________ Exp. date ____ Signature ____________

Address:

Name ______________________________

Address ______________________________

City ______________ State ________ Zip ________

Send orders to:
The Johns Hopkins University Press, Journals Division, 701 W. 40th Street, Suite 275, Baltimore, Maryland 21211

Subscriptions are available on a calendar year basis only. Make checks payable to The Johns Hopkins University Press. Prepayment is required before shipment. Subscribers in Mexico and Canada add $4.50 postage; other subscribers outside the U.S., Mexico, and Canada add $8.00 air freight. Payment must be drawn on a U.S. bank or be by international money order. Maryland residents add 5% sales tax. **EA9**

HELIOS, vol. 16, no. 1, 1989

MISTRESS AND METAPHOR IN AUGUSTAN ELEGY

Maria Wyke

1. Written and Living Women

A pressing problem confronts work on the women of ancient Rome: a need to determine the relation between the realities of women's lives and their representation in literature. Several of the volumes on women in antiquity that have appeared in the 1980s expose the methodological problems associated with any study of women in literary texts,[1] but few of their papers have yet investigated the written women of Rome.[2] In any study of the relations between written and living women, however, the heroines of Augustan elegy deserve particular scrutiny because the discourse in which they appear purports to be an author's personal confession of love for his mistress. The texts of Latin love poetry are frequently constructed as first-person, authorial narratives of desire for women who are individuated by name, physique, and temperament. This poetic technique tempts us to suppose that, in some measure, elegy's female subjects reflect the lives of specific Augustan women.

Moreover, in presenting a first-person narrator who is indifferent to marriage and subject to a mistress, the elegiac texts pose a question of important social dimensions: if Augustan love poetry focuses on a female subject who apparently operates outside the traditional constraints of marriage and motherhood, could it constitute the literary articulation of an unorthodox place for women in the world? This question has generated considerable controversy, as the debate between Judith Hallett and Aya Betensky in *Arethusa* (1973, 1974) reveals.[3]

In particular, the corpus of Propertian poems seems to hold out the hope that we may read *through* the written woman, Cynthia, to a living mistress. Poem 1.3, for example, conjures up before its readers a vision of an autobiographical event. The first-person narrator recalls the night he arrived late and drunk by his mistress's bed. The remembered occasion unfolds through time, from the moment of the lover's arrival to his beloved's awakening. The details of the beloved's sleeping posture, her past cruelty, and her present words of reproach all seem further to authenticate the tale. The portrait of a Cynthia possessed of a beautiful body, a bad temper, and direct speech inclines us to believe that she once lived beyond the poetic world as a flesh and blood mistress of an Augustan poet.[4]

Even the existence of Cynthia within a literary work appears to be explained away. Poem 1.8 creates the illusion that it constitutes a fragment of a real conversation. The persistent employment of the

NOTICE: THIS MATERIAL MAY BE PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT LAW (TITLE 17 U.S. CODE)

second-person pronoun, the punctuation of the text by questions and wishes that center on "you," turns the poem itself into an event. As we read, Cynthia is being implored to remain at Rome with her poet. Subsequently, we are told that this poetic act of persuasion has been successful:

> hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis,
> sed potui blandi carminis obsequio.
> sunt igitur Musae, neque amanti tardus Apollo,
> quis ego fretus amo: Cynthia rara mea est!
>
> Her I, not with gold, not with Indian pearls, could
> turn, but with a caressing song's compliance.
> There are Muses then, and, for a lover, Apollo is not slow:
> on these I relying love: rare Cynthia is mine! (1.8.39-42)[5]

Writing poetry, on this account, is only the instrument of an act of courtship. The text itself encourages us to overlook its status as an Augustan poetry-book and to search beyond it for the living mistress it seems to woo.

There are, however, some recognized dangers in responding to Propertian poetry in this way, for the apparently personal confession of a poet's love is permeated with literary concerns and expressed in highly stylized and conventional terms. Even the female figures of the elegiac corpus—Propertius's Cynthia, Tibullus's Delia and Nemesis, Ovid's Corinna—display highly artful features.[6] Thus, once we acknowledge that elegy's debt to poetic conventions and Hellenistic writing practices is so extensive as to include in its compass the depiction of elegy's heroines, we are forced to call into question any simple relation between elegiac representations and the realities of women's lives in Augustan Rome. But if the relation between representation and reality is not a simple one, what then is its nature?

In the last few decades one answer to this question has gained particular currency. The extreme biographical methodology of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—the search for close correspondences between the individual characters and events of the text and those of its author and his milieu—has long since been abandoned. Nor has the opposite view, that elegy's ladies are entirely artificial constructs, proved satisfactory; for, like the Platonic assessment of literary processes, the theory that Latin erotic discourse is modelled on Hellenistic literature, which is itself modelled on Hellenistic life, leaves Augustan poetry and its female subjects at several removes from reality. Recently, critics have preferred to seek accounts of the relation between representation and reality that accommodate the literariness of elegiac writing and yet keep elegy's written women placed firmly on the map of the Augustan world.

Poets, we are told, deal in "verbal artefacts," yet their poetry "adumbrates," "embodies," or "emblazons" life.[7] Love elegy, it is argued, is neither an open window affording glimpses of individual Roman lives, nor a mirror offering their clear reflection, but a *picture* of Roman realities over which has been painted a dignifying, idealizing

veneer of poetic devices.[8] Idioms such as these form the ingredients of a critical discourse that does not treat elegiac poems as accurate, chronological documents of an author's affairs, but still describes their stylized heroines as somehow concealing specific Augustan girlfriends.[9] In the vocabulary of this revised critical language, Cynthia, and possibly Delia, are not the mirror images of living women, but their transposed reflections.

Thus the realism of the elegiac texts continues to tempt us. While reading of women who possess some realistic features, we may think that—once we make some allowances for the distortions that a male lover's perspective and a poet's self-conscious literary concerns may impose—we still have an opportunity to reconstruct the lives of some real Augustan mistresses. Controversy arises, however, when we ask exactly what allowances should be made. Is the process of relating women in poetic texts to women in society simply a matter of removing a veneer of poetic devices to disclose the true picture of living women concealed beneath?

It is precisely because readers of Cynthia have encountered such difficulties as these that I propose to explore aspects of the problematic relations between women in texts and women in society by focusing on the Propertian corpus of elegiac poems. My purpose is, first, to survey approaches to the issue of elegiac realism and by placing renewed emphasis on Cynthia as a *written* woman to argue that she should be related not to the love life of her poet but to the "grammar" of his poetry; second, to demonstrate that the poetic discourse of which she forms a part is firmly engaged with and shaped by the political, moral, and literary discourses of the Augustan period, and therefore that to deny Cynthia an existence outside poetry is not to deny her a relation to society; and, third, to suggest that a study of elegiac metaphors and their application to elegiac mistresses may provide a fruitful means of reassessing one particular set of relations between written and living women.

II. Augustan Girl Friends/Elegiac Women

The first-person narratives of the elegiac texts and their partial realism entice us. They lead us to suppose that these texts form poetic paintings of reality and their female subjects poetic portraits of real women. Yet realism itself is a quality of a text, not a direct manifestation of a "real" world. Analysis of textual realism discloses that it is not natural but conventional. To create the aesthetic effect of an open window onto a "reality" lying just beyond, literary works employ a number of formal strategies that change through time and between discourses.[10]

As early as the 1950s, Archibald Allen drew attention to this disjunction between realism and reality in the production of Augustan elegy. He noted that the realism of the Propertian corpus is partial since,

for example, it does not extend to the provision of a convincing chronology for a supposedly extratextual affair. And, focusing on the issue of "sincerity," Allen argued that the ancient world was capable of drawing a distinction that we should continue to observe, between a poet's art and his life. From Catullus to Apuleius, ancient writers could claim that poetry was distinct from its poet and ancient readers could construe "sincere" expressions of personal passion as a function of poetic style.[11]

More recently, Paul Veyne has pursued the idea that the *I* of ancient poets belongs to a different order than do later "*Is*" and has suggested that *ego* confers a naturalness on elegy that ancient readers would have recognized as spurious. Exploring the quality of *ego* in elegy's narrative, Veyne further argues that the ancient stylistic rules for "sincerity" observed in the Catullan corpus were scarcely obeyed in Augustan love elegy. Full of traditional poetic conceits, literary games, mannerisms, and inconsistencies, the texts themselves raise doubts about their potential as autobiography.[12]

Both these readings of elegiac first-person narratives warn us to be cautious in equating a stylistic realism with Augustan reality. But what of the particular realist devices used to depict women? Some modern critics think, for example, that the elegiac texts do offer sufficient materials from which to sketch the characteristics and habits of their authors' girlfriends or, at the very least, contain scattered details that together make up plausible portraits. From couplets of the Propertian corpus, John Sullivan assembles a physique for Cynthia:

> She had a milk-and-roses complexion. Her long blonde hair was either over-elaborately groomed or else, in less guarded moments, it strayed over her forehead in disarray . . . Those attractive eyes were black. She was tall, with long slim fingers.[13]

Oliver Lyne adds credible psychological characteristics:

> We find a woman of fine artistic accomplishments who is also fond of the lower sympotic pleasures; superstitious, imperious, wilful, fearsome in temper—but plaintive if she chooses, or feels threatened; pleasurably passionate—again if she chooses. I could go on: Propertius provides a lot of detail, direct and circumstantial. But the point I simply want to make is that the figure who emerges is rounded and credible: a compelling 'coúrtesan' amateur or professional.[14]

An ancient tradition seems to provide some justification for this process of extracting plausible portraits of Augustan girlfriends out of the features of elegiac poetry-books. Some two centuries after the production of elegy's written women, in *Apologia* 10, Apuleius listed the "real" names that he claimed lay behind the elegiac labels *Cynthia* and *Delia*. Propertius, we are informed, hid his mistress Hostia behind *Cynthia* and Tibullus had Plania in mind when he put *Delia* in verse. If we accept these identifications then, however stylized, idealized, or mythicized the elegiac women Cynthia and Delia may be, their titles are to be read as pseudonyms and their textual characteristics as reflections of the features of two extratextual mistresses.[15]

There are, however, a number of problems that attach themselves to this procedure, for the process of extricating real women from realist techniques involves methodological inconsistencies. Beginning with an ancient tradition that does not offer "real" names to substitute for *Nemesis* or *Corinna*, the procedure is not uniformly applied. The inappropriateness of attempting to assimilate Ovid's Corinna to a living woman is generally recognized. Because the text in which she appears easily reads as a playful travesty of earlier love elegy, most commentators would agree with the view that Corinna is not a poetic depiction of a particular person, but a generalized figure of the Mistress.[16]

As a poeticized girlfriend, a transposed reflection of reality, the second Tibullan heroine has likewise aroused suspicion. David Bright offers detailed support for an earlier reading of Nemesis "as a shadowy background for conventional motifs."[17] Nor does he find that this fictive Mistress is preceded by at least one poeticized girlfriend in the Tibullan corpus. The first Tibullan heroine, Delia, also seems to be entangled in elegy's literary concerns, as the characteristics of Nemesis in Tibullus's second poetry-book are counterbalanced by the characteristics of Delia in the first to produce a poetic polarity. Delia is goddess of Day, Nemesis daughter of Night.[18] Bright states: "The flexibility of fundamental characteristics and the meaning of the two names, indicates that Delia and Nemesis should be regarded as essentially literary creations."[19] Faced with such readings, we may want to ask whether Propertian realism is anchored any more securely to reality than that of Ovid and Tibullus. Does Cynthia offer a close link with a real woman only to be followed by a series of fictive females?

Realist portraits of a mistress do not seem to have so bold an outline, or so persistent a presence, in Propertian poetry as to guarantee for Cynthia a life beyond the elegiac world, because realism is not consistently employed in the corpus and sometimes is challenged or undermined by other narrative devices. Even in Propertius's first poetry-book the apparent confession of an author's love is not everywhere sustained. Poem 1.16, for example, interrupts the realistic use of a first-person narrative. At this point the narrative *I* ceases to be plausible because it is not identifible with an author and is voiced by a door. Poem 1.20 substitutes for expressions of personal passion the mythic tale of Hercules' tragic love for the boy Hylas. The poetry-book closes with the narrator establishing his identity (*qualis*) in terms not of a mistress but of the site of civil war.

The formal strategies that produce for us the sense of an Augustan reality and an extratextual affair are even less prominent or coherent in Propertius's second poetry-book. The *ego* often speaks without such apparently authenticating details as a location, an occasion, or a named addressee. The object of desire is not always specified and sometimes clearly excludes identification with Cynthia.[20] The margins of the poetry-book and its core are peopled by patrons and poets or take for their

landscape the Greek mountains and brooks of poetic inspiration. At these points, the text's evident concern is not to delineate a mistress but to define its author's poetic practice.[21]

By the third and fourth poetry-books a realistically depicted, individuated mistress has ceased to be a narrative focus of Propertian elegy. The third poetry-book claims as its inspiration not a girlfriend but another poet. Callimachus has replaced Cynthia as the motivating force for poetic production. The title *Cynthia* appears only as the text looks back at the initial poems of the corpus and draws Cynthia-centered erotic discourse to an apparent close. Far more frequently the first-person authorial narrator speaks of love without specifying a beloved, and poetic eroticism takes on a less personal mode.

In the fourth book there is not even a consistent lover's perspective. Several poems are concerned with new themes, such as the aetiology of *Roma*, rather than the motivations for *amor*. And the narrative *I* fluctuates between a reassuring authorial viewpoint and the implausible voices of a statue, a soldier's wife, and a dead *matrona*. When the more familiar mistress appears, the sequence of poems does not follow a realistic chronology but moves from the stratagems of a dead Cynthia who haunts the underworld (4.7) to those of a living Cynthia who raids a dinner party (4.8).[22]

These inconsistencies and developments in the Propertian mode of incorporating a mistress into elegiac discourse cannot be imputed merely to an author's unhappy experiences in love—to Propertius's progressive disillusionment with a Hostia—for each of the poetry-books and their Cynthias seem to be responding to changes in the public world of writing. The general shift from personal confessions of love toward more impersonal histories of Rome may be determined partially by changes in the material processes of patronage in the Augustan era, from the gradual establishment of Maecenas's circle through to the unmediated patronage of the *princeps*,[23] and the particular character of individual poetry-books by the progressive publication of other poetic discourses such as Tibullan elegy, Horatian lyric, and Virgilian epic.[24] But are the individual, realistically depicted Cynthias of the Propertian corpus then immune from such influences?

Literary concerns permeate even the activities and habits of the Cynthias who appear in the first two books. Poem 1.8, for example, implores its Cynthia not to depart for foreign climes and asks: *tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas,/ tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre nives*? ("Can you on delicate feet support settled frost? Can you Cynthia, strange, snows endure?" 1.8.7-8) The Gallan character of this, Cynthia, and the trip from which she is dissuaded, is well known. In Virgil's tenth *Eclogue*, attention already had been focused on the laments of the earlier elegiac poet over the absence of another snow-bound elegiac mistress. Propertius caps the Virgilian Gallus, in the field of erotic writing, by contrasting his ultimately loyal Cynthia with the faithless

Lycoris.[25] Cynthia's delicate feet both recall and surpass the *teneras plantas* of the wandering Lycoris (*Ecl.* 10.49). Simultaneously, they give her a realizable shape and mark a new place in the Roman tradition for written mistresses.

Similarly, it has been observed that the disturbing narrative techniques of the second book—its discursiveness, parentheses, and abrupt transitions—constitute a response to the publication of Tibullus's first elegiac book.[26] And the process of transforming Propertian elegy in response to another erotic discourse again extends to realist depictions of the elegiac beloved. Poem 2.19 presents a Tibullanized Cynthia, closer in kind to the images of Delia in the countryside than to the first formulation of Cynthia in the *Monobiblos*:

> etsi me inuito discedis, Cynthia, Roma,
> laetor quod sine me devia rura coles . . .
> sola eris et solos spectabis, Cynthia, montis
> et pecus et finis pauperis agricolae.
>
> Even though against my will you leave, Cynthia, Rome,
> I'm glad that without me you'll cultivate wayward fields . . .
> Alone you'll be and the lonely mountains, Cynthia, you'll watch
> and the sheep and the borders of the poor farmer. (2.19.1-2, 7-8)

Tibullus began his fanciful sketch of a countrified mistress—the guardian (*custos*) of a country estate—with the words *rura colam* (1.5.21). So here *rura coles* begins Cynthia's departure from the generally urban terrain of Propertian discourse. The apparently realistic reference to Cynthia's country visit contains within its terms a challenge to the textual characteristics of a rustic Delia.

The Cynthias of the third and fourth books also disclose the influence of recently published literary works. The third Propertian poetry-book initiates an occasionally playful accommodation of Horatian lyric within erotic elegy. This literary challenge is articulated not only through the enlargement of poetic themes to include social commentary and the elevation of the poet to the rank of priest,[27] but also through the alteration of the elegiac mistress's physique.

The book opens with an erotic twist to the Horatian claim that poetry is an everlasting monument to the poet. For, at 3.2.17-24, Propertian poetry is said to immortalize female beauty (*forma*).[28] The book closes appropriately with the dissolution of that monument to beauty and the threatened construction of one to ugliness:

> exclusa inque uicem fastus patiare superbos,
> et quae fecisti facta queraris anus!
> has tibi fatalis cecinit mea pagina diras:
> euentum formae disce timere tuae!
>
> Shut out in turn—may you suffer arrogant contempt,
> and of deeds which you've done may you complain—
> an old hag!
> These curses deadly for you my page has sung:
> the outcome of your beauty learn to fear! (3.25.15-18)

The threatened transformation of Cynthia on the page from beauty to hag—the dissolution of the familiar elegiac edifice—mirrors similar predictions made about the Horatian Lydia in *Odes* 1.25.9-10.[29]

The two Cynthias of the fourth book take on Homeric rather than Horatian shapes. Although multiple literary influences on the features of these Cynthias may be noted—such as comedy, aetiology, tragedy, epigram, and mime—their pairing takes up the literary challenge recently issued by Virgil. Just as the Virgilian epic narrative conflates an Odyssean and an Iliadic hero in the character of Aeneas, so the Propertian elegiac narrative constructs a Cynthia who becomes first an Iliadic Patroclus returning from the grave (4.7) and then a vengeful Odysseus returning from the war (4.8).

In the last book of the Propertian corpus, the precarious status of realism is put on display. Whole incidents in the lives of a poet and his mistress now reproduce the plots of the Homeric poems, while their details echo passages of the *Aeneid*. In poem 4.7, the first-person authorial narrator recalls the occasion on which he had a vision of his dead mistress. Her reproaches are replete with apparently authenticating incidentals such as a busy red light district of Rome, worn-down windows, warming cloaks, branded slaves, ex-prostitutes, and wool work. But the ghost's arrival and departure, her appearance, and her reproofs sustain persistent links with the heroic world of *Iliad* 23 and the general conventions of epic discourse on visions of the dead. Similarly, in poem 4.8, the first-person narrator recalls the night when Cynthia caught him in the company of other women. The narrative of that night is also littered with apparently authenticating details such as the setting on the Esquiline, local girls, a dwarf, dice, a slave cowering behind a couch, and orders not to stroll in Pompey's portico. But Cynthia's sudden return finds her playing the role of an Odysseus to her poet's aberrant Penelope. Echoes of *Odyssey* 22 dissolve the poetic edifice of a real Roman event.[30]

When critics attempt to provide a plausible portrait of Cynthia, they must undertake an active process of building a rounded and consistent character out of physical and psychological characteristics that are scattered throughout the corpus and are often fragmentary, sometimes contradictory, and usually entangled in mythological and highly literary lore. But the discovery of Gallan, Tibullan, Horatian, and Virgilian Cynthias in the Propertian corpus argues against the helpfulness of this process. The strategies employed in the construction of a realistic mistress appear to change according to the requirements of a poetic project that commences in rivalry with the elegists Gallus and Tibullus and ends in appropriation of the terms of Horatian lyric and Virgilian epic.

It is misleading, therefore, to disengage the textual features of an elegiac mistress from their context in a poetry-book, so as to reshape them into the plausible portrait of an Augustan girlfriend, for even the

physical features, psychological characteristics, direct speeches, and erotic activities with which Cynthia is provided often seem subject to literary concerns. Thus the realist devices of the Propertian corpus map out only a precarious pathway to the realities of women's lives in Augustan society and often direct us instead toward the features and habits of characters in other Augustan texts.

The repetition of the title *Cynthia* through the course of the Propertian poetry-books may still create the impression of a series of poems about one consistent female figure.[31] Does support remain, then, for a direct link between Cynthia and a Roman woman in the ancient tradition that *Cynthia* operates in elegy as a pseudonym for a living mistress Hostia?

On entry into the Propertian corpus, the epithet *Cynthia* brings with it a history as the marker of a poetic programme. Mount Cynthus on Delos had been linked with Apollo as the mouthpiece of a poetic creed by the Hellenistic poet Callimachus. That association was reproduced in Virgil's sixth *Eclogue* where the god directing Virgilian discourse away from epic material was given the cult title *Cynthius*.[32] The Propertian text itself, draws attention to that history at, for example, the close of the second poetry-book where in the course of poem 2.34, Callimachus, Virgil, Cynthius, and Cynthia are all associated with writing-styles. First, Callimachean elegy is suggested as a suitable model for poetic production (2.34.31-32); then, in a direct address to Virgil, *Cynthius* is employed as the epithet of a god with whose artistry the works of Virgil are explicitly compared: *tale facis carmen docta testudine quale/ Cynthius impositis temperat articulis* ("Such song you make, on the learned lyre, as/ Cynthius with applied fingers controls," 2.34.79-80). Finally, a reference to *Cynthia* closes the poem and its catalogue of the male authors and female subjects of earlier Latin love poetry: *Cynthia quin etiam uersu laudata Properti—/ hos inter si me ponere Fama uolet* ("Cynthia also praised in verse of Propertius—/ if among these men Fame shall wish to place me," 2.34.93-94).

The alignment within a single poem of Callimachus, Virgil, Cynthius, and Cynthia constructs for Propertian elegy and its elegiac mistress a literary ancestry. The title *Cynthia* may be read as a term in the statement of a poetics, as a proper name for the erotic embodiment of a particular poetic creed. In a corpus of poems that frequently voices a preference for elegiac over epic styles of writing that use a critical discourse inherited from Callimachus and developed in Virgil's *Eclogues*,[33] the title *Cynthia* contributes significantly to the expression of literary concerns.[34]

The name of the elegiac mistress does not offer us a route out of a literary world to the realities of women's lives at Rome. But, as with her other apparently plausible features, her name is inextricably entangled in issues of poetic practice. Any attempt to read through the name *Cynthia* to a living mistress, therefore, overlooks its place in the "grammar" of

elegiac poetry where *Propertius* and *Cynthia* do not perform the same semantic operations. In the language of elegy, a poet generates a different range and level of connotation than his mistress.

The issue of the elegiac mistress's social status further elucidates the peculiar role women play in the poetic language of Augustan love poetry; for, when attempts have been made to reconstruct a real girlfriend out of Cynthia's features, no clear clues have been found in the poems to the social status of a living mistress and conclusions have ranged from Roman wife[35] to foreign prostitute,[36] or the evident textual ambiguities have been read as reflections of the fluidity of social status to be expected within an Augustan *demi-monde*.[37]

In Propertius 2.7, for example, the narrator describes his mistress as having rejoiced at the removal of a law which would have separated the lovers. He declares that he prefers death to marriage:

> nam citius paterer caput hoc discedere collo
> quam possem nuptae perdere more faces,
> aut ego transirem tua limina clausa maritus,
> respiciens udis prodita luminibus.[38]
>
> For faster would I suffer this head and neck to part
> than be able at a bride's humor to squander torches,
> or myself a husband pass your shut doors,
> looking back at their betrayal with moist eyes. (2.7.7-10)

And he rejects his civic duty to produce children who would then participate in Augustus Caesar's wars: *unde mihi Parthis natos praebere triumphis?/ nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit* ("From what cause for Parthian triumphs to offer my sons?/ None from my blood will be a soldier," 2.7.13-14). Here, if nowhere else in Augustan elegy, we might expect to find a clearly defined social status allocated to the elegiac mistress, because, at this point in the elegiac corpus, the text seems to be directly challenging legal constraints on sexual behaviour.

Nevertheless, even when the elegiac narrative takes as its central focus a legislative issue, no clear social position is allocated to Cynthia. We learn instead that men and women play different semantic roles in this poetic discourse. The female is employed in the text only as a means to defining the male. Her social status is not clearly defined because the dominating perspective is that of the male narrator. What matters is his social and political position as a man who in having a mistress refuses to be a *maritus* or the father of *milites*.[39]

What this analysis of elegiac realism seems to reveal is that the notion of *concealment*—the idea that the stylized heroines of elegy somehow conceal the identities of specific Augustan girlfriends—is not a helpful term in critical discourse on elegiac women. Perhaps Apuleius's identification of Cynthia with a Hostia is suspect, since it forms part of a theatrical self-defence and should be read in the light of a long-standing interest in biographical speculation. (We do not now accept, for

example, Apuleius's identification of Corydon with Virgil or of Alexis with a slave boy of Pollio.[40]) But the point is that, whether or not a Hostia existed who was associated with Propertius, the Cynthia of our text is part of no simple act of concealment.

While the combination of realist techniques and parodic strategies in the Ovidian corpus is thought to deny Corinna any reality, the realist strategies of the Propertian corpus have been isolated from other narrative techniques and left largely unexplored in order to secure for Cynthia an existence outside the text in which we meet her. But I have argued that, However, even the realist devices of Propertian elegy can disclose the unreality of elegiac mistresses. Cynthia too is a poetic fiction: a woman in a text, whose physique, temperament, name, and status are all subject to the idiom of that text. So, as part of a poetic language of love, Cynthia should not be related to the love life of her poet but to the "grammar" of his poetry.

The Propertian elegiac narrative does not, then, celebrate a Hostia, but creates a fictive female whose minimally defined status as mistress, physical characteristics, and name are all determined by the grammar of the erotic discourse in which she appears. The employment of terms like "pseudonym" in modern critical discourse overlooks the positive act of creation involved in the depiction of elegy's mistresses.[41] Therefore, when reading Augustan elegy, it seems most appropriate to talk not of pseudonyms and poeticized girlfriends but of poetic or elegiac women.

III. Metaphors

So the bond between elegiac women and particular Augustan girlfriends has proved to be very fragile. The realistic features of elegy's heroines seem to owe a greater debt to poetic programmes than to the realities of female forms. But if we deny to Cynthia an existence outside poetry, are we also denying her any relation to society? If elegiac narratives are concerned with fictive females, how do women enter their discourse? What relation might still hold between women in Augustan society and women in its poetic texts? And what function could a realistically depicted yet fictive mistress serve in elegy's aesthetics?

A possible approach to some of these questions has already been suggested, as I have argued that the characteristics of elegiac women are determined by the general idioms of the elegiac discourse of which they form a part and that Cynthia should be read as firmly shaped by the Propertian poetic project. But elegiac discourses and poetic projects are, in turn, firmly engaged with and shaped by the political, moral, and aesthetic discourses of the Augustan period. And so it is through the relation of elegiac narratives to all the other cultural discourses of the specific period in which they were produced that we can at last see a more secure fit between women in elegiac texts and women in Augustan society.

A. Cultural Discourses

The general idioms peculiar to elegiac writing have been as intriguing to the reader as the specific attributes provided for women at various points in the elegiac corpus, for they seem to be offering a challenging new role for the female, a poetic break away from the traditional duties of marriage and motherhood.

First of all, features of the elegiac vocabulary seem to overturn the traditional Roman discourses of sexuality. In the poetic texts the elegiac hero is frequently portrayed as sexually loyal while his mistress is not.[42] The Propertian lover protests: *tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus* ("You alone please me: may I alone please you, Cynthia," 2.7.19). He desires as the wording on his epitaph: *unius hic quondam seruus amoris erat* ("Of a single love this man once was the slave," 2.13.36). Now this elegiac expectation of eternal male faithfulness, according to one analysis, "spurns the double standard characterizing Roman male-female relationships" because traditionally, extramarital sex was acceptable for husbands while their wives were legally required to uphold the principle of *fides marita*.[43] It was the ideal of a woman's faithfulness to one man that was most frequently expressed on Roman epitaphs and, furthermore, it was expressed in the same terms as the elegiac ideal: *solo contenta marito, uno contenta marito* ("content with her husband alone," "content with but one husband").[44]

Another feature commonly cited as evidence for an elegiac transformation of traditional sexual roles is the application of the *seruitium amoris* metaphor to a heterosexual liaison.[45] A parallel for the *topos* of the lover-as-enslaver can be found in Hellenistic erotic writing, but Augustan elegy's casting of the female in the dominant sexual role seems to work against the operations of other Roman sexual discourses. The Propertian narrator asks: *quid mirare, meam si uersat femina uitam/ et trahit addictum sub sua iura uirum?* ("Why are you surprised, if my life a woman directs/ and drags bound under her own laws a man?", 3.11.1-2).

The male narrator is portrayed as enslaved, the female narrative subject as his enslaver. The Tibullan lover, for example, says farewell to his freedom: *hic mihi seruitium uideo dominamque paratam:/ iam mihi, libertas illa paterna, uale* ("Here for me I see slavery and a mistress at the ready:/ now from me, that fathers' freedom, adieu," 2.4.1-2). Thus the control of household slaves, a woman's version of the economic status of a *dominus*, has been transformed figuratively into the erotic condition of control over sexual slaves. The sexual domain of the elegiac *domina* contrasts with that traditionally prescribed for Roman wives, namely, keeping house and working wool.[46]

A third significant feature of this poetic discourse is the declaration that the pursuit of love and poetry is a worthy alternative to more traditional equestrian careers. This elegiac declaration is best known in its formulation as the *militia amoris* metaphor.[47] The elegiac hero is

portrayed as already enlisted in a kind of military service, battling with love or his beloved. The Propertian narrator receives the following instructions:

> at tu finge elegos, fallax opus: haec tua castra!—
> scribat ut exemplo cetera turba tuo.
> militiam Veneris blandis patiere sub armis,
> et Veneris pueris utilis hostis eris.
> nam tibi uictrices quascumque labore parasti,
> eludit palmas una puella tuas.
>
> But you, devise elegies, a tricky task: this is your camp!—
> That they, the remaining crowd, write at your example.
> The warfare of Venus you'll endure under alluring weapons
> and to Venus's boys a profitable enemy you'll be.
> Because for you whatever Victorias your effort's procured,
> escapes your awards one girl. (4.1.135-40)

Similarly an Ovidian poem entirely dedicated to the exploration of the metaphor of *militia* begins: *militat omnis amans, et habet sua castra Cupido* ("Every lover soldiers, and Cupid has his own barracks," *Am.* 1.9.1).

Augustan elegy represents its hero as faithful to his usually disloyal mistress, and as engaged metaphorically in either sexual servitude or erotic battles. But the unconventional sexual role bestowed, through poetic metaphor, on the elegiac male seems to implicate the elegiac female in equally unconventional behaviour: he slights the responsibilities of being citizen and soldier, while she operates outside the conventional roles of wife and mother.

So, if specific features of the elegiac mistresses do not seem to reflect the realities of particular women's lives, might not the general idioms employed about them nevertheless reflect general conditions for the female in Augustan society? Is the elegiac woman unconventional because there are now some unconventional women in the world?

Once again, the elegiac texts tempt us: if, as Georg Luck has argued, "the woman's role in the Roman society of the first century BC explains to a large extent the unique character of the love poetry of that period,"[48] then elegy would be invested with a social dimension of substantial interest to the student of women in antiquity. The mistresses stylized in elegy might then constitute poetic representatives of a whole movement of sexually liberated ladies and may be read as "symbolic of the new freedom for women in Rome's social life in the first century B.C."[49]

To establish such a connection between elegiac mistresses and Augustan women it is first necessary to find parallel portraits of the female outside the poetic sphere. If external evidence can be found for the gradual emergence of a breed of "emancipated" women, then it might be possible to argue that such women *provoked* elegiac production.

Sallust's description of an unconventional Sempronia provides the most frequently cited historical parallel for the elegiac heroines:

> litteris Graecis et Latinis docta, psallere, saltare elegantius quam necesse est probae, multa alia, quae instrumenta luxuriae sunt. Sed ei cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit; . . . lubido sic accensa ut saepius peteret uiros quam peteretur.
>
> Well educated in Greek and Latin literature, she had greater skill in lyre-playing and dancing than there is any need for a respectable woman to acquire, besides many other accomplishments such as minister to dissipation. There was nothing that she set a smaller value on than seemliness and chastity . . . Her passions were so ardent that she more often made advances to men than they did to her.[50]

Similarly, the Clodia Metelli who appears in Cicero's forensic speech *pro Caelio* is often adduced as an example of the kind of emancipated woman with whom Roman poets fell in love in the first century B.C. and about whom (thus inspired) they composed erotic verse. The early identification of Clodia Metelli with Catullus's *Lesbia* seems to strengthen such a link between living and written women and to bind the habits of a late Republican noblewoman—as evidenced by Cicero's *pro Caelio*—to poetic depictions of a mistress in the Catullan corpus.[51]

But the process of matching love poetry's heroines with a new breed of "emancipated" women raises methodological problems. Sallust's Sempronia and Cicero's Clodia have often been employed as evidence for the phenomenon of the New Woman—as elegy's historical twin is sometimes called.[52] It is important to observe that, even outside the poetic sphere, our principal evidence for the lives of ancient women is still on the level of representations, not realities. We encounter not real women, but representations shaped by the conventions of wall-paintings, tombstones, and, most frequently, texts. Any comparison between elegiac women and emancipated ladies tends, therefore, to be a comparison between two forms of discourse about the female.

Sempronia and Clodia are both to be found in texts. And as written women, they are—like their elegiac sisters—no accurate reflection of particular female lives. Sallust's Sempronia is written into a particular form of literary discourse, for, in the context of his historical monograph, she is structured as a female counterpart to Catiline.[53] Her features also belong to a larger historiographic tradition in which the decline of Roman *uirtus* and the rise of *luxuria* are commonly associated with aberrant female sexuality. Sempronia's qualities contradict the norms for a *matrona*. She is whorish because a whore embodies degeneracy and thus discredits the Catilinarian conspiracy.[54]

Clodia is also written into a text. The villainous features of this prosecution witness are put together from the stock characteristics of the comic *meretrix* and the tragic Medea. Cicero's Clodia is a *proterua meretrix procaxque* (*pro Cael.* 49) because sexual promiscuity was a long-standing *topos* in the invective tradition against women. As part of a forensic discourse, the sexually active woman is designed to sway a jury. The rapaciousness of this supposedly injured party turns the young, male defendant into a victim and her sexual guilt thus underscores his innocence.[55]

When attempting to reconstruct the lives of ancient women from textual materials, some critics have drawn upon a kind of hierarchy of discourses graded according to their usefulness as evidence. Marilyn Skinner, for example, argues that Cicero's letters offer a less tendentious version of Clodia Metelli than does his oratory. And the Clodia she recuperates from that source is one concerned not with sexual debauchery, but with the political activities of her brother and husband and with property management.[56] Perhaps this picture of a wealthy, public woman is a better guide to the new opportunities of the first century B.C., but it is not the picture of female behavior that Augustan elegy paints. The term *domina* could identify a woman of property, an owner of household slaves. But within the discourse of Augustan elegy, it takes on an erotic, not an economic, significance. The female subject that the poetic narrative constructs is not an independent woman of property but one dependent on men for gifts: *Cynthia non sequitur fascis nec curat honores,/ semper amatorum ponderat una sinus* ("Cynthia doesn't pursue power or care for glory,/ always her lovers' pockets she only weighs," 2.16.11-12). Augustan elegy, then, does not seem to be a response to the lives of particular emancipated women, but another manifestation of a particular patterning of female sexuality to be found in the cultural discourses of Rome.

Now Rome was essentially a patriarchal society sustained by a familial ideology. The basic Roman social unit was the *familia* whose head was the father (*pater*): "a woman, even if legally independent, socially and politically had no function in Roman society in the way that a man, as actual or potential head of a *familia*, did."[57] Consequently, in the conceptual framework of Roman society, female sexuality takes on positive value only when ordered in terms that will be socially effective for patriarchy. Sexually unrestrained women are marginalized. Displaced from a central position in cultural categories, they are associated with social disruption.

Using the Ciceronian Clodia as her starting-point, Mary Lefkowitz has documented the prevalence of this way of structuring femininity in antiquity. Praise or blame of women, Lefkowitz argues, is customarily articulated with reference to their biological role, assigned according to their conformity with male norms for female behaviour. The good woman is lauded for her chastity, her fertility, her loyalty to her husband, and her selfless concern for others. The bad woman is constantly vilified for her faithlessness, her inattentiveness to household duties, and her selfish disregard for others.[58]

A notable example of this polarization of women into the chaste and the depraved occurs at the beginning of the Principate: "In the propaganda which represented Octavian's war with Antony as a crusade, it was convenient to depict [Octavia] as a deeply wronged woman, the chaste Roman foil of the voluptuous foreigner Cleopatra."[59]

This patterning of discourses about the female can be grounded in history. A figure like Sempronia was not articulated in Roman texts before the middle of the second century B.C., after Rome's rise to empire—and its consequent wealth and Hellenization—had brought with it significant social and cultural change.[60] From this period there began a proliferation of moral discourses associating female sexual misconduct with social and political disorder. And by the first century B.C. childlessness, procreation, marriage, and adultery were appearing regularly as subjects for social concern in the texts of writers such as Cicero, Sallust, Horace, and Livy.[61]

So persuasive have these discourses on the female been that they have often been taken for truth. Many of the histories on which elegy's commentators once relied for reconstructions of Rome's New Woman invested their accounts of changes in women's social position with elements of moral turpitude transferred wholesale from the writings of the Roman moralists. For example, the *Cambridge Ancient History* claimed that "by the last century of the Republic, females had in practice obtained their independence, and nothing but social convention and a sense of responsibility barred the way to a dangerous exploitation of their privilege."[62] Similarly, Balsdon's *Roman Women* stated emphatically: "Women emancipated themselves. They acquired liberty, then with the late Republic and the Empire they enjoyed unrestrained licence."[63] Thus in the ready association of liberty with licence, the strictures of Roman moralists were turned into the realities of Republican lives.[64]

One particular form of discourse about female sexuality had considerable and significant currency during the period in which elegiac eroticism was produced. From 18 B.C. on, legislation began to appear that criminalized adultery and offered inducements to reproduce. But the production of elegy's female figures cannot be read as a direct poetic protest against this social legislation, although it appears to be the subject of one Propertian poem:

> gauisa est certe sublatam Cynthia legem,
> qua quondam edicta flemus uterque diu,
> ni nos diuideret.
>
> She was delighted for sure at the law's removal—Cynthia—
> over whose publication once we both cried long,
> in case it should part us. (2.7.1-3)

Since the tradition of erotic writing to which the Propertian Cynthia belongs stretched back at least as far as the Gallan corpus, the earliest examples of the elegiac mistress considerably predate the legislation.[65] But the appearance of the Augustan domestic legislation from 18 B.C. demonstrates that the discourses about female sexuality with which elegy was already engaged were now being institutionalized. Female sexual practice was now enshrined in law as a problematic issue with which the whole state should be concerned.[66]

Augustan elegy and its mistresses constitute, therefore, a response to, and a part of, a multiplication of discourses about, the female, which occurred in the late Republic and earlier Empire. Similarly, in his first volume on the history of sexuality, Michel Foucault demonstrates that, when "population" emerged as an economic and political problem in the eighteenth century, "between the state and the individual, sex became an issue, and a public issue no less: a whole web of discourses, special knowledges, analyses, and injunctions settled upon it."[67] In the first century B.C., at a time when female sexuality was seen as a highly problematic and public concern, the poetic depiction of the elegiac hero's subjection to a mistress would have carried a wide range of social and political connotations. And the elegiac mistress, in particular, would have brought to her poetic discourse a considerable potential as metaphor for danger and social disruption.

B. Metaphoric Mistresses

A brief outline of the operations of realism and of metaphor in Augustan elegy discloses that elegy's mistresses do not enter literary language reflecting the realities of women's lives at Rome. An examination of their characteristics reveals that they are fictive females engaged with at least two broad—but not necessarily distinct—categories of discourse. Shaped by developments in the production of literary texts and in the social construction of female sexuality, they possess potential as metaphors for both poetic projects and political order.

The second of these two categories will be further explored in the remainder of this article; for it is the range of connotations that the elegiac mistress gains as a result of her association with the erotic metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia*, rather than those arising from her identification with the Muse and the practice of writing elegy, that may most intrigue the student of women in antiquity.[68] Amy Richlin argues that on entry into a variety of Rome's poetic and prose genres such as invective and satire, the ordering of female sexuality is determined by the central narrative viewpoint which is that of a sexually active, adult male.[69] So, in depicting their hero as subject to and in the service of a sexually unrestrained mistress, do the elegiac texts offer any challenging new role for the female, or for the male alone?

Some critics have made much of the boldness of appropriating the term *laus* for the erotic sphere and *fides* for male sexual behaviour, but their descriptions of such strategies are seriously misleading. The Propertian narrator declares: *laus in amore mori: laus altera, si datur uno/ posse frui: fruar o solus amore meo*! ("Glorious in love to die: glorious again, if granted one love/ to enjoy: o may I enjoy alone my love!", 2.1.47-48). Both Judith Hallett and Margaret Hubbard, for example, frequently refer to such material as involving a bold reversal or inversion of sex roles—the elegiac hero sheds male public virtues and

takes on the female domestic virtue of sexual loyalty.[70] Such terminology suggests, erroneously, that in elegiac poetry the female subject gains a position of social responsibility at the same time as it is removed from the male.

But it is not the concern of elegiac poetry to upgrade the political position of women, only to portray the male narrator as alienated from positions of power and to differentiate him from other, socially responsible male types. For example, in the same poem of Propertius's second book, the narrator's erotic battles are contrasted with the activities of the *nauita*, the *arator*, the *miles*, and the *pastor*, without any reference to a female partner:

> nauita de uentis, de tauris narrat arator,
>   enumerat miles uulnera, pastor ouis;
> nos contra angusto uersantes proelia lecto:
>   qua pote quisque, in ea conterat arte diem.
>
> The sailor tells of winds, of bulls the farmer,
>   numbers the soldier his wounds, the shepherd his flock;
>   we instead turning battles on a narrow bed:
>   in what each can, in that art let him wear down the day. (2.1.43-46)

Similarly, in the first poetry-book the Propertian lover expresses, in the abstract terms of an erotic militancy, his difference from the soldier Tullus (1.6.19-36).

Furthermore, the elegiac texts take little interest in elaborating their metaphors in terms of female power but explore, rather, the concept of male dependency. The elegiac mistress may possess a camp in which her lover parades (Prop. 2.7.15-16) or choose her lovers like a general chooses his soldiers (*Am.* 1.9.5-6), but generally the elegiac metaphors are more generally concerned with male servitude not female mastery, and with male military service not female generalship. In *Amores* 1.2 it is Cupid who leads a triumphal procession of captive lovers, not the Ovidian mistress, and in *Amores* 1.9 it is the equation *miles/amans* not *domina/dux* that receives the fullest treatment.

The metaphors of *servitium* and *militia amoris* thus disclose the ideological repercussions for a man of association with a realistically depicted mistress. In a society that depended on a slave mode of production and in which citizenship carried the obligation of military service, these two metaphors define the elegiac male as socially irresponsible. As a slave to love he is precluded from participating in the customary occupations of male citizens. As a soldier of love he is not available to fight military campaigns.

The heterodoxy of the elegiac portrayal of love, therefore, lies in the absence of a political or social role for the male narrator, not in any attempt to provide or demand a political role for the female subject. The temporary alignment with a sexually unrestrained mistress that Augustan elegy depicts does not bestow on the female a new, challenging role but alienates the male from his traditional responsibilities. The elegiac poets exploit the traditional methods of ordering female

sexuality which locate the sexually unrestrained and therefore socially ineffective female on the margins of society, in order to portray their first-person heroes as displaced from a central position in the social categories of Augustan Rome. And, moreover, they evaluate that displacement in conventional terms. At the beginning of the second book of the *Amores*, the poet is introduced as *ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae* ("I, Naso, that poet of my own depravity," 2.1.2) and in the Propertian corpus the lover and poet of Cynthia is also associated with the scandal of *nequitia* ("vice" or "depravity," 1.6.26 and 2.24.6). Thus, the poetic depiction of subjection to a mistress is aligned, in a conventional moral framework, with depravity.

Finally, despite claims of eternal devotion, none of the elegiac poets maintain this pose consistently or indefinitely. At the end of the third poetry-book, the Propertian lover repudiates his heroine and describes himself as restored to Good Sense (*Mens Bona*). At the end of his first poetry-book, the Tibullan hero finds himself dragged off to war. And, toward the end of the *Amores*, the appearance of a *coniunx* on the elegiac scene disrupts the dramatic pretence that the narrator is a romantic lover involved in an obsessive and exclusive relationship.[71]

IV. Conclusion

The purpose of this article has been to suggest that, when looking at the relations between women in Augustan elegy and women in Augustan society, we should not describe the literary image of a mistress as a kind of poetic painting whose surface we can remove to reveal a real Roman woman hidden underneath. Instead, an exploration of the idioms of realism and metaphor has demonstrated that elegiac mistresses are inextricably entangled in and shaped by a whole range of discourses, which bestow on them a potential as metaphors for the poetic projects and political interests of their authors.

I hope that such an analysis proves not the conclusion of, but only the starting-point for, a critical study of elegy's heroines and their constructive power as metaphors for poetic and political concerns. But one aspect of this analysis may still seem unsatisfactory or unsatisfying, for it seems to offer no adequate place for living Augustan women in the production of elegiac poetry. Further questions confront us. How did women read or even write such male-oriented verse? Would a female reader be drawn into the male narrative perspective? And how did a female writer, such as Sulpicia, construct her *ego* and its male beloved? In such a context, would the erotic metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia* be appropriate or have the same range of connotative power?

Notes

An earlier version of this paper was read in 1987 to Oxford's seminar group on Women in Antiquity. I am very grateful to the participants for the comments they made at the time and to all those who have commented on or criticized the paper since, including C. Edwards, J. Henderson, E. Rawson, A. Scafuro, J. P. Sullivan, and the *Helios* referees.

1. See, for example, the comments of Foley in her preface to *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (1981), and the articles of Skinner and Culham in *Helios* (1986.2).
2. The bias in favour of Greek material is observed by Fantham (1986), 5-6.
3. Hallett (1973), 103-24, and (1974), 211-17; Betensky (1973), 267-69, and (1974), 217-19.
4. See Wyke (1987a), 47.
5. Quotations from the elegiac corpus follow the most recent editions of the Oxford Classical Texts.
6. For the problematic artifice of Augustan poetry see Griffin (1985), ix. On the genre of personal love elegy see Du Quesnay (1973), 1-2.
7. Lyne (1980), viii and *passim*.
8. The idiom belongs to Griffin (1985), for example, 105.
9. See, for example, Williams (1968), 542.
10. A classic exposition of the disjunction between textual realism and reality and a detailed exploration of the strategies of nineteenth-century French realist writing can be found in Barthes' *S/Z* (1975). For the importance of this work see Hawkes (1977), 106-22.
11. Allen (1950), 145-60.
12. Veyne (1983).
13. Sullivan (1976), 80.
14. Lyne (1980), 62.
15. For Cynthia and Delia as pseudonyms, see, for example, Williams (1968), 526-42.
16. Bright (1978), 104. Cf. Wyke (forthcoming), but contrast McKeown (1987), 19-24.
17. Williams (1968), 537.
18. Bright (1978), 99-123.
19. *Ibid.*, 123.
20. See Veyne (1983), 67 and 71, and Papanghelis (1987), 93-97.
21. Wyke (1987a).
22. For the narrative techniques of Books 3 and 4 see Wyke (1987b), 153-78.
23. See, for example, Stahl (1985).
24. See, for example, Hubbard (1974).
25. For a convenient summary of views on this literary relationship, see Fedeli (1980), 203-5 and 211.
26. For example, Hubbard (1974), 57-58, and Lyne (1980), 132.
27. See, for example, Nethercut (1970), 385-407.
28. For the comparison with *Odes* 3.30.1-7, see Nethercut (1970), 387, and Fedeli (1985), 90.
29. Fedeli (1985), 674 and 692-93.
30. For references to the extensive literature on these two poems, see Wyke (1987b), 168-70, and Papanghelis (1987), 145-98.
31. Cf. Veyne (1983), 60 on *Delia*.
32. See Clausen (1976), 245-47, and Boyance (1956), 172-75.
33. See, for example, Wimmel (1960).
34. For the intimate association of Cynthia and Callimachus in the Propertian corpus, see Wyke (1987a).
35. Williams (1968), 529-35.
36. Cairns (1972), 156-57.
37. Griffin (1985), 27-28.
38. The interpretation of verse 8 is open to much dispute.
39. See especially Veyne (1983), who argues that it is sufficient for elegy's purposes to locate its *ego* "chez les marginales."
40. See, for example, Fairweather (1974), 232-36.
41. Bright (1978), 103-04.
42. For references to male faithfulness in the elegiac corpus, see Lilja (1965), 172-86, and Lyne (1980), 65-67.
43. Hallett (1973), 111; cf. *ibid.*, 106.
44. *Carm. Epigr.* 455 and 643.5, for which see Williams (1958), 23-25.
45. For references to erotic *servitium* in the elegiac corpus, see Lilja (1965), 76-89; Copley (1947), 285-300; Lyne (1979), 117-30.

46. Hallett (1973), 103, contrasts the epitaph of Claudia (*ILS* 8403): *domum seruauit, lanam fecit*.
47. For references to erotic *militia* in the elegiac corpus, see Lilja (1965), 64-66, and Lyne (1980), 67-78.
48. Luck (1974), 15.
49. King (1976), 70.
50. Sallust, *Cat.* 25.2-4 (Budé edition, ed. A. Ernout 1964). The translation is that of Lefkowitz and Fant (1982), 205. For Sempronia's use as part of the social backdrop for elegiac production, see Lyne (1980), 14, and King (1976), 70 and n. 7.
51. See, for example, Lyne (1980), 8-18, and Griffin (1985), 15-28.
52. Balsdon (1962), 45.
53. Paul (1966), 92.
54. Boyd (1987).
55. Lefkowitz (1981), 32-40, and Skinner (1983), 275-76.
56. Skinner (1983).
57. Gardner (1986), 77.
58. Lefkowitz (1981), 32-40.
59. Balsdon (1952), 69. Griffin (1985), 32-47, also draws attention to correspondences between representations of Antony and the Propertian narrator.
60. I am indebted to Elizabeth Rawson for this observation.
61. See, for example, Richlin (1981), 379-404.
62. Last (1934), 440.
63. Balsdon (1952), 14-15.
64. Cf. Gardner (1986), 261.
65. For the details of the Augustan legislation see Last (1934), 441-56, and Brunt (1971), 558-66. Badian (1985), 82-98, doubts that even by the time Propertius's second book was published any attempt had yet been made to introduce the legislation concerning marriage. For the relation between Augustan elegy and the moral legislation, see also Wallace-Hadrill (1985), 180-84.
66. I am very grateful to Catherine Edwards for giving me access to an unpublished paper on the subject of adultery and the Augustan legislation.
67. Foucault (1981), 26.
68. For the elegiac mistress as a metaphor for her author's poetics, see, for example, Veyne (1983), and Wyke (1987a).
69. Richlin (1983).
70. Hallett (1973) and Hubbard (1974).
71. Cf. Butrica (1982), 87.

Works Cited

Quotations from Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid follow the Oxford Classical Texts of E. A. Barber (1960), J. P. Postgate (1915), and E. J. Kenney (1961), respectively.

Allen, A. "'Sincerity' and the Roman Elegists." *CP* 45 (1950): 145-60.

Badian, E. "A Phantom Marriage Law." *Philologus* 129 (1985): 82-98.

Baldson, J. P. V. D. *Roman Women*. London: The Bodley Head, 1962.

Barthes, R. *S/Z*. Trans. R. Miller. London: Jonathan Cape, 1975.

Betensky, A. "Forum." *Arethusa* 6 (1973): 267-69.

———. "A Further Reply." *Arethusa* 7 (1974): 211-17.

Boyancé. P. *L'influence grecque sur la poésie* latine de Catulle à Ovide. Entretiens Hardt 2. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1956.

Boyd, B. "Virtus Effeminata and Sallust's Sempronia." *TAPA* 117 (1987): 183-201.

Bright, D. F. *Haec mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in his World*. Leiden: Cincinnati Classical Studies, New Series 3, 1978.

Brunt, P. A. *Italian Manpower*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Butrica, J. "Review Article: the Latin Love Poets." *EMC* n.s. 1 (1982): 82-95.

Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972.
Clausen, W. "Cynthius." *AJP* 97 (1976): 245-47.
Copley, F. O. "Servitium Amoris in the Roman Elegists," *TAPA* 78 (1947): 285-300.
Culham, P. "Ten Years after Pomeroy: Studies of the Image and Reality of Women in Antiquity." *Helios* 13.2 (1986): 9-30.
Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M. "The Amores." In *Greek and Latin Studies, Classical Literature and its Influence: Ovid*, ed. J. W. Binns: 1-48. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
Fairweather, J. "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers." *Ancient Society* 5 (1974): 231-75.
Fantham, E. "Women in Antiquity: A Selective (and Subjective) Survey 1979-84." *EMC* 5.1 (1986): 1-24.
Fedeli, P. *Sesto Properzio: Il Primo Libro delle Elegie*. Florence: Accademia Toscana Studi 53, 1980.
——. *Properzio: Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie*. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1985.
Foley, H. P. *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. H. P. Foley. New York, London and Paris: Gordon and Breach, 1981.
Foucault, M. *The History of Sexuality*. Volume 1: *An Introduction*. Middlesex: Pelican Books, 1981. Reprint and translation of 1976 edition.
Gardner, J. F. *Women in Roman Law and Society*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
Griffin, J. *Latin Poetry and Roman Life*. London: Duckworth, 1985.
Hallett, J. P. "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism." *Arethusa* 6 (1973): 103-24.
——. "Women in Roman Elegy: A Reply." *Arethusa* 7 (1974): 211-17.
Hawkes, T. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. London: Methuen, 1977.
Hubbard, M. *Propertius*. London: Duckworth, 1974.
King, J. K. "Sophistication vs. Chastity in Propertius' Latin Love Elegy." *Helios* 4 (1976): 67-76.
Last, H. "The Social Policy of Augustus." In *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 10: 425-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
Lefkowitz, M. R. *Heroines and Hysterics*. London: Duckworth, 1981.
Lefkowitz, M. R. and M. B. Fant. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*. London: Duckworth, 1982.
Lilja, S. *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tideakatemia, 1965.
Luck, G. "The Woman's Role in Latin Love Poetry." In *Perspectives of Roman Poetry*, ed. G. K. Galinsky: 15-31. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1974.
Lyne, R. O. A. M. "Servitium Amoris." *CQ* 29 (1979): 117-30.
——. *The Latin Love Poets: from Catullus to Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
McKeown, J. C. *Ovid: Amores*. Volume 1, *Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool: Arca Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 20, 1987.
Nethercut, W. R. "The Ironic Priest. Propertius' 'Roman Elegies' iii, 1-5: Imitations of Horace and Vergil." *AJP* 91 (1970): 385-407.
Papanghelis, T. *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Paul, G. M. "Sallust." In *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey: London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
Richlin, A. "Approaches to the Sources on Adultery at Rome." In *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. H. P. Foley: 379-404.
——. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humour*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.
Skinner, M. "Clodia Metelli." *TAPA* 113 (1983): 273-87.
——. "Rescuing Creusa: New Approaches to Women in Antiquity." *Helios* 13.2 (1986): 1-8.
Stahl, H.-P. *Propertius: "Love" and "War." Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.

Sullivan, J. *Propertius. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
Veyne, P. *L'Élégie érotique romaine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983.
Wallace-Hadrill, A. "Propaganda and Dissent?" *Klio* 67 (1985): 180-84.
Williams, G. "Some Aspects of Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals." *JRS* 48 (1958): 16-29.
——. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
Wimmel, W. *Kallimachos in Rom*. Wiesbaden: Hermes Einzelschriften 16, 1960.
Wyke, M. "Written Women: Propertius' Scripta Puella." *JRS* 77 (1987a): 47-61.
——. "The Elegiac Woman at Rome." *PCPS* 213, n. s. 33 (1987b): 153-78.
——. "Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3.1." In *History as Text*, ed. Averil Cameron. London: Duckworth, forthcoming.

ILL record updated to IN PROCESS
Record 17 of 27

Case

ILL pe Record 17 of 27

CAN YOU SUPPLY ? YES NO COND FUTUREDATE

:ILL: 1793925 :Borrower: VZS :ReqDate: 20011018 :NeedBefore: 20011117
:Status: IN PROCESS 20011018 :RecDate: :RenewalReq:
:OCLC: 2464767 :Source: OCLCILL :DueDate: :NewDueDate:
:Lender: *VVC,VYF,VZH,VZJ,XQM
:CALLNO:
:U TITLE: Helios (Lubbock, Tex.)
:TITLE: Helios : journal of the Classical Association of the Southwest.
:IMPRINT: Lubbock, Tex., : The Association,
:ARTICLE: Wyke, Maria. Mistress and metaphor in Augustan Elegy
:VOL: 16 :NO: 1 :DATE: 1989 :PAGES: 25-47
:VERIFIED: OCLC ISSN: 0160-0923:0610-0923
:PATRON: Drennan, Katy DEPT: - STATUS: stu

:SHIP TO: ILL
Skidmore College Library
815 No.Broadway
Saratoga Springs
NY
12866

:BILL TO: Same
:SHIP VIA: Fastest at no chg. :MAXCOST: $0 IFM :COPYRT COMPLIANCE: CCL
:FAX: (518)580-5540 *** ARIEL ADDRESS 141.222.170.254
:E-MAIL: ILLDESK@skidmore.edu
:BORROWING NOTES: SUNY/OCLC Deposit Account# w/ UMI:D#800108 Oberlin Grp. Mem/CANNOT PAY INVOICE WITHOUT COPY OF REQUEST We do not charge for ILL services. Please reciprocate.
:AFFILIATION: SUNY/OCLC, Oberlin Grp., LVIS
:LENDING CHARGES: :SHIPPED: :SHIP INSURANCE:
:LENDING RESTRICTIONS:
:LENDING NOTES:
:RETURN TO:
:RETURN VIA:

10/18/01

SLC