THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

OF INCLUSION, VALUE, AND ROMAN ELEGY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

BY

JENNA SARCHIO

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2021

Any act of acknowledgement is doomed to be exclusive, and so it with the discomfort of knowing that there are many whom I will have failed to recognize that I give particular due to:

David Wray, whose energy and enthusiasm were a light in the dark.
Michèle Lowrie, whose incisiveness and encouragement fueled the fire.
Sarah Nooter, whose insight and expansiveness sparked creativity.

Kathy Fox, who always had my back, and whose door was always open.

The faculty committee for Classics graduate student recruitment for Academic Year 2014-2015, who gave me the opportunity to start.
The Mellon Dissertation Completion Fellowship, which gave me the surety to finish.

Rebekah Spearman, Rosalie Stoner, David Williams, Jordan Johansen, and Kate Miller, whose feedback made this work a better product, and whose friendship made this graduate endeavor a better experience. I am lucky to be included in their company.

Mom, for talking me down when I was overwhelmed; Dad, for talking things through when I was under-optimistic; and Tucker, for talking it out when I was in need. The verbal is but one dimension of the support you have given me, and words cannot express the depth of my gratitude.

Otto, whose patience allowed me to focus, whose impatience forced to me to take breaks, and whose presence brings me perspective. The summer, my friend, is yours.

And finally, E.S.R, who taught me to read closely, and who has remained, however unknowingly, however intangibly, however illogically, my beloved.

Including

Abstract

Contemporary critiques and modern criticism of Roman elegiac poetry and its distinctly transgressive lifestyle align in casting its practitioner on the outside of Roman cultural values. It is a notion that has crystalized in the *topos* of erotic exclusion and the figure of the *exclusus amator* doomed to suffer it, which have become both the indelible image and the governing metaphor of the genre of Roman elegy as a whole. This project amplifies the conversation around the exclusion of elegy and its practitioners from insider status—from both the bedroom of the beloved and the theater of Roman cultural value—with a consideration of how elegy fashions its own inclusion. Through readings of the elegies of Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid (the *Amores*), I consider how each harnesses the complementary *topos* of erotic inclusion to counter the cultural devaluation of the elegiac craft.

I approach this issue through a study of two overarching themes, both anchored in the notion that the elegiac *amator* is categorically *exclusus*: the conception of love as lacking in substance and the conception of love as a waste of time, whose development I chart in two respective sections. Part I, *In Venere Veritas*, addresses the assessment that erotic love is a delusion that cannot survive an encounter with the beloved, tracing instances in elegy of the poet-lover shown in the company of his mistress and discussing the ways in which such episodes harness the state of inclusion to demonstrate the validity of passionate love—and the viability of elegiac poetics along with it. Part II, *Operosus in Otio*, turns to the charge that love and its poetry are idle and indolent. Against this accusation, I position the elegists' own depictions of love as a form of personal industriousness through their representations of erotic activity in terms of *lucubratio*, the practice of working during the off-hours of the night, which challenges the devaluation of the erotic-poetic undertaking as an exercise incompatible with Roman *mores*.

Introduction

Outside Impressions

This is a study in intimacy, in shared space and interior interaction.

Then again, this is a study in publicity, in social standing and cultural capital.

It is, in short, a study of Roman elegy, which turns on axes of alterity and assimilation, balanced precariously on the tipping point between private and public, participatory and peripheral. Its poetics profess a preference for rebellious rejection of social standards—a pointed withdrawal from the culture of *Romanitas* and its prescriptions for lifestyle and livelihood—while simultaneously belying an anxiety to meet them, fashioning itself in the very terms it programmatically denounces.[1] It is always, we could say, on the outside looking in.

It is, perhaps, for this reason that the condition of erotic exclusion and the *amator* who is subject to it have become such a compelling image for representing the genre of Roman elegy. If the experience of the elegiac lover is routinely one of desire endured and expressed at the door of an imperious *domina*—a fixture equally forsworn and feted in the course of the *amator*'s performance—then the position of elegiac poetics could be seen as equally *exclusus*: ever on the threshold of Imperial Roman society, locked in a battle of impulses to be received and to renounce.

As it happens, the structure of the threshold—as both architectural and literary construct, cultural symbol and poetic device—offers one image around which more nuanced readings of the elegiac experience have coalesced. Piero Pucci has approached the elegiac *limen*, ever implicated in both the exterior and the interior worlds between which it mediates, as a metonym

[1] As Platter (1995), 224 puts it, Roman elegiac poetry positioned itself "to contend directly with Roman political ideology and to attempt to secure for itself an equal or superior standing, while rhetorically representing itself as a marginal discourse at the fringes of traditional political life."

for the *domina* and her domesticity, such that "the pursuit and fulfillment of desire take on the connotations of a crossing of the *LIMEN*. Accordingly, crossing the *LIMEN* and possessing the mistress become the same thing."[2] Jeri Debrohun has similarly enfolded the structure of "the *limen*, always dynamic with its two-sidedness and inherent issues of inclusion and exclusion" into the issue of elegiac poetics, where it becomes "the property of the poet who creates his poetry", "a tool… for the poet himself to manipulate and control."[3] Both are limited to the dynamics of liminality in the poetry of Propertius (though the feast is movable); both establish a dialectic between exterior and interior in the representation of the elegiac experience; and both represent a counter-turn from the categorical association of the elegiac *amator* with a state of separation and disappointment.

But the centrality to the elegiac worldview of the *exclusus* and his antics—generically identified with the *paraclausithyron*, the song of (s)exile sung "beside the closed door" of the beloved's abode—is steadfast. Advanced by Frank Copley in 1956, who proposed understanding the *vigilatio ad clausas fores* as "the most telling and most nearly all-inclusive of the lover's experiences",[4] the model has endured, more or less uninterrogated, as a tenet of elegiac generic criticism, anchoring analyses that span ranges both chronological and thematic. A smattering ensues:[5]

> Alison Sharrock (1995), in an examination of elegiac impotence: "for the classic paradigm of elegy is the locked-out lover."
>
> Parshia Lee-Stecum (2000), in a study of power dynamics in Tibullan poetics: "The appearance of the *exclusus amator* theme … suggests the definitive role which exclusion from the beloved's presence plays in the self-presentation of the elegiac poet/lover."

[2] Pucci (1978), 55.
[3] Debrohun (2003), 127-128, 134.
[4] Copley (1956), 74.
[5] Sharrock (1995), 157; Lee-Stecum (2000), 198; James (2003b), 141; Nappa (2007), 58; Damer (2019), 57.

Sharon James (2003), in a consideration of the *docta puella* as the audience for elegy: "References to the condition of the *exclusus amator* occur regularly, so that it seems virtually omnipresent in elegy."

Christopher Nappa (2007), in a reconsideration of the *paraclausithyron* in Propertius 1.16: "Frank Copley calls the '*vigilatio ad clausas fores* … the central experience of the lover,' and this is no overstatement."

Erika Zimmerman Damer (2019), in a treatment of the physical body as a motif in elegy: "the classic pose of the speaker is that of the *exclusus amator*, languishing outside his hard mistress's door."

There is good reason for the endurance of the paradigm. The alterity of elegy, its representation as literary and social pariah, is a touchstone in elegiac poetics, a common component of the elegiac *recusatio*, in which disavowal of the Roman ethic of assiduous engagement in respectable occupation—

> navita de ventis, de tauris narrat arator
> enumerat miles vulnera, pastor oves:
> nos contra angusto versamus proelia lecto (Prop. 2.1.43-45)[6]
>
> The sailor speaks of winds, the farmer of bulls,
> the soldier tallies his wounds, the shepherd his sheep:
> but we wage our battles in a narrow bed
>
> Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro …
> me mea paupertas vitae traducat inerti (Tib. 1.1. 1, 5)
>
> Wealth, let someone else stockpile it for himself with gleaming gold …
> As for me, may my poverty consign me to a languid life
>
> ipse ego segnis eram distinctaque in otia natus;
> mollierant animos lectus et umbra meos. (Ov. *Am*. 1.9.41-42)
>
> I, myself, was indolent and destined for singular idleness;
> The bed and the bower had softened my constitution.

—intersects with rejection of vaunted literary modes:

> nec mea convenient duro praecordia versu
> Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos. (Prop. 2.1.41-42)
>
> I do not have the stuff to cement, in forceful verse,
> the name of Caesar among his Phrygian ancestors.

[6] Latin text throughout will use consonantal *v*; translations of Latin and Greek will be my own.

rura cano rurisque deos (Tib. 2.1.37)

I sing of rustic fields and rustic gods

hoc quoque iussit Amor—procul hinc, procul este, severae!
non estis teneris apta theatra modis. (Ov. *Am*. 2.1.3-4)

This, too, Amor commanded—be gone far, far from here, serious matters!
You are no suitable audience for my delicate meters.

To speak of the depreciation of elegy as an orientation is to take at face value the word of its primary purveyors, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid, when they offer such apologies for the indulgence of base impulses that its composition represents. The sentiment is voiced so systematically by the elegists that it is easy to discount as a poetic trope, a requisite component of the elegiac *recusatio*, whose hollow formalities ask not—perhaps ought not—to be taken seriously. Indeed, Ovid's image of his elegiac poetry as would-be epic save for the cruel intervention of metrical larceny—both artistic self-defense and generic origin story—is so well-turned that it seems to betray self-satisfaction more than genuine insecurity.[7] But it is not unreasonable to detect in these programmatic gestures the looming presence of a cultural reality. Yelena Baraz has taken a similar approach to the apologetic posturing done by Cicero in the prefaces to his philosophical treatises, where "the criticisms he ventriloquises … indeed represent real social and cultural pressures. They form part of a discourse shared with other roughly contemporary works that attempt to broaden the field of socially acceptable intellectual inquiry."[8]

Certainly the elegists share a language of contradistinction, both poetic and personal, whose expression can, while it reflects the conceit of Callimachean λεπτότης (minimalism) of

[7] Ov. *Am*. 1.1.1-5: *arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam/edere, materia conveniente modis./par erat inferior versus—risisse Cupido/dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem* (I was poised to write about arms and violent wars in hexameter, with material befitting meter. My lower line was no lesser—Cupid is said to have laughed and stolen away a foot).
[8] Baraz (2012), 22.

literature and lifestyle alike,[9] equally refract a cultural reality. But a wider conversation around the relative merits of Venus and verse can also be tapped. For, in fact, the sense of a cultural devaluation of the ways and means on which elegy turns is discernible in "roughly contemporary" appraisals of both love and its poetry that come from without, not just from within. As in Lucretius' withering depiction of the impassioned *exclusus amator*, on the wrong side of the door, reason, and social decorum at once;[10] as in Cicero's scholarly dismissal of love as singularly vacuous and ascription of its portrayal to the playful poet—[11] presumably a different brand of bard from the one who, like Archias, *omne … studium atque omne ingenium contulerit … ad populi Romani gloriam laudemque celebrandam* (has applied every effort and every talent to enshrining the glory and praise of the Roman people, *pro Arch.* 19). Assessments, both, that speak to a set of prevailing attitudes about the general tenor of the *amor* that was, at the time Catullan,[12] and that would come to be elegiac—even if not to elegiac poetry specifically. Assessments, both, that position the lover and the versifier of amorous activity on the outside of better Roman sensibilities, as concern both comportment and composition.

So it would seem that elegy speaks of, by, and for the outside, denied access to the vault of literary-social value both from within, by those who produce it, and from without, by those who peruse it. The othering of elegy and its practitioners is, undeniably, a salient aspect of the poetry. It is, undeniably, a central and structural conceit of the elegiac orientation, one whose presence can be felt even in moments that do not deal overtly in alienation. But the condition of exclusion is not quite as categorical as Copley's model would hold. Indeed, as per Charles

[9] See Hunter (2006) and (2012) for discussion of Hellenistic Greek poetry and its reception in Roman poetics.
[10] Luretius *DRN* 4. 1177-1184.
[11] Cic. *Tusc*. 4.68-70.
[12] Cf. Kenney (1970a), 389 where Lucretius' diatribe against passionate love in *DRN* Book IV "is in effect a sustained polemic against the Catullan view of life and love."

Platter's estimation that "In creating for itself a position of empowered otherness, poetry tacitly reinserts itself within the control of the political world it attempts to deny",[13] elegy exists as much on the inside of the discourse it purports to eschew as it does at its margins.

And not just on the inside of social discourse, but on the inside of domestic space. For the elegiac poet-lover inhabits the same quarters as his beloved just as routinely as he does the language of the wider cultural conversation—and with no less significance. As much truth as there is in Erika Damer's observation that "Elegy rarely depicts sexual encounters between the poet-speaker and the *puella*," that "these encounters, when they do appear, are depicted fleetingly before the elegiac collection moves past them by means of deferral or deflection",[14] it remains that this description of elegiac poetics can apply, equally, to its scholarship, which has, by and large, offered only fleeting engagement with the depiction of elegiac interiority, making the impression of elegy's relative disinterest in a *topos* of non-exclusion somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Even Pucci's sensitive study of the architectural and symbolic significance of the threshold in structuring the action and interaction of the *amator*—deviate as it does from the standard of categorical denial and disappointment—hinges on the lover's experience of separation and exteriority. For Pucci, being on the threshold is being within, an inside-out model in which the door and its sill represent the interior and the mistress, such that when the poet-lover is acting the *exclusus*, he is, in effect, performing his own reception.[15] A compelling insight, one that will reverberate throughout the treatment I offer, but one that nonetheless operates across a partition.

[13] Platter (1995), 224.
[14] Damer (2019), 57.
[15] Pucci (1978), 55-56.

And so what follows will be a sustained consideration of the elegiac interior, of elegy's occupation of insides both physical and ideological in its generic self-(re)presentation. It is an approach to the poetry that takes several cues from Pucci and Debrohun, but that moves even beyond the threshold at which they stop to witness the *amator* included—spatially, sexually, socially. It is an approach that sees as much programmatic significance in the poet-lover's experience as insider as has been attached to his position as outsider—a reading of Roman elegy as a genre that not only distinguishes itself against an in-group of cultural values and practices, but that also demonstrates its claims to distinction on those very terms. A reading, in short, that seeks to locate in moments of inclusion a revaluation of Roman elegiac poetics.

And it is an approach that is not out of step with the broader conversation around spatial confinement that Victoria Rimell has heard conducted in Roman Imperial poetry, whose preference for nooks and niches and recesses, for close quarters and the language of contraction, becomes symptomatic of an anxiety of empire, a poetic enclosure to offset a political expansion.[16] Like Rimell's perception of a dialectic between expanse and enclosure—of socio-spatial enlargement inducing a need for confinement, of confinement being comfortable only in a context of socio-spatial enlargement—exclusion and inclusion operate, in my reading, as states that obtain simultaneously, rather than conditions that contradict one another. I am not proposing that we replace one binary with another; both, we will see, are integral to elegiac intercourse.

Inside Job

This is a study, but it is also a story—of doors opened and access gained and inclusion performed, literally and literarily. The narrative runs like this:

[16] Rimell (2015). Cf. Roman (2014), 243 on "the early Augustan concept of the sheltering niche of literary exchange."

As a response to the undermining of erotic poetry inherent in the cultural depreciation of the experience and practice of love as lacking substance and consequentiality—the life of love as exclusive, we could say, of any meaningful value—is offered the figure of the elegiac poet-lover engaged. Engaged, first, with the person of his beloved, in whose company, as an *inclusus amator*, he can substantiate a passion that is otherwise dismissed as illusory. Engaged, second, in the practice of love, his amatory interaction coming to embody poetic productivity in a way that counters depictions of the elegiac poetic lifestyle as idle and otiose.

The discussion will unfold by degrees:

Part I, *In Venere Veritas*, explores the *topos* of inclusion and the counter-figure of the *inclusus amator* as they are harnessed by Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid to demonstrate the validity of passionate love, rebutting a representation of erotic *amor* as delusional that finds its best articulation in Lucretius' famous denunciation of erotic passion in Book IV of *De Rerum Natura*.[17] Here, instances of elegiac inclusion are registered as moments in which the lover is shown in the company of his beloved—sometimes sexual in nature, though not exclusively so; and the consequences of this logistical shift in the experience of the *amator* are aligned with a program of portraying the validity of elegiac love, now seen to obtain in conditions of intimacy, not just of isolation.

The course of thematic development, from Propertius to Tibullus to Ovid, will be of beloved encountered, imagined, evacuated: Propertius will meet with the body of Cynthia, Tibullus with the thought of Delia, Ovid with overexposure to Corinna. In each case, the encounter will reify the nature of elegiac love, even if the nature of the encounter differs from

[17] A position that Brown (1987), 85 summarizes thus: "Through the connection established between dreaming and love Lucretius suggests that love, too, is a kind of illusion. For love, like dreams, vision, and other illusory experiences, is based upon a misleading mental response to raw perceptual data."

poet to poet. What this consideration of scenes of inclusion will ultimately encourage is a rethinking of exclusion as the categorical state of the elegiac *amator*—and indeed, of exclusion and inclusion as a binary at all. For the elegiac lover need not derive his identity from a singular standpoint; the nature of his experience, in fact, suggests that exclusion and inclusion are not polarized states of being.

Inclusion is, in a way, already a term applied to Roman elegiac poetics. To speak of inclusion in elegy is to repurpose the language of formal analysis, wherein "inclusion" designates a specific rhetorical device by which "material from one genre can be found within an example of another".[18] It is a poetic property on particular display in Roman elegy—one that Francis Cairns notes is frequently used to tuck tokens of the κῶμος (the umbrella performance of public revelry under which the *paraclausithyron* is subsumed)[19] into otherwise non-komastic contexts; a phenomenon that Cairns concedes is "usually, but not always, of little generic significance", but that nevertheless reflects the pervasiveness of the orientation of exclusion in the interpretation of elegy, if a primary purpose to which the device of inclusion is put by the elegists is the implication of a context of exclusion.[20]

This is not what I am talking about when I talk about inclusion, although my use of the word is not at cross-purposes with the formally descriptive work the term can do. Indeed, as we will see, my deployment of the concept to circumscribe the specific situation of the poet-lover portrayed in the presence of his beloved—a *topos* of togetherness proposed as a counterpart to the well-defined one of separation—will activate many of the principles that underlie rhetorical inclusion: the recollection of one generic situation within the expression of another, the

[18] Cairns (1972), 159.
[19] For the relationship between the κῶμος and *paraclausithyron*, see Copley (1942) and Cairns (2020).
[20] Cairns (1972), 158.

conversation between the two that is instantiated thereupon, the possibility for "innovations on the topical level" that such an embedding allows.[21] Cairns' observation, in fact, that formal inclusion in elegy is often applied to allude to the κῶμος will become quite apt, as the experience of union with the beloved will be seen to amount to a kind of exclusion-in-inclusion for the *amator*.

The situation of the poet-lover's presence before his beloved has also, in a way, already been thematized: in the figure of the *receptus amator*, whose rare welcome into the bed of his mistress constitutes those scenes of sexual success that Damer identifies as so fleeting.[22] Rather than recycle the language of the *receptus*, though—which is arguably a more immediate foil, in Latin, to the experience of the *exclusus*—I have chosen to embrace the English-informed complement of *inclusus*, which, while being a less direct correspondent, is all the more copious a descriptor for it. For the instances of inclusion I will consider are not always products of reception—that would make, to follow Damer, for a very brief study, indeed; and to speak of the elegiac *amator* as *inclusus* is to redirect language that has been used, if only in a localized way, to capture an elegiac condition whose dimensions fit the contours of the representation I will be defining.

The adjective is used by Sharon James to distinguish the domesticated *puella*—the *inclusa amata*—from her gallivanting swain (the *exclusus amator*);[23] and is applied directly to modify the *amator* by Debrohun, who advances the concept of an *inclusus amator* to describe the unique positionality of the character of Arethusa in Propertius 4.3.[24] For both, *inclusus* speaks to a

[21] Cairns (1972), 158. For further explication and examples of rhetorical inclusion in ancient Greek and Latin poetry: Cairns (1972), 158-176.
[22] Cf. James (2003b), 108 where "the elegiac lover seeks always to be the received lover (*receptus amans*)".
[23] James (2010), 335.
[24] Debrohun (2003), 149 ff.

passive, feminine interiority that sits either in contradistinction to (James) or tension with (Debrohun) an active, masculine externality. For neither does *inclusus* apply to the *amator qua amator*. In Debrohun's construction, in particular, the designation *inclusus amator* functions as more of a portmanteau, an uneasy yoking of passive feminine domestication to active masculine execution to convey the singular experience of the homebound but battle-craving Arethusa, physically contained (*inclusus*) but actively coveting (*amator*), and so neither fully *inclusa amata* nor *exclusus amator*. Debrohun's purview may be limited in its scope, but her use of the language of *inclusus* to designate an experience that mediates between simultaneous states of inclusion and exclusion aligns with the valences of the representation that I will draw out.

Part II, *Operosus in Otio*, builds on the foundation of inclusion established in Part I to consider one of the representational possibilities that arises from the recognition of the *inclusus amator* as a salient figure in Roman elegy. The scene of inclusion and the presence of the beloved, we will see, can catalyze a portrayal of love as a form of personal industriousness—venery as versification—presented in the trappings of a formal *lucubratio*, the practice of working by lamplight in hours without daylight; this as a way to counter the critique of love—and the composition of poetry dedicated to it—as indolent.

The cultural virtue of *lucubratio* stems from the capitalization on leisure time that it exemplifies: it is not itself work proper, but in its conversion of otherwise unused hours into working hours, it demonstrates a respectably productive use of downtime. By presenting amorous pursuits in the mold of *lucubratio*—appropriating the visual and contextual cues that attend its performance—the elegists can both challenge the characterization of the erotic-poetic lifestyle as an exercise in wanton idleness and remain true to the nature of elegiac pursuits as an activity of *otium*.

The intersection of the amatory and the literary is one exploited by poets before, most notably in the nexus of erotic and poetic that animates Catullus *c.* 50, but it is more systematically developed and reworked in Roman elegy, more explicitly assimilated to a particular context of performance that carries particular cultural associations. In this, the now conventional term of art for the elegiac persona—poet-lover—will be thematically apropos. More than a way to navigate the issue of poetry that presents as autobiography, it becomes true to the poetic representation: the lover, in his amatory exercise, engaged in poetic practice; the elision between the erotic and the poetic inherent in elegy—a generic descriptor itself connotative of both love and its poetry—reflected in the figuration of loving as composing.

A similar developmental pattern to the one that underpins the study of inclusion will emerge across each poet's depiction of lucubratory activity: Propertius articulates, positioning the act of loving as a direct instantiation of lucubratory writing; Tibullus abstracts, deconstructing the *lucubratio topos* and thematizing its constituent elements—light and dark, domesticity and productivity—in the name of Delia and Nemesis; Ovid alters, pulling back the curtain on the private amatory-cum-literary practice and taxing the performative possibilities of the *lucubratio* representation as he opens up the portrayal of erotic-poetic productivity to include not just the beloved, but the reader. Here, too, an assumed binary will ultimately be reconsidered: the dichotomy between productivity and profligacy, reconciled through readings that allow elegy to embrace both industry and indolence simultaneously—to be at once a form of leisure and labor, rather than limited to one or the other identity.

The instantiation of an elegiac *lucubratio*, then, becomes a means to revalue the erotic-poetic practice by identifying it with a "third space"—to borrow again from Debrohun's lexicon

in conceiving of elegy as a zone of generic intersection—[25] that is neither fully immersed in the business and busyness of the day nor utterly lost to the seductions and shiftlessness of the night, but that is, all the same, wholly integrated into the Roman cultural program. Like the figuration of the *amator* as *inclusus*, the portrayal of love as *lucubratio* creates a form of exclusion-in-inclusion, allowing the elegiac practice to retain its exteriority to the workings of Roman society while simultaneously participating in the economy of time that structures Roman sensibilities.

The ultimate irony of this elegiac project is its parallelism with efforts at occupational rehabilitation undertaken by the very figures who contribute to the devaluation of the erotic and its poetics: Cicero and his stratum of scholarly writers, in whose philosophical and historical works Baraz detects a comparable anxiety to combat the public perception of their literary endeavors "as a product of *otium*, a sphere that is not expected to be productive of things to be taken seriously", a campaign that "requires that the dominant paradigm be, if not overturned, then at least significantly modified and expanded to make room for intellectual activity."[26] With a few nominal tweaks, Baraz's evaluation of the postures assumed by Republican writers of prose could be applied, substantively unchanged, to Augustan authors of elegy. Both face a chorus of critiques to which their works voice a sensitivity; both work to destabilize a prevailing set of attitudes about their pursuits; both invest in the revaluation of their craft within a culture that sees it as marginal.

And so there is a good deal of consequence contained in the representation of inclusion.

We have long been singing the song of the *exclusus*. Time, now, to voice the other side.

---

[25] Debrohun (2003), 24 ff. *et passim*. Debrohun is concerned with Propertius Book IV, wherein "the genre of elegy, or elegiac discourse, itself becomes a sort of 'third,' a manipulable space in which patriotic, aetiological elegy (*Roma*) and love elegy (*amor*) confront each other" (25). Her conception of Propertian elegy as a metaphorical "third space" in which generic binaries can be complicated is fodder for my own reading of *lucubratio* across the Roman elegists, even while my application of the term is as literal as it is metaphorical.
[26] Baraz (2012), 39.

Part I

In Venere Veritas

Overview

The State of Affairs

sic in amore Venus simulacris ludit amantis[1]

just so, in love, does Venus delude lovers with mirages

Thus observes Lucretius at the outset of an extended criticism of erotic love that closes Book IV of *De Rerum Natura*. It is a moment in which the pitfalls of sensory (and sensual) perception are witheringly borne out: a beloved, he reveals, for all the beauty and allure, can contribute nothing to the person of the lover *praeter simulacra .../tenuia; quae vento spes raptast saepe misella* (except feeble images; a pitiful hope that is often spirited away by the wind, 4.1095-1096). True connection develops gradually through repeated exposure to someone otherwise unoffensive;[2] but the gripping passion of immediate desire is an illusion—there's no there there.

However "extreme", in Georg Luck's estimation,[3] this position on the unreality of the erotic may have been, Lucretius was not alone in his denial of weight to the amatory experience. Cicero echoes the sentiment in the *Tusculan Disputations*, dismissing out of hand so empty an emotion as love:

> Totus vero iste, qui vulgo appellatur amor—nec hercule invenio quo nomine alio possit appellari—tantae levitatis est, ut nihil videam quod putem conferendum. (*Tusc.* 4. 68)
>
> But this whole business, which is popularly called love—nor, by god, do I know by what other name it can be called—is so lacking in substance that I can see nothing that I consider comparable.

As with the Lucretian conception of the sensation of passionate *amor* as rooted in devotion to a *simulacrum*, the Ciceronian take denies to love the dignity of consequence, reducing it to a

[1] Lucretius, *DRN* 4. 1101
[2] *DRN* 4. 1278-87
[3] Luck (1969), 22 where he locates Lucretius on the negative end of the scale of representations of love in Roman literature, with Plautus and Terence and their "conventional" happy endings for romance providing the counterbalance.

condition that is singularly meaningless.[4] And lest the denigration of erotic desire be limited to its manifestation in human action, Cicero continues on to implicate poetry in the ill-conceived veneration of passion's fatuous thrall:

> Sed poetas ludere sinamus, quorum fabulis in hoc flagitio versari ipsum videmus Iovem. … O praeclaram emendatricem vitae poeticam! quae amorem, flagitii et levitatis auctorem, in concilio deorum collocandum putet (*Tusc.* 4. 69-70)
>
> But let's allow the poets their fun, in whose tales we see Jove himself engaging in this debauchery. … O poetry, that eminent editor of life! It reckons love, the author of disgrace and triviality, to be lodged in the company of the gods.

What Cicero here conveys is poetry's departure from reason and reality in its representation of the erotic. Only in a flight of poetic fancy would Jupiter degrade himself by perpetrating sexual *flagitium*; only in the poetic imaginary could Amor, in truth the begetter of base misbehavior, rank among the divine. A sentiment with which Lucretius, despite the famed incompatibility between his own worldview and Cicero's,[5] would no doubt agree, if his demystification of the origins of love can offer any evidence:

> idque petit corpus, mens unde est saucia amore;
> namque omnes plerumque cadunt in vulnus et illam
> emicat in partem sanguis, unde icimur ictu …
> sic igitur Veneris qui telis accipit ictus,
> sive puer membris muliebribus hunc iaculatur

[4] I am not alone in reading *levitas* here as "trifle", rather than as a more charged denotation of corrupt morality. King (1945), 407 does so in his translation for the Loeb: "In fact the whole passion ordinarily termed love … is of such exceeding triviality that …"; as does Graver's (2002), 64 more recent translation: "Indeed, speaking of what is popularly called love … all of it is so frivolous that …". (And the *OLD* bears this out, according to which *levitas* on its own does not tend to reflect moral deficiency.) I do not, though, want to dismiss out of hand the notion that *levitas*, when understood within the broader context of the *Tusculanae*, conveys something more nuanced than mere insignificance—that it perhaps approaches something closer to improbity. But on this count I would say that if *levitas* here imputes to erotic love the valence of immorality, it does so less on its own terms and more by way of its implication in a direct acknowledgement of *amor*'s unseemliness in the two sentences prior, which I did not include above, but which I reproduce here: *haec laetitia quam turpis sit satis est diligenter attendentem penitus videre. et ut turpes sunt qui efferunt se laetitia tum, cum fruuntur Veneriis voluptatibus, sic flagitiosi, qui eas inflammato animo concupiscunt*. (One need only pay close attention to get a complete picture of just how unseemly this pleasure is. And, in the same way that those who lose themselves in pleasure at the time when they are enjoying erotic delights are disgraceful, equally so are those who long for those erotic delights with impassioned spirit.) My suggestion, then, would be that, while *amor is* here being condemned as base, the specific charge of its *levitas* sits alongside that of its impropriety—a general dismissal of love's import within the larger discussion of its devotees' debasement. As a final note, I will add that the Roman elegists' own defiant application of the adjectival form, *levis*, to describe the nature of their poetry makes this passage a particularly resonant point of reference.

[5] Cf. Conte (1994a), 158.

seu mulier toto iactans e corpore amorem,
unde feritur, eo tendit gestitque coire (*DRN* 4.1048-1050, 1052-1055)

and his body seeks that by which his mind was wounded with love;
for all, for the most part, list in the direction of their wound
and our blood rushes to that very place from which we are struck by the blow …
and so it is that he who receives a blow of Venus' weapon,
whether struck by a boy with feminine build
or a woman radiating passion from every inch of her body,
inclines toward that very place where he is struck and longs to couple

The "weapon of Venus" is revealed to be cast not by any divine hand, but by the physical body of the desired; and the attendant attraction is exposed as a physical response rather than a heaven-sent affliction. *haec Venus nobis est, hinc autemst nomen Amoris*, he concludes (*this* is our 'Venus', from *this*, moreover, comes the name of *Amor*, *DRN* 4.1058), his biological etiology of the erotic impulse working to similar ends as Cicero's depreciation of *amor*: the deconsecration of love.[6]

What is more, Cicero's reflection in the *Tusculanae* trivializes the work of the poets as much it does their theme.[7] *poetas ludere sinamus* he grants in language that recalls Lucretius' *simulacris ludit amantis*. Cicero's use of the verb is doubtless less sinister in valence here—far more likely that he is willing to give poets license to play around than to deceive—but the resonance is undeniable. And the deluded (and deluding) nature of their poetry is, in fact, borne out: Jupiter disgraceful in love, love itself deified. As Venus makes sport of lovers, so poets make sport of the truth.[8]

[6] On which, see Kenney (1970a), 381 where he discusses Lucretius' "denunciation [of love] by way of its physical origins. Love is human and animal and material, there is nothing 'divine' about it; 'love', so called, consists of the physical effects generated by one human body on another …."

[7] Which project, Kenney argues (1970a), 380 Lucretius might also be pursuing in *DRN*: "…Lucretius employs allusive irony to attack the erroneous notions of love that he saw at work around him and to convey the implication that the responsibility for them must at all events in part be fastened on the foolish romanticism and sentimentality of contemporary poetry."

[8] There is also, of course, the inherent trivialization of love poets and their output in the suggestion that what they do is play, not work; and the implication that their writings, however much they amend reality, are so harmlessly silly as to pose no real threat to their readership and thus to warrant no oversight.

Even if the literary landscape began to shift with Catullus and Horace and the Augustan contingent of poets who embrace the erotic experience as meaningful,[9] it does not erase the tradition that rejects it as hollow. And it is under the auspices of literary tradition that I invoke the wisdom of Cicero and Lucretius—not in order to make nuanced arguments about their authorial intent or sweeping claims about cultural attitudes in the late Republic, but rather to articulate one prevailing perception of love as being, in both practice and poetry, illusory. Whether this notion of amorous attraction was widespread and in what, if any, form it might have endured into the early Empire is less my concern than the reality of its purchase in the literary tradition and, thus, in the literary consciousness—a consciousness that suffuses the neoteric poetry of Catullus,[10] and that would have gone on to inform the elegiac poetry that was, in many ways, descended from it.[11] Indeed, if E.J. Kenney is correct to see in Lucretius' poetry, in general, a cultivated Callimacheanism and in his diatribe against love, in particular, a direct response to the Catullan poetics of desire,[12] then placing his work in conversation with that of the elegists is hardly a stretch, given that their own indebtedness to Catullus and Callimachus—and the respective

[9] As per Luck (1969), 22 where he observes that "the attitude toward love in literature changes radically" around Lucretius. I will add here that the nature of this attitude adjustment as a *literary* phenomenon does not necessarily mean that love was vindicated in the broader cultural consciousness. Vestiges of the Lucretian and Ciceronian disdain for passionate love can be detected in later writers: Seneca, for example, who, in one such instance, unites *amor* with *ira* and *cupiditas* in an unholy trinity of states that drive one out of one's senses and into dangerous doings (*Ep. Luc*. 76.20-21).

[10] Cf. Konstan (1972), 102 ff. where he expounds on "Catullus' concern with and re-evaluation of traditional Roman attitudes toward love."

[11] Suggesting that the elegists are very much aware of, and working within/alongside/against, the literary tradition into which they have entered is hardly controversial. Discussion of Roman elegy's engagement with other traditions and genres—Greek elegy, Alexandrian Hellenism, New Comedy, pastoral, epic to name but a few—is abundant. A succinct diagnosis of its polyglot nature is provided by Farrell (2003), 397: "Latin love elegy draws quite self-consciously on all of these traditions without confining itself to any one of them; but it also owes a lot to other, nonelegiac genres. … The poets themselves have a lot to say about why they do not write epic, tragedy, or philosophy (whether in prose or verse), and about the antecedents, real or imagined, of their own work."

[12] Kenney's (1970a) thinking has since been followed and expanded by Betensky (1980), Brown (1982), Gale (2001), and Nethercut (2018). The "learnedness" of Lucretius' poetics and their reflection of Callimachean influence is the focus of Kenney's (1970a) article; for the connection to Catullus: 380 ff., summed up thusly on 389: "… the whole discussion of love in *DRN* Book IV is in effect a sustained polemic against the Catullan view of life and love."

traditions that formed around them—is well-documented, both in their poetry itself and in the scholarship dedicated to it.[13]

So it is in the context of this particular condemnation of love as voiced by Cicero and Lucretius, which I will here condense as the charge of its unreality, that I would like to consider elegy: how its practitioners engage with, and work to undermine, the criticism of its vanity. I see this enacted in the development of a *topos* of inclusion in elegiac poetry, one that counters the paradigmatic figure of the *exclusus amator* with an image of the lover in the company of his beloved. This shift in the status of the lover from outsider to insider allows each of the elegists to craft scenes in which the validity of the amatory experience is reinforced.

But before turning, in earnest, to the workings of elegy, I would do well to return to Lucretius, whose exposition of love will provide the framework for my discussion. The nuances of his position on *amor* are instructive for my purposes here and are, perhaps, unfairly deemphasized in my preamble. For the Lucretian stance on love is more complex than categorical contempt for all things amatory. Aya Betensky has compellingly elucidated the distinctions Lucretius draws between the love that is unreal, which he aligns with passion, and that which is true, which is not fervent, but is rather the product of gradual habituation (*consuetudo*) to, and discovery of the merits of, another.[14] The rub for Lucretius, Betensky demonstrates, is blind, idealizing erotic love, the kind that descends instantaneously and grips absolutely, burning hot and fierce for a time, only to wane just as quickly as it waxed. Love that builds gradually, on the other hand, not involving an uncritical veneration of the beloved, but a clear-eyed recognition of her foibles, and that leads to a

[13] As in Hunter (2006), Cairns (2006b), Miller (1997), Arkins (1988), Rubino (1975), Clausen (1964), though the well is so deep and the pronouncement so commonplace that the enumeration need hardly go on. Hunter and Bessone supply respective chapters on the Greek and Roman precedents for Latin elegy in its Cambridge Companion volume (2013), where more bibliography can be found. For readings of elegy in relation to Lucretius, see Pillinger (1971), Miller (1997), Fabre-Serris (2005), O'Rourke (2014) and (2016).
[14] Betensky (1980). Cf. *DRN* 4.1283: *quod superest, consuetudo concinnat amorem* (as for the rest, habituation breeds love)

lasting partnership is the objective.[15] Even so, as much as Lucretius does allow for love—true love—in human endeavors, elegiac *amor* is not vindicated. It is anything but a slow-burn: Propertius famously is captured, in an instant, by Cynthia's eyes in 1.1; Ovid's *Amores* open with the lover on the receiving end of Cupid's arrow and the immediate fire it inculcates (1.1.25-26). Love in elegy is of the passionate kind, and as such is Lucretian *simulacrum*.

Or is it? For the issue of the unreality of passion is systematically addressed by the elegists, who harness the logistics of these scenes of inclusion to create a context in which the ideal love and the real love can obtain simultaneously—and indeed can be one and the same. In these moments, passion is no illusion and elegy is not deluding.

The State of Exclusion

This may seem, at first blush, a rather anti-elegiac contention—that the *amator* and his experience are equally defined by the presence of the beloved as by her absence. The essence of elegy as poetry of desire depends precisely upon it being poetry of desire; and desire, as we know from Plato, is contingent on separation.[16] Exclusion and unfulfillment have thus, quite logically, been upheld as the *sine qua non* of Roman elegy—the erotic poet's stock-in-trade—[17] and the image of the mistress' closed door and the lover's encampment thereat has become a metaphor for the worldview of the elegiac *amator*, always on the outside looking in.[18] So much so that the very

[15] Betensky (1980), 294.
[16] Plato *Symp*. 200a8-b3, where it is agreed between Socrates and Agathon that τὸ ἐπιθυμοῦν ἐπιθυμεῖν οὗ ἐνδεές ἐστιν, ἢ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ἐνδεὲς ᾖ (one desires what is lacking, and experiences no desire when it is not lacking). Cf. Frederick (2012), 431: "Elegy most definitely has a 'story' to complement its frozen moments of erotic contemplation, and the essence of this story is separation from the *puella*."
[17] Copley's (1956) seminal study of the figure of the *exclusus amator* in Roman elegy did much to cement the status of the shut-out as *primus inter paribus* in the conceptualization of the genre.
[18] Cf. Copley (1956), 122 where the *vigilatio ad clausas fores* is deemed "the central experience of the lover". Nappa (2007), 58 similarly identifies the *paraclausithyron* as the vehicle best suited to represent the elegiac *amator*, who "is defined both by his exclusion and his potential admission" and provides a useful summary of scholarship on the subject (n. 6).

bosom of the *topos*—the poetic κῶμος and its *pièce de résistance*, the *paraclausithyron*—[19] represents for J.C. McKeown, in his appraisal of Ovid's *Amores*, an "unpromising theme for dramatic development," a potential pitfall for the poet of desire to be navigated with care: "the komast's aim is … the opening of the door, but, if that were to happen, the komos would lose its *raison d'être*."[20] If the very potentiality of the closed door to open threatens to destabilize not just the elegiac universe, but the elegiac undertaking altogether, then representing the lover on the far side of the *fores* would be anathema to the amatory condition and the genre it underwrites.

Such a notion certainly seems to have informed Lucretius' sensibilities about desire and its demonstration, the ferocity of whose attack on erotic *amor* attends, in part, a derisive depiction of the hapless suitor-cum-komast, so lost in love that he is blind to the reality of his beloved's disinterest, metonymically and metaphorically communicated by her closed door, beside which he plants himself and upon which he lavishes imprecations and decorations in the vain hope that it will open:

> at lacrimans exclusus amator limina saepe
> floribus et sertis operit postisque superbos
> unguit amaracino et foribus miser oscula figit (*DRN* 4.1177-1179)
>
> but tearfully the shut-out lover often covers her threshold
> with flowers and garlands and anoints her lofty posts
> with unguent and plants kisses, the wretch, on her doors

The classic *paraclausithyron* scene that Lucretius portrays was already by his time a staple of the erotic experience on page and stage.[21] The readiness of a man in love to stoop to demeaning

[19] Where the κῶμος is, in Griffin's words (1981), 42 "a more or less noisy, often violent, progress of the lover, with or without companions, to the house of his beloved, by night"; and the *paraclausithyron* the plea for entrance once there. The latter term technically refers only to the song performed by the denied suitor "beside the closed door" of the beloved, but has come to encompass the context of utterance just as much as the utterance itself: the late night, the threshold, the histrionics. For the relationship—and distinction—between the two: Cairns (2020); and for their generic identities: Cairns (1972).
[20] McKeown (1988), 66.
[21] Canter (1920), Copley (1942) and (1956), 1-28.

demonstrations of devotion despite the futility of the performance no doubt provided the fodder for comedic use of the pastiche; the pitilessness of that same futility certainly inspired the woeful warbling of the lyric "I." But the takeaway for Lucretius is not so much the self-abasement and the senselessness in and of themselves; it is the very origin of the act in the false impression of true love that is passion. It is for this reason that his discussion envisions the *amator* doing what McKeown's does not: moving beyond the closed door to reveal the reality of that oh-so-desired admission:

> quem [sc. amatorem] si, iam ammissum, venientem offenderit aura
> una modo, causas abeundi quaerat honestas,
> et meditata diu cadat alte sumpta querella,
> stultitiaque ibi se damnet, tribuisse quod illi
> plus videat quam mortali concedere par est. (*DRN* 4.1180-1184)
>
> if just one waft from her strikes him, now granted admission, as he enters,
> he'd cast around for creditable reasons to leave,
> and his plaintive tune, so long practiced, so profoundly inhabited, would cease,
> and then and there he would curse himself for his stupidity, when he sees that
> he has attributed more to her than is suitable to impart to a mortal.

As per Plato's prognosis that desiring and acquiring are mutually exclusive, the raging passion that binds the lover to his beloved's sill cannot, Lucretius contends, endure once the threshold has been crossed. The idealized projection of the beloved that holds sway on the outside cannot withstand the encounter with her real body on the inside, where her earthly scent dispels the heavenly ether of her imagined form, a smelling salt that jolts the lover out of his reverie—and out of Dodge.

Given this appraisal of erotic *amor* as predicated on the lover's separation from his beloved—that is, as able to obtain only when the lover is on the outside, where false impressions go unchallenged—it is no wonder that the figure of the *exclusus amator* has become definitive of the elegiac lover. If the passionate love that defines his experience and the poetry that captures it is the effect of his beloved's inaccessibility, then neither he nor his poetry can, by definition,

embrace the body of the mistress. This is Plato's *eros* in action, the embodiment of the philosophy of desire on which the participants of the *Symposium* settle: salient in separation, curtailed upon contact.

The State of Union

It comes as some surprise, then, that the obstacle of the closed door is not, in fact, all that often encountered by the elegiac *amator*. Propertius' corpus contains only one explicit *paraclausithyron*—a statistic comparable in the collections of Tibullus and Ovid—[22] and even this is nontraditional in its orientation. If the experience is so emblematic of the elegiac *amator*'s raison d'être, it would not be unreasonable to expect to find more.[23] The lover's isolation does, of course, precipitate poems that preserve the essence of gated exclusion even while abstracting its context,[24] but the particular confluence of circumstance and behavior that characterizes the doorstep vigil remains only occasionally enacted. What is even more unexpected is that the lover is captured in the company of his mistress more often than he is on her threshold,[25] a situation that would seem to have particular appeal for elegy despite its ostensible deviation from the prototypical state of elegiac exclusion.[26]

---

[22] *Paraclausithyra* proper appear once in Propertius (1.16), twice in Tibullus (1.2 and 1.5), and once in Ovid's *Amores* (1.6). Cf. Copley (1956), 91, 113, 125.

[23] Passing reference is made to nights spent on an unfriendly threshold in Prop.1.8.21-22 and 3.25.9-10, but the only fully realized episode—at least that adheres to the conventions of the *topos*—is embedded in the door's airing of grievances in 1.16.

[24] As, for example, Tib. 2.6, which Murgatroyd (1994), 242 places as a *paraclausithryon* alongside 1.2 and 1.5 on the strength of the invocation of its circumstances in ll. 11-18; or Ovid *Am*. 3.6, which McKeown (1988), 67 dubs a *paraclausithyron* in essence, "the obstruction being caused by a mountain-torrent in flood, rather than by a door or door-keeper." The stringency with which the *paraclausithyron* is identified can vary; Copley (1956), for his part, is more judicious in his assignments, though he does (70-90) include alongside his discussions of true *paraclausithyra* instances of allusion to, rather than enactment of, the performance.

[25] In Prop. 1.3, 1.6, 2.14, 2.15, 2.29, 3.8, 4.7, 4.8; compare to instances in Tib. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6; and in Ov. *Am*. 1.4, 1.5, 1.10, 1.13, 1.14, 2.5, 2.12, 2.18, 2.19, 3.2, 3.7.

[26] This suggestion is offered in light of the perceived lack in Catullus of scenes in which the lover is in the actual, rather than imagined, company of his beloved. In Cat. *c*. 32, which seems to come closest to a representation of togetherness in its description of the lover's afternoon delight with Ipsitilla, intercourse is hoped for, not realized. Horace *Ode* 3.9 gives voice to the *puellae* Lydia and Chloe, but their presence before the poet is not established; *Ode* 3.29, a directive given to Lyde, does not make clear whether she and the speaker are together (or, for that matter, whether she is a love interest in this context); *Ode* 4.11 offers a similar set-up, this time with Phyllis, but the

In light of this observation, what I would like to suggest is that the elegists are pointedly redefining the terms of the elegiac experience, taking us where elegy seemingly cannot go: behind the closed door. It is an advancement that even Plato was willing to make: in the disruption of his *Symposium* by the komiastic (and encomiastic) Alcibiades, who breaches the gates in his revelry but is no less besotted for his intrusion.[27] The introduction of the lover into this space—in which passion is, per Lucretius, extinguished, false idols toppled—allows for a reinvention of the *amator* as *inclusus*, and with that a reconsideration of the unreality of love. Granted entrance into the company of his mistress, whether for conversation or coitus, the elegiac protagonist can be seen to transpose the trappings of exclusion to the context of inclusion—to repurpose the elements of the *paraclausithyron* in his interaction with his beloved—in so doing undermining the notion that the sheen of envisioned love is tarnished by embodied reality.

A consideration, though, before proceeding: it is not my intention to deny to the state of exclusion a role in shaping the experience of the elegiac *amator*. But I do think that the categorical identification of the elegiac lover's worldview with the closed door and the condition of being *exclusus* is both too limited and too limiting. Indeed, it seems counterintuitive to ascribe so singular a standpoint to the elegiac *amator* in his negotiation of the physical and emotional

---

proximity of lover to beloved is not clarified; *Epode* 8, a rebuttal of his mistress' presumed complaint about his erectile dysfunction, does not place the two in the same space; *Epode* 17 represents the speech of the addressee, Canidia, but does not make clear her physical proximity to the poet. *Epodes* 12 (a riff on the theme of erectile dysfunction, this time involving an unnamed mistress) and 15 (addressed to Neaera) are the only poems in which the Horatian lover interfaces with his mistress. It might, additionally, be worth noting that scenes in which the lover interacts with his beloved in the flesh are not hard to find in epic.

[27] Plato *Symp*. 212c6-7, d3-4: καὶ ἐξαίφνης τὴν αὔλειον θύραν κρουομένην πολὺν ψόφον παρασχεῖν ὡς κωμαστῶν …. καὶ οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον Ἀλκιβιάδου τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούειν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ (and suddenly the exterior door was struck and let in a good deal of noise, as of revelers …. And not long after they heard the voice of Alcibiades in the hall); and 222c1: εἰπόντος δὴ ταῦτα τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου γέλωτα γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ παρρησίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐδόκει ἔτι ἐρωτικῶς ἔχειν τοῦ Σωκράτους (once Alcibiades had said his piece, laughter arose at his frankness, as he seemed still to have desire for Socrates).

space between himself and his beloved while simultaneously embracing polyvalence as a distinguishing characteristic of Roman elegy as a genre.[28] And if we accept as a generic attribute of elegy an *amator* who oscillates between, for example, masculine and feminine poles of gender expression,[29] why should we resign ourselves to an understanding of his fundamental orientation as fixed by the shutting of a door?

Such a sensibility, no less such imagery, aligns quite naturally with studies of literary closure, interested, in their purest expression, in literal endings—of poems, of collections—but less strictly entertaining issues of finality broadly construed, as in the question of a given work's amenability to new interpretations.[30] My own reading does, perhaps, represent the obverse of interest in completion and completeness—the aperture to its closure—but concern with conclusions naturally feeds questions of what does, or might, continue beyond them, and in this way the two are very much facets of the same coin.[31] Indeed, the finality of ending that "closure"—and, concomitantly, the image of the closed door—ostensibly signals can be misleading: the concern of studies in closure with the dialogue between open and shut—the "deconstruction of the opposition itself that shows their mutual implicature", as Don Fowler puts it—[32] equally allows for the possibility of instances of "false" closure, a notion that will be

[28] Farrell (2003), 397 ff.
[29] As studies of elegy do, of which Wyke (2007), Miller (2001), Greene (2000), Hallett (1973) are representative.
[30] Cf. Fowler (1989), 78 where he outlines the "five different senses of 'closure' in recent criticism", of which "The degree to which the work allows for new critical readings" is the fifth. For an introduction to the concerns of studies in poetic closure, see Smith (1968). Fowler additionally provides a useful overview of the scope of scholarship on closure, both in general literary criticism (1989) and in Classics in particular (1997).
[31] Fowler (1989) himself approaches the relationship between literary closure and aperture as a dialectic; in which critical tradition Grewing, Acosta-Hughes, and Kirichenko (2013), 3 locate their edited volume of essays on "False Closure", positioned as extending the study of literary closure "not only to consider the inherent dialectic between closure and aperture but also to ponder on (or to question) the heuristic value offered by the emphasis on the relativity of the end."
[32] Fowler (1997), 6-7.

instructive for my own understanding of the relationship between inclusion and exclusion in structuring the elegiac experience.[33]

What I am proposing, then, is not the correction of the vision of elegiac exclusion, but the expansion of the elegiac paradigm to embrace the state of inclusion. Not just the *possibility* of admittance that a closed door can signal, as in Christopher Nappa's formulation of the elegiac condition,[34] but the lover's *actual* presence before his mistress. In this alternative model of interaction between lover and beloved, the elegiac experience is determined as much by the state of inclusion as that of exclusion; and the elegiac *amator* and his *puella* are defined by desire not just unfulfilled, but satisfied.[35] Indeed, it is not just the hope of union, but its very accomplishment that comes to engender longing. Gaining access to the beloved does not, ultimately, represent the achievement of the elegiac end-game; it restarts the cycle of desire and fulfillment, reversing the symbolism of the closed door through the demonstration that the state of inclusion brings the possibility of exclusion—and with it the desire for more. What comes to define the elegiac experience, accordingly, is not the moment deferred—in which model achieving a state of inclusion represents total satiety and the consequent dissolution of the desire that enables elegiac activity—but the instant repeated, whereby inclusion does not represent a conclusion of elegiac aspiration, but a catalyst for renewed desire. As a result, the elegiac lover ceases to exist in a perpetual state of suspension (as attends the *exclusus*) and comes to be in a perpetual state of motion—a sequence of inclusion craved, obtained, and craved anew. For such

[33] For the concept of "false closure", see Grewing, Acosta-Hughes, Kirichenko (2013).
[34] Nappa (2007), 58 where "The door keeps the lover from that which he desires, and yet a barred door is always **potentially** unbarred. … The *exclusus amator* is defined both by his exclusion and his **potential** admission" (emphasis mine).
[35] This in distinction to Nappa's (2007), 68 articulation of the mechanics of elegiac identity: "…the paraclausithyron is central to love elegy and erotic literature generally: not only does it provide a schematic of desire by showing us the would-be lover within reach of, but barred from, his beloved, it also represents the way that the beloved is generated by the thwarted desire and resultant fantasizing of the *amator*."

a conception of the elegiac state of affairs, the image of the locked door is, I think, too immobile—better that it be a revolving one.[36]

[36] The image of the revolving door as an apposite elegiac image has also been advanced by Johnson (1997), 180 in his discussion of the figure of Cornelia in Prop. 4.11.

Chapter 1

Outside-In in Propertius

Recasting the *Exclusus*

Let us open at the close: the *ianua clausa*, that is, of Propertius 1.16, an unconventional *paraclausithyron* in its presentation (in that it is the door, not the lover, who speaks), but one that nevertheless depicts the standard elements of the conventional elegiac *vigilatio*.

> nunc ego, nocturnis potorum saucia rixis,
> pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus,
> et mihi non desunt turpes pendere corollae
> semper et exclusi signa iacere faces. (1.16.5-8)
>
> now I, wounded by the nightly brawls of drunks,
> knocked by unworthy hands, complain often,
> and without fail unsightly garlands hang on me
> and always torches lie on me, the souvenirs of the shut-out.

Thus run the opening lines of the *porta*'s complaint, the standard features of the jilted lover's vigil catalogued by our unhappy intermediary: the nocturnal visitation (*nocturnis … rixis*); the remonstrations (*pulsata … manibus*); the imprecatory festooning (*pendere corolla … iacere faces*). All of this the mere prelude to the main event: the lover's song itself.

> ille meos numquam patitur requiescere postis,
> arguta referens carmina blanditia: …
> 'cur numquam reserata meos admittis amores,
> nescia furtivas reddere mota preces? …
> sed tu sola mei, tu maxima causa doloris,
> victa meis numquam, ianua, muneribus, …
> ut me tam longa raucum patiare querela
> sollicitas trivio pervigliare moras?' (1.16.16-17, 19-20, 35-36, 39-40)
>
> he never allows my posts to have any peace,
> performing his ditties with ringing niceties: …
> 'why do you, never unbolted, never let in my love,
> unknowing how to budge and convey my clandestine appeals? …
> But you are the only—the greatest—cause of my grief,
> you, door, who are never swayed by my gifts, …
> such that you allow me, hoarse from such prolonged complaining,
> to spend the night in disquieted suspense in the street?

These, then, are the essential components of the *paraclausithyron* for Propertius; and, as such, if we adhere to conventional wisdom, definitive of the elegiac experience—and its demonstration of Lucretian delusion. It is here on the threshold, under cover of night, amidst the detritus of unsuccessful suitors, that the elegiac *amator* is fully realized, warbling his songs in a perpetual state of hankering and hope, longing for a mistress whose allure would surely evaporate with the opening of the door.

Against this backdrop of a stock representation of the lover excluded I would position the portrayal of inclusion in Propertius 1.3,[1] which witnesses the lover returning to Cynthia after a night of carousing:

> ebria cum multo traherem vestigia Baccho,
> et quaterent sera nocte facem pueri.
> hanc ego, nondum etiam sensus deperditus omnis,
> molliter impresso conor adire toro (1.3.9-12)
>
> while I was wending my way on footsteps tipsy from much wine,
> and the boys where fanning the torch in the wee hours of the night.
> Her, not yet deprived of all my faculties, even,
> I make to approach on the bed, weighted ever so slightly.

The scene should be familiar: the intoxication (*ebria … Baccho*), the late hour (*sera nocte*), the perching on a delimited spot (*impresso … toro*) in an attempt to access the *puella* (*hanc … conor adire*) all characterize the *paraclausithyron*. But the episode has been transferred inside and restaged to make the central interaction between poet-lover and beloved, rather than poet-lover and door. Indeed, the transferal is carried beyond the mere logistics to encompasses the poet-lover's behavior, rechoreographing the movements of the *paraclausithyron* in the context of his interaction with his mistress:

[1] Correspondence between 1.3 and 1.16 was first suggested by Otis (1965), 8, 18-22 in his argument for a reading of the *monobiblos* as a cohesive and intentionally structured unit and was revisited by Courtney (1968), 253-254 in a similar project. Both position the poems as inverses of one another; neither interprets 1.3 as a play on the *paraclausithyron*.

et modo solvebam nostra de fronte corollas
ponebamque tuis, Cynthia, temporibus;
et modo gaudebam lapsos formare capillos;
nunc furtiva cavis poma dabam manibus;
omniaque ingrato largibar munera somno,
munera de prono saepe voluta sinu (1.3.21-26)

and at one time I was loosening the garland from my forehead
and was placing it, Cynthia, on your temples;
and at another I was delighting in doing your undone hair;
and now I was offering secreted apples to your cupped hands;
and every gift I was bestowing on ungrateful sleep,
gifts that kept tumbling from the fold of your body in its repose

The *corollae* hung on the door by the *exclusus amator* in poem 1.16 are here used by the *inclusus amator* to decorate his girl; the *furtiva … poma*—lavished on Cynthia just as the *furtivas … preces* of the frustrated lover were bestowed upon the door (1.16.20)—constitute the detritus of the performance, themselves *signa inclusi* that correspond to the *exclusi signa* of garlands and torches from 1.16.8.

Now, the reading of the door in Propertius 1.16 as a stand-in for the elegiac *domina* has been advanced by other studies of the poem.[2] But what is emerging from its juxtaposition with poem 1.3 is the sense of an interior tableau that is crafted in the image of the familiar exterior spectacle. Here, the elegiac performance of passion does not end once the poet-lover has gained entrance to his beloved. Indeed, when faced with the reality of her body, it is not to flight that the lover turns in shame and disillusionment, but to the same display of devotion that the threshold thought of her inspires: captivated beholding, expectant approach, ritualistic festooning. Daniel Harmon similarly notes the echoes of the *exclusus* in the Propertian *amator*'s domestic doings[3] and even grants that their enactment does little "to encourage the interpretation that the lover is

[2] See James (2003b), 138-139 where she notes similarities between the lover's representation of the door as *dura, crudelis, perfida* and his characterization of Cynthia in consonant language. Nappa (2007), 71 builds on this notion in his discussion of the door's obstinacy as akin to the *puella*'s rejection of her suitor's overtures.
[3] Harmon (1974), 160 where "the poet's gestures … are those of a frustrated lover."

somehow purified of his passion in the encounter with his 'otherworldly mistress'."[4] To the same end, Shelley Kaufhold has observed the recurrence of language in this context of inclusion that further speaks to the endurance of *amor* beyond the state of separation. Commenting on the use of the participle *fixa* to describe the position Cynthia will, upon waking in line 34, assume (*in molli fixa toro cubitum*, her elbow planted on the soft couch) she connects the verb *figo* whence it is derived to the general characterization of love as the product of Cupid's piercing arrow (as in *spicula quot nostro pectore fixit Amor*, how many shafts Amor planted in my heart, 2.13.2); and to the poet-lover's own riveted surveillance of the sleeping form of his beloved in 1.3.21, where he admits that *intentis haerebam fixus ocellis* (I just kept standing there, planted, with eyes fixated). Her suggestion is that the use of *figo* in 1.3 carries with it the erotic connotation at work in the implanting of love shafts in 2.13, and that its use to describe Cynthia not only imbues her with an ardor that mirrors the lover's own, but that allows her to assume the role of *amator* in their interaction.[5]

Kaufhold's primary interest is in the slippage between beloved and poet-lover that the use of *figo* here effects—a transformation that will become salient in my own discussion below. But on a more basic level, her analysis speaks to the recreation of the dynamics of exclusion in a context of inclusion and the continued experience of love that accompanies it. For not only does the twinned use of *figo* to describe both poet-lover and beloved imply their joint participation in the workings of passion, it harkens back to the impassioned display of the *exclusus* on the threshold of his beloved, where—if we recall the portrayal in Lucretius—he *foribus miser oscula* ***figit*** (*DRN* 4.1179). And so we are presented, in 1.3, with a moment in which the poet-lover's encounter with the person of his beloved fails to dampen his passion (or hers, for that matter);

[4] Harmon (1974), 161.
[5] Kaufhold (1997), 94.

passion that continues to be expressed in the same gestural vocabulary that characterizes his canonical experience of exclusion and ideation.

The argument can be, and in fact has been, made that the poet-lover's mythologizing experience of Cynthia in lines 1-30 is grounded in fantasy, and that her eventual awakening and delivery of a lament *in propria voce* signals the incursion of a less attractive reality.[6] While the heady quality of the initial encounter and the sobering tone of the address to which it yields cannot be denied, any distinction between ideal and real does not here necessarily upset the ardor that otherwise should, in Lucretius' estimation, be dispelled by the dissolution of the reverie.

To this point, consider the nature of Cynthia's speech: if she initially is cast as an idealized beloved, she quickly assumes the guise of the traditional elegiac lover upon waking and bemoaning her lot.[7] Kaufhold again has suggested that the scene of Cynthia's ornamentation, which witnesses a shift in narrative orientation from description of her at rest (ll. 1-20) to direct address of her as she is being decorated (ll. 21-30), presages her eventual speech, a transitional device that moves the poetic perspective from Cynthia as object to Cynthia as subject.[8] I would add that the act of adornment itself is implicated in the progression toward Cynthia's soliloquy. By outfitting her in the regalia of elegiac exploit—the *corollae*, the *poma*—the poet-lover is transferring to her the tokens of the elegiac *amator*: she is visually transformed in the image of the lover whose "song before the door" her own speech will shortly approximate. A similar

[6] Lyne (1970) and Harmon (1974) represent earlier engagements with the issue; Kaufhold (1997), 88 offers a more recent take, in the course of which she provides a useful doxography on the subject in n.9.
[7] Cf. Kaufhold (1997), 94 ff. James (2010), 335 observes that Cynthia here "uses language typical of the male lover, and presents an elegiac *querela*", though for James this "song of the *inclusa amata*" represents "a counterpart to the song of the *exclusus amator*", rather than a recasting of the *puella* as the *amator*. Harmon (1974), 163-164 aligns Cynthia's speech with the complaint of the tragic heroine and, similarly to James, positions the lover-cum-*exclusus* as her "foil."
[8] Kaufhold (1997), 92-93. Traces of this interpretation are also present in Harmon's earlier observation (1974), 160 that "in setting the flowered crown upon her head, Propertius anticipates the gradual shift of interest from his own thoughts and fantasies to those of the sleeping girl."

pattern can be detected in the door's plight in 1.16: littered with the *exclusi signa*—in that case, *corollae* and *faces*—the door likewise becomes a reflection of the lover; and it is only when sporting his spolia that it reproduces the lover's song.

And what of the poet-lover himself? If he enters poem 1.3 as the classic elegiac lothario, tipsy and hapless in his ill-advised performance, his bestowal upon Cynthia of his lover's costume strips him of the marks of the elegiac *amator* and relegates him to the receiving end of the lover's complaint. The episode thus rechoreographs the movements of the scene of exclusion, enacting the very mechanics of the *paraclausithyron* on display in the *exclusus amator*'s interface with the door of 1.16 in the *inclusus amator*'s interaction with Cynthia: the transfer of elegiac accoutrements transforms their recipients, visually and then substantively, into quintessential elegiac *amatores*.

The scene of inclusion, accordingly, becomes a mirror image of the scene of exclusion, where subject and object are reversed, where the *puella* is recharacterized as *amans* and the *amator* as *amatus*, and where the erotic compulsion continues to obtain.[9] For elegiac passion is not extinguished once the poet-lover ceases to be *exclusus*; it is rather embodied by the beloved, whose emotional reciprocity legitimizes the poet-lover's own ardor, and whose physical transformation into a reflection of the *amator* maintains the essential dynamic of the elegiac relationship, even without the physical barrier of the door to inculcate desire. It is a rotational exchange that allows for both poet-lover and beloved to experience both desire and being desired; and the validity of the relationship is, consequently, reified, albeit indirectly: they circle

[9] This type of role-reversal has been observed by scholars interested in elegiac gender dynamics, as Wyke (2007), 31 ff. who discusses the features of the "elegiac transformation of traditional sexual roles"; Hallett (1973), 109 who remarks the elegists' "bent toward social innovation by consciously and deliberately (if sometimes ironically) inverting conventional sex roles in their poetry"; and Greene (2005), 211 whose account of the elegiac *amator* involves his "identification with feminine powerlessness and vulnerability and his concomitant classification of elegy as a distinctly 'feminine' genre."

each other, to indulge the revolving door imagery, in partitioned experiences that, by virtue of their compartmentalization, preserve the essence of elegiac longing.

A quick spin through a moment of inclusion in poem 1.6 will help to anchor this interpretation. In declining to join Tullus on his travels, the poet-lover cites as a prohibiting factor Cynthia's displeasure at the prospect of his absence:

> illa mihi totis argutat noctibus ignes,
> et queritur nullos esse relicta deos;
> illa meam mihi iam se denegat, illa minatur
> quae solet ingrato tristis amica viro. (1.6.7-10)
>
> all through the night she harangues me about her blazing passion
> and complains that, if she's left behind, there are no gods;
> she denies that she is still mine, she threatens
> those threats that an upset girlfriend tends to level at a thankless man.

The resonance between the representation of Cynthia's complaint here and the characterization of the lover's lament in 1.16 is suggestive. The speech of both is described using forms of *arguto*(*r*): the Cynthia of 1.6 actively *argutat*; the *exclusus amator* of 1.16 seasons his monologue with *arguta … blanditia.* And it is likewise couched in permutations of *queror*: the Cynthia of 1.6 actively *queritur*; the *exclusus amator* of 1.16 is hoarse with *longa … querela*. So, too, is the substance of their respective objections summarized—arguably trivialized—in generic terms: the Cynthia of 1.6 threatens *quae solet ingrato tristis amica*; the *exclusus amator* of 1.16 is disdained as intoning all those platitudes *si quae miseri novistis amantes* (whatever you sorry lovers are well-versed in, 1.16.45). And with this inverted reproduction of the performance of exclusion in a context of inclusion comes, as in 1.3, the persistence of passion: the *ignes* are not smothered by the realization of their relationship, but continue to rage *totis … noctibus*. That poet-lover and beloved share space inserts the scene into the paradigm of inclusion; that they continue to enact the dynamics of desire associated with exclusion evinces that elegiac *amor* can

obtain even in a context of physical proximity. Ardor, here again, is not contingent on bodily separation.

Repurposing the *Paraclausithyron*

What I am offering is an articulation of the scene of interior interaction between poet-lover and beloved along the lines of the standard *paraclausithyron*, using Propertius' own interpretation of the *topos* in 1.16 as a reference point for the iterations it undergoes in the context of inclusion in poems 1.3 and 1.6. Such moments, when the poet-lover is face to face with his beloved, even if not sexual in nature, challenge the paradigm of the *exclusus amator* and his circumstantial ardor with a depiction of the two of them sharing both space and performative roles. Physical separation does not, in these moments, define elegiac experience, nor does physical proximity necessitate romantic dissolution. The meeting of poet-lover and beloved rather carves out a niche in which each becomes the mirror image of the other across the span of the threshold—donning the same guise, displaying the same gestures, describing the same grievances.

The *topos* of exclusion, in other words, is deconstructed and its constituent elements repurposed in the context of inclusion. This can, in one light, be seen as a reiteration of the salience of exclusion in informing the elegiac experience—that the interaction between poet-lover and *puella* inevitably reverts to the behavioral pattern of separation, that the only language in which they can communicate is that of the locked-out lover. And perhaps this is, to an extent, the case, but only insomuch as the condition of physical exclusion has been taken as singularly representative of the kind of erotic passion that animates the elegiac *amator*—a passion that can only obtain in the circumstances of longing and ideation that desirous separation imposes. For if we see in this replication of the dynamic of exclusion in the context of inclusion a demonstration

of the persistence, in a state of union, of the passionate desire that characterizes the condition of bodily separation, then the *topos* of physical exclusion need not remain the only habitat for an elegiac *amor* that is, by virtue of being unsubstantiated, nothing more than Lucretian delusion.

Such mirroring, in fact, speaks to the endurance of the requisites of the *paraclausithyron* and its particular brand of *amor* beyond the threshold and the condition of separation: the *amator*, when in the presence of his beloved, does not cut and run as his illusions collapse, but instead becomes the object of elegiac desire; the passion that sustains the doorstep vigil does not evaporate, but is embodied by the *puella*; and physical proximity becomes a new vehicle for the performance of the elegiac relationship. Meeting with the mistress does not necessitate a sacrifice of the elegiac *amor* of desire. Rather, it reproduces it from the other side, validating the erotic impressions of the *exclusus* through the *puella*'s reciprocal behavior while simultaneously maintaining, in the approximation of the dynamic of separation, the infrastructure of erotic passion, even when the physical barriers are removed.

With this grounding, I would like to catalogue a few more instances of the inclusion phenomenon in the Propertian corpus, looking now beyond the *monobiblos*.

Poem 2.29, often printed in parts A (ll. 1-22) and B (ll. 23-42),[10] riffs on the set-up of poem 1.3 and, in so doing, activates the mechanics of the inclusion scene explored above. It opens with the nocturnal roving of the drunken poet-lover (*cum potus nocte vagarer*, while I, in my drunkenness, was wandering at night, l.1) and deposits him, at dawn, at Cynthia's bedside:

> mane erat, et volui, si sola quiesceret illa,
> visere: at in lecto Cynthia sola fuit.
> obstipui … (2.29.23-25)
>
> It was early, and I wanted to see if she was sleeping alone:
> and what do you know, Cynthia was alone in her bed.

[10] Though Fedeli, in his 1984 Teubner edition, prints 2.29 as one continuous poem. The optics of the poem's presentation aside, I am treating it as recounting a single episode.

I was dumbstruck …

As in poem 1.3, Cynthia wakes to deliver a sound harangue to the prodigal *speculator amicae* ("girlfriend spy"), as she dubs the poet-lover in line 32. But the content of her speech is less revealing, for my purposes here, than the context.[11] For while the ceremonial garb of the *exclusus amator* (and its transferal to the sleeping *puella*) does not factor into this narrative as it did in 1.3, the basic framing of the exchange between poet-lover and beloved does invoke the features of the interior encounter. Upon his return home, the now *inclusus amator*, in the company of his *puella*, is riveted, not taking to flight in disillusionment but pinned to the spot in wonder (*obstipui*, just as he was *fixus* in 1.3.21). No longer actively *amans* (but, perhaps, equally *amens*) he becomes the audience for—and object of—the lover's plaintive performance, shifted to the position of the beloved while Cynthia, now in the role of the spurned lover, goes on to deliver her complaint (ll. 31-38). As before, bodily exclusion does not delimit the elegiac poet-lover's experience, nor does it determine the lifespan of his relationship. He and his passion exist in the interior, where the nature of the threshold display is tapped and the dynamic between lover and beloved upheld.

The pattern is detectable even when the interaction between them becomes more physical. As in poem 3.8, wherein the poet-lover revels in the recollection of a brawl between himself and Cynthia:

> dulcis ad hesternas fuerat mihi rixa lucernas,
> vocis et insanae tot maledicta tuae.
> tu vero nostros audax invade capillos
> et mea formosis unguibus ora nota …
> cum furibunda mero mensam propellis et in me
> proicis insana cymbia plena manu,
> nimirum veri dantur mihi signa caloris (3.8.1-9)
>
> Our tussle by last night's lamplight was delightful for me,

[11] For discussion of Cynthia's speech in Propertius, see Flaschenriem (1998), Gold (2007), Michalopoulos (2011), Racette-Campbell (2016); and of female speech in elegy writ-large, James (2010).

> and that great number of curses from your crazed mouth.
> But come, my bold one, grab my hair
> and mark my face with your lovely nails …
> when you, unhinged from wine, upend the table and
> hurl full mugs at me with hysterical hand,
> the signs of true passion are unmistakably given to me.

Again, an interior scene (as the *lucernas* and furniture—*mensam*, *cymbia*—would lead us to believe) witnesses poet-lover and beloved together. Cynthia does not deliver a speech here, as she does in her turns as the *exclusus amator* in poems 1.3, 1.6 and 2.29, but what she lacks in words she recoups in deeds, acting the aggressor in the very kind of drunken *rixa* scornfully attributed to the would-be paramours relegated to the stoop of the door in 1.16 (*ego, nocturnis potorum saucia rixis*).

And so the fracas unfolds with Cynthia, intoxicated like those spurned suitors (*furibunda mero*), unleashing on the poet-lover the kind of abuse leveled by the *exclusus*: curses (*maledicta*) that correspond to the cutting impudence of the shut-out lover (*meae laesit petulantia linguae*, "the impudence of my tongue inflicts wounds" 1.16.37); scratching (*unguibus ora nota*), vis-à-vis the pounding of the exile's hands (*pulsata … manibus*, 1.16.6); projectiles (*mensam propellis*, *proicis … cymbia*) whose trajectory evokes the imagery of garlands hung and torches deposited, themselves *exclusi signa* (1.16.8), just as the weaponized furnishings are taken to be *signa caloris*. Not, I should add, signs of passing passion, but of *true* passion (*veri*), the very experience of which would, in the Lucretian worldview, be denied the elegiac lover. And throughout this display, it is Cynthia who levels the abuse, Cynthia who acts in the image of the *exclusus amator*, and the poet-lover who is positioned as the object of the outburst. He is there, in her company, bearing the full brunt of her body and inviting the physicality as the *signum* of real love, his doorstep demonstrations of devotion reflected in her interior antics.

The scene, in short, speaks to the authenticity of elegiac *amor*—an *amor* of passionate physicality born of desire, an *amor* defined by the ardor canonically ascribed to the condition of separation, to the figure of the *amator* alone, now shown to obtain equally in the *puella*, in a state of communion. The beloved's reproduction, on the inside, of the lover's impassioned display, on the outside, reifies a love that is otherwise only a projection; and the preservation, in their encounter, of the kind of passion thought only to flourish in their separation, points to the persistence of elegiac *amor* in the face of the one experience that should, ostensibly, undo it. Through the activation of the visual and structural language of inclusion, the erotic desire attached to physical separation transcends the qualifying *topos* of the *amator*'s bodily exclusion.

It is a language that operates even in those improbable moments—improbable, that is, if exclusion is the defining state of elegiac affairs—when poet-lover and beloved share not just space, but a bed. A dyad of poems in Book II chronicles the lover's amatory successes in terms that play off of the tropes of the inclusion scene. First, the triumph of 2.14:

> quanta ego praeterita collegi gaudia nocte:
> immortalis ero, si altera talis erit.
> at dum demissis supplex cervicibus ibam,
> dicebar sicco vilior esse lacu.
> nec mihi iam fastus opponere quaerit iniquos,
> nec mihi ploranti lenta sedere potest. …
> hoc sensi prodesse magis: contemnite, amantes!
> sic hodie veniet, si qua negavit heri.
> pulsabant alii frustra dominamque vocabant:
> mecum habuit positum lenta puella caput.
> haec mihi devictis potior victoria Parthis,
> haec spolia, haec reges, haec mihi currus erunt. (2.14.9-14, 19-24)
>
> How much pleasure I reaped last night:
> I'll live forever, if another such night is in my future.
> And yet, while I was going along as a suppliant with bowed neck,
> I was said to be worth less than a lake without water.
> But she no longer aims to meet me with outsize hostility,
> is no longer able to remain indifferent to my pining. …
> I have come to understand that this is more profitable: show disdain, lovers!
> In this way, whatever girl said no yesterday today will come.
> Others were knocking and calling to their mistress in vain:

the girl, indifferent, had her head resting on me.
This, for me, is a greater victory than the conquered Parthians,
this will be my spoils, my kings, my chariot.

Basking in the post-coital glow, the poet-lover reflects, from the vantage point of an insider, on the respective positions of the *amator exclusus* and *inclusus.* Fettered by the trappings of the canonically hapless lover—the slavish demeanor (*demissis supplex cervicibus*) of the *servus amoris*, the desperate serenade (*mihi ploranti*) of the *paraclausithyron*—[12] the aspiring *amator* is doomed to rejection. For it is in the context of this self-presentation—and only, as the coming lines will reveal, in the context of this self-presentation—that he meets with his beloved's disdain (*dum ibam … dicebar sicco vilior esse lacu*; *nec mihi iam fastus opponere quaerit iniquos*). What shifts the paradigm, transporting the poet-lover from outside to inside, transforming him from *exclusus* into *inclusus*, is his own donning of a new air, one more akin to that conventionally ascribed to the beloved: insensitivity (*hoc sensi prodesse magis: contemnite, amantes!*). It is the presentation of a hardened front that earns the poet-lover access to the beloved (*sic hodie veniet*), a classic instance of playing it cool that, through the demonstration of dispassion and suggestion of divestment from the relationship, inspires the role reversal that sees the *puella* uncharacteristically pursuing the *amator*.[13]

[12] The centrality of the trope of *servitium amoris* to the generic identity of Roman elegy—for overview and discussion of which, see Copley (1947), Lyne (1979), Murgatroyd (1981), McCarthy (1998)—makes the poet-lover's correction of classic erotic techniques equally a critique of conventional poetic devices. However wry the tone here, such a disavowal of a traditional elegiac orientation gives more purchase to the possibility that a similar rethinking of the *paraclausithyron* and its exigencies is being undertaken.

[13] This tactic, it must be conceded, seems at odds with the advice offered to Gallus in 1.10, where compliance, not intransigence, is presented as the ticket to ride. As a cursory resolution of the tension, I'll offer the following: (1) it is not that Gallus is instructed *never* to be unresponsive, just that he limit the span of his obduracy: *tu cave …/… neve tacere diu* (you be careful not to keep the silent treatment up for too long, 1.10.21-22); and (2) the demeanor suggested in 1.10 seems to apply more to those situations in which the lover is already in the company of his mistress than those in which he is attempting to gain access (a context suggested by *cave ne tristi cupias pugnare puellae, neve superba loqui*, be careful not to fancy picking a fight with a gloomy girl, or making arrogant statements, 1.10.21-22).

It is this very turnabout that evokes the maneuvers of inclusion, with its *puella amans* and its *amator amatus*, with its reproduction on the inside of the structures that reinforce elegiac *amor* on the outside: the impassive *fores*, metonymic of the *puella*,[14] now the stony façade of the *inclusus amator*. And where other scenes of inclusion incidentally relegate the poet-lover to the inaction conventionally associated with the beloved, 2.14 witnesses him actively cultivating that same passivity: it is the *puella* who is amorously forthcoming and the *amator* who is femininely unreachable.

Indeed, the word that conveys the poet-lover's exhortation, at 2.14.19, to rebuff as a means to reward, *contemnite*, makes its earliest appearances in the Propertian corpus in the context of feminine behavior that, tellingly, implicates the performance of the *paraclausithyron*. First, in 1.4.23-27, in which a colleague's encouragement of the poet-lover to forsake his relationship with Cynthia and sample what others have to offer is predicted to result in her own outpouring of grief:

> nullas illa suis **contemnet** fletibus aras,
> et quicumque sacer, qualis ubique, lapis.
> non ullo gravius temptatur Cynthia damno
> quam sibi cum rapto cessat amore decus,
> praecipue nostro.
>
> She will leave no altars unvisited by her tears,
> nor any stone—any kind anywhere—that is sacred.
> By no loss is Cynthia more deeply affected
> than when dignity forsakes her with love snatched away,
> most of all ours.

Though the correspondence of the image to the *paraclausithyron* is broadly gestural, the structural elements are there: Cynthia, in a state of amatory exile (*rapto … amore*), addresses her grief (somewhat periphrastically conveyed by *suis contemnet fletibus*) to architectural objects

[14] Cf. Pucci (1978), 56 where "the *LIMEN* and the door (*ianua* or *fores*) separate the lover from his sweetheart, but by the same metonymy the *ianua* and the *LIMEN* become both the image of her refusal (her absence) and the personification of her denied presence." See also James (2003b), 137-138, and Nappa (2007), 71.

(*aras*, *lapis*) in an emotional outburst that evokes both the fixtures of exclusion (the tearstained threshold of the beloved) and the state of the excluded (the disgrace, *cessat … decus*, that attends the experience).[15]

Contemno recurs in 1.5, when a different confrère, Gallus, is projected to experience the torment of rejection by his lady love:

> a, mea **contemptus** quotiens ad limina curres,
> cum tibi singultu fortia verba cadent …
> tum grave servitium nostrae cogere puellae
> discere et exclusum quid sit abire domum (1.5.13-14, 19-20)
>
> ah yes, how often you'll rush to my threshold after you've been denied,
> when brave words will fail you for your sobbing …
> then you'll be forced to experience the harsh bondage of our girl
> and what it is to head home in exile.

Here, the parallels are more direct: spurned by his beloved (*contemptus*), Gallus is pitched into the proceedings of the *paraclausithyron*, first mimicked in his tearful recourse to the door of his friend, then modeled in the vision of his denied access to his mistress. In both passages, it is a form of *contemno* that anchors feminine action in a context that recalls the *paraclausithyron*—first Cynthia's active bestowal of tears upon monuments; then Gallus' rejection by his girl that ignites an exilic tailspin; and the poet-lover's inducement of his peers to the same conduct in 2.14.19 participates in this verbal-visual lexicon. Couched in the language of *contemno*, with its evocations of feminine behavior and contexts of exclusion, the poet-lover's advised tactics here evoke the essence of the role reversal and scene restaging that have come to define moments of inclusion. The *amator* becomes *amatus*; the *puella* becomes *amans*; and their dual participation in the performance of passion validates the nature of their *amor*.

[15] As a side note, I will point out the correspondence of the asylum imagery in the altar scene to the *paraclausithyron*, which can be a site of slippage between the beloved's door and religious structures, as in Tib. 1.2.79-88. But this is for another day.

I will round out my consideration of the workings of the inclusion scene in poem 2.14 with a turn to the poet-lover's crowning moment of glory:

> pulsabant alii frustra dominamque vocabant:
> mecum habuit positum lenta puella caput.
> haec mihi devictis potior victoria Parthis,
> haec spolia, haec reges, haec mihi currus erunt. (2.14.21-24)
>
> Others were knocking and calling to their mistress in vain:
> the girl, indifferent, had her head resting on me.
> This, for me, is a greater victory than the conquered Parthians,
> this will be my plunder, my kings, my chariot.

The reversal of the circumstances of the *paraclausithyron* here is both figurative and literal. The logistical inversion of the scene is immediately appreciable. Now *inclusus*, the poet-lover experiences the *paraclausithyron* from the other side of the door, the hard threshold replaced by the comfort of the mistress, the song of complaint heard instead of performed. In an echo of lines 13-14, the *puella*, who in her former disdain of the poet-lover was described as *lenta*, is here represented in the same terms in her idle enjoyment of their entanglement and her indifference to the imprecations of other would-be lovers. That these rivals are fated to fail (*frustra*) reinforces the notion, pronounced in lines 11-14, that it is the very enactment of the traditional behavior of the *exclusus amator* in the traditional context of the *paraclausithyron* that foretells the futility of the lover's attempts to gain entrance. Contrary to the wisdom that the scene of exclusion always carries with it the potential for inclusion,[16] the suggestion here, however myopic, is that there is no hope of success for the *exclusus amator*—who is, by definition, relegated to the outside—and thus no opportunity for his *amor* to be realized by a reciprocal interaction with his girl. It is our poet-lover, whose own recreation of the reverse-*paraclausithyron* dynamic has rendered him

[16] As per Copley (1956), Nappa (2007).

inclusus, who is shown not retreating from a repulsive reality, but reveling in the spoils of his erotic exploit.

It is a moment in which poet-lover and beloved connect in their reversed roles of desirer and desired, representing the achievement of the elegiac end of successful intercourse. But the presence of the would-be suitors on the other side of the door interrupts as a reminder of the possibility of exclusion—of the revolving nature of elegiac interaction—making the experience of inclusion insecure. And so, just as in those scenes of inclusion that witnessed poet-lover and beloved performing each other's generic roles without connecting in the process—allowing them to be simultaneously both desired and desiring—so here the poet-lover exists in a state of simultaneous success and failure: his identification of, and with, the unsuccessful suitors on the far side of the door makes him aware of the possibility of separation even while he is enjoying union. A literal *paraclausithyron* has introduced a figuration of exclusion that allows the elegiac identity to be preserved even when the context of elegiac performance has been changed, even when *puella* and *amator* are harmonized in the enactment of inclusion. The site of elegiac exclusion, essentialized as the seat elegiac desire, has been harnessed as a device by which erotic *amor* can obtain in the face of erotic fulfilment.

The phenomenon is reflected in the closing lines of the poem, where the *amator* concedes the fragility of his own inclusion:

> quod si forte aliqua nobis mutabere culpa,
> vestibulum iaceam mortuus ante tuum (2.14.29-32)
>
> but if, by chance, by some transgression, your feelings for me should change,
> may I lie dead before your door

His current status as *inclusus* is counterposed with an image of himself summarily returned to that of the *exclusus* (*vestibulum iaceam … ante tuum*), thus recapitulating elegiac *amor* even in the context of elegiac attainment. And despite my decision to render *nobis* here as the singular

"I," it could just as easily be a true plural, thereby implicating those presently luckless callers in the process of revolution: should your feelings for *us* change, such that I, though now included, am rotated out and they, though now excluded, are rotated in.

The *topos* of inclusion as I have delineated it has developed from the *puella* voicing the *exclusus amator* in poems 1.3 and 1.6 to her embodiment of his actions in poem 3.8, in each case in the presence of a passive poet-lover. Poem 2.14 witnesses the elegiac *amator* more actively performing the choreography of the inclusion scene, himself catalyzing the role reversal that underwrites it (as if he, too, has perceived the pattern) and basking in the afterglow of physical passion. Poem 2.15 continues this trend toward equal involvement in the acts of inclusion on the part of both poet-lover and mistress. Its detailing of erotic triumph allows the figure of the poet-lover to be fully expressed as actively *amans*; and while the cultivated cool of the courting ritual in 2.14 drops away, it is replaced by the heated participation of both *puella* and *amator* in activity that reimagines the performance of the *paraclausithyron* to efficacious ends.

First, in terms of the action itself:

> quam multa apposita narramus verba lucerna,
> quantaque sublato lumine rixa fuit! …
> quam vario amplexu mutamus bracchia! quantum
> oscula sunt labris nostra morata tuis! …
> quod si pertendens animo vestita cubaris,
> scissa veste meas experiere manus:
> quin etiam, si me ulterius provexerit ira,
> ostendes matri bracchia laesa tuae. (2.15.3-4, 9-10, 17-20)
>
> How many words we speak when the light is set near us
> and how much contest there was when the light was put out! …
> How we shift our arms in varied embrace! How often
> my kisses lingered on your lips! …
> But if you have it firmly in mind to come to bed clothed,
> you'll experience my hands, your clothing in tatters;
> And what's more, if fury drives me further,
> you'll be showing wounded arms to your mother.

Here, mutuality in love replaces unrequitedness in longing, transforming the pitiable action of the *exclusus* into the triumphant exploits of the *inclusus*. There is an exchange of words—that hard-won first person plural *narramus*—between the *inclusus amator* and the *puella*, rather than the empty delivery of speech of the *exclusus amator* to an audience that will not respond. There is an enviable exchange of blows, with both *inclusus amator* and *puella* imbricated in an erotic *rixa*, rather than the debased brawling of the wayward *exclusus*—ineffectual but a *rixa* nonetheless, if we recall 1.16.5. And there is the replacement of the door by the girl, who herself will wear the evidence of the *inclusus amator*'s insistence, where the *exclusus amator* had only the proxy of the *ianua* to impact.

Then, in terms of the imagery:

> qualem si cuncti cuperent decurrere vitam
> et pressi multo membra iacere mero …
> ac veluti folia arentis liquere corollas,
> quae passim calathis strata natare vides,
> sic nobis, qui nunc magnum spiramus amantes,
> forsitan includet crastina fata dies. (2.15.41-42, 51-54)
>
> If all desired to live such a life as this
> and, overcome by much wine, to lay down their limbs …
> And just as leaves leave behind their dry garlands,
> the leaves you see floating in wine cups, strewn all around,
> so for us, who now have high hopes as we love each other,
> perhaps tomorrow's fate will bring our day to a close.

The languid drunkenness of the *amator* here attends satiety rather than deprivation, loving rather than longing—it is the sign of a life to be emulated for the *inclusus*, while it contributes to the humiliation of the *exclusus*. The closing maxim, in its *carpe diem* spirit, harnesses the visual of the *corolla*, so emblematic of the performance of the *paraclausithyron*, for the representation of inclusion: in both contexts, time is measured in garlands. For while the wreath of the *exclusus*

hangs as a testament to his unseen vigil—a *signum exclusi* that captures his time spent longing—[17] that of the *inclusus* becomes a witness to his fulfillment—a *signum caloris* that serves as a keeper of his time spent loving. And just as in 2.14, where the literal performance of exclusion by rival lovers interrupted the *amator*'s enjoyment of inclusion, rendering him at once *inclusus* and *exclusus*—at once fulfilled in his love and desirous for the continuation of that love—so 2.15 destabilizes the ostensible success of inclusion with a reminder of the ultimate form of separation: death. Even in the throes of desire fulfilled is desire inculcated: the awareness of an end to the relationship renders the poet-lover both *inclusus* and *exclusus*—both complete in his enjoyment of the *puella* and craving its perpetuation, its repeatability, thus preserving the essence of the elegiac dynamic.

The *amator*'s full participation in the erotic *acta* allows for the notion of a shared passion that had been implied in earlier instances of inclusion to be made explicit. His recovery of an active role modeled on the exploits of the *exclusus* continues to cast the scene of inclusion in terms of the *paraclausithyron*, but in a way that rebalances the scales: either both poet-lover and beloved are equally implicated in the proceedings (*narramus*, *mutamus*); or the poet-lover is acting the part of the traditional elegiac *amator*, this time in a context of inclusion and success, rather than exclusion and frustration. Here, as in the other instances of the poet-lover's interaction with his mistress, the model of love as a projection that can exist only in fiction is countered with a vision of reciprocal passion that obtains in person and of the endurance of the elegiac identity beyond the closed door.

[17] As it will again in Ov. *Am* 1.6.67-70: *at tu, non laetis detracta corona capillis,/dura super tota limina nocte iace!/tu dominae, cum te proiectam mane videbit,/temporis adsumpti tam male testis eris* (but you, crown removed from hair that hates to see you go, lie on this hard threshold the whole night through! You, when tomorrow she sees you cast down there, will be evidence for my mistress of my time so miserably spent).

Reclaiming *Amor*

The thread that I have been following throughout this survey of Propertian scenes of inclusion is their reconfiguration of the elements of the *paraclausithyron* on the near-side of the door, and the way in which this reimagining of the *topos* of exclusion allows for the presentation of elegiac love as something more than a fantasy. When in the company of the beloved, the poet-lover is not undone, as Lucretius would have him be, but is subject to the same passion that characterizes his exclusion, a state whose refiguration—whether through emotional distance or the threat of the encounter's conclusion—preserves the essence of the elegiac experience as desiderative; and the *puella*'s embodiment of the very language and gestures of the canonical elegiac *exclusus*, through the close identification of poet-lover and beloved that it entails, speaks to a mutuality of sentiment and experience. All of this is the product of their physical proximity, of the *amator* progressing beyond the threshold. In these moments, the body of the beloved does not repulse the poet-lover, but reflects his very being, responds in kind, and reinforces the connection between them, in certainty of which he was initially drawn to her door.

Given this treatment of inclusion as a *topos* that Propertius develops to demonstrate the reality of passionate love, the image with which he closes Book III of the poet-lover rudely disabused of the impression that his *amor* was true poses an interpretive challenge. In an indignant farewell to Cynthia (and the elegies in which she has been immortalized), the poet-lover intones the disparagement of love as delusion:

> mixtam te varia laudavi saepe figura,
> ut, quod non esses, esse putaret amor (3.24.5-6)
>
> Often I celebrated you as a blend of diverse beauty,
> such that love figured you to be what you were not.

and disavows his experience of anything other than exclusion and disappointment:

> limina iam nostris valeant lacrimantia verbis,

nec tamen irata ianua fracta manu. (3.25.9-10)

and now, farewell, threshold tear-stained by my words,
and door, all the same unparted by my impassioned hand.

The words would seem to signal a turn away from poetry that recounts erotic entanglement and an embrace of more august themes, such as populate the poems of the coming Book IV.[18] But elegiac love does not, in fact, become a thing of the past. It reasserts itself in poem 4.7, what Micaela Janan deems the book's "epicenter",[19] in the ghostly apparition of the recently deceased (presumably since poem 3.25) Cynthia; and it dominates poem 4.8, in which Cynthia, apparently resuscitated, crashes the poet-lover's attempted threesome with her would-be replacements, Phyllis and Teia. I will ultimately be suggesting that, given the resurrection of the beloved in a book that is ostensibly post-*amor*, the apparent awakening that results in the poet-lover's concession of love's unreality at the close of Book III proves to be the delusion. But in order to better ground this proposed resolution, a few observations should be made about poems 4.7 and 4.8.

Poem 4.7 interrupts the ambitious mytho-historical project on which Propertius has embarked in Book IV, abruptly reinserting Cynthia—and the poetics of desire that she represents—back into the narrative in the midst of treatments of Roman etiology.[20] She returns, rather appropriately given the interment of erotic elegiacs that occurred at the end of Book III, as a ghost, criticizing the revived poet-lover for his insensitive treatment of her and dictating the course

[18] A sensibility detectable in, for example, DeBrohun (2003), 36 where she identifies in Prop. 3.24-25 a promise of a new "(thematic) direction [in which] his next poetic venture would lead"; and 183, where she summarizes the relationship between Books I-III and Book IV in terms of "a polar poetics" that "sets up a potential clash between the themes and ideals of love elegy (*amor*) and those of a harder patriotic, aetiological elegy (*Roma*)." An assessment reminiscent of Pillinger's characterization (1969), 174 of Book IV as structured around a "polarizing of the contents … into two broad categories—etiological and amatory poetry."

[19] Janan (2001), 101.

[20] A problem wryly articulated by Johnson (1997), 177 who dubs 4.7 "a poem about Cynthia, who is not even supposed to be in this volume, which is supposed to be about Rome." The incongruity has continued, in various expressions, to be at issue, for example in Janan (2001), DeBrohun (2003), Knox (2004), Wallis (2016).

of his recompense. *Sunt aliquid Manes* the poem opens, setting the stage for the spectral visitation, yes, but also implicitly substantiating visions—they *are* a thing, ghosts—embracing, in a counter-turn from Lucretius, the reality of what is otherwise held to be illusion, where 3.24-25 saw him forswear amorous flights of fancy altogether. The poem is quickly taken over by the voice of Cynthia past, present and future, as she bemoans her lot and catalogues her demands. *Perfide nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae,/in te iam vires somnus habere potest?* she begins (faithless man, not to be counted on by any girl, can sleep, even now, exert its strength on you?, 4.7.13-4), reminiscent in tone of the complaint she delivered in her turn as the *amator* at 1.3.39 (where she reproached the poet-lover as *improbe*); and of her playful chastisement of the poet-lover for his fatigue in 2.15.7-8 (*sicine, lente, iaces?*).

Throughout the course of the speech on which Cynthia launches, she represents the love affair documented in Books I-III in terms that, according to Janan, contradict the impression that those three prior books of poetry offer: she was faithful, she was doting, she was wronged.[21] A contradiction, perhaps, of the poet-lover's more generic complaints, as at 1.18.16 and 2.5.3, where Cynthia is accused of the standard elegiac woman's crimes of being hard-hearted (*dura*) and treacherous (*perfida*), respectively. But in her re-presentation of the dynamics of their relationship, Cynthia claims for herself the defining characteristics of the canonical elegiac *amator*, positioning the poet-lover as the mercurial beloved.[22] And this is not wholly inconsistent with their interpersonal dynamics in the preceding books, if we take our cues from moments of inclusion. For

[21] Janan (2001), 100. Wallis (2016), 557 refines Janan's position to reflect "the paradoxical similarity to Propertius' own discourse that Cynthia's speech also displays." His interest in how Cynthia's voice in 4.7 echoes that of the elegiac *amator* of Books I-III in ways that "threaten his role as controlling poet" (565) is similar in spirit to my take here. Though while Wallis sees in the role reversal an open and shut case of Cynthia bespeaking "a new chapter in which she subsumes and replaces" the poet-lover (566), I am of the mind that it more cyclically effects their mutual identification.

[22] Cf. Wallis (2016), 565 where Cynthia's "appeal to conspicuously 'Propertian' subjects seemingly affirms that *she* now plays the poet's part, leaving Propertius himself in the (almost) voiceless and objectified position typically occupied by elegy's *puella*."

the scene in 4.7, despite its phantasmagoric nature, is fundamentally one of inclusion, with poet-lover and beloved sharing space and interacting, even while Cynthia's spectral state presents a barrier to physical connection, her enclosure behind the door of death imposing the structure of exclusion and its dynamic of desire (*inter complexus excidit umbra meos*, her shade slipped away from between my embraces, 4.7.96) on an enactment of inclusion. And so the scene in 4.7 participates in the same pattern of restaged exclusion that earlier iterations of inclusion evinced: the assimilation of amatory experiences, with *amator* turned beloved and *puella*, in her delivery of a soliloquy in the style of the *exclusus*, turned *amator*; and the reification, in the context of inclusion, of the kind of elegiac *amor* that obtains in exclusion.

To this end, it is worth noting that approaches to this poem tend to underscore the element of reality that Cynthia, despite her paranormal appearance, introduces into the elegiac narrative. Janan sees in her recharacterization of their relationship an "indictment of the elegiac tradition as representing only Woman, a masculine fantasy", concluding that "the bravura diatribe … passionately contrasts with that fantasy women's [sic.] (lived, experienced) reality".[23] Similarly, both T.D. Papanghelis and Gareth Williams understand the poem as engaging with the "reality" of the relationship. For them, that reality primarily is to be parsed in the conflicting representation of the experiences and actions of lover and beloved, in that 4.7 provides an unvarnished depiction of their day-to-day realities, as well as a correction to the record of the relationship constituted by Books I-III.[24]

But if read against the backdrop of the moments of inclusion that punctuate the first three volumes of elegies, Cynthia's monologue could just as readily attest to an authenticity of *amor*, just as easily reinforce the reality of the erotic experience, just as do the instances of inclusion in

[23] Janan (2001), 113.
[24] Papanghelis (1987), 147-148 ff.; and Williams (2018), 51-67.

those earlier books. For despite the fact that Cynthia is here a literal *simulacrum*[25] (and yet, as we are assured in line 1, such likenesses are, in fact, real), despite the fact that she literally deceives the lover in his attempt to possess her (*inter complexus excidit umbra meos*), she nevertheless gives voice to a narrative that speaks to her reciprocal love. What we have, then, is a simultaneous enactment and evisceration of the Lucretian characterization of passionate *amor* as *simulacrum*: Cynthia, the seat of erotic desire, is, like the love she embodies, simultaneously both vision and reality, immaterial and manifest. Her very spectral appearance encapsulates the essence of the scene of inclusion: a state of presence that preserves the dynamics of absence, a position of proximity that reproduces the element of inaccessibility that fuels the elegiac *amor* associated with separation. She is, as a phantasm, as real as ever, and the passion she represents along with her.

And so elegiac *amor* has not, in the end, dissipated: not for the *amator*, who despite his avowals of 3.24-25 is still compelled to embrace her; and not for Cynthia, whose unworldly omniscience foretells a future in which she and her beloved are indelibly and eternally united:

> nunc te possideant aliae; mox sola tenebo:
> mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram. (4.7.94-95)
>
> Others can have you now; soon, I alone will claim you:
> you'll be with me, and I'll burnish your bones with my own bones blended in.

Her prophetic assurance of their final union, spiritual and skeletal, reflects a persistence of devotion and entanglement that supplants any impression that the relationship was founded on false pretenses. Other interests might temporarily intervene, but these, not their passions, are the passing distractions. The absolute and abiding connection is their own. It is an avowal of ultimate inclusion that offsets the conception of death as the ultimate separation—a final remaking of a

[25] And the term *simulacrum*, per the *OLD*, can be used to refer to ghosts as well as visions (i.e. as, essentially, a synonym for *manes*), as it is in Lucr. *DRN* 1.123, 4.1099; Verg. *G*. 1.477, *A*. 2.772; Ov. *Am*. 1.6.9

situation of exclusion as a circumstance of union—and that corrects the notion of the illusory nature of *amor* proclaimed in 3.24-25. Here is Cynthia, asserting the mutuality of passion. Here is Cynthia, projecting a future of eternal inclusion in which they are intermingled and indistinguishable—a bed of bones on bones (***mixtis*** *ossibus ossa*)—in language that rewrites the very locus of the professed falsity of their love in 3.24.5, where the poet-lover was deluded into glorifying her ***mixtam*** *… varia … figura*. The reality introduced in 4.7, then—and introduced, I should add, through the vehicle of the scene of inclusion—renders the "awakening" of the poet-lover in 3.24-25 to his erotic fallacies the true misconception; and the veracity of his relationship with Cynthia is demonstrated by, of all things, a *simulacrum*. Lucretius be damned.

If 4.7 returns to the context of inclusion to reassert the reality of the *amor* that inspired Books I-III (and that was summarily dismissed at their conclusion), 4.8 makes its substantiation complete. The narrative complexities of the poem have been much puzzled over[26] and it is not my intent to weigh in on their possible resolution here. What I would like to call attention to is the enactment of mutual physicality, an aspect of inclusion, that attends the reunion of the poet-lover and Cynthia—now no longer a ghost, it would seem, but fully restored and corporeal—beginning at line 51.

The set-up sees the poet-lover attempting to stick it to Cynthia for her repeated infidelity by consorting with other women (*cum fieret nostro totiens iniuria lecto*,/*mutato volui castra movere toro*, since wrongdoing befell our bed so many times, I decided to encamp on a different couch, 4.8.27-28). He takes up with two local personalities, Phyllis and Teia, in a courtyard prepared for their sympotic delight, but the *convivium* is quickly crashed by Cynthia, who has returned early from a tryst of her own and arrived to put a stop to the proceedings: *nec mora, cum totas resupinat*

[26] See Janan (2001) and Williams (2018) for a detailing of the issues of interpretation and suggestions for paths forward.

Cynthia valvas,/non operose comis, sed furibunda decens (no delay, and Cynthia breaks down the doors completely, with hair unstyled, but appealing in her rage, 4.8.51-52). Her entrance, in its passionate parting of the gates to access an inner sanctum in which her beloved is ensconced, cannot help but evoke the figure of the *exclusus amator*[27] and the conditions of the κῶμος—the κῶμος, that is, à la Alcibiades, whose raucous incursion into the erotic *Symposium* is a closer model for Cynthia's dramatic progression beyond the threshold than, say, McKeown's paradigm of programmatic proscription, which dismisses the *paraclausithyron*, with its possibility for admittance, as "an unpromising theme for dramatic development."[28]

The act, then, becomes a literal restaging of the performance of exclusion with Cynthia overtly acting the *amator*, whose successful disruption of the barrier and the deeds being done behind it enacts in real time the overlaying of the scene of exclusion on that of inclusion. For once she has penetrated the enclosure, the patterns of inclusion begin to take hold:

> Cynthia gaudet in exuviis victrixque recurrit
> et mea perversa sauciat ora manu,
> imponitque notam collo morsuque cruentat,
> praecipueque oculos, qui meruere, ferit. (4.8.63-66)
>
> Cynthia revels in her spoils and returns the victor
> and wounds my face with back-turned hand,
> and she plants a mark on my neck and bloodies me with her bite,
> and most of all she rages at my eyes, which had earned it.

The violent choreography hearkens back to the performed inclusion of poems 2.14 and 3.8, where the gestures of exclusion were adapted for a context of sexual intimacy. There, it was the poet-lover who exulted in his triumph, recounting *quanta … gaudia* he had enjoyed in the course of his night with Cynthia (2.14.9), and who had counted his success at the expense of his rivals among his *spolia* (2.14.24). There it was that they both engaged in a *rixa* (3.8.1), and where

[27] And indeed, Debrohun (2003), 145 speaks of "Cynthia's role as *exclusa*" here and its provision of "a marvelous transmutation of the conventional imagery."
[28] McKeown (1988), 66.

Cynthia was encouraged to leave marks of a wine-inspired (*furibunda mero*, 3.8.7) beating on the poet-lover's body as *signa caloris* (*invade capillos; ora nota; minitare oculos … exurere; in morso … videant mea vulnera collo*, 3.8.3-5, 21).[29] Janan sees the violence of 4.8 in terms of Lacan's concept of the intangible, indescribable quality (the *object a*) that the lover perceives, and hungers for, in the beloved—an erotic *je ne sais quoi* that compels the lover to physical violence in an attempt to possess this ineffable something.[30] While my own reading is not of the Lacanian persuasion, Janan's formulation does speak to the notion of a simultaneity of exclusion and inclusion that obtains in the *amator*'s interactions with his beloved, the structural traces of which I have noted in the instances of inclusion already examined. The *object a*, in Janan-Lacan parlance, becomes, in the argot of inclusion, the figuration of the condition of exclusion that renders any ostensible fulfillment of elegiac desire incomplete: lover and beloved are always, in some way, kept from perfect union.

Janan's conclusion that the relationship between poet-lover and Cynthia here is rife with "amorous frustrations and enmities" that underscore "the sexual relation's failure"[31] speaks to this notion; though it cannot be overlooked that the fundamental salience of the primary elegiac relationship between poet-lover and chosen *puella* is simultaneously reinforced: the severity of the abrasions emphasizes the impassioned physicality of their interaction (which cannot here be interpreted as imaginary, as could the disembodied encounter of 4.7), the drawn blood the visceral reality of their connection. Read against the backdrop of Lucretius' description of love for a single individual as a wound that can be healed with the dressing of a new erotic interest

[29] Janan (2001), 123-124 similarly comments on the parallels between 3.8 and 4.8, though she differentiates the violent action recounted in each on the basis of degree: 3.8 works out "at a purely theoretical level, the idea that violent behavior signals true love", and the poet-lover's invitation to Cynthia to do him harm can be chalked up to "sarcastic hyperbole"; while 4.8 actualizes the physical violence, and to an extent "that even exceeds his ironic invitation … extended in 3.8."
[30] Janan (2001), 124.
[31] Janan (2001), 121.

(*DRN* 4.1066-1072)—a prescription that the disillusioned poet-lover of 3.24 seemed to invoke when he proclaimed his love-wounds cured (*vulneraque ad sanum nunc coiere mea*, 3.24.18)—the inability of the poet-lover to find erotic satisfaction with anyone but Cynthia, and Cynthia's inability to do the same, demonstrates that occupying oneself with another cannot displace the passion for the true beloved.

And so the violence in Propertius reifies the relationship as much as it does undermine it. The closing image of 4.8 is, after all, one of Cynthia and the poet-lover peaceably (re)united in their shared interior:

> atque ita mutato per singula pallia lecto
> despondi, et noto solvimus arma toro. (4.8.87-88)
>
> and so, with the bed remade as a single mattress,
> I gave my word, and we loosed our arms on that familiar couch.

This is how we leave them. This is the condition in which they live on beyond the conclusion of the poetic cycle: united in a love that proves invulnerable to the seeds of its own invalidation. Looking back from this vantage point of inclusion obtained, enjoyed, enduring, the poet-lover's staunch disavowal of the reality of his elegiac *amor* in 3.24 seems to have been the illusion, more so than the love he foreswore.[32]

Rewriting the Script

The image of the *inclusus amator* and the revolving door as metaphors for the elegiac experience thus seem quite apt. They allow for a persistence of elegiac desire even in the face of elegiac satisfaction that routine exclusion cannot provide; and for the elegiac *amator*, in the renewal of exclusion that inclusion brings, to be in perpetual motion rather than suspended

[32] A reading that is shared by Wallis (2018), 216 who sees the renunciation of love in poem 3.24 as a red herring and concludes that "the irrepressible vitality of 4.8—the final Cynthia poem—reinstates the mistress to her position of authority over the poet for all time, in a brilliant poetic recantation of any and all past claims to have become love-free."

animation. The figure of the *inclusus*, then, does not replace so much as supplement that of the *exclusus*.

False closure, indeed. For are they not both, exclusion and inclusion, in a sense gestures of false closure? Exclusion for its ostensible representation of the end of the lover's quest to become a lover: the finality of the locked door in his progression toward his mistress. And yet, by inspiring the song of exclusion, it signifies the beginning of a poetic undertaking and the onset of a new phase of the relationship in which the terms have changed, in that the beloved is no longer ideally alluring, but ideally cruel. And inclusion for its apparent signification of the end of the same endeavor: the attainment of the stipulated goal of entry. And yet, in its recapitulation in reverse of the experience of exclusion, it, too, represents the beginning of a poetic undertaking—whether in the beloved's delivery of a song of exclusion or the lover's successful erotic performance—and the onset of a new phase of the relationship, in which both the terms, together with the roles, have been reimagined.

To speak of inclusion is to expand the parameters of what can be considered elegiac. If the scene of inclusion retains the structure of the experience of exclusion, such that elegiac desire can obtain even in a context of elegiac attainment—whether that attainment is through physical intercourse or merely physical proximity—then a state of separation is no longer needed to define the elegiac *amator* as such. The passionate *amor* of desire that would otherwise be unable to survive the encounter with the body of the beloved is able to exist on the other side of the door; and the poet-lover can be both *inclusus* and elegiac at once—can retain the essence of the elegiac relationship even while he experiences the person of the *puella*. Exclusion and inclusion, then, represent less a binary and more a continuum: the lover is not, by definition, statically positioned as either *exclusus* or *inclusus*, but dynamically inhabiting both identities at once.

Chapter 2

Inside-Out in Tibullus

The Dream Decried

As entrée to Tibullus, a Lucretian conclusion. The reduction of passion to *simulacrum* is invited by the likening of love to a dream—both equally compelling in the moment, both equally empty in the end:

> ut bibere in somnis sitiens quom quaerit, et umor
> non datur, ardorem qui membris stinguere possit,
> sed laticum simulacra petit frustraque laborat
> in medioque sitit torrenti flumine potans,
> sic in amore Venus simulacris ludit amantis,
> nec satiare queunt spectando corpora coram (*DRN* 4.1097-1102)
>
> as in dreams, when a man, in thirst, seeks to drink and no fluid
> is provided to quench the burning in his limbs,
> but he pursues the mirage of liquid and endeavors to no avail
> and is parched, though taking drafts in the middle of a rushing stream,
> just so, in love, does Venus delude lovers with mirages,
> and their bodies are not able to satisfy them with seeing each other in person

The parallels are clearly established: love is a dream state, as the mirror constructions *in somnis* and *in amore* underline, and anything experienced therein is no more real than what unfolds in sleep's imaginary. It is for this reason that even corporeal encounters between lovers leave them unfulfilled. The envisioned effects of impassioned interaction—any salve for the fervor that might be conjectured in romantic intimacy—cannot be conveyed to the physical form, bound as it is the reality of physical experience (*spectando*), any more than dream water can rehydrate the thirsty body that envisions it. And so the lover is a dreamer, sleepwalking through his romance in the belief that he is experiencing something real, unaware that his perception is doing nothing for his person.

On the face of it, Tibullan poetics would seem to speak directly to the illusory nature of erotic love that Lucretius' simile conveys. Unlike the elegiac *amator* of Propertius, Tibullus'

poet-lover never concretely enjoys the company of his mistress in person, drifting instead out of his contextual reality of isolation and into an imagined union with her. This aspect of his representation of elegiac love as a flight of fancy in the face of physical exclusion would ostensibly disqualify him from any treatment that purports to position scenes of inclusion as counterpoints to charges of the unreality of passionate *amor*. But I am not convinced that, in Tibullus at least, the imagined is necessarily distinct from the realized; indeed, upon reconsideration, the two can be seen to be sutured, with imagined and lived—interior and exterior—interlocked and shaping, as a single unit, the entirety of the poetic experience. It is precisely the salience of this poetic reality that destabilizes the determination that romantic fantasy cannot coexist with lived experience.

The Dream Defined

But to circle back to the image of the revolving door: if Propertian poetics can be seen to complicate the outlook of the elgiac *amator*, subjecting him and his beloved to a rotating positionality that reimagines the dynamics of exclusion in the realization of inclusion, it is to the poetry of Tibullus that the revolutionary spirit can be traced. Alternation has been recognized as a theme central to the Tibullan conception of love—the vicissitudes of *amor* keeping the lover in an emotional whirl as true as the cycle of the seasons—and its early expression in the image of the "wheel of fortune" as a metaphor for the erotic experience has been credited to his poetry.[1] Yet it has not seemed to affect the fixity of the *amator* as *exclusus*: he remains rooted in the *topos* of separation and exclusion despite the fluidity of the relational landscape around him.

[1] Maltby (2004), 105 where he identifies Tibullus 1.5 as the site of "the first attested occurrence in Latin poetry" of the image of the "wheel of fortune" (*versatur celeri fors levis orbe rotae*, fickle fortune spins on the swift circuit of a wheel, 1.5.70) "and the first with reference to the instability of love", going on to suggest that Propertius might have been inspired by Tibullus to use the figure of fortune's wheel at 2.8.8 (*vinceris a victis: haec in amore rotast*, you're conquered by the conquered: such is the wheel in love); and 106, where he determines that "For Tibullus this theme of the instability of love and the constant replacement of one partner by another is in fact central to his conception of elegiac love."

Even Robert Maltby, who compellingly details Tibullus' portrayal of love as a rotary club, does not disturb the essence of the poet-lover's outsider orientation: though the collection may open with "a pacifist ideal of love in the country with a faithful mistress, the subsequent poems of the book illustrate the impossibility of its achievement."[2]

The persistence of the fixed perspective in the face of a poetics of revolution can, to a certain extent, be seen as a byproduct of the dreamy quality of Tibullus' poetry. His vision of the life of love is just that: a vision of an ideal elegiac existence that is ever bumping up against the reality of lived circumstance. It is this aspect of his poesy that has become its most encompassing and enduring characteristic;[3] and the notion of Tibullan reverie has made the "real" a fault line in the reading of his elegies, the tension between actual and imagined the structural principle on which his poetry, and its interpretation, is hung.[4]

It is true that the Tibullan *amator* is constitutionally preoccupied with his visions of what love could be, arguably more so than he is occupied by the actualities of what love is; true that he is only ever aspirationally united with his beloved, never realizing in body the kind of union that he projects for the two of them in mind. And it is no doubt for this reason that his identity as *exclusus* has remained categorical: his reality, despite his dreams of attainment, is always, it

[2] Maltby (2004), 104.
[3] In varying degrees of directness, his poetry is associated with the abstract and surreal, from Paul Veyne's (1988), 36-43 description of Tibullan poetic structure as, essentially, image association and likening of the poetic experience to "dream theater"; to Paul Allen Miller's (1999) overt explication of the Tibullan corpus as a "Dream Text." More recently, James (2003b), 116 with a nod to Miller's work, observes that the lament in Tibullus is "less energetic and more wishful" owing to the poet's "characteristic bent toward fantasy and wish fulfilment."
[4] I use this not in the Lacanian sense of the "Real", as does Miller (1999), but in its more prosaic capacity as a synonym for actual experience. Miller's article (1999), 221 exploits these tensions in a psychologizing reading that posits the Tibullan dream as "the sole medium able to achieve a momentary and longed-for coherence, even as its status as wish-fulfillment insures that in reality it can only be the most insubstantial, utopian articulation of the desire to escape History's nightmare." But the uneasy abuttal of ideal and real informs readings not indebted to psychoanalytic models, such Baca's (1968), Bright's (1978), Maltby's (2004), all of which see the issue thematized in Delia and Nemesis as representations of, respectively, the elegiac ideal in Book I and the incursion of elegiac reality in Book II; and Putnam's (1973), 11 where he observes in Tibullus' poetry "the creation of a dream world … which serves as a touchstone against which present reality is measured."

would seem, one of distance and deficiency. But to define the lover by the exigencies of his physical experience is to privilege reality over fantasy, something that neither the Tibullan *amator*—in his ritual inhabitation of his dreams—nor the poetry itself, with its blurry transitions between scenes and themes,[5] readily encourages.

And so I would like instead to minimize the rupture between fantasy and reality—between interior and exterior, inclusion and exclusion—and approach the so-called "dream text" *as* poetic reality (or, perhaps, *a* poetic reality). For the lover does, in his mind, enjoy the company his beloved—does, in his mind, attain a state of inclusion—and the nature of such experiences as envisioned does not make them any less real. Indeed, when moments of inclusion occur in Tibullus, conjured though they may be, they alter the poetic experience, reshaping the poetic world such that the dream becomes the reality;[6] and it is precisely in the unspooling of such fantasies that the figure of the lover is shaped. The image of the Tibullan *inclusus amator*, then, emerges as a locus of integration of dream and reality: at once contextually *exclusus* and conceptually *inclusus*, he supplants the experience of physical separation with an equally salient vision of union—one that speaks directly to the nature of poetry as a medium in which representation and reality are one and the same, and that counters the criticism of elegiac longing as fatuously fanciful that Lucretius levels against lovers.

The Dream Defended

The notion of rotation is thus, as Maltby models, very much at the heart of Tibullan poetics—and in a dimension even beyond what his study reveals. It is not just that the Tibullan *amator* finds himself now on this side of his beloved's affections, now on that, suffering

[5] Cf. Damer (2014a), 446 on the "dreamy quality of transitions between Tibullus' verses" that "obscures the movement from one scene to the next and from one theme to another."
[6] What I am suggesting for Tibullus here is not unrelated to Lieberg's (1982), 281 discussion of the concept of the "poet-creator" that arises from the tendency "à concevoir le pouvoir qu'a la poésie de produire ses sujets."

fortune's inconstancy as he cycles between feelings of amity and enmity, his romantic ideal continuously collapsing under the weight of his loveless reality. He is ever turning from the context of his experience to the experience of his imaginings, the content of his visions supplanting the particulars of his circumstances, such that his dream is substantiated by the poetic reality that takes hold, even as his contextual reality compromises the dream that holds him. Just as the Propertian *amator* activates the mechanics of exclusionary desire as he achieves his desired inclusion, so the Tibullan lover can be seen to actualize his fantasy as he faces his actuality, both loving and longing simultaneously in his circular embodiment of *exclusus* and *inclusus.*

Take poem 1.2, in which the reality of physical exclusion that the *paraclausithyron* set-up[7] necessitates is routinely undermined by the force of envisioned inclusion. *nam posita est nostrae custodia saeva puellae*/*clauditur et dura ianua firma sera*, the poet-lover laments in lines 5-6 (for an unforgiving guard has been set over our girl, and the door is shut fast with rigid bolt), launching on the sea of platitudes and imprecations characteristic of the wayward *exclusus*:

> Ianua difficilis domini, te verberet imber,
> te Iovis imperio fulmina missa petant.
> ianua, iam pateas uni mihi, victa querelis,
> neu furtim verso cardine aperta sones (1.2.7-10)

> Door of an adamant landlord, may the rain lash you,
> may the bolts of lightning launched by the hand of Jove land on you.
> Door, won't you now open for me alone, undone by my wheedling,
> but don't make a sound, opened on hinge stealthily turned.

And yet, the focus of the poetic outpouring that follows is not the condition of the lover's exclusion, but the circumstances of his (re)union with Delia:

> tu quoque ne timide custodes, Delia, falle;
> audendum est: fortes adiuvat ipsa Venus.

[7] All the same, the poem has given rise to much scholarly consternation over the question of its dramatic setting, an issue summarized by Cairns (1979), 166: "Tibullus seems to be at a symposium, but a littler later he turns out to be on his mistresses' doorstep." Miller (1999), 187 provides a nice doxography of treatments of the issue.

illa favet, seu quis iuvenis nova limina temptat,
  seu reserat fixo dente puella fores;
illa docet molli furtim derepere lecto,
  illa pedem nullo ponere posse sono,
illa viro coram nutus conferre loquaces
  blandaque conpositis abdere verba notis. (1.2.15-22)

You, too, Delia, don't slip past the guards apprehensively;
one must be confident: Venus herself aids the bold.
She shows favor, whether some young man makes trial of new thresholds,
or a girl unlocks the doors by inserting a prong;
she teaches how to steal away from a soft bed,
how to move your feet without a sound,
to exchange, before your man's eyes, gestures that speak volumes,
and to encode flirtatious words in agreed-upon signs.

The grievous guard whose post at the door seemed to spell doom for the *amator* at the outset—and whose generic presence supplies a wealth of material for the canonical lament of the *exclusus*—[8] has become, by line 15, a surmountable obstacle: a figure not to be feared, a sentry not so vigilant that he cannot be duped. What is more, it is not Delia who denies admission, not Delia who is *saeva* and *dura*, as the *puella* is often accused of being by the disgruntled *exclusus*.[9] Indeed, she remains of a piece with the poet-lover, claimed as *nostra puella*,[10] encouraged to act

[8] See Copley (1956), 1-6, 28-42 for a survey of the stock elements of the *paraclausithyron*, of which protracted execration and wheedling of the door guard is one.

[9] Bright (1978), 206 notes that *saevus* is not used to describe Delia but rather "the forces controlling her", though it is applied to Nemesis at Tib. 2.4.6: *uror: io, remove, saeva puella, faces* (I burn: oh please, cruel girl, remove your firebrand). Murgatroyd (1994), 242 makes the same observation of *dura*, claimed of Nemesis at Tib. 2.6.28 (*ei mihi, ne vincas, dura puella, deam*, ah me, don't, pitiless girl, topple a goddess) but never directly of Delia. For discussion of the trope of the elegiac *puella* as harsh and unfeeling, see: Wyke (2007), 158; James (2003a), 102-103 and 103 n.14; Greene (2000), 241; Miller (2000), 136; Fabre-Serris (2013).

[10] Realities of metrical constraint aside, it might be worth noting that Tibullus' use of the possessive adjective to describe the beloved tends to proliferate in situations of imagined inclusion, as in 1.1.57-58: *non ego laudari curo, mea Delia; tecum/dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque vocer*; 1.5.21: *rura colam, frugumque aderit mea Delia custos*; 1.2.73: *ipse boves—mea is tecum modo Delia—possim*; also: 1.3.29; 1.6.55; 2.3.1, 2.3.55, 2.3.81-84; 2.4.59 Compare this to contexts of exclusion, in which the possessive tends to be omitted, as in 1.1.55-56: *me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae,/et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores*; 1.6.5-6: … *iam Delia furtim/nescioquem tacita callida nocte fovet*; 2.5.111: *usque cano Nemesim, sine qua versus mihi nullus*; 2.6.28-29: *spes facilem Nemesim spondet mihi, sed negat illa:/ei mihi, ne vincas, dura puella, deam*. For a study of instances of the plural possessive (*nos, noster*) in Tibullus, see Maguinness (1944).

on the desire to escape her confinement, implied to be equally *exclusa* herself, unwillingly kept on the far side of the door and capable, through her own action, of righting the injustice.[11]

And so the condition of exclusion is tempered by the possibility of inclusion. The *amator*'s psychological unity with his beloved shifts the tenor of the poem from lamentation to expectation: instead of adumbrating the iniquities of exclusion, it outlines the routes to inclusion, supplanting the physical reality of separation with the projected one of union. Thus the presentation of the *amator* in line 17 is not as an impotent *exclusus*, but as an empowered swain. Thus the quality of the door bolt remarked in line 18 is not its intransigence, but its compliance. Thus the focus of lines 19-22 is not on the barriers that separate lover and beloved, but on the methods by which they can come together. This *paraclausithyron*, in short, is not about being *exclusus*, it is about be(com)ing *inclusus*; and the logistics of inclusion, imagined though it may be, accordingly shape the poetic reality.

The shape of said reality is formed by a pattern of presences absented and absences presented, of conditions rotated in the gradual incursion of dream into reality.[12] The guard is there but not there: a *custodia saeva* who enforces physical exclusion in line 5, a technicality all but imagined away with a change of mindset in line 15 (*ne timide custodes*, *Delia, falle*). The door is there but not there: an immovable object in line 6 (*dura iauna firma sera*), an obstruction voided through the unstoppable force of love in line 18 (*reserat fixo dente*), its intransigence

[11] Cf. Maltby (2004), 105 who sees in the poet-lover's early dealings with Delia an idealization of the relationship as only ever externally threatened (e.g. by a locked door or a watchful guard) that devolves by the end of the Delia cycle in 1.6 to show Delia herself as the agent of harm.

[12] Hardie (2002) explores similar issues of presence and absence in the poetry of Ovid. He frames his study as one on the themes of "presence and illusion" (6) in Ovid's oeuvre, considering how his poetics work to conjure fictive scenarios and characters for an audience that must be made to feel that the representation is the reality. His focus is on the "visualizing" devices of the poetry (7)—and how they are marshalled to persuade a reading audience of the vividness of the poetic material. My interest here is related, but is less about the persuasive effect on a reader of the language of presence, and more about the relationship between presence and absence as have and not have, there and not there, in the intrapoetic experience of the Tibullan *amator*.

mere illusion in the light of envisioned union. Delia herself there and not there: a pictured prisoner in line 5 (*posita est nostrae custodia saeva puellae*), a projected escapee in line 15 (*custodes, Delia, falle*). What is physically present at the outset—the guard, the lock—recedes, a shadow of its former self as the vision changes the scene; and what is physically absent—the girl—advances, materializing on the page as the imagined circumstances shift. In the conjuring of an instance of separation surmounted, the script of the contextual "reality" of exclusion is systematically rewritten to reflect a new paradigm of inclusion, the very language of division turned to its own undoing: the bolt (*sera*) unbolted (*reserat*); the *puella*, a captive of positioning (***posita est*** *nostrae custodia … puellae*), repositioned to make placements of her own (*illa pedem … **ponere** posse*). We may have entered a new field of vision, a new frame of inclusion, but exclusion is not fully expunged: its vestiges are there, in the language repurposed, in the imagery reworked. As in Propertius, the terms of separation are renegotiated in the context of union, such that the fulfilment of intimacy is shown to be as latent in the experience of estrangement as estrangement is lurking in intimacy.

This pattern holds as the poem progresses to enumerate the advantages of love in the context of envisioned union:

> nec sinit occurrat quisquam, qui corpora ferro
> volneret aut rapta praemia veste petat.
> quisquis amore tenetur, eat tutusque sacerque
> qualibet: insidias non timuisse decet.
> non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis,
> non mihi, cum multa decidit imber aqua.
> non labor hic laedit, reseret modo Delia postes
> et vocet ad digiti me taciturna sonum. (1.2.27-34)
>
> She [sc. Venus] doesn't allow anyone to cross my path who might
> harm my body with a weapon or hope for enrichment from my stolen clothing.
> Whoever is gripped by love, let him go safe and sanctified
> wherever he pleases: it's not right that he fear an ambush.
> The numbing cold of a winter night does me no harm,
> it doesn't harm me when a storm unleashes a torrent of water.
> This trial does no damage, provided that Delia unbolts the doors

and silently summons me with the snap of a finger.

Here again, the canonical experience of exclusion is transformed by the projection of inclusion. The dangers that present in the nighttime roving associated with the *exclusus* and his *vigilatio*—the twin threats of attack and mugging—pose no risk to the poet-lover whose passion, far from being a source of suffering, is the wellspring of his protection.[13] It is likewise the thought of inclusion—of doors opening, of Delia beckoning—that rewrites the playbook of the elegiac *exclusus*: cold nights and fierce storms are not objects of complaint, not unforgiving conditions in which the pitiable lover is made to stage his fruitless vigil, but elements of no consequence in the *amator*'s progression toward his beloved.

And so we see the trappings of physical exclusion from the opening lines rendered, in the lover's reverie, as tokens of inclusion: exposure reimagined as shelter, the rain wished upon the door in punishment for its violation of intimacy (*verberet imber*) not nearly so punishing in the light of Venus inviolate (*non mihi ... decidit imber*); the door repictured as Delia, the prayed-for silence of its hinge as it opens (*furtim verso cardine sones*) refigured as the silent curve of her finger as she beckons (*ad digiti me taciturna sonum*).[14] The thought of love accomplished has altered the poetic reality, supplanting the initial context of barriers and separation with a vision that recasts the actors of exclusion as corresponding figures of inclusion, the mechanics of separation subsumed in the expression of togetherness. Absence and presence navigated again—the rain, the door, the beloved all there and not there, repurposed in this new narrative to bespeak inclusion rather than exclusion. Through his projected union with Delia—that stipulated *digiti sonum*—the poet-lover transcends the physical realities of their division; and his vision of

[13] For discussion of marauding and other unsavory nighttime activities: Ker (2004), 219-221 and (2020), 8-10; Wilson (2018), 63; and Copley (1942), 47-48 for instantiations of such threats in the κῶμος and *paraclausithyron*.
[14] A transformation of door into *domina* that recalls Pucci's (1978) identification of the door as metonym for the Propertian mistress.

reception, in turn, transforms the poetic reality from a performance of a *paraclausithyron* into an act of intimacy.

So it is that the Tibullan *amator* can be characterized as simultaneously *exclusus* and *inclusus*: physically separated, psychologically united. In the course of his musings, he rotates from a position of without to one of with(in), the vividness of his vision altering the contextual determinants around him, shifting them in and out of focus as his reverie becomes the poetic reality, his present circumstances receding as imagined ones advance.

This sensibility similarly informs the situation in poem 1.6, which witnesses the poet-lover betrayed by Delia for another man, physically separated from his beloved while she *nescioquem tacita callida nocte fovet* (deviously keeps warm god knows who in the silent night, l.6.6). But rather than lament the logistics of their division, the poet-lover reflects, instead, on the shared experience that connects them:

> ipse miser docui, quo posset ludere pacto
> custodes: heu heu nunc premor arte mea.
> fingere tunc didicit causas, ut sola cubaret,
> cardine tunc tacito vertere posse fores.
> tum sucos herbasque dedi, quis livor abiret,
> quem facit inpresso mutua dente venus. (1.6.9-14)
>
> I myself, wretch that I am, taught her how she could deceive
> the guards: and oh, oh, now I am struck down by my own skill.
> She learned, back then, to fabricate reasons for sleeping alone,
> and how she could push back the doors on silent hinge.
> And there was the time I gave her unguents and herbs to make disappear
> the bruise that our shared love left when my teeth met her skin.

The ruing of separation is supplanted by a reflection on unity. The physical space between the poet-lover and Delia is bridged by his reverie, by his slippage into a past state of togetherness that witnessed the two of them joined not only in body, but also in mind. There is a fusion that occurs in the transmission of erotic tactical knowledge from poet-lover to beloved: the poet-lover's education of Delia in the amatory arts enables their physical union, yes—the surmounting

of the literal barriers of watchful *custodes*, squeaky *fores*, entitled bedfellows that stand between them—but more importantly it endows a unity of purpose, a like-mindedness that binds them in spirit. Through the transmission of knowledge, Delia becomes a reflection of the poet-lover, who in turn becomes a part of her, an essential blending of the two that gives another valence to the description of their love as *mutua*,[15] and that allows the poet-lover to remain *inclusus* in essence even when *exclusus* in substance.

We can hear, in this sharing of identity—this making of the *puella* in the image of the *amator*, such that she, in her erotic agency, becomes an *amatrix* in her own right—the echoes of Propertian inclusion: the beloved-cum-lover in her reperformance of exclusion in the context of inclusion. The effect here is similar, even if the mechanics are different. Rather than sharing physical space in their enactment of inclusion—as do Cynthia and the Propertian *amator*—the Tibullan poet-lover and Delia share head-space, their joint facility with love's devices and the common experience of their transmission constituting a union that obtains even in the face of separation. They are each, *amator* and Delia, simultaneously with and without the other: Delia embodying the poet-lover in her activation of his erotic knowledge, even in its application to an illicit assignation; the poet-lover conjuring Delia in his assertion of their mutual experience, even while couched in the context of his estrangement. Each is, for the other, equally absent and present—indeed, it is precisely the physical absence that makes the psychological presence possible: Delia's instantiation of the poet-lover is contingent on her being with another, just as the poet-lover's inculcation of their shared mentality is a product of his physical rejection. As in

[15] Indeed, it is this very condition of mutuality that characterizes the Tibullan poet-lover's conception of ideal love, cf. 1.2.65-66: *non ego totus abesset amor sed mutuus esset*/*orabam* (I was praying for a love that was mutual, not altogether absent). Cf. Gutzwiller (2015), 27 where she identifies "reciprocal desire and affection" as one of the primary axes along which Roman elegiac *amor* can be distinguished from the Greek model of ἔρως, which "does not necessarily anticipate a like desire."

the poems of Propertius, the state of inclusion is coterminous with that of exclusion—the performance of presence a facet of the incidence of absence—though the vehicle for its expression in Tibullus is the mind, rather than the body.

It is this aspect of union—its ascription to the workings of the imagination—that comes to dominate the poetic reality that unfolds. Consider the trajectory of 1.6, which, rather than revert to expressions of woe at the condition of physical separation, continues instead to reflect on moments of connection. First, those achieved by virtue of the cuckholding of Delia's *vir*:

> Saepe, velut gemmas eius signumque probarem,
> per causam memini me tetigisse manum;
> saepe mero somnum peperi tibi, at ipse bibebam
> sobria subposita pocula victor aqua. …
> ille ego sum, nec me iam dicere vera pudebit,
> instabat tota cui tua nocte canis.
> quid tenera tibi coniuge opus? tua si bona nescis
> servare, frustra clavis inest foribus. (1.6.25-28, 31-34)
>
> Often, as if I were examining her jewels and ring,
> on this pretext I remember touching her hand;
> often I induced your sleep with wine while I myself, the victor,
> drained dry cups, substituting water. …
> It was I, there's no shame in admitting it now,
> whom your dog was harassing all night.
> What business do you have with a tender woman? If you don't know how
> to protect your own goods, the lock on your door is for naught.

The thrust of the rumination is not the trials that divide, but the ties that bind. The poet-lover is here conjured in the act of deploying those very *artes* whose communication to Delia represented the site of their envisioned integration, reinforcing their spiritual synchrony while rehashing their physical connection. That is to say, he is, in his mind, together with his beloved, projecting himself into a past experience of union—the touching of hands, the night visitations—made possible by the very methodology that connects him to his girl—the pretense of innocence, the dupery of watchful eyes. It is a retrojection that becomes his present experience: the vision of past inclusion overshadows the reality of present exclusion, such that the *amator* is no longer

crying *miser*, but crowing *victor*, no longer conferring Delia to another (*nescioquem … fovet*), but claiming her for himself (*tua si bona nescis/servare, frustra clavis inest foribus*).

He is also, in effect, transposing his own role and that of the *vir*. With this slip into reverie, the poet-lover overlays a present in which he himself is the victim of Delia's indiscretions with a vision of himself as past beneficiary, replacing one image of a cuckhold, one image of a favorite, with another. Call it revisionist: the *vir* as *amans* replaced with the recollection of the poet-lover as *amans*; the poet-lover as dupe replaced with the recollection of the *vir* similarly victimized. And with this implication of one lover in the scene of the other, a fundamental identification of the two. Through the associative property of *amor*, the poet-lover can perform the role of Delia's *vir* even while the *vir* is with Delia—can relegate the *vir* to the status of *exclusus* even while he himself acts the part. He can, in short, relate himself into her company, no matter the mister she entertains.

Maltby would see this dynamic as a reversal of circumstance—a turning of Tibullus' wheel of fortune that illustrates, in the game of musical partners, the inconstancy of love that informs his elegiac outlook.[16] There is more, though, to this erotic roulette than the reiteration of amatory vicissitude. Yes, the implication is that yesterday's favorite is today's fool, that the darling of the moment will be the dupe of the future. But the connection established between poet-lover and *vir* is not as clear-cut as a strict exchange of position.

In the superimposition of the poet-lover of the past atop the *vir* of the present, there is a merging of their two identities as much as there is a performative *volte-face*. Just as in poem 1.2, where the vestiges of exclusion were latent below the surface of their re-presented forms, so here the outlines of the *exclusus* are discernible in the contours of the *inclusus*: the shadow of the

[16] Maltby (2004), 106.

poet-lover rejected in the sight of the *vir* received; the tinge of exclusion to come in the vision of the poet-lover's inclusion. Much as with the union of poet-lover and Delia through the medium of their mutual knowledge, so here the shared experience of poet-lover and *vir* makes them coextensive, rather than distinct alternatives. And it is precisely this coextension that enables the poet-lover to reprise his role as Delia's *vir* even while he is not, in practice, her *vir*.

It is an act of integration—of poet-lover and *vir*, *exclusus* and *inclusus*, presence and absence—that in turn shapes the poetic reality, an imaginative representation reified in the poetic experience:

> haec [sc. tua mater] mihi te adducit tenebris multoque timore
> coniungit nostras clam taciturna manus.
> haec foribusque manet noctu me adfixa proculque
> cognoscit strepitus me veniente pedum. (1.6.59-62)
>
> She leads you to me in the darkness and
> with great trepidation silently joins our hands in secret.
> She expects me at night, planted at the door, and even from a distance
> recognizes the scuffs of my feet as I approach.

The circumstances of the poet-lover's union with Delia are here not even confined to the past—they take over the present. Love's liaison *adducit*, *coniungit*, *cognoscit*, the vividness of the vision literally supplanting the reality of the present circumstances described at the outset (*iam Delia furtim*/*nescioquem … fovet*). The imagined unity, then, becomes its own actuality, dominating the poetic consciousness, such that all traces of physical exclusion are replaced by images of inclusion and the *amator*, by all accounts logistically *exclusus*, is all the same simultaneously *inclusus* in the domain that comes to have the greater influence: the imagination.

It is no wonder, then, that the poem concludes not by returning from the reverie of union to the reality of separation, but with a projection of continued togetherness:

> nec saevo sis casta metu sed mente fideli;
> mutuus absenti te mihi servet amor. …
> haec aliis maledicta cadant. nos, Delia, amoris
> exemplum cana simus uterque coma. (1.6.75-76, 85-86)

> Be pure not out of wild fear, but with true intention,
> let our shared love preserve you for me, even when I'm away. …
> Let these abuses befall others; as for us, Delia, let us both
> be the paradigm of love when our hair is grey.

The parting image is one of inclusion, of Delia true for pure reasons, of a love that is *mutuus*, just as it was when teeth blemished body back in line 14. Though while there the focus was on physical unity with the attendant mind-meld implicit, here the sense of psychological assimilation is brought to the fore: it is a *mens fidelis* that represents the ultimate union, the mind that settles the matter. Just as at 1.2.15, where psychology underlay intimacy (***nec timide*** *custodes, Delia, falle*), so here Delia's mindset is determinative: that same mentality (*nec saevo … metu*, twice telling for its characterization of a psychological state in language used, in 1.2.5, of a physical cause of separation: *custodia* ***saeva***) leads again to a state of inclusion (*mutuus absenti te mihi servet amor*). In this paradigm of the primacy of mental activity, love can continue to bind—to be *mutuus*—even when the poet-lover is physically absent. The truth of their psychological unity is truer than the measure of distance between their bodies, and the poetry in turn bears this out: *absenti te mihi—te* and *mihi,* inseparable by *absenti; absenti* and *mihi*, embracing *te*. And so the *amator*, still, by the logic of the narrative, physically *exclusus*, lives on poetically as an *inclusus*, joined indelibly with Delia in a vision of "we" (through *nos*, through *simus*, through *uterque*) that not only displaces the circumstance of their separation, but that even allows their connection to outlast the canonical shelf-life of the elegiac relationship (*cana … coma*).[17]

[17] The inappropriateness of love for the blue-haired is elsewhere remarked in Tibullus at 1.1.71-72, 1.2.91-98, and 2.1.73-74. Cf. Prop. 2.18a and Ov. *Am*. 1.9.4. Hunter (2013) discusses the implications of aging for elegiac relationship dynamics; and at 5-6 and 221 notes the general consensus that love is for the young.

The Dream Deferred

Poem 1.6 articulates, in a single line, what I have been tracing as a theme in Tibullan poetics: *mutuus absenti te mihi servet amor*, an image of physical separation and psychological union, a play of absence and presence—out of sight, but not out of mind—the promise of envisioned inclusion made good in the poetry. All well and good; but all the same, such instances of imagined inclusion are not always comfortably manifested—are met, now and then, with moments when the nexus of vision and reality seems to fray. They are moments that have been ascribed to the impossibility of the elegiac dream to survive the actual erotic experience;[18] and are moments that would thus seem to turn away from the project of demonstrating the soundness of amatory reverie in their apparent confirmation of the veracity of physical experience.

Indeed, that same line that captures in pentameter the essence of Tibullan inclusion also calls for an enactment of the very pitfalls of passionate love that Lucretius exposes:

> nam si abest quod ames, praesto simulacra tamen sunt
> illius, et nomen dulce obversatur ad auris.
> sed fugitare decet simulacra et pabula amoris
> absterrere sibi atque alio convertere mentem
> et iacere umorem conlectum in corpora quaeque,
> nec retinere, semel conversum unius amore
> et servare sibi curam certumque dolorem (*DRN* 4.1061-1067)
>
> for even if the object of your affection is absent, all the same its likeness is
> right there, and its name sounds sweetly in your ears.
> But it's better to shun such likenesses and abstain
> from passion's fodder and turn one's mind elsewhere
> and to release one's reservoir into any body,
> and not hold onto it, bound once and for all by the love of one,
> and sustain pain and certain grief for oneself.

[18] And as such tend to be seen more in the course of the poet-lover's pursuit of Nemesis in Book II. Cf. Bright (1978), 185-186; Murgatroyd (1994), xvii; Maltby (2004), 114-120; Booth and Maltby (2005), 128-130. Fineberg (1993), 249 contrasts Delia and Nemesis both along the lines of amenability (Delia) and cruelty (Nemesis), and of the reality (Delia) and unreality (Nemesis) of their portrayals.

The psychic connection that is, for Tibullus, the surety of love represents, for Lucretius, passion's delusion. And yet, for both, it is essential to the erotic experience: for the former as the province of true feeling (*mutuus … amor*); for the latter, as the provenance of false impressions (*simulacra*). Tibullus' poet-lover, it would seem, is instantiating all the Lucretian tropes about the misguided *amator*: the investment of weight in an image, the ascription of reality to a fantasy. The very motif of present absence and absent presence that underlies his poetics of inclusion (***absenti*** *te mihi*) is exploited by Lucretius to demonstrate love's duplicity: *nam si* ***abest*** *quod ames, praesto simulacra tamen sunt*, the substance of the matter gone (*abest*), the empty perception lingering (*sunt*), the deception of the impression underscored by an adverb (*praesto*) that speaks at once to its vividness ("at hand") and, in its echo of the homonymous verb (*praesto*), the tendency of that impression to predominate ("be superior")[19].

We would, then, seem to have in Tibullus an erotic experience crafted in the image of Lucretius' polemic—and with that, a reiteration of the fundamental falsity of passionate love, of its rootedness in a heady vision that is ever at odds with bodily truth. But what presents as a validation of the exigencies of reality over the inventions of fantasy—of physical separation and exclusion over the projection of union and inclusion—is, upon a second look, misdirection. Indeed, the apparent collapse of the elegiac imaginary in these instances is ultimately a thin veil for its purchase.

Poem 1.5, a meandering reflection on the poet-lover's relationship with Delia, speaks to this point:

> saepe ego temptavi curas depellere vino,
> at dolor in lacrimas verterat omne merum.
> saepe aliam tenui, sed iam cum gaudia adirem,
> admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus. (1.5.37-40)

[19] Or even, "make good on a promise", cf. *OLD s.v.* 11.

> Often I have tried to drown my troubles in wine,
> but grief turned all my drink into tears.
> Often I have held another, but just as I was on the cusp of pleasure,
> Venus reminded me of my mistress and left me.

The situation, on its face, illustrates Lucretius' pleasure trap: the unromantic reality clashing with the erotic fantasy, the image of the beloved up against tangible experience. First, in the vain attempt to self-medicate with drink, where the reality of separation is acutely felt, where no pretense of imagined inclusion can intervene to offset it. Then, in the failed sex act, where preoccupation with the absent Delia takes over the present pursuit, where reality is literally foregone for a vision.

As much as the Tibullan poet-lover here embodies the symptoms of unreal love, though, he debunks the diagnosis altogether. For we have, in this image of the *amator* incapable of performing physical love for being beholden to his envisioned beloved, a simultaneous enactment and erosion of Lucretian didactics: the poet-lover, turning away from the image of Delia toward the body of another (*sed fugitare decet simulacra … et iacere umorem conlectum in corpora quaeque*, *DRN* 4.1063-1065); the poet-lover, turning out to be just as physically governed by his thoughts as he is mentally ensconced in them, unable to make love for being in love (*admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus*, 1.5.40). A bodily experience uncoupled from a psychological one is no antidote to the seduction of the vision—it only serves to lay bare the inadequacy of unadulterated physicality.

What it boils down to is an opposite model of erotics from that employed by Lucretius; and in the breach, the power of Tibullan ideation to dictate bodily experience is underscored. For Lucretius, the sexual experience is all physical.[20] When in the throes of passion, the body takes

[20] Cf. Brown (1987), 61-62 where he observes of the end of *DRN* Book IV that "the polemical portion grows out of a physiological explanation of desire" and remarks Lucretius' "wholesale reduction of sexuality to impersonal physical factors, devoid of supernatural influence." Tibullus' account, as it happens, speaks directly against this

over, promising lovers a contact and connection—sought ever more desperately and thoughtlessly—that the sexual experience ultimately is unable to confer:

> denique cum membris conlatis flore fruuntur
> aetatis, iam cum praesagit gaudia corpus
> atque in eost Venus ut muliebria conserat arva,
> adfigunt avide corpus iunguntque salivas
> oris et inspirant pressantes dentibus ora—
> nequiquam, quoniam nil inde abradere possunt
> nec penetrare et abire in corpus corpore toto …
> tandem ubi se erupit nervis conlecta cupido,
> parva fit ardoris violenti pausa parumper.
> inde redit rabies eadem et furor ille revisit,
> cum sibi quod cupiunt ipsi contingere quaerunt,
> nec reperire malum id possunt quae machina vincat. (*DRN* 4.1105-11, 1115-19)
>
> finally, when with limbs laced they relish
> the bloom of their youth, right when the body starts to sense
> its coming pleasure and that point has arrived when Venus
> is to sow the woman's field, they greedily grab at the other's body
> and mingle their mouths' saliva and pant while pressing teeth to lips—
> all in vain, since they are able to come away with nothing from this
> and cannot penetrate and permeate one body with the entirety of the other …
> When finally the desire that has been pent up in their sinews breaks free,
> a short stay of their seething passion is, for a moment, issued.
> Then the same madness returns and that craze reappears,
> when they seek to obtain what they crave,
> and can identify neither the malady nor the means of overcoming it.

This is the body independent of the mind. Our lovers lose themselves in the physicality of sexuality, striving for a complete satisfaction that cannot be achieved, and only in the aftermath of their intercourse do they feel the inadequacy of their efforts. Herein lies love's deception: it teases fulfilment through physical connection, but cannot deliver the goods. Mindless desire drives the body, again and again, to pursue a state of satiety that is not physically possible—the

impulse: sexuality is intensely personal, and the "supernatural" hold of the beloved is not supernatural at all—it is decidedly natural (cf. 1.5.43-44: *non facit hoc verbis; facie tenerisque lacertis/devovet et flavis nostra puella comis*, she doesn't do this [sc. enchant] with incantations: she bewitches with her visage and her delicate arms, our girl does, and her flaxen hair).

crux of the insanity and inanity of Lucretian *amor*, this compulsion to cure a craving that sexual union cannot, in reality, address.

Tibullus' model rotates this physiological position within the framework of the same physical arrangement. Each episode witnesses the lover and beloved entwined: Tibullus' *amator* sets the scene with *aliam tenui*; Lucretius' lovers lie *membris conlatis*. Each episode locates its *amator* on the cusp of sexual release: in Tibullus, *gaudia adirem*; in Lucretius, *praesagit gaudia corpus*. Each episode accords to Venus a central role in the proceedings, though while for Lucretius she is responsible for the release (*ut muliebra conserat arva*)[21], for Tibullus she is guilty of denying it (*admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus*). But despite the consonant language and imagery, the Tibullan representation of passion and its expression through sex is de-physicalizing: for his poet-lover, the moment of climax is all thought—the intimate subjectivity of *adirem* against the scientific objectification of *praesagit … corpus*. And when on the cusp of pleasure, the mind overpowers the body, rendering it impotent despite the presence of *bona fide* physical stimulation. Sex is not a thoughtless, frenzied physical act, but one governed by the head, without the sensible participation of which the body cannot perform. It is, ultimately, the mind that controls the body, not the body that precludes the mind.

For Tibullus and Lucretius both, then, the sex act comes to nothing, though for the latter this failure stems from the body's disappointment of the mind, while the former rather locates it in the mind's disappointment of the body. To be a successful lover in the Tibullan model means to be in one's right mind, not out of it—and to be in one's right mind means to be with the object of one's desire. He thus counters Lucretius' image of lovers out of their minds with lust with one

[21] Bailey's commentary (1947), *ad loc*. links the metaphor to Verg. *Geor*. 3.136, cf. Aesch. *Sept*. 753. There is also, of course, the tantalizing overlap between Lucretius' agrarian imagery in his characterization of sex and Tibullus' own fondness for all things rural in his amorous fantasies.

of the lover lacking lust for being too much in his head. Tibullus has, essentially, reversed the phenomenon—his poet-lover is not lost in the throes of passion, does not have an out-of-mind experience in the misguided attempt to satisfy his desire with sex. His head knows that the sex will not be satisfying, and his body acts accordingly.

What is more, the Tibullan poet-lover's failed attempt to loosen the grip of passion through the wild sowing of oats demonstrates that the idea of the beloved has very material dimensions, indeed. It is, after all, the thought of her that alters the poet-lover's physical experience, that derails the alleviation of love with indiscriminate intercourse: in his anti-climax in the shadow of her image—where *deseruitque Venus* signals an erotic absence that presents in response to the present absence of the beloved, physical impulse and emotional investment converging in the singular figure of Venus; and in the denaturing of the scene as sexual—where *deseruitque Venus* suggests an un-planting of the sexual seed, a making barren of a poetic landscape that was, under Delia, fertile (as at 1.1.73-74: *nunc levis est tractanda Venus, dum … rixas* ***inseruisse*** *iuvat*, now is the time to practice easy Love, … while there's pleasure to be had in cultivating quarrels).[22]

And so, despite the apparent rupture between the imagined and the real—the seeming confirmation that the beloved envisioned is not the same as the beloved embraced—it is, just as before, the psychological experience that holds sway, the image of Delia that supplants the body of not-Delia, the mentality that impacts the reality. The scene, in short, still turns on the

[22] A similar, if more tenuous, point can be made of the poet-lover's inability to find solace in drink, which could be read in relation to Lucretius' likening of impassioned sex to a dream of water at *DRN* 4.1097-1104 (discussed above: The Dream Decried). Lucretius' simile activates what Brown (1987), 83 identifies as a thematized "association between dreaming, drinking, and sex" in Book IV, whereby the lover's foolish hope to find fulfilment in sexual coupling is equated to the irrational expectation that the water of a dream can quench the thirst of the body that dreams of it. Lucretius is speaking to the inability of a dream to have tangible physical effects; Tibullus' poet-lover calls up that same complex of dream, drink, and sex to demonstrate the opposite. His amorous preoccupation renders his body unable to incorporate the physical properties of his drink—the mental, that is to say, unsubstantiates the physical.

dynamics of inclusion and exclusion that animate more "successful" realizations of reverie. The poet-lover is, with both women, at once *inclusus* and *exclusus*; in both contexts—lived and imagined—both there and not there: physically together with, but psychologically divorced from, not-Delia; psychologically united with, but physically separated from, Delia herself. The physical consequences of this distance—his inability to perform sexually—are in turn triggered by his psychological state.

No wonder, then, that Delia is figured as *domina* here, for her image dominates the action: it is the thought of her that dictates the poet-lover's physical reality, not the reality of his physical experience that occludes his thoughts of her. Yes, Tibullus affirms, the beloved is there with her siren song, in spirit if not in person. But no, the mind cannot be redirected—the vision of *unius amor* ensures that sexual release cannot be channeled *in corpora quaeque*, that physical reality cannot change metaphysical truth. The incursion of Delia's image into the poet-lover's bodily experience—and the alteration of the poetic reality in its wake: the un-sowing of fields, both literal and metaphoric, in the absenting of love—serves only to reiterate the primacy of the imaginative process in the construction of the elegiac reality. A reality that manifests first in the mind and then in the corpus.[23]

The power of the love that captivates over the accessibility of the body that presents—of *unius amor* over *corpora quaeque*—in the Tibullan *amator's* enterprises is reiterated in poem 2.5, where the lover bemoans his separation from Nemesis:

> et mihi praecipue, iaceo cum saucius annum
> et faveo morbo, cum iuvat ipse dolor.
> usque cano Nemesim, sine qua versus mihi nullus

[23] A take that pushes back against Kennedy's (2016), 52 use of Tib. 1.5 as an example of "a failed fantasy" whose intertextual relationship to Ovid *Tr*. 4.2 can help to refine the scholarly impression that Ovid's exilic reveries successfully "provide him with access to Rome in spite of his physical absence … Ovid's fantasy in *Tristia* 4.2 turns out to be just as ineffectual as Tibullus' in 1.5." Indeed, in light of the scholarly tradition that Kennedy invokes, it might be equally instructive to see in Ovid's "effectual" projections a reason to suspect that those of the Tibullan poet-lover are not quite so fruitless, after all.

verba potest iustos aut reperire pedes. (2.5.109-112)

> And especially in my case, when for a year now I languish in pain
> and welcome the affliction, since that very pain brings pleasure.
> All the while I sing of Nemesis, without whom no verse of mine
> can find the language or the right meter.

The singular beloved is here, as she was in 1.5, figured as integral to the elegiac poetic project, determinative of the success of its instantiation.[24] While in 1.5 it was physicality that was complicated by mental stimulation—in that sexual performance, ostensibly a cornerstone of the elegiac identity, could not be accomplished without her—in 2.5 it is poetic realization that directly hinges on her presence (*sine qua versus mihi nullus/verba potest iustos aut reperire pedes*). Where 1.5 demonstrated the centrality of the image to embodied experience, 2.5 demonstrates the centrality of envisioned experience to poetic realization, the implication of passion and its price in the construction of a poetic reality. For the agony that is born of the poet-lover's singular passion is not, as for Lucretius, something to shun. Indeed, the very ache (*dolor*) that plagues the Tibullan poet-lover—the same *dolor* that Lucretius identifies as a sure source of torment (*certum dolorem*, *DRN* 4.1067) for him who would not move on—is a locus of integration of body and mind, lover and beloved, there and not there.

Consider the dynamic that the poet-lover describes: the sting of love a pleasurable pain (*iuvat ipse dolor*); that pleasurable pain bound up in the expression of Nemesis (*faveo morbo ... **usque** cano Nemesim*). In the experience of heartache, a nexus of mental and physical—emotions corporally manifested (*iaceo cum saucius*); of there and not there—the beloved present to the mind in the form of desire, to the body in the form of affliction, absent in person, present in name. The poet-lover is thus simultaneously with and without his mistress, the two conditions

[24] And yet, the irony cannot be overlooked that Tibullus is unique among the elegists for naming two different central love interests in Delia and Nemesis, cf. Baca (1968), 51; Fulkerson (2018), 62.

mutually implicated: being without her causes grief, which in turn conjures the image of Nemesis, which in turn presents her to the poet lover. To be in pain, in short, is to behold the beloved—more than this, to feel her presence with(in) one's own body—and so the agony of separation is coextensive with the ecstasy of union. An "impure blend",[25] for Lucretius, but not so compromised for the Tibullan *amator*—it is a clear benefit, an abiding sense of love's presence, and as such a form of the beloved herself: an internal reproduction of the mistress, now made a part of the poet-lover, despite any distance between them. Just as in poem 1.2, where the poet-lover and Delia were united through a performative identification that effected their essential connection—where their shared knowledge allowed them to inhabit the same role, to become one while remaining two—so here the mistress is enfolded into the poet-lover's person, included in his psychology and physiology, even while he is suffering the effects of exclusion. So much for Lucretius' pronouncement that the psychological "lesion" of love induces the lover's deluded desire for an impossible integration with his beloved.[26] Through the medium of love's injurious imprint, the Tibullan *amator* is able to merge with his mistress in mind in a way that physicality alone does not allow.

But the pain is not just pleasant, here—it is useful (*iuvat*)[27]; and useful for poetic expression. For the poetic implications of this psychosomatic condition are immediately felt in the poetry itself. Indeed, the very simultaneity of the absence and presence of the beloved that underlies the poet-lover's psychic experience is embodied with the production of "Nemesis" on the page: *Nemesim, sine qua*—Nemesis, there and gone. And yet, the utterance accomplishes the

[25] Brown (1987), 74: "the sick lover (*miser*) experiences an impure blend of pleasure and pain."
[26] For love as lesion: *DRN* 4.1068 (*ulcus*). For relevant discussion, see Brown (1987), 73-75.
[27] Where *iuvo* denotes both delight ("it is pleasing") and utility ("it is helpful"). Indeed, the duality of meaning suggests a causal-conceptual overlap: it is useful, and therefore welcome—pleasure conferred by profitability (cf. *OLD s.v.*, where the sense of enjoyment is secondary to that of instrumentality).

materialization of her image in the poetic reality: the singing of her name (*cano Nemesim*) instantiates her linguistic form, and the form of her name in turn determines the metrical reality of the verse that follows. Her grammatical presence, regardless of the status of her "real" physicality, allows for the literal execution of the right words and meter, even while her implied absence metaphorically prevents it (*sine qua versus mihi nullus* …). This is isometric poetics: the pull of her envisioned absence equally offset by the force of her presence in the poetry. And so that very psychological affliction—that *dolor*—that Lucretius denounces as the root of passionate derangement (*ulcus enim vivescit et inveterascit alendo/inque dies gliscit furor atque aerumna gravescit*, *DRN* 4.1068-69) proves to be a boon, after all (*iuvat ipse dolor*, 2.5.110); the mental "disorder"[28] that is Lucretian love becomes a device of poetic order (*sine qua versus mihi nullus/verba potest iustos aut reperire pedes*, 2.5.111-112); and the image of the beloved that preoccupies the lover to his own undoing is reified in the poetic reality that is actualized through passionate reverie.

The mechanics of inclusion, then, by which the poet-lover can be psychologically and emotionally *inclusus* even when physically *exclusus*, come to define (or redefine) the Tibullan poetic experience. Indeed, the primacy of the romantic vision as the catalyst for the *amator*'s inclusion and the poetic reality that cossets it is the parting image of poem 2.6—and of the Tibullan elegiac collection as we have it. In a series of gnomic reflections, the poet-lover meditates on the force of hope:

> iam mala finissem leto, sed credula vitam
> Spes fovet et fore cras semper ait melius. …
> Spes facilem Nemesim spondet mihi, sed negat illa.

[28] The characterization is Brown's (1987), 85: "It is the *mind* which as the seat of emotion, judgment, and volition is 'wounded by love' … and it is the *mind* which must be diverted in other directions for the purpose of forestalling love … or compelled to confront the truth behind the façade …. Love, then, is a *mental* disorder …" (emphases original).

ei mihi, ne vincas, dura puella, deam. (2.6.19-20, 27-28)

> I would already have met my end in unfortunate death, but guileless
> hope kindles life and every time says that tomorrow will be better. …
> Hope assures me an amenable Nemesis, but she refuses.
> Ah me, don't better a goddess, you callous girl.

The lines capture the dichotomy between physical and emotional reality and speak to the ability for both of those realities to coexist. Vision, here figured as *Spes*, overtakes body, sustaining life (*vitam … fovet*) when it would otherwise collapse under the weight of erotic disappointment (*mala finissem leto*).[29] It is a vision of unity (*Spes facilem Nemesim spondet mihi*) that brushes up against a reality of separation (*negat illa*). That the two experiences, psychological and physical, are balanced in one line speaks to the simultaneity of the conditions of being *inclusus* and *exclusus*; that hope springs eternal (*fore cras semper ait melius*) reflects the capacity of the vision to constitute a meaningful reality of its own. It should come as no surprise, then, that the situation that inspires this reflection is one of exclusion, no less a *paraclausithyron*: *magna loquor* the poet-lover admits in lines 11-12, *sed magnifice mihi magna locuto/excutiunt clausae fortia verba fores* (I'm talking big, but, though my piece was spoken eloquently, her closed doors send brave words flying). The canonical context of physical separation sets the stage for the poet-lover's reversion to the imagined, in which the projection of unity comes to constitute its own reality.

And yet, it is the condition of physical separation ("He is *exclusus* to the end," in D.F. Bright's estimation)[30] that has led to the identification of 2.6 with the death of the Tibullan elegiac ideal—to the recognition, in this aretalogy of *Spes*, of an end to erotic infatuation and

[29] See Fulkerson (2018) for a discussion of the particular implications of *spes* in Tibullus; and of the centrality of hope, as a concept, in the wider elegiac universe. Hardie (2002), 11-12 similarly discusses *spes* as a phenomenon of "erotic absent presence."

[30] Bright (1978), 225. A sentiment shared by Cairns (1979), 183-187 who categorizes the poem as a κῶμος/*paraclausithyron*; and Murgatroyd (1989), who explicates the elements of exclusion beyond what Cairns describes.

elegiac poetics altogether, bound as they are to a vision of love that the *amator* now accepts as impossible.[31] Laurel Fulkerson sums it up when she points to "Tibullus' growing realization of the fruitlessness of further poetic discourse: after 2.6, the blinkers are off, and Tibullus has nothing more to say", attributing this disavowal of love and its poetry to his "clear understanding of the elegiac situation, which is … *by definition* one in which hopes are always disappointed" (emphasis original).[32]

A disjunct between the optimistic *Spes* of poem 1.1—who assured a fruitful harvest and allegorized a happy love life—and the realistic *Spes* of 2.6, who cannot spring back from the bout with Nemesis, is the pith of such assessments.[33] And perhaps we are, in these lines, returned to 1.1.19, where *nec Spes destituat* (Hope would not fail) in the rosy dawn of the poet-lover's amatory-agrarian enterprise. Perhaps the point is that, by the curtain call for the elegiac cycle in 2.6, it has. But these lines of 2.6 also recycle material from a different point in Book I—poem 1.6—whose repurposing speaks to the endurance of amatory reverie as much as any disappointment of *spes* might betray its evanescence:

> … iam Delia furtim
> nescioquem tacita callida nocte fovet.
> illa quidem tam multa negat, sed credere durum est;
> sic etiam de me pernegat usque viro. (1.6.5-8)
>
> … now deft Delia deviously
> keeps warm god knows who in the silent night.
> Sure, she denies it with so much resolve, but it's hard to believe;
> In exactly the same way, without missing a beat, she denies everything about me to her man.

The echoes across the books are resonant. Where Delia *nescioquem … fovet* in poem 1.6, Spes *vitam … fovet* in 2.6; where Delia *negat* and *pernegat* again in 1.6, Nemesis *negat* in 2.6; where

[31] As in Bright (1978), 221-22; Rambaux (1997), 87; Fulkerson (2018), 60-61.
[32] Fulkerson (2018), 61-62.
[33] As at Bright (1978), 222; Fulkerson (2018), 59-60.

credulity is difficult in 1.6 (***credere*** *durum est*), it is the defining characteristic of hope in 2.6 (***credula*** *spes*); and while that same belief is hard in 1.6 (*credere* ***durum***), it is the beloved who is so in 2.6 (***dura*** *puella*).

The effect is a blending of vision and reality—of image and body, absence and presence—that refashions and rehabilitates erotic disappointment as poetic possibility. If Delia's act of denial in 1.6 (*tam multa negat*) is an illusion of inclusion that belies a condition of exclusion (*sed credere durum est*), that sense of separation is immediately offset by the envisioning of her parallel disavowal to her *vir* of her intimacy with the poet-lover (*de me pernegat usque viro*).[34] That is to say, the act of denial both undermines and induces hope: undermines, because the knowledge of its routinization loosens the purchase of its claim; induces, because that same cyclicality of its delivery allows for the thought of the poet-lover's inclusion pretended away to the *vir*. As soon as the power of the mind to supplant the circumstance of the body threatens to fail, the danger is imagined away: analogy swoops in to rescue the *amator* from the brink of disillusionment, a poetic device as *deus ex machina*.

It is the same dynamic remarked of *Spes* in 2.6.28—where the vitality it offers his fantasy life is just enough to keep the poet-lover from losing his physical one—and that equally underwrites the line just prior, in the symmetry struck between *Spes facilem Nemesim* and *sed negat illa* in 2.6.27: three words of projected inclusion against three words of pronounced exclusion, with the imaginative capacity of the poet-lover, as the point of intersection of vision and reality, in the balance (*spondet mihi*). Which is to say, there is indelibly, in the refusal of Nemesis to sustain the dream of inclusion, a reminder of Delia's dual denials and the state of union that the experience of exclusion triggers.

[34] Where the force of *tam multa* in 1.6.7—glossed by Maltby (2002), *ad loc.* as "adverbial … 'so much', 'so persistently'"—is matched by the prefix *per* in 1.6.8 ("thoroughly", "completely", "very much").

So, too, for the medium of heat, which accomplishes a comparable coextension of inclusion and exclusion. For the warmth Delia provides in 1.6 is a symptom of physical absence as much as it is a catalyst for mental presence. It is, after all, the image of her stoking the fires of another's physical experience (*nesquioquem … fovet*, 1.6.6) that both kindles the poet-lover's sense of exclusion and sparks the very psychological processes that enable his contravening thoughts of inclusion (*sic etiam de me pernegat usque viro*, 1.6.8). And just as with the responsion between Delia's *negat* and Nemesis', the idea of Delia keeping warm the body of another in 1.6 is recapitulated, in 2.6, as the shimmer of hope—and what is hope but projection?—that sustains the corpus, physical and poetic, of the poet-lover in his hour of darkness (*iam mala finissem leto, sed credula vitam/Spes fovet*, 2.6.19-20). Through this refashioning of *foveo* from 1.6 to 2.6, what emerges is a suggestive identification of the mistress with the very process of envisioning: the disappointment of love lacked becomes the possibility of romance regained; the substitution of *Spes* for the *puella*—and the rehabilitation of dashed visions that it represents—positions the beloved as hope incarnate, a physical body that represents a mental projection, each of them, hope and the mistress, a phenomenon of have and not have, of there and not there.[35]

It is this conceptual overlap that allows for the chiastic alternation, between 1.6 and 2.6, of hope and faith with difficulty and the mistress: the shroud of disbelief that portends the failure of poetic vision in 1.6.7 (*credere durum est*) is lifted in 2.6.19-20 with the realignment of belief with possibility (*credula … Spes*) and with the association of belief with the beloved herself that

[35] Cf. Ovid *Her*. 18.178, where Leander reflects on his separation from Hero: *et res non semper, spes mihi semper adest* (and her person is not always here with me, possibility always is); and Lee-Stecum (2000), 198 where "the poet/lover's emphatic *spes* places the presence of the beloved in a (forever) deferred *cras*. *Spes*, in the poet/lover's case, is the desire for presence, but that presence is perpetually deferred by the intransigence of the beloved (or, as the reader may think, by the generic requirements of the elegiac *amor*-relationship)."

emerges from the correspondence of *credere durum* in 1.6.7 to the *dura puella* of 2.6.28, as if *puella* is merely a byword for faith—difficult, yes, but ultimately not disillusioning. This is not, in the end, the dashed *spes* of Lucretius' erotic *amor*, whisked away by the wind and leaving in its place nothing sustaining for the craving *corpus* of the lover (*nil datur in corpus praeter simulacra fruendum/tenuia; quae vento spes raptast saepe misella,* nothing is contributed to the body's enjoyment except feeble images, a pitiful hope that is often spirited away by the wind, *DRN* 4.1095-1096). It is an intimate identification of *puella* and possibility, such that the experience of one is the experience of both.

There is a way, then, to read poem 2.6 not as a snuffing out of the elegiac flame, but as a resuscitation of the romantic vision—a reimagining of hopeful projection and the figure of the beloved whose façade began to show cracks in poem 1.6. Even there, though, the elegiac vision did not collapse completely when its structure was strained: the experience of physical exclusion still managed to inspire a vision of inclusion that reoriented the poetic reality away from separation and toward union, a reprieve that allows for poem 1.6 to end with what Maltby concedes is "a return to the wishful thinking associated with the earlier poems of the cycle"; this despite his general characterization of poem 1.6 as the definitive de-blooming of the Delia rose.[36] In picking up and reworking the language and imagery of poem 1.6, poem 2.6 is not so much delivering a death-blow to a delusional dream left on its last leg at the end of the Delia series, but is reactivating the same dynamics between a dominant vision of inclusion and a recessive context of exclusion that allow for the romantic vision always to be a viable reality.

[36] Maltby (2004), 107; and 104-105, where he flags poem 1.5 as "closural, putting an end to the poet's dreams of an ideal existence in the country with Delia" and positions poem 1.6—which "closes the cycle of Delia poems"—as the fall-out from this disillusionment.

And so I prefer to see poem 2.6 not as the end of Tibullan elegy, but its rebirth. Closural, in a sense—as the final poem of the collection—but not a hard stop. Indeed, its thematic circularity—the "ring composition" of its reference to 1.1,[37] its recomposition of the elements of 1.6—brings us back to the very notion of rotation with which we started: an image of the Tibullan poet-lover of 2.6 not as the end-product of a linear evolution from visionary to realist, but as ever implicated in a continuous revolution between states of inclusion and exclusion, presence and absence, having and not having. In this paradigm, the self envisioned and the self experienced are coextensive: the *exclusus* also always *inclusus*, the *inclusus* also always *exclusus*.[38] They are, in short, a continuous whole, ever the twain meeting in the act of visualization and poetic actualization—in the realization of representation that is poetry.

[37] Noted by Fulkerson (2018), 60.
[38] Cf. Johnson (1990), 108 where "A sheer discontinuum, fragmentations of self and work and love, multiple and mutually exacerbating conflicts: such are the materials of Tibullus' art …. where disordered loves and exquisite sensibilities can find their integrations." And 108 n.13, where "the impossible conflict ignites the poetry."

Chapter 3

Upside-Down in Ovid

Inheritance

By the time of Ovid, the figures of Roman elegy are so entrenched that his contributions to the genre with the *Amores* have seemed, to some, capable of little more than parodic derivation—imitations of elegy gone by that have about as much substance as Lucretius' erotic *simulacra*.[1] The purported state of depletion of love elegy as it is passed down to Ovid is behind much of this naysaying: its themes fully explored, its limits fully expanded by Propertius and Tibullus, there was nothing interesting for Ovid to do with the genre but satirize it, and so endeth the genre with him.[2]

Barbara Boyd's reading of the *Amores* pushes back against this construal of Ovid's elegiac legacy, redeeming the collection as serious in its engagement with the poetic tradition and in its project of "redefining the boundaries of elegy", an undertaking she sees expressed primarily through Ovid's movement "beyond the usual horizons of elegy to other forms."[3] In the spirit of Boyd's study, what I offer here will tend toward a similar sense of the *Amores* as a profound participant in the evolution of the genre, though not by venturing outside of its strictures—by working within them. Specifically, within the figure of inclusion. For if Propertius

[1] Some seminal assessments of Ovidian imitation come from: Du Quesnay (1973); Morgan (1977); Lyne (1980). Particularly trenchant on this point are Sullivan (1961), 535 who decrees that "Ovid represents a debasement of the elegiac tradition; he is a parody of his predecessors, not representative of them"; and Arkins (1990), 827 who concludes that "Ovid's *Amores* do not continue along the path definitively established for love-elegy by Propertius, but rather function as a parody of that genre … with the results that the serious intent of the genre up to Ovid's time is undermined and that he himself is cast as a figure of fun."

[2] Best conveyed by Lyne (1980), 286-287, who answers his own question of "Why does Latin Love Poetry as we understand it finish with Ovid?" by concluding that "Its continuation in the *Amores* was really posthumous, artificial …. We must be glad that there was a poet ingenious and irreverent enough to construct such an artifice—and conclude a period of literary history with such neatness." Though Harrison's (2002), 80 description of the *Amores* as "Defining and exhausting love-elegy" speaks to the endurance of the epitaph.

[3] Boyd (1997), 15.

establishes a model of inclusion that reverses the dynamics of exclusion; if Tibullus develops inclusion as a poetic state that is not alternative to, but coextensive with, any condition of exclusion; then Ovid is handed an elegiac theme that has been worked into an elegiac trope—as much a part of the *amator*'s identity as any—and as such can be subject to meaningful manipulation. We can, thus, find in the *Amores* both confirmation of inclusion as a legitimate poetic figure in Roman elegy; and continuation of its use for elegiac vindication and commentary on the nature of elegiac poetics.

Instability

As early as the origin story of the Ovidian poet-lover offered in *Amores* 1.6, we are presented with what is hard not to see as a challenge to the Lucretian dismissal of love as *simulacrum*:

> at quondam noctem simulacraque vana timebam …
> nec mora, venit amor—non umbras nocte volantis,
> non timeo strictas in mea fata manus (*Am.* 1.6.9, 13-14)
>
> but at one time I feared the night and its empty images …
> no delay, love arrived—no shadows flying in the night,
> no hands poised for my death do I fear

The onset of *amor* is what dispels *simulacra* here, not what is responsible for them. But if passionate love is, for Lucretius, the locus of illusion, its antithesis is reasoned companionship, figured in the closing lines of Book IV of *De Rerum Natura* as *consuetudo*[4]:

> quod superest, consuetudo concinnat amorem
> nam leviter quamvis quod crebro tunditur ictu,
> vincitur in longo spatio tamen atque labascit.
> nonne vides etiam guttas in saxa cadentis
> umoris longo in spatio pertundere saxa? (*DRN* 4.1283-1287)
>
> As for the rest, familiarity gives rise to love,
> for what is struck by repeat blow, however light,
> is all the same undone in the long run and succumbs.
> Don't you see how even droplets of water dripping

[4] On this, see Betensky (1980), discussed above, Part I, Overview: The State of Affairs.

on rocks, in the long run, eat those rocks away?

Repeat exposure is what brings true intimacy—it is not the intense fire of erotic desire, but the inuring pressure of constant presence that constitutes real love.

The later Ovid of exile would appear to have accepted this wisdom, if his resigned observation that *gutta cavat lapidem* (a drop of water hollows out a stone, *Pont*. 4.10.5) is any indication.[5] But the Ovid of the *Amores* seems to chafe against it, harnessing the context of inclusion to establish a new paradigm of elegiac interaction, in which the *amator* is essentially *inclusus*—enjoying, we would assume, habitual access to his girl—and, as a result, begins to lose the very love that defines him and his pursuits. The Ovidian poet-lover, then, can be seen to push back against this identification of romantic feeling with prosaic *consuetudo*: his experience of fundamental inclusion, of easy access to and frequent interaction with his beloved, does not enhance his devotion, but inhibits it. Just as Tibullus accepts the Lucretian premise of imagined love and works to revalue the reality that it constitutes in and of itself, so Ovid enacts Lucretius' principle of passionless partnership to demonstrate that this form of "true" love is hardly love at all.

I should be careful here to distinguish between the anti-*consuetudo* stance that I identify in Ovid's poetics and one of pro-exclusion. To be sure, Ovid's poet-lover does, in the Platonic model, identify distance with desire (as in *Am*. 3.4.25-26), but not with routine exclusion. *speremus pariter, pariter metuamus amantes* he counsels in 2.19.5 (let us hope, let us dread in equal measure, we lovers), suggesting that it is not union, per se, that induces dispassion, but *habitual* union: the delight and disappointment should be commensurate, inclusion and exclusion equal.

[5] He is, to be fair, describing his own gradual decline as a prisoner of Pontus, not the process of falling in love, but the consonant imagery and language are nonetheless worth noting. All the more so if we can see in Ovid's elegiac *epistulae* a recapitulation of his early-career erotic elegies—with Rome as the beloved of a poet who is, quite literally, an *exclusus amator*—and thus a return to the same dynamics of inclusion and exclusion, presence and absence explored therein, now just as salient as ever. For which, see: Nagle (1980), 61-64; Fish (2004), 864; this despite the doubts of Claassen (1999).

And so the Ovidian *amator*, positioned as essentially *inclusus*, comes to demonstrate that the very experience of reliable inclusion results in the dissolution of *amor*, not its generation. Once the poet-lover has become accustomed to being together with his beloved—that is, once his relationship has become a practice in *consuetudo*—he ceases to love her, suggesting that *consuetudo* represents the antithesis of *amor*, not its true expression.

Inversion

Even before we get our first glimpse of the poet-lover of the *Amores* wallowing in exclusion in the *paraclausithyron* that is 1.6, we are presented with images of him orchestrating and enjoying inclusion. After a trio of poems (1.1, 1.2, 1.3) that document the *amator*'s capitulation to the personified force of love, 1.4 is the poet-lover's presentation to the *puella* of a catalogue of tactics to preserve intimacy when her *vir* unwittingly intervenes. It is a playbook for surreptitious communication, for clandestine interaction, that evokes the *nutus loquaces* of Tibullus 1.2, the artful pretense of Tibullus 1.6, and that, in the same vein, serves to keep lover and beloved united even when their passion can be neither upfront nor sexually realized. This behavioral lexicon is followed in poem 1.5 by a scene of inclusion, and sexual intimacy no less, that is unmediated by obfuscatory acts and interposing husbands. And so it is with 1.5 that I would like to begin my consideration of the figure of the Ovidian *inclusus* in earnest.

The backdrop is an afternoon nap, the poet-lover lolling in bed under the cover of midday heat (*aestus erat, mediamque dies exegerat horam;/apposui medio membra levanda toro*, it was hot, and the day had already passed the noon hour; I laid my limbs to rest in the middle of the bed, 1.5.1-2). And then:

> ecce, Corinna venit tunica velata recincta,
> candida dividua colla tegente coma …
> deripui tunicam; nec multum rara nocebat,
> pugnabat tunica sed tamen illa tegi;
> cumque ita pugnaret tamquam quae vincere nollet,

victa est non aegre proditione sua.
ut stetit ante oculos posito velamine nostros,
in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit: …
singula quid referam? nil non laudabile vidi,
et nudam pressi corpus ad usque meum.
cetera quis nescit? lassi requievimus ambo. (*Am.* 1.5.9-10, 13-18, 23-25)

But soft! In comes Corinna, clothed in a belted dress,
her parted hair draping over her faultless neck …
I tore off the dress; it wasn't much of a blight, sheer as it was,
but even so she struggled to keep covered by the garment;
and since she was resisting like one who didn't really want to prevail,
she was overcome with no difficulty by her own surrender.
As she stood before my eyes, her clothing set aside,
there was nary a fault on her whole body …
Why recount each detail? I saw nothing unworthy of praise,
and I drew her, naked, right up against my body.
Who doesn't know the rest? Spent, we both lay at ease.

The epiphanic nature of this Corinna encounter has received much attention, the bewitching noontide and her sudden appearance, as if by apparition, seminally elaborated by T.D. Papanghelis.[6] It is not, however, the aspect of theophany on which I want to comment, at least not yet. It is the context of inclusion that first needs remarking, a context that witnesses our poet-lover not just in the company of his beloved, not just in the throes of intercourse, but himself an unsuspecting beneficiary of his girl's erotic agency. Beside the mechanics of her arrival (earthly or divine) is the very fact of her arrival, seemingly unbidden and unexpected, at the bed of the *amator*. The circumstances of their union, with the beloved initiating contact and the poet-lover responding to her overture, speak to the conditions of inclusion observed in Propertius, where the *puella* was figured as *amans*, taking on the characteristics of the *exclusus amator* in both conversation and coitus.

The nature of Corinna's revelation to the poet-lover echoes scenes of inclusion in Tibullus, as well. For however the poem is interpreted—as real event, daydream, or the space in

[6] Papanghelis (1989), a short and sweet piece that tracks instances of literary theophany, in which tradition he compellingly situates *Am*. 1.5.

between that the argument for epiphany fills[7]—the fantastic elements of the scene cannot be denied. There is the enchanting half-light cast in line 5 (*qualia sublucent fugiente crepuscula Phoebo*, the kind of twilight that glimmers when Phoebus is fading), the sudden apparition (*ecce!*), the divinized presentation (*candida … colla*, *nusquam corpore menda*), all of this in the general dreamy register of Tibullus' envisioned inclusion,[8] and in the particular tenor of one such projection of union with Delia:

> tunc veniam subito nec quisquam nuntiet ante
> sed videar caelo missus adesse tibi.
> tunc mihi, qualis eris, longos turbata capillos,
> obvia nudato, Delia, curre pede. (Tib. 1.3.89-92)
>
> Then, suddenly, I will arrive; let no one announce me beforehand,
> but let me seem, in my presence to you, to have been sent from heaven.
> Then you, just as you are, your long hair disheveled,
> run to meet me, Delia, on bare foot.

The resonance is not hard to appreciate: the unexpected arrival (*subito*, *nec … nuntiet*), the quality of the divine (*videar caelo missus*), the loose hair (Ovid's *dividua … coma* vis-à-vis Tibullus' *longos turbata capillos*) and bare skin (*nudam* in Ovid against *nudato pede* in Tibullus) of the beloved. It is, I would say, deep enough to suggest that Corinna's apparition to her Ovidian *amator* is, at least in part, a restaging in reverse of the Tibullan *amator's* appearance to Delia, and with it an invocation of the visionary nature of Tibullan inclusion in the gender-inverting idiom of Propertian interaction.[9]

---

[7] As Papanghelis (1989), 57 sums it up.

[8] It is, perhaps, worth noting that Ovid elsewhere attributes to his poet-lover this Tibullan insistence on the power of the mind to dictate reality, staging *Am*. 3.14 as a plea to the beloved to pretend, in his presence, that she is faithful to him, assuring that his eagerness to believe her will make, for him, a truth of the lie, even while encouraging her to continue her polyamorous ways. For discussion of this brand of Ovidian pretense, which turns on themes of absence and presence, see Hardie (2002), 38.

[9] Prop. 4.7 and 4.8 being notable exceptions. One additional parallel that might be worth advancing is between *Amores* 1.5 and Propertius 2.15; not, as has been done, on the grounds of the sexual act itself—for which see Huntingford (1981), 110 and Papanghelis (1989), 54—but on the point of mythology. Reflections on *Am*. 1.5 that focus on the epiphanic undertones of the unexpected afternoon delight tend not to allow enough leeway to read it against *Iliad* 3.373-461, where Aphrodite whisks Paris out of battle and facilitates a midday dalliance for him and Helen. Montuschi (2005), 224-225 does situate the temporal indicators of the Ovidian "epifania erotica" against the

Traces of Propertian and Tibullan dynamics of inclusion notwithstanding, the fundamental takeaway for purposes of my discussion remains this starting stance of the Ovidian *amator* as *inclusus*—and, what is more, as untaxed by pursuit of the *puella* (as attest *non multum … nocebat*; *tamquam quae vincere nollet*; *non aegre*; *requievimus*). The move in itself upends the logistical *modus operandi* of Roman elegy, where scenes of inclusion tend to deliver the poet-lover to the *puella*, as occurs in Propertius 1.3 and 2.29.[10] Here, all effort at wooing the beloved is obviated, all obstacles to obtaining her removed; the elegiac experience is reframed as one of passive acceptance, not active acquisition, an extension, it would seem, of the Propertian poet-lover's passivity in engagements of inclusion with his mistress. And this so early in the corpus. Indeed, it is our first glimpse of the primary relationship whose course the ensuing books of poetry will chart, such that the fundamental position of our Ovidian elegiac *amator* is one of inclusion, one of sexual satisfaction, one of love freely given and enjoyed at no cost.

I am not, of course, the only one to have observed this. Georg Luck, discussing the role this poem plays in establishing the character of Corinna, notes that its presentation of love encourages associations with "pleasure and fulfillment", not desire and disappointment, as Frank Copley and the *paraclausithyron* model would hold.[11] But I want to suggest that the poem, as much as it might be saying something about the figure of Corinna,[12] is just as readily

backdrop of appearances of the divine in Homeric epic, but does not extend the analysis to treat divinely orchestrated revelations of humans, as are Paris' transportation from battleground to bedroom and Helen's appearance to him as he lies in wait. The connection might be strained, but if borne out it would tie the experience of inclusion in *Am.* 1.5 to that in Prop. 2.15 by way of the Paris-Helen exemplum, which the Propertian *amator* invokes at 2.15.13-14 as an analogy for his own amatory experience.

[10] I limit this to elegy (and in so doing think principally of Propertius and Tibullus, whose scenes of inclusion all involve the *amator* approaching the *puella*) to leave room for Catullus 32, in which Ipsitilla is encouraged (but notably encouragement is as far as it goes) to make her way to the poet-lover's bedroom; and which Huntingford (1981), 110 cites as one of the possible "*starting-points*" (emphasis original) for the Ovidian episode in 1.5.

[11] Luck (1969), 152; also cited in Huntingford (1981), 2.

[12] And just what it might be saying about Corinna is a question that has inspired much debate, as Huntingford (1981), 2 ff. nicely sums up and which I cannot hope to address here.

contributing to the conceptualization of the figure of the *amator*. For the recharacterization of the elegiac poet-lover as essentially *inclusus*, rather than *exclusus* by definition, necessarily reframes the nature of his relationship with his beloved: their union is no longer the exception, but the rule.

So it is that he is able to associate the practice of elegy with the persuasion of the beloved:

> Clausit amica fores! ego cum Iove fulmen omisi;
> excidit ingenio Iuppiter ipse meo.
> Iuppiter, ignoscas! nil me tua tela iuvabant;
> clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet.
> Blanditias elegosque levis, mea tela, resumpsi;
> mollierunt duras lenia verba fores. (*Am*. 2.1.17-22)
>
> My girlfriend closed her doors! I abandoned Jove's thunder together with Jove;
> Jupiter himself has slipped my mind.
> Jupiter, forgive me! Your weapons could do nothing for me;
> a closed door holds thunder greater than yours.
> Sweet nothings and slight elegies, my weapons, I have taken up again;
> lilting words have loosened unyielding doors.

It is the poet-lover of elegy who experiences success with the *puella*. The *amator*'s assumption of an elegiac identity (*blanditias elegosque levis … resumpsi*) brings with it a state of inclusion (*mollierunt duras … fores*),[13] the implication being that erotic actualization is inextricably linked with the condition of being an elegiac lover, if not contingent upon it. Far from it being the case that the elegiac *amator* is represented as categorically denied access to the *puella*, here it is made clear that he is the only one for whom it is certain.[14]

[13] This same power to influence in romantic endeavors is attributed to elegy—and elegy alone—by Propertius in 1.10, where the poet-lover advises a love-struck Gallus of the value of elegiacs in such circumstances: *possum ego diversos iterum coniungere amantes,/et dominae tardas possum aperire fores* (I can reunite separated lovers, and the recalcitrant doors of a mistress—I can open them, 1.10.15-16).

[14] Compare to James (2003b), 109 ff., where she discusses the elegiac generic trait of the complaint (*querela*) of the spurned *amator* as "a program of back-door persuasion" that protests "the lover-poet's pitiful condition … and his lack of access to his mistress" and constitutes "the overarching unifying element in virtually every address made by the lover-poet to the *docta puella*."

This principle of the elegiac poet-lover's propensity for inclusion underwrites the celebration of his sexual triumph that he goes on in Book II to mount:

> Ite triumphales circum mea tempora laurus!
> Vicimus: in nostro est, ecce, Corinna sinu,
> quam vir, quam custos, quam ianua firma, tot hostes,
> servabant, nequa posset ab arte capi! (*Am*. 2.12.1-4)
>
> Come, encircle my temples, triumphal laurel!
> We have won: look, she is here in our arms, Corinna is,
> whom husband, whom steward, whom bolted door—so many adversaries—
> were guarding, lest she be liable to be taken by expertise!

Again, the poet-lover has prevailed in the face of his generic foe: the same relegation to exclusion whose circumvention his practice of elegy enabled in 2.1. And again, it is the condition of being an elegiac *amator* that attends his state of inclusion: his recognition that the intended protection of the *puella* was against the influence of outsider *ars* such as his cannot help but suggest the amatory efficacy of poetic practice, in general—and of elegiac poetic practice, in particular.[15]

Indeed, the lines capitalize on the quintessential elegiac experience of erotic captivation, rescripting a dynamic made paradigmatic by Propertius in the first line of the first poem of his first book: *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*.[16] So it is that the elegiac mistress became indelibly associated with seizure and the elegiac *amator* with subjugation, the power in the poetic relationship ascribed to a beloved whose allure the poet-lover is powerless to withstand.[17] And yet, in the experience of Ovid's *amator*, the reverse is the rule: it is the *puella* who is subject to capture (*posset … capi*) and the poet-lover whose endowments are enticing (*ab arte*), a change in fortune born of a change in roles—the elegiac *amator* ascendent for his channeling of the elegiac *puella*,

---

[15] As it does in *Am*. 1.10.59-60: *est quoque carminibus meritas celebrare puellas/dos mea; quam volui, nota fit arte mea* (so too is celebrating deserving girls in poems my gift; she whom I have desired becomes known through my craft); and 3.8.1-2: *et quisquam ingenuas etiamnunc suspicit artes,/aut tenerum dotes carmen habere putat?* (and does anyone still admire the liberal arts, or impute assets to a sentimental poem?)
[16] Boyd (1997), 81 similarly positions *Am*. 2.12 against a Propertian model in 2.6.15-22, but does not discuss any evocation of Prop. 1.1.1 in *Am*. 2.12.4.
[17] Kennedy (2012), 189-190.

the elegiac *puella* relegated to the *amator*'s generic captivity. In this vision of elegiac success, a revision of the terms of the elegiac contract enacted by Propertius, in the very terms of Propertian inclusion:[18] the *amator,* as *inclusus*, playing the part of the *puella*; the *puella*, in this event of inclusion, displaying the behavior of the *amator*; and a demonstration, in the process, of the poet-lover's mastery of an elegiac argot (*ab arte capi*) that enables his circumvention of elegiac tropes.

What we have, then, is a vision of an *amator* who is successfully *inclusus* by the grace of his own cultivation of an elegiac identity; a reinforcement of a fundamental association of the elegiac poet-lover with a state of inclusion; and with that, an elegiac poetics that is uncoupled from the generic conventions that define it.

It is, perhaps, for this reason that the poet-lover is able to represent himself as having the upper hand in interactions with his girl:

> nec facies oculos iam capit ista meos.
> cur sim mutatus, quaeris? quia munera poscis.
> haec te non patitur causa placere mihi. …
> Nec dare, sed pretium posci dedignor et odi;
> quod nego poscenti, desine velle, dabo! (*Am*. 1.10.10-12, 63-64)
>
> That face of yours no longer captivates my eyes.
> Why my change of heart, you ask? Because you demand gifts.
> This is what keeps you from pleasing me. …
> It's not giving, per se, but the demanding of money that I disdain and despise;
> what I deny you when you ask, stop wanting it and I'll deliver!

In what would otherwise be an instance of the lover deprived of entrance for his poverty (as happens, for example, at Tibullus 1.5.47), the Ovidian elegiac *amator* flips the script, attributing to himself the power of denial while his *puella* is the one who wants and is wanting. It is, presumably, a move that only one confident in his ability to access his girl would dare make. And by reframing the typical elegiac angst over the cost of love in terms of a denying *amator* and desiring beloved,

[18] Cf. Boyd (1997), 89 whose observation of "how far Ovid's *Amores* can stray beyond Propertian models and the boundaries of genre" is germane to my assessment here.

the poet-lover reconceives the relationship dynamic: no longer is he so starved for the love of his girl that he scrounges together, on a dime, what he can to satisfy and secure her, ultimately bemoaning his failure to do so. In the Ovidian model, he is negotiating from a relative position of power, certain enough of his ability to access the *puella*—in other words, of his status as *inclusus*—that he feels no desperation to take whatever he can get at whatever price he can get it.

But note, again, the same rescripted lexicon of elegiac relationship dynamics observed in poem 2.12—and here, even more directly defiant of Propertian poetics than there. For in the poet-lover's disavowal of the *puella*'s captivating countenance (*nec facies … iam capit*), in his recasting of the eyes as agents of his own resistance rather than of her irresistible force (*nec … oculos iam capit … meos*), Propertius' famous first words are rebranded—and the elegiac viewpoint along with them. Much as with the rechoreographing of *capio* in 2.12, the repurposing here of language so definitive of the elegiac experience effectively rewrites the erotic playbook, both for the *amator* in his intratextual relations with the *puella*, and for the elegiac poetry in which those relations are captured. To wit: the *iam* of 1.10.10, which speaks immediately to the course of the Ovidian *amator*'s relationship with his girl (perhaps once your allure was irresistible, but no longer), and just as readily bespeaks a detour in the trajectory of the elegiac poetic tradition itself (there was a time when generic tropes left lovers beholden to their beloveds, but no longer).[19] It is not just the elegiac *amator* who has been reconceptualized—elegiac poetry has, too.

Innovation

The reorientation of the Ovidian *amator*'s outlook from a starting stance of exclusion to one of inclusion thus becomes a catalyst for reconceptualizing the elegiac experience. For if, as

[19] Cf. Boyd (1997), 108: "even as Ovid calls into question the conventions of elegiac love, he uses the literary traditions that make its expression possible." At 104-108, she reads *Am*. 1.10 in relation to Prop. 1.3, but again does not discuss any possible conversation between *Am.* 1.10.10 and Prop. 1.1.1.

these recontextualizations of the poet-lover seem to suggest, the Ovidian *amator* does not just happen upon occasional moments of inclusion but is himself constitutionally *inclusus*, then it becomes possible to view his intimacy with Corinna as customary, habitual, predictable. It becomes possible, in short, to view the relationship in terms of *consuetudo*—as habit, as routine, as the very type of coexistence that Lucretius identifies as reflective of real love.

Such love, in the language of *consuetudo*, connotes marriage;[20] but the *puella* need not be identified as a wife in order to be identified with the wife. Corinna is not, of course, a *coniunx*; and yet, she has come to embody all the features of conjugal dispassion, her accessibility making a habit of inclusion, that habituated inclusion divesting the relationship of passionate *amor*, and that divestment, in turn, adulterating the nature of the elegiac experience—and the poetry that expresses it.

To this end, take the poem that closes the second book of the *Amores*, 2.19:

> Si tibi non opus est servata, stulte, puella,
> at mihi fac serves, quo magis ipse velim!
> quod licet, ingratum est; quod non licet acrius urit.
> ferreus est, siquis, quod sinit alter, amat.
> speremus pariter, pariter metuamus amantes,
> et faciat voto rara repulsa locum. (*Am.* 2.19.1-6)
>
> Perhaps *you* feel no need to keep your girl guarded, you idiot,
> but at least keep her guarded for *my* sake, so I can desire her all the more!
> What's freely granted is unwelcome; what isn't ignites passion more fiercely.
> Steely is he who loves what another allows.
> Let us have hope, have apprehension in equal measure, those of us in love,
> and let the occasional refusal make a place for prayer.

The turnabout from the standard elegiac attitude is immediately appreciable: the lover laments his unencumbered access to the *puella*, not her impenetrable imprisonment. Union, free and

[20] And it does seem that marriage is at least part of what Lucretius intended to convey with his use of *consuetudo* in 4.1283. As per Bailey's commentary (1947), *ad loc*: "as Ernout points out, [*consuetudo*] probably has the sense of *concubitus, matrimonium* …"; echoed by Betensky (1980), 294 who defines *consuetudo* here as "a gradual, conscious, and realistic process of learning to live with another person" and points to Bailey in her observation that "the term is synonymous with *concubitus* or *matrimonium*."

guaranteed, is no longer a desirable state of affairs for the *amator*, whose longing for a reinjection of hardship into his interactions with his girl signals that his standard amatory experience is now one of habitual inclusion. In an ironic reversal of the stock-in-trade complaint of the song of exclusion—the chastising of obdurate doors and pitiless doormen, of cruel *dominae* and the crueler *viri* who hoard them—the *amator* criticizes the lack of obstacles to his pursuit of erotic fulfillment. He transfers the accusation of ill-willed intransigence from the barrier that separates (as, for example, the *ferreus … ianitor* of *Am*. 1.6.26) to the beneficiary of its absence (the *ferreus ... quisquis* of 2.19.4). He divorces passion from reliable fulfillment (*quod licet, ingratum est*) and aligns it instead with insecurity (*speramus pariter, pariter metuamus*) and unpredictability (*rara repulsa*).

And the inversion of the *paraclausithyron* model becomes even more acute, still:

> At tu, formosae nimium secure puellae,
> incipe iam prima claudere nocte forem.
> incipe, quis totiens furtim tua limina pulset,
> quaerere, quid latrent nocte silente canes,
> quas ferat et referat sollers ancilla tabellas,
> cur totiens vacuo secubet ipsa toro. (2.19.37-42)
>
> But you, all too reckless with your lovely girl,
> start locking the door at nightfall, already.
> Start wondering who keeps tapping furtively on your door over and over,
> why the dogs are barking in the silent night,
> what messages your maid adroitly ferries,
> why your lady so often sleeps in an empty bed.

The canonical site of suffering for the *exclusus* has been transformed into a locus of longing for the Ovidian *amator,* whose worldview has, as his desire for separation suggests, been shaped by the experience of inclusion. The rectification of the conditions of exclusion—the unsecured doors and their overly-secure masters—has assured the poet-lover access to the beloved, and with it a stable relationship, no longer contingent on the whims of the girl or the susceptibility of her guards. It is this very recalibration of the *amator* from *exclusus* to *inclusus*, and of the nature

of his relationship from gamble to custom, that leaves him dissatisfied. The experience of habitual inclusion—of, we could say, *consuetudo* in its absolute sense[21]—does not, for the Ovidian poet-lover, stoke the fires of *amor*, but rather leaves him longing for the days of ardent uncertainty.

The poem, then, points to a transformation of the figure of the elegiac *amator* and the way in which he navigates his world. His experience has become one of amatory success, his position one of inclusion, his character that of an erotic ringer, and the way in which he relates to his girl changes accordingly:

> iamque ego praemoneo: nisi tu servare puellam
> incipis, incipiet desinere esse mea! (*Am.* 2.19.47-48)
>
> And so I'll give you this warning: if you don't begin guarding your girl, she'll begin ceasing to be mine!

The state of inclusion is no longer figured as the erotic ideal. Union has been replaced by separation as the condition conducive not just to passion (recall *quod non licet acrius urit*), but to the very identification of the *puella* as beloved (*incipiet desinere esse mea*). In short, the Ovidian *amator*, through habituation to union with his mistress, has become a suffering *inclusus* and is primed to fall out of the very love that defines him.

As much as this situation might speak to a fundamental identification of exclusion with the elegiac *raison d'être*, in that the erotic game loses its cachet when the thrill of the hunt is obviated, it equally reflects a shift in the terms of practice for the poet-lover. For it is only as an *inclusus*—and a systematic *inclusus*, at that, not just an occasional one—that he can beg to be kept *exclusus*; and it is the very experience of routinized inclusion that ultimately leaves him

[21] That is, as "a habitual or usual practice … the normal state or condition. … What is wont to happen, normal experience" (*OLD s.v.* 1a-e), rather than its more idiomatic application to marriage and intimacy, noted above (for which see *OLD s.v.* 5).

loveless. This same anxiety over love lost when access is assured informs the poet-lover's advice to the unwitting *vir* of a desired *puella* in *Amores* 3.4:

> Quidquid servatur cupimus magis, ipsaque furem
> Cura vocat; pauci, quod sinit alter, amant. (*Am*. 3.4.25-26)
>
> Whatever is guarded we covet all the more, and your very
> assiduity summons the thief; few love what another grants.

Here again, fervent *amor* and fixed access cannot coexist. The alignment of love with inaccessibility (*quidquid servatur cupimus magis*) and of regular attainment with indifference (*pauci, quod sinit alter, amant*) suggests that love does not blossom in a relationship of habit, that routine inclusion—what we can understand in terms of *consuetudo*—breeds dispassion, not *amor*.

To wit: *Amores* 3.7, wherein the poet-lover tries, with remarkably less success than in poem 1.5, to enjoy the sex that is offered him.

> At non formosa est, at non bene culta puella,
> at, puto, non votis saepe petita meis!
> hanc tamen in nullos tenui male languidus usus,
> sed iacui pigro crimen onusque toro;
> nec potui cupiens, pariter cupiente puella,
> inguinis effeti parte iuvante frui. (3.7.1-6)
>
> It's not that she isn't beautiful, not that the girl doesn't present well,
> not, I think, that she hasn't often been the object of my desires!
> And yet I, damnably limp, held her to no purpose,
> but I lay there a crime, a burden on an inert bed;
> and I couldn't—though I wanted it, though the girl was equally eager—
> I couldn't enjoy any gratifying contribution of my enervated groin.

Erotic entanglement—the pinnacle of elegiac inclusion—is thwarted by the lover's inability to, well, love. The situation described is an ideal one: the beautiful girl, coveted (*petita*) and compliant (*pariter cupiente puella*); the yearning *amator* (*cupiens*) whose wishes have been granted (*votis … meis*). It is the fantasy of the *exclusus* realized—and realized not just in the Tibullan sense, but in the Lucretian—but once it has become the foregone reality of the *inclusus*,

it loses the magic. Indeed, while a disjunct between simultaneous states of physical exclusion from, and imagined inclusion with, the beloved rendered the Tibullan poet-lover of 1.5 physically unable to perform, not even their resolution can avail the Ovidian *amator*. For Ovid's poet-lover here experiences the very coincidence of body and mind that the Tibullan *amator* was denied: the beloved both of his dreams (*votis saepe petitia meis*) and of his reality (*hanc ... tenui*); both lover and beloved reflecting, in real time, a *mutuus amor* (*cupiens*, *partier cupiente puella*). The conditions that the Tibullan poet-lover associated with romantic success are, for the Ovidian *amator*, insufficient. The scene thus advances the association of routinized inclusion with absence of passion: for a figure who is fundamentally *inclusus*, even coitus with the mistress—the hard-won victory of the classic elegiac lover—is uninspiring.

And so, just as was the case in poem 2.19, the condition of union—and the reconceptualization of the *amator* in its terms—introduces a new elegiac paradigm, one in which intimacy is not the handmaiden of intercourse, and inclusion is no longer the promised land. And just as in 2.19, in this new order of admittance, it is separation—not togetherness—that comes to coincide with erotic achievement:

> At quae non tacita formavi gaudia mente!
> quos ego non finxi disposuique modos!
> nostra tamen iacuere velut praemortua membra
> turpiter hesterna languidiora rosa —
> quae nunc, ecce, vigent intempestiva valentque,
> nunc opus exposcunt militiamque suam. (3.7.63-68)
>
> But what pleasures did I not summon up in the quiet of my mind!
> What positions did I not try, did I not orchestrate!
> And in spite of this my member just lay there as if dead before its time,
> more torpid—the shame!—than a rose picked yesterday—
> And now look! It's hale and hearty at the wrong time,
> *now* it's ready for duty and its deployment.

The psychological projection that allowed the Tibullan *amator* to supplant his lackluster reality with a rosier vision of love is here fruitless; the physical remains unaltered by the fantasy. What

does prove the cure for the poet-lover's erectile dysfunction, though, is separation. It is only after the erotic moment has passed, only after the *puella* has gone and the state of inclusion evanesced, that the *amator* is able to perform, the implication being that a condition of physical exclusion needs to be recovered in order to reinstate the appropriate elegiac dynamic. Inclusion, it would seem, is the new exclusion.

There is a sense, then, in which the plight of the Ovidian *inclusus* speaks to two traditions at once—traditions ostensibly at odds, now shown to share more than initially allowed: the Lucretian, with its predication of real love on regular exposure; and the elegiac, with its professed longing for the kind of reliable intimacy that Lucretius' model recommends. If Lucretius advances a vision of true love as a product of familiarity, not fervor, Ovid embraces the principle to its detriment, enacting a form of elegiac *consuetudo* that only lays bare its inadequacy, much as Tibullus harnessed the dream of love to demonstrate its reality, much as Propertius parlayed the passion of exclusion into the experience of inclusion. But he equally challenges, in the process, the elegiac impression that routine inclusion is the erotic *telos*, for reliable exposure, however ideal the concept may be in the classic elegiac worldview, becomes, in practice, over-exposure. Contrary to both the Lucretian prescription and the elegiac aspiration, constant contact with the *puella* does not contribute to anything recognizable as *amor*. There is no love to be found in *consuetudo* for anyone.

When read in light of the Ovidian poet-lover's earlier expressions of dissatisfaction with his access to his beloved, then, the failure in 3.7 of their literal *concubitus* (sleeping together) to give rise to love hints at the failure of a social *concubitus* (cohabitation or marriage) to do the same.[22] To take this to its logical conclusion: poem 3.13, one of the last of the *Amores*, and one

[22] This falls just shy of an argument for narrative continuity within and between poems and books of elegies. But all the same, recent scholarship has come to concede that, at the very least, narrative elements are detectable in the

notably light on the elegiac *amor*. "This is the one and only indication in the elegiac corpus of any wife," Joseph Farrell notes,[23] and its deviation from the *status quo* has been hard to reconcile with the rest of the poetic collection.

Treatments of 3.13 have largely tried to ease the shock to the elegiac system that this poem induces by implicating the rupture in a whole-hearted move away from the domain of the erotic; and all roads, it would seem, lead to redemption. Leslie Cahoon's construal posits 3.13 as a corrective to the wantonly erotic ethos of Ovid's elegiac *amator* whose antics occupy the majority of the collection with the assertion of a new model of elegiac ethics in the *coniunx*.[24] Farrell's interpretation positions 3.13 as charting a new path forward for elegy whose terminus will be the etiological elegiacs of the *Fasti*.[25] Boyd is notable for not trying to insert the poem into a program of generic rehabilitation, rather seeing in its subversive and depoliticizing dialogue with Vergil's *Aeneid* a move to rewrite epic in terms of elegy, and thus to innovate within the limits of erotic poetry, not abandon it altogether.[26] But while Boyd's focus is on the end of the poem—where the account of the story of Halaesus offers a revision of the saga of Aeneas—I would like to linger on its beginning, for it is here that its most generically disruptive components congregate.

---

elegiac *corpora*, if not developed narratives. Cf. Johnson's (1997), 179 observation that the individual poems within Propertius' corpus derive meaning from being read in relation to those positioned around them; and Holzberg's (2002) approach to Ovid's *Amores* as a novel. For more sustained treatment of elegiac narratology: Lively and Salzman-Mitchell (2008).

[23] Farrell (2003), 400. One possible exception being *Am*. 3.5, in which the lover describes a dream of a bull and his mate (*taurus erat comes huic, feliciter ille maritus/cumque sua teneram coniuge pressit humum*, she had a bull as her mate, a happily married fellow, and he lay with his wife on the soft ground, 3.5.15-16) that is later revealed to be allegorical (*vaca puella tua est …/tu vir et in vaca compare taurus eras*, the heifer was your girl … and you, her man, were the bull for the corresponding cow, 3.5.37-38), an interpretation that associatively describes the *amator* as *maritus* and the *puella* as *coniunx*. Though the poem's status as a product of Ovid's hand is debated—on which see McKeown (2002)—it remains printed as part of the collection of the *Amores*; and indeed, in its clear echoes of *Am*. 1.5—cf. McKeown (2002), 116-117—could be read as returning to an early site of inclusion to explore the ramifications of steady relations with the beloved.

[24] Cahoon (1983), 8.

[25] Farrell, (2014), 218-220.

[26] Boyd (1997), 51-53.

Cum mihi pomiferis coniunx foret orta Faliscis,
  moenia contigimus victa, Camille, tibi.
casta sacerdotes Iunoni festa parabant (3.13.1-3)

As my wife has her roots in fruitful Falerii,
we have come to those captured walls of yours, Camillus.
The ministers of Juno were readying the sacred festivities

coniunx, casta, Iuno: words ill at ease in the elegiac universe, unless as flimsy foils to erotic sensibilities.[27] And yet, here they are, populating the first three lines of the poem without the trace of an ulterior motive to qualify them. We are suddenly in a landscape tended not by venereal Venus, but connubial Juno; not populated by an arousing *puella*, but a doting wife; not colored by elegiac libido, but reverential virtue. That wife, in particular, is a doozy, any whiff of marriage "being antithetical to the construction of the elegiac persona",[28] so much so that the mere use of *maritus* in relation to the poet-lover of *Amores* 3.5 was enough grounds to pronounce that poem inauthentically Ovidian.[29]

The status of 3.13 as a product of Ovid's hand has not, to my knowledge, been problematized, and so it remains for readers to make sense of a poem that seems to break so suddenly and so singularly from the collection in which it is included.[30] Farrell's reading of *coniunx* is surprisingly historical—he sees in Ovid's inclusion of a wife as much autobiographical truth as poetic conceit—while Cahoon's is more strictly literary, approaching the *coniunx* as a device to signal the moral of the elegiac tale: that the erotic escapades of the *amator* were a negative *exemplum* all along.[31] But neither reads the *coniunx* as contributing to

[27] Cf. Farrell (2014), 216-218;
[28] Farrell (2003), 400. See also James (2006), 227. Cf. Prop. 2.7, the indicated occasion for which is the repeal of the Augustan marriage law: *gavisa est certe sublatam, Cynthia, legem,/qua quondam edicta flemus uterque diu* (No doubt you're delighted, Cynthia, that the law was repealed, which writ we once wept over at length, 2.7.1-2).
[29] McKeown (2002), 120 where Kenney's (1962), 12 n. 4 determination that the language of marriage made the poem an impostor is succinctly summarized: it "violates the conventions of the genre and therefore cannot be Ovidian."
[30] A tension often eased by associating 3.13 more with the etiological project of the *Fasti* than the erotic one of the *Amores*, cf. Lenz (1958), echoed by Farrell (2014), 218-220.
[31] Farrell (2014), 217; Cahoon (1983), 7-8, following Rand (1925).

the erotic elegiac program in a way that is not closural—neither, that is to say, does for the *coniunx* what Boyd does for Halaesus, by which I mean integrate the figure into a program of generic invention and inversion that works with the machinery of love elegy, rather than against it. For, on a very basic level, the abrupt introduction of a *coniunx* into the poet-lover's proceedings, and the staid tenor of the verse that unfolds in her shadow, makes clear the incompatibility of the kind of relationship associated with *consuetudo*—"any wife, marriage (and all that it implies, such as children, a career, solid citizenship, and so forth)", to redirect Farrell's summary of the poem's unelegiac sensibilities—[32] with the kind of passion that sustains elegiac *amor*.

This is the conclusion of the *amator*'s habitual inclusion, of his relationship of *consuetudo* with his *puella*: she is, in fact, replaced by a *coniunx*, and all the *amor* stripped away—passionate Venus now nuptial Juno. It is as if the association of customary inclusion with marital accustomization has been literalized, and the specter of elegiac bed-death substantiated, both for the *amator*, whose experience of artless chastity as a *maritus*—of *casta … festa* performed at an *ara … facta sine arte* (an altar simply erected, 3.13.10)—is a stark reversal of his sensibilities as the triumphant *amator* of 2.12.4, where he crowed of a *puella ab arte capi*; and for the poetry, which now turns on devotion of a different kind—a relationship not of desire, but of duty, both spousal and spiritual. The poem, then, does not have to be corrective of the *amator*'s erotic exploits in order to be in conversation with them, does not have to represent a disavowal of erotic concerns in order to make sense in a collection dedicated to them. If we take as a unifying thread the theme of *consuetudo* as routinized inclusion and its toxicity to any

[32] Farrell (2003), 400.

meaningful expression of love, then 3.13—in its instantiation of steady marriage and the poetics that attend it—is not nearly so divorced from the concerns of the *Amores* as it may at first seem.

And so my suggestion that the relationship with Corinna need not be one of marriage to represent the dynamics of marriage remains relevant. The literalization of the analogy between habitual *eros* and dispassionate *connubium* that we get in poem 3.13 makes the cycle complete: the poet-lover's premonition that chronic inclusion is the antithesis of *amor* has been realized in the form of a steady *coniunx* who displaces both the elegiac *puella* and the poetics that accompany her. Supplanting an amorous assignation with a routinized relationship has fundamentally altered the nature of the elegiac experience, for here we are met with elegy that does not read as elegiac: the loss of Venus has not only de-eroticized the primary relationship between the poet-lover and his partner, it has doused the thematic flames that make the poetry generically recognizable. Somewhat ironically, achieving elegiac inclusion has threatened the very stability of the elegiac identity. And somewhat wryly, enacting Lucretian *consuetudo* has accomplished its purpose—has resulted in the separation of ardor from *amor*—but only to the exclusion of the very "true" love it purports to inculcate. To divorce passion from love is, we can see, to lose love entirely—both its figures and its foci. Call it *consuetudo*, but do not call it *amor*: there is no love here, only custom.

Iteration

There is a case to be made, then, that Ovid develops the motif of inclusion and its attendant figure the *inclusus amator*, inherited from the poetics of Propertius and Tibullus, and makes it the governing elegiac worldview. Throughout the *Amores*, and certainly by the end of Book II, exclusion has become the exception, not the rule, such that in the final poems of the cycle the condition of separation needs to be recaptured in order for erotic activity to be possible,

and that of union is nothing but a locus of frustration. All of this contributes to the sense that reliable intimacy with the beloved—*consuetudo*, if you will, understood both absolutely as habitual experience and figuratively as domestic union—is not the lifeblood of love, but the death of it; and that the passion of the elegiac lover is the only real love to be had.

There is also a case to be made for seeing in this destabilization of interpersonal *consuetudo* a statement more ringingly poetical—this if we can find allegorical implications in amatory situations. In such a paradigm, erotic *consuetudo* becomes a metaphor for generic *consuetudo*, and the sense that comfortable desensitization is anathema to love comes to apply equally to poetry. Just as over-exposure and inurement to one's partner makes for a loveless relationship, so habituation to routinized modes of poetic expression—to poetry that is generic, in both senses of the word—makes for an equally bland artistic experience. That Ovid is working, in the *Amores*, to forestall what we can call poetic *consuetudo* by reworking elegiac conventions in the course of their instantiation is a takeaway from Boyd's study;[33] that he does this even with the *topos* of inclusion—itself already, as used by Propertius and Tibullus, expansive of the parameters of erotic-elegiac experience, already innovative on the representation of the lover's condition, as portrayed by Lucretius— further speaks to that project. Even innovation cannot be left uninnovated. How quickly a trope becomes a truism.

[33] Boyd (1997), 18, "Ovid conceived the *Amores* to be not simply the replica of a tradition but rather a contribution to that tradition"; and 108, "even as Ovid calls into question the conventions of elegiac love, he uses the literary traditions that make its expression possible."

Review

Loose Ends

In the spirit of doors that revolve rather than close, let us return whence we began: to the threshold, where we left Copley and the *exclusus amator*. There, the closed door was a hard stop, the terminus of the *amator*'s progression toward his beloved and of poetic innovation alike, an image developed but never reimagined—abiding as "the most characteristic manifestation and symptom of love"—wrought and overwrought until "Finally, drained of all its expressive possibilities, it falls into the limbo of discarded literary themes."[1] But if this survey has done anything, it has been to suggest that the closed door is not closural; that it is, in fact, a starting point for poetic explorations of what takes place behind it—an invitation to continue the conversation inside.

It is an invitation that Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid alike accept on behalf of their *amatores*, each harnessing the dynamics of intimacy by different means, but all to the same end of revaluing the passionate love that is both the stimulus and the response of their poetic output. Lucretius' (in)famous exposé of erotic *amor* in *De Rerum Natura* IV has proven a useful lens for framing the cultural devaluation of the amatory experience; and a no less useful framework for delineating the differences in the elegists' approaches to, and deployments of, scenes of inclusion.

In Propertius, we saw moments of togetherness become interior reflections of the *paraclausithyron* to challenge the notion that passionate *amor* can exist only in the context of separation, when the fantasy of the beloved flourishes unchecked by the sobering reality of her body (cf. *DRN* 4.1177-84). We heard Tibullus speak more directly to the nature of this fantasy in his scenes of envisioned inclusion, which—for all their imagined beginnings—themselves come to

[1] Copley (1956), vii, 70.

dictate the reality that unfolds around them, undermining the wisdom that love, as a dreamy *simulacrum*, has no bearing on worldly experience (cf. *DRN* 4.1097-1102). "Love cannot help but be a fiction," as Don Fowler puts it, "but it is a fiction by which we live."[2] And for Ovid, inclusion offered an opportunity to turn the trope on its head: his *amator*, by dint of more reliable inclusion, is losing love to habit, demonstrating that where *consuetudo* obtains, *amor*, in the end, does not (cf. *DRN* 4.1283-7). Testaments, all, to the substantiality of love and its poetry: the one as a meaningful experience, the other as a meaningful expression.

Latent Beginnings

And so the staging of the *paraclausithyron* and the status of the *exclusus amator* are ultimately too much of a prologue to be a compelling conclusion for the elegiac identity and the experience it undergoes. Reading elegy in terms of scenes of inclusion that are in conversation with representations of exclusion leaves more room for the poetry—and, accordingly, the genre that formed around it—to breathe and grow, opening the door (further) to possibilities beyond elegy's engagement with the condition of separation.

Indeed, once the scene of inclusion is recognized as a structural episode in the experience of the elegiac *amator*, the representation of his activity takes on new dimensions. Amplifying the soliloquy of the *exclusus* with a dialogue between states of exclusion and inclusion allows the poetry to be more nuanced in its own self-representation, to become more than the univocal *cri de coeur* of a professional outsider as it subtly insinuates itself into the accepted vernacular. For elegy need not always be situated on the outside of Roman mores in order to be disruptive of them: it can push back from the inside, can demonstrate the degree to which it embodies social standards as much as it flaunts the extent to which it does not.

[2] Fowler (1994), 245.

Part II

Operosus in Otio

Overview

Inclusion and its Applications

We come away from the survey of inclusion with a sense of the possibilities that the *topos* opens up for the representation of the elegiac experience and the revaluation of the poetry that portrays it. We have seen how liberating the *amator* from the tyranny of the threshold and the singular orientation that it imposes expands his vocabulary, allowing him to speak to conditions outside of closure. I have hinted that the dialogue between the statuses of *inclusus* and *exclusus* can be symbolic of a more thematic call-and-response between states of interiority and exteriority, participation and marginalization, the poet-lover's experience of erotic inclusion introducing a model that moves beyond the binary of in and out to position the *amator* as in while out, out while in, ever as much insider as outsider. And so, in this section, I will go beyond mere hints to consider one valence of the conversation that unfolds between moments of inclusion and exclusion, demonstrating how the discourse between them works to revalue elegy by positioning it on the inside of Roman principles.

The issue that I will take up is, broadly speaking, *otium*—specifically, the contention that the life of the lover and the composition of poetry around it are a waste of time. That they are, in a word, *otiosi*. It is an issue that has been approached through the argument from exclusion—that is, with an understanding that erotic poetry accentuates its externality to social norms, either by defiantly embracing the life of indolence ascribed to it or by insisting on the status of its practice as an equal but opposite alternative to decent occupations.[1] I would like to reconsider the

[1] For defiant embrace, see: Nappa (2007), 57; Wyke (2007), 173-174; Gale (1997), 84-85. For equal alternative: Perrelli (2019), 1217; Platter (1995); Sadlek (2004). Keith (2008), 139-165 explores the interrelationship between elegiac *otium* and industrious *negotium*—which she formulates in terms of imperial *militia*—considering how elegiac leisure is predicated on political labor, and thus very much participatory in the Roman business of imperial *negotium*.

expression of the anxiety around *otium* in elegy through the lens of inclusion, focusing not on how the elegiac exercise is distanced from conventional practices, but on how the two are aligned.

Rather than approach elegy as championing love as either languorous or laborious—and in each case as defiantly outside the bounds of accepted behavior—I will endeavor to trace how the elegiac poets represent their craft as adhering to the established social code; how they, in effect, make elegy participate in the very delineation of respectable pursuits from which it would seem to recoil. They do this, in my reading, not by embracing the elegiac lifestyle as debauched unemployment or insisting on its status as *negotium* proper, but by demonstrating that the practice of elegy constitutes a productive use of leisure time, rather than its frittering away.

I see this accomplished through the development of two overlapping devices: the delineation of scenes of inclusion and exclusion within elegy along the lines of productive and unproductive uses of free time; and the correlation of the experience of inclusion with the practice of *lucubratio*, canonized as the habit of writing by lamplight and commended as the pursuit of the industrious statesman.[2] This differs in purview from other treatments of poetic leisure in that it positions elegy not on the outside of acceptable forms of *otium* and *negotium*, but on the inside of the discourse about what constitutes appropriate conduct.

Otium **and its Discontents**

καλῶς μὲν γὰρ πραττόμενον καὶ ὀρθῶς καλὸν γίγνεται, μὴ ὀρθῶς δὲ αἰσχρόν.[3]

For something is respectable when done well and properly, but when improperly it becomes disgraceful.

[2] Not explicated until Quintilian incorporates it into his program for oratorical and personal excellence at *Inst.* 10.3, but all the same enacted by earlier politicos, such as Cicero, for discussion of which see below.
[3] Plato, *Symp*. 181a

So posits Pausanias in the preamble to his discursus on Eros in Plato's *Symposium*. He will go on to apply this principle to the act of loving—a point to which I will return in due course—but the axiomatic observation itself offers a useful framework for broaching the issue of *otium* and its implications. Leisure is, of course, a theme that has inspired many studies before this one, and to reproduce the scope of their findings and the intricacies of the arguments they have spawned would be a project unto itself.[4] In that knowledge, what I offer here is a streamlined overview of those aspects of *otium* that will be salient to my treatment of Roman elegy, with the recognition that my summary will not account for all of its facets and the many nuances of its use.

To circle back, then, to Pausanias: if one thing can be remarked about the connotations of *otium*, it is that they are contingent on context. Despite the stereotypical account of Roman culture as one that prized exertion and disparaged relaxation, *otium* was not categorically taboo. Much as with Pausanias' principle of conduct, it was the doing that made the difference. W.A. Laidlaw's study of the concept exposes what he describes as the "ambivalence of *otium*",[5] highlighting its adaptation to evoke either a welcome break in the action—as in the case of its use as a near-synonym for political *pax*, or Cicero's styling of studious retirement after serving the state as *cum dignitate otium*—or a condemnable dereliction of duty, of the sort perpetrated by the do-nothing sybarites of Roman comedy.[6] Good *otium* was, paradoxically, industrious

[4] The lodestar has been André's (1966) diachronic study of *otium* and its socio-cultural significance in Roman moral and intellectual life. For more condensed overviews, see: Balsdon (1960), Frank (1968), Laidlaw (1968), Vickers (1990), and the entry for *otium* in the *TLL*.
[5] Laidlaw (1968), 42. This assessment is echoed by Vickers (1990), though while Laidlaw tends to position *otium* as a neutral term that takes on a positive or negative valence depending on the context in which it is used, Vickers (1990), 4-5 posits *otium*'s essential negativity, which can then be offset with positive qualifications (as in the case, for example, of Cicero's *cum dignitate otium* and *honestum otium*).
[6] For *otium* in Cicero, see Wirszubski (1954); André (1966), 279-337; Hanchey (2013); Bragova (2016), among others. And in Comedy: André (1966), 67-134, esp. 89-116.; Laidlaw (1968), 42-43; and Vickers (1990), 8.

otium—otium negotiosum—and its implementation inured to the benefit of the practitioner's image as much as the enjoyment of indolent *otium—otium otiosum*—detracted from it.[7]

The distinction is recognized as early as Ennius, who gives it voice in the form of a chorus of soldiers at loose ends in his *Iphigenia*:

> … otio qui nescit uti
> plus negoti habet quam cum est negotium in
> negotio. …
> otioso in otio animus nescit quid velit. [8]
>
> He who doesn't know how to make use of his leisure
> is more preoccupied than when occupied in his occupation. …
> the mind in leisurely leisure doesn't know what it wants.

The issue here is not *otium*, per se, but *otio … uti*—putting free time to use.[9] These troops have clearly not benefitted from Cato's formula for greatness—*non minus oti quam negoti rationem exstare oportere* (there ought to be no less intention behind one's leisure than one's business)—however much their disgruntlement intones its wisdom.[10] Having time to kill is not the problem; having nothing constructive with which to kill it is.

The complaint of Ennius' unemployed army speaks to the essential disquiet around the potential pitfalls of *otium*: its capacity, in its worst iteration, to become a *raison d'être*, eclipsing any scintilla of purpose and resolve, and jeopardizing civic identity. It is for this reason that it

---

[7] Vickers (1990), 6.

[8] The passage is preserved in Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* 19.10.12, though *otium* is not the term in which Gellius is interested. For discussion of the implications of *otium* in Ennius, see André (1966), 17-8; Laidlaw (1968), 43-4; Vickers (1990), 6.

[9] As André (1966), 35-36 puts it: "Le désespoir des soldats d'*Iphigenie* … s'explique par le fait qu'ils ne peuvent attacher à l'*otium* ni intérêt positif, ni récréation …."

[10] Preserved at Cic. *Pro Planc*. 66: *etenim M. Catonis illud quod in principio scripsit Originum suarum semper magnificum et praeclarum putavi, 'clarorum virorum atque magnorum non minus oti quam negoti rationem exstare oportere.'* (Indeed, that dictum of Marcus Cato's that he wrote at the outset of his *Origines* I have always considered noble and quotable: "in the case of great and eminent men, there ought to be no less intention behind one's leisure than one's business.") Cato, it would seem, did not reject *otium* outright, but rather being *otiosus*, a condition associated with the perceived wantonness of the much-maligned *otium graecum*, or "Greek" *otium.* Cf. André (1966), 36-45; and his additional observation at 29-30 that "l'adjectif *otiosus* est restée … plus péjoratif encore que l'*otium*" until Seneca reevaluates it *de Brevitate Vitae*.

represented so particular a threat to the soldier on campaign, with its promise to undermine the rigor and inurement to discomfort on which his value was predicated.[11]

But it is Cicero's elegy for Roman greatness, lost to the Epicurean evils of *umbris, deliciis, otio, languore, desidia* (shady retreats, pleasures, indolence, lethargy, sloth),[12] that conveys the broader implications of the negative association. His diagnosis for Roman socio-cultural decline activates a network of concepts that speaks to a fundamental alignment of *otium* of the *otiosum* variety with overindulgence. This is expressed both literally—portraits of languid leisure frequently involve, for example, unfettered feasting—[13] and figuratively, with *inertia, luxuria, torpedo* and *avaritia* (listlessness, decadence, torpor, and greed) often being either the handmaidens or the harbingers of time misspent.[14] In this, the crux of the differentiation of good *otium* from bad is detectable: it can be understood as hinging, essentially, on the poles of productivity and consumption. That is to say, *otium* responsibly deployed results in output and speaks to the diligence and industriousness of the practitioner;[15] frittered away, it contributes nothing and becomes an index of self-indulgence.

It is out of an anxiety to avoid being tainted by this complex of negative connotations that Cicero and Sallust take such pains to distinguish their brand of *otium* from the disreputable

---

[11] Hence its frequent pairing with verbs of deterioration, such as *marcescere* and *tabescere*, cf. André (1966), 34. Sallust encapsulates this notion in his narrative of the decline of the Roman ethos after the defeat of Carthage at Cat. 10.2: *qui labores, pericula, dubias atque asperas res facile toleraverant, eis otium divitiaeque, optanda alias, oneri miseriaeque fuere* (they who had easily endured hardships, dangers, circumstances uncertain and harsh, were now burdened and beset by leisure and wealth, things to be desired in other circumstances). As does Livy in his description of Hannibal's inability to rouse his troops from their respite at *AUC* 21.39.1-2: *sed armare exercitum Hannibal ... non poterat; otium enim ex labore, copia ex inopia, cultus ex inluvie tabeque squalida et prope efferata corpora varie movebat* (but Hannibal was unable to marshal his army ... for leisure after labor, surplus after shortage, cleanliness after filth and fetidness was, in various ways, compelling bodies that were bedraggled and nearly bestial).

[12] Cic. *Tusc*. 5.78: *sed nos umbris, deliciis, otio, languore, desidia, animum infecimus, opinionibus maloque more delenitum mollivimus* (but we have tainted our character with shady retreats, pleasures, indolence, lethargy, sloth; we have softened it, enticed as it has been by whims and bad practices)

[13] As at Cic. *Cat*. 2.10, *pro Sest*. 138; Livy 23.18.12; Sallust *Cat*. 13.3, et al.

[14] Vickers (1990), 7-8.

[15] Represents, in the words of André (1966), 30 "une seconde zone de l'activité, soumise elle aussi à un contrôle."

kind.[16] Take Sallust's assurance that, in forsaking his career as a statesman, *non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium conterere* (the plan was not to waste my good time in indolence and sloth, *Cat.* 4.1). And Cicero's avowal of his own preternatural diligence in the *Pro Plancio*: *ecquid ego dicam de occupatis meis temporibus, cui fuerit ne otium quidem umquam otiosum?* (What need I say about how my time was spent, I who never even had any leisure that was leisurely? *Pro Planc.* 66). This in contradistinction to the recreation of his antagonist, Cassius: *nam quas tu commemoras, Cassi, legere te solere orationes, cum otiosus sis, has ego scripsi ludis et feriis, ne omnino umquam essem otiosus* (For those speeches that you, Cassius, recall you used to read when you were at leisure, I wrote them during games and festivals, such that I was never really "on vacation" at all, *Pro Planc*. 66).

Germane to Cicero's differentiation of himself as employer of *otium*—his *tempus* is, after all, *occupatus*, his *otium* never *otiosum*—from Cassius as the *otiosus in otio* is his juxtaposition of his own production (*scribere*) with Cassius' consumption (*legere*). The withdrawal from society implicit in the notion of a retiring and self-serving *otium* threatens to position its enjoyment as an antisocial practice; redirecting one's energy from activities of intake (as reading essentially is) to ones of output represents a workaround.[17] Writing, in particular, becomes a byword for leisure productively and conscientiously spent, though in the hierarchy of recreational *opera*, those that resulted in some tangible public benefit outranked those that

[16] Cf. Baraz (2012), 34 where she identifies as points of intersection between Cicero's and Sallust's representations of their writing projects "the issue … of choosing the right way to spend one's retirement" and the demonstration "that the *otium* in question is *bonum*, 'good,' 'wholesome'"—that is, the issue of "the problematic status of writing that results from its being a product of *otium.*" Indeed, while Baraz's interest is in the efforts taken by these writers to recuperate their *materia*, doing so entails a concomitant legitimization of their *otium*.

[17] Hence the interest in emphasizing the good practitioner's mitigation of the solitude inherent in *otium*, as at Cic. *de Off*. 3.1.1, where Scipio Africanus is quoted as boasting that *numquam se minus otiosum esse quam cum otiosus, nec minus solum quam cum solus esset* (he was never less leisured than when at leisure, never less alone than when alone); and again at *de Off*. 3.1.3, where Cicero makes an implicit distinction between an *otium* that is engaged and one that is removed: *otio fruor… nec eam solitudinem languere patior* (I am making use of my leisure … and am not allowing this alone time to go to waste). On this last point, see Vickers (1990), 11.

conferred pure personal enjoyment.[18] Accordingly, capitalizing on *otium* to author historical and philosophical texts contributed more to one's image than dabbling *in levioribus studiis*, like poetry.[19]

This emphasis on devoting downtime to making a meaningful contribution is present in those self-conscious justifications for their *otium* that Sallust and Cicero offer. Sallust, who underscores that the program for his leisure is *res gestas populi Romani carptim … perscribere* (to write out in full the history of the Roman people, in individual episodes, *Cat.* 4.2). Cicero, who admits that even he fell prey to insidious *otium* before he resolved to reform:

> nam cum otio langueremus et is esset rei publicae status ut eam unius consilio atque cura gubernari necesse esset, primum ipsius rei publicae causa philosophiam nostris hominibus explicandam putavi (*de Nat. Deor*. 1.4.7)
>
> For, while I was going to waste in idleness and the state of the Republic was such that it had to be governed by the will and interest of a single individual, I first of all considered it necessary, for the sake of the Republic itself, to set forth philosophy for our people

By writing, and expressly by writing for the benefit of the public, Cicero is able to rehabilitate his leisure—to convert it from a period of self-focused depletion (*langueremus*) to one of ministerial production (*explicandam*).[20] His *apologia*, in its invocation of both the negative and positive instantiations of *otium*, exemplifies the Pausanian principle of quality predicated on

---

[18] André (1966), 327-29; also 46 and 126 n.8.

[19] Cf. André (1966), 47: "Parmi les occupations qui meublent l'*otium negotiosum*, l'agriculture … et la mise au point des discours politiques, qui servent la pédagogie morale et civique." Of Cicero's *otium litteratum*, he points to its concurrence with "la vie active … plus proche de la vie intellectuelle … que du culte des Muses" (314). Baraz (2012), 23 similarly notes that "Intellectual pursuits are felt to be more appropriate when they are limited to the sphere of *otium*, time free from the important business of the state" and observes that "both Sallust and Cicero, who can claim no public *negotia* of their own at the time of their writing, are engaged in constructing their intellectual occupations as a new type of *negotium*, functionally similar to the traditional ones, and just as valuable." The comparable impulse that I detect in elegy will be the focus of the treatment I offer in the following chapters. Apropos of which, for those lesser *leviora stuida*, see Cic. *de Senec*. 50.

[20] André (1966), 328. This sense of profitability will become a lasting characteristic of good *otium*. Seneca, for example, will later encourage the virtuous away from an inconsequential *otium* toward one that is civically oriented: *imperfectum ac languidum bonum est in otium sine actu proiecta virtus, numquam id, quod didicit, ostendens. … Quo animo ad otium sapiens secedit? Ut sciat se tum quoque ea acturum, per quae posteris prosit* (it is an imperfect and feeble good, the virtue relegated to leisure without action, never making known that which it has learned. … With what mindset does the wise man approach leisure? With the knowledge that during this time, too, he will be doing things by which he can benefit future generations, *de Otio* 6.3-4).

performance: his leisure is lamentable only insofar as it is misused; once it is well-spent, it becomes commendable.

The same is true, per Pausanias, of Eros: καὶ ὁ Ἔρως οὐ πᾶς ἐστι καλὸς οὐδὲ ἄξιος ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ὁ καλῶς προτρέπων ἐρᾶν (and Eros is not uniformly respectable or worthy of praise, just the kind that urges us to love in a respectable way, Plato *Symp*. 181a). Good Roman sensibilities would, perhaps, balk at this assertion. The convergence of the corrupting forces of *voluptas* and *amoenitas* (pleasure, especially of a sensual kind, and delight, of *locus amoenus* significance) on the profligate brand of *otium* rendered the lover, for whom such conditions are the bread and butter, inherently bent toward luxuriating leisure.[21] So much so that a niche for *otium-amor* has been carved out in the lexicon to specify the particular state of vacuity that renders the *amator* susceptible to the overtures of Eros—and the state of all-consuming desire into which he slips thereby.[22] To be *amans* is to be *otiosus*, with little to no room for practical nuance.

So, too, for the *poeta*, or at least for the lyric *poeta*, for whom being free from occupation represents a condition necessary for creation—an *otium poeticum* that offers the comfort and pleasure necessary to foster creativity, but that offends the sensibilities of a culture of industriousness in so doing—and who cannot claim educative applications for his musings in any traditional sense.[23] In this, poetic and erotic undertakings align: for both, leisurely *otium* is

[21] Incidentally, the lover shares with one other figure the constitutional predisposition to sensual corruption: the soldier. Vickers (1990), 5 remarks the "two classes of mankind" considered "particularly prone to these harmful states [i.e. of *otium*], lovers and soldiers." That the *amans* and the *miles* are identified in their shared susceptibility to *otium*'s baser enticements makes the elegiac trope of *militia amoris* seem more apt than ironic. Cf. Keith (2008), 140 where she observes of Propertius' portrayal of the plight of Tarpeia in 4.4 that it "identifies elegiac action as coextensive with military *otium*, licensed by the suspension of public business."

[22] Cf. *TLL* β B.1, on *otium amantium*; André (1966), 406-407; Rosivach (1986); Segal (1970), 33; Itzkowitz (1983), 133 and n.22, where he points to the roots of the concept in Greek poetry.

[23] For poetic *otium* (*otium poeticum* or *otium-poesis*), see André (1966), 217 where "la poésie se présente comme un jeu léger autorisé par le loisir"; Itzkowitz (1983), 133; Segal (1970), 28-30, 33, esp. 28, where *otium poeticum* "is a prerequisite for poetry, but also reflects the mood and the essential tonality which such poetry will have." It should

definitive of the experience—as it is for the poet in Catullus *c.* 50, whose erotic-poetic exchange with Licinius is a decadent product of their inoccupation (*hesterno, Licini, die otiosi/multum lusimus in meis tabellis/ut convenerat esse delicatos*, yesterday, Licinius, we, in our leisure, did much playing around on my writing tablets, as per our agreement to be indulgent, 50.1-3)—and any activity practiced therein is doomed to be deemed a waste of time. Vergil, however ingenuously, bows to the eminence of this wisdom when he qualifies the non-epic chapter of his career as time he spent *studiis florentem ignobilis oti* (luxuriating in the pursuits of ignoble leisure, *Georg*. 4.564).[24] And if even Catullus has seemingly come to recognize the pitfalls of amatory-literary idleness by the close of *c.* 51,[25] where he disavows the very *otium* prized, just one poem prior, for facilitating his afternoon delight (*otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est:/otio exsultas nimiumque gestis*, leisure, Catullus, is your problem: leisure you enjoy and relish too much, 51.13-14), where does that leave love poets, the embodiment of the overlap between the twin indignities of *otium-amor* and *otium-poesis*?

The prevailing take on Roman erotic poetry would have the answer be the point: that it is intrinsic to the erotic poet and his verse that he inhabit the counterculture and defiantly embrace what well-heeled society censures.[26] The alterity of the erotic-elegiac ethos is not something I wish to question, *per se*; it is the method by which such otherness is enacted that I aim to

---

be noted that each of these discussions of poetic *otium* occurs in the context of a broader treatment of Catullus *cc.* 50 and 51.

[24] For discussion of the import of this concession: André (1966), 464 n. 3, "Pour Virgile, qui aspire à l'épopée de toutes ses fibres, la sérénité du poète représente … un ignobile otium , une paix sans gloire qui n'aura jamais la dignité de la vie active …".

[25] The nature of Catullus' relationship to *otium*, as problematized by the dichotomous characterization in *cc*. 50 and 51, has been much belabored. For a sense of the issues—and their proposed resolutions—see: Lavency (1965), 178 ff.; Woodman (1966); Segal (1970); Clack (1975); Itzkowitz (1983); Finamore (1984); O'Higgins (1990), 165-166; Platter (1995), 218; Clark (2008), 268-269; Klentke (2016).

[26] The sentiment is sufficiently widespread in scholarship on elegy to represent somewhat of a commonplace, but Sullivan (1972), 23 sums up the position: "The professed aims and ideals of the elegists, however playfully they are interpreted, clearly and consciously fly in the face of accepted Roman standards of seriousness, sobriety, public service, and personal ambition."

reconsider. Rather than approach Roman elegiac poetry as flaunting its own dissension, I would like to explore the ways in which it participates in the very discourse that marginalizes it, how it presents its practice not as a cheeky approximation of true *negotium* or a combative championing of *otium otiosum*, but as one that is sensitive to the distinction between productive and profligate uses of downtime and works to instantiate the former. Simply put, how the elegists accept their poetry as a pursuit of *otium*, but shape that *otium* in the image of the productive kind. I see this achieved through their capitalization on a suite of *topoi* coincidental to both elegiac-poetic activity and productive *otium*—one that Catullus had already put to work in his love letter to Licinius, and one that finds its most salient expression in the practice of *lucubratio*, the habit of working by lamplight during hours without daylight.

Lucubratio and its Literary Legacy

illa mihi totis argutat noctibus ignes[27]

all through the night she harangues me about her blazing passion

Thus the Propertian poet-lover excuses his privileging of *eros* over expedition, citing Cynthia's displeasure at seeing the two of them parted in the course of declining an opportunity to embark on worldly travels. The apology pulls on a commonplace of a metaphor—the characterization of ardor in terms of heat (*ignes*), no less familiar in modern parlance than elegiac, in which particular idiom it denotes passion and poetry alike, as it does in Ovid's reminiscence about the publication habits of his elegiac bedfellows: *saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes* (Propertius was in the habit of performing his "loves" often, *Tr*. 4.10.45). But it also points to a more novel thematic nexus of night and fire, passion and poetry—one that is at the heart of the appropriation of the *lucubratio* practice that I see instantiated in Roman elegy.

[27] Prop. 1.6.7, quoted and discussed at greater length in Chapter 1: Recasting the *Exclusus*.

In a single line, Propertius encapsulates the essence of the representation: the nocturnal setting (*totis … noctibus*), the staging of amatory interaction (*mihi … argutat … ignes*) that amounts to elegiac-poetic activity (where *arguto* speaks to verbal production, while *ignis* simultaneously connotes the erotic experience and its expression in elegiacs), the centrality of light (where *ignes*, even while metaphorical, conjures the essence of illumination, its juxtaposition with *noctibus* producing on the page the coextension of light and dark that lamplight engenders); all of this within a narrative framework of exterior roving (travel) foregone in favor of domestic doings (the relationship with Cynthia). It is the subtlest of insinuations of the lucubratory ethos into the elegiac interaction, and it suggests how compatible the sensibility is with the orientation of elegy—how naturally the same forces that power the *lucubratio* practice animate the elegiac.

But to step back for a moment: Cicero's lamentation of Rome's lapsed morals that we encountered above happens to offer apposite entrée to the discussion of *lucubratio* and its ripeness for portrayal in elegy. In decrying the deterioration of the Roman character at the hands of *umbris, deliciis, otio, languore, desidia*, he aligns lackadaisical leisure with a lack of light (*umbra*), fusing the notion of do-nothing *otium* with the imagery of darkness. The pairing of sloth and shade, as it happens, is a classic one. Though Cicero may be to thank for the language in which the relationship is codified—that being the decadent *vita umbratilis* (life made in the shade) of *Tusculanae* 2.27—the correlation of darkness with shiftlessness is already at work in Plautus[28]; and informs more general sensibilities about the conflicting natures of rigorous occupations said to be pursued "in the sun" and languorous pastimes proverbially enjoyed "in the

[28] In whose comedies André (1966), 93 observes "la métaphore de l'ombre complice de la paresse revient assez fréquemment."

shade."[29] This association of shadow with *otium otiosum*, it should be noted, is particularly pertinent in the case of writers: Balsdon has remarked the unique shadiness attached to the career of the professional author—poet even more so than historian or philosopher.[30] A bias thematized by Vergil, whose pastoral poet Tityrus is famously introduced in *Eclogue* 1.1 as *patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi* (lolling in the shade of a sprawling Beech tree); and whose agrarian Meliboeus, later in that same introduction, jealously characterizes his otiose counterpart as *lentus in umbra* (at ease in the shade, *Ecl*. 1.4).[31]

It is, perhaps, owing to the popular construal of the *otiosus* as *umbratilis* that *lucubratio* becomes all but synonymous with leisure productively spent—a device for dispelling the darkness of decadent retreat with a source of light (etymologically a lamp, *lucubrum*) to abet one's after-hours industry.[32] If the shade of the *vita umbratilis* is the symbol of indolent leisure, the tenebrism of *lucubratio* is the token of industrious down-time, the dissipation of dark with a light signaling preternatural productivity where the diffusion of light with a shade bespeaks marked abnegation of responsibilities. Though it acquires the distinction of writing by lamplight, at its core, *lucubratio* is the practice of doing any work outside of canonical daylight hours.[33]

---

[29] Balsdon (1969), 136. André (1966), 478 points to "des clichés moraux imposés par l'austérité ancestrale : *otium vigilae sol/negotium somni umbra*", detectable in Cicero's exhortation, in the *pro Murena*, *cedat … forum castris, otium militiae, stilus gladio, umbra soli* (let the *forum* give way to the battle camp, leisure to military service, pen to sword, shade to sun, *pro Mur.* 30). Smith (1965), 301 similarly observes the "conventional opinion" that associated "shade with softness and effeminacy, and hot sun with work, toughness, and fortitude."

[30] Balsdon (1969), 138-139. Though this is not to say that writers of philosophy and history were given a pass, on which see Baraz (2012), 22 where she points to Cicero's anxiety to justify his philosophical works in a cultural climate that "finds that a different literary genre would be preferable to philosophy", as it "is not compatible with the author's high social standing, his *dignitas*"; 23, where she identifies philosophy as "a severely marginalized discipline" in comparison to history and rhetoric, "fields that fit more readily within the traditional Roman framework"; and 39 ff., where she discusses in more detail this hierarchy of subject matters and authors' efforts to address it in their works.

[31] Cf. André (1966), 458 where he notes of Vergil's poetry that "*umbra* et *somnus* représentent … des équivalents imagés de l'*otium*"; Smith (1965), 300 ff., who offers a survey of the imagery of shade in the *Eclogues*, central, in his estimation, to Vergil's programmatic identification of pastoral withdrawal as "personal ideal"; and Theodorakopoulos (1999), 142-161, who identifies shade as a motif that acts as a unifying thread throughout Vergil's poetic collections and that accordingly comes to define the shape of his career.

[32] Ker (2004), n.33.

[33] Ker (2004), 217.

Thus the industrious farmer of Cato's *Res Rusticae* can be encouraged to get a head start on the next day's tasks by toiling *lucubratione*;[34] and Livy's Lucretia can be depicted dutifully laboring over her loom *inter lucubrantes ancillas* (among the night-shift of her maids, *AUC* 1.57).

But the particular tie of *lucubratio* to literary conceits is its most indelible. While Cato commended the practice in an agricultural context, Varro cites its centrality in his own academic career: *non solum ad Aristophanis lucernam, sed etiam ad Cleanthis lucubravi* (it is not just at the lamp of Aristophanes, but also that of Cleanthes that I have spent my nights working, *L.L.* 5.9). Cicero, too, links *lucubratio* to letters—both literal, as when he styles an epistle penned at night as *lucubrationem meam* (my night's work);[35] and metonymic, as when he mourns his lapsed scholarly *lucubrationes*, the victim of his relegation from the political arena.[36]

That Cicero's *lucubratio* is all but synonymous with his political career speaks to the appeal the practice held for a statesman eager to demonstrate his diligence. Devoting a portion of the night to one's work signaled remarkable industriousness and productivity—a reflection of the ability to maximize time, both day and night, and of the self-regulation required to do so—and thus of one's moral fortitude and fitness for service.[37] This is certainly the valence it has by the time Seneca portrays his nightwork as an exercise in the mastery of physical impulse;[38] by the time Pliny the Younger extols his uncle's superhuman work ethic;[39] by the time Quintilian

[34] Cato, *R.R.* 37: *per hiemem lucubratione haec facito* (during the winter, do these tasks by lamplight).
[35] Cic. *ad Fam*. 9.2.1: *conscripsi epistulam noctu … tamen perire lucubrationem meam nolui et eam ipsam Caninio dedi* (I wrote up the letter at night … all the same, I didn't want my nightwork to go to waste and I gave it as it was to Caninius).
[36] Cic. *Div*. 2.68.142: *nunc quidem propter intermissionem forensis operae et lucubrationes detraxi et meridiationes addidi* (now, as it is, on account of the lapse in my legal career, I have done away with working at night and have taken up afternoon naps).
[37] Ker (2004), 218-19.
[38] Sen. *Ep*. 8.1
[39] Plin. *Ep*. 3.5.7-9

canonizes the practice in both form—solitary composition by candlelight—and function, as a cornerstone in the orator's education.[40]

But it has no less appeal to poets in the characterization of their craft. The image of poetry as the product of sleeplessness is present in Callimachus' characterization of the *Phaenomena* as the Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης (token of Aratus' sleeplessness, *Epig.* 27.3-4); and is more explicitly grounded in the language of *lucubratio* by the time Cinna, in a Callimachean homage, offers his verse as *haec tibi Arateis multum vigilata lucernis/carmina* (these poems, the product of many a night illuminated by the light of Aratus, *Epig*. 13.1-2).[41]

Lucretius makes a similar gesture in the opening book of *De Rerum Natura*, when he recognizes the virtues of his relationship with the poem's dedicatee, Memmius, as the force igniting his creative efforts:

> sed tua me virtus tamen et sperata voluptas
> suavis amicitiae quemvis efferre laborem
> suadet et inducit noctes vigilare serenas
> quaerentem dictis quibus et quo carmine demum
> clara tuae possim praepandere lumina menti
> res quibus occultas penitus convisere possis (*DRN* 1.140-146)
>
> and yet, your quality and the anticipated enjoyment
> of your pleasant company convinces me to carry out any task
> there is and spurs me to stay up during the silent nights,
> searching for the words, for the verse, with which, at last,
> I can expose your mind to the clear light
> that will enable you to see through to matters deeply concealed

Lucretius' portrayal of poetic composition as nocturnal occupation invokes the legitimizing power of *lucubratio* on two levels: there is the demonstration of assiduity that working through the night (*noctes vigilare serenas*) enables; and there is the assertion of light over dark (*clara* ...

[40] Quint. *Inst*. 10.3.25
[41] For the tradition of representations of "the astronomer-poet at night"–and the evolution of the motif through its transmission—see Wilson (2020).

lumina/res quibus … occultas penitus convisere) that the lucubratory scenario involves.[42] For while it may be staged in darkness, this activity is anything but *umbratilis*. Indeed, it is not merely an effort (*laborem*) in elucidation (and here, *clara lumina* allows for a play on the visual and intellectual dimensions of clarity, both the literal light in the dark that enables the practice and the metaphoric light of understanding). It is an undertaking that itself embodies light, becoming the very vehicle of illumination in whose glow the poetic project unfolds, the verse that crystallizes in the night itself a source of light for the reader. The image, then, of Lucretius elucubrating his *magnum opus* in the wee-hours activates the network of positive associations with time management that informs the appraisal of *otium*: by pursuing *laborem* during non-canonical work hours, he cannot be criticized as *otiosus*; by bringing the *clara lumina* of comprehension to the reader, his project is externally oriented and clearly consequential. So much the import of the performance of *lucubratio*.

The alternative, of course, is either the unremarkable enjoyment of sleep or the nefarious engagement in misdeeds, the latter of which represents a particular sticking point in social critique. Nights spent in carousal or criminality inspire the identification of the *nocturnus* as a distinct brand of low-life, the proverbial creature of darkness who exploits the conditions of night for private advantage.[43] Seneca will, in language that nicely echoes the lilt of *lucubratio*, refer to this subset as *lucifugae* (the light-averse), but their sins are already accounted for in the harsher legal penalty outlined in the XII Tables for the *fur nocturnus* (thief in the night) than the *diurnus* (the daytime bandit);[44] in Cato's reported denunciation of late-night revelers as those who *nec orientem umquam solem viderunt nec occidentem* (have never seen the rising or the

[42] There is also a coincidence of desire (*voluptas*) and (literary) productivity that identifies the former as an integral component of the latter, a relationship that will be discussed in greater detail below, Chapter 4: The Convention.
[43] Ker (2004), 219.
[44] Ker (2004), 219. Cf. Cic. *pro Mil*. 9.

setting of the sun)[45]; in Cicero's invocation of this same turn of phrase when he defines libertines (*asoti*) as those *qui de conviviis auferantur crudique postridie se rursus ingurgitent, qui solem, ut aiunt, nec occidentem umquam viderint nec orientem* (who get carried away at parties and, still hammered, do it all again the next day; who, as the saying goes, have never seen the rising or the setting of the sun, *de Fin*. 2.8.23-24), this in the course of an excursus on pleasure (*voluptas*).

In this we can hear the reverberation of Cicero's invective at *pro Sestio* 138, aimed at those *qui somno et conviviis et delectationi natos arbitrantur* (who believe their birthright is sleep and revelry and amusement), further qualified as *qui voluptatibus ducuntur et se vitiorum inlecebris et cupiditatium lenociniis dediderunt* (those who are guided by pleasures and have given themselves over to the lures of vices and the attractions of desires). Herein lies a fundamental identification of nocturnal endeavors with self-gratification, whether through the wanton servicing of *cupiditas* and cultivation of *voluptas*—a *voluptas*, it should be noted, that differs in valence from the amicable desire Lucretius expresses for the dedicatee of his work and that he credits with underwriting its production, the one driving licentiousness, the other industriousness;[46] or through the willful pursuit of illicit activity. Forms of nocturnal perversity, both, that are rooted, as with *otium otiosum*, in consumption—the taking-in of sympotic delights, the taking of stolen goods—asocial interests made even more so by their fulfillment in a temporal space that is not woven into the social fabric.[47]

Or not fully, at least. For it is against this dislocation of night and its enterprises from the hum of society that the practice and portrayal of *lucubratio* work. James Ker has illustrated, both in prose and in diagrams, the antipodal representations of nocturnal activity as either "extension"

[45] Attributed by Seneca at *Ep*.122.3.
[46] Lucr. *DRN* 1.140-142. We can, in this, see that *voluptas*, like *otium*, is qualitatively determined by the use to which it is put: when subtending productivity, it is a boon; when subverting respectable conduct, it is a bane.
[47] Cf. Ker (2004), 219-221.

or "inversion" of daytime ventures—a paradigm in which the sybaritic license of *lucifuga* that upends the propriety of diurnal norms is mirrored in the spartan ethic of *lucubratio* that upholds it.[48] Unlike the shady lowlife, the practitioner of *lucubratio* is still civically minded, still socially oriented, still self-regulating.[49]

Seneca makes this much germane to the exercise when he adumbrates his lucubratory routine:

> in hoc me recondidi et fores clusi, ut prodesse pluribus possem. Nullus mihi per otium dies exit. Partem noctium studiis vindico. Non vaco somno sed succumbo, et oculos vigilia fatigatos cadentesque in opere detineo. … posterorum negotium ago; illis aliqua, quae possint prodesse, conscribo. (Sen. *Ep*. 8.1-2)
>
> I have hidden myself away in here and closed the doors so that I can be of use to as many as possible. I lose no day to idleness. I claim part of the night for my studies. I do not make myself open to sleep, but surrender to it, and I keep my eyes absorbed in the work, though weary and drooping from the vigil. … I do the work for those to come; for them I write down whatever tidbits might be useful.

However predicated on his removal from society (*recondidi*, *fores clusi*), the essence of Seneca's *lucubratio* is his continued engagement with it (*ut prodesse pluribus possem*, *posterorum negotium ago*). To this end, his characterization of the process makes nocturnal conduct correspond to daytime enterprise. First, through the direct parallelism established between his days and nights as equally structured, equally productive (no day idle, no night wasted). Then, in the demonstration of the discipline that *lucubratio* itself demands, both in its physicality—he forcibly lays claim to the time (*vindico*), he assiduously struggles against sleep (*non vacuo somno*, *oculos … detineo*)—and in its mental exigencies: it is his intellectual work that drives

[48] Ker (2004), 216-21, 223.

[49] And so the practice of literary *lucubratio* is very much responsive to what Baraz (2012), 23 identifies as an anxiety among Roman writers to present "their intellectual occupations as a new type of *negotium*, functionally similar to the traditional ones, and just as valuable." The *topos* of *lucubratio* does visually much of the same work that Baraz sees Cicero and Sallust at pains to perform apologetically in the prefaces to their tracts; and indeed, the fact that representations of the author engaged in lucubratory writing tend to populate the prefaces of works—e.g. in Aulus Gellius, Pliny the Elder, and Seneca, all discussed by Ker (2004)—enfolds the representation as literary device into the same project of value production that Baraz explores (22-45).

him (*in opere detineo*; *negotium ago*; *conscribo*).[50] All of this in service of the general public (*illis aliqua, quae possint prodesse*), as if the reality of his solitude is a mere technicality, as if he never really decamped from the forum at all.

The virtue of *lucubratio* is its requirement of the practitioner of the same decorum and demeanor that would be expected of him in the daylight, an ethic that informs Quintilian's canonical prescription for the practice: *ideoque lucubrantes silentium noctis et clusum cubiculum et lumen unum velut rectos maxime teneat* (and so, as we do our night work, let the silence of night and a closed-off bedroom and a single light keep us in the highest degree, as it were, upright, *Inst*. 10.3.25). Spatio-temporal distance from the culture of the day (*silentium noctis*, *clusum cubiculum*) does not bring with it abandonment of diurnal standards (*lucubrantes ... velut rectos*, a dual evocation, in *rectus*, of posture—upright, rather than prone—and propriety: upstanding, rather than perverse)[51]. Quite the opposite: the very conditions of the nightwork enforce them.

The descriptions of *lucubratio* offered by Seneca and Quintilian are admittedly at some remove, temporally and generically, from elegiac poetry, and yet they pull from a set of markers that likely informed Augustan culture, as well. Cicero's invocations of his *lucubratio* are close enough in time to be a meaningful point of reference for the elegists, and they bear the marks of the same attributes with which Seneca and Quintilian imbue the practice. When Cicero humble-brags, for example, of his *Paradoxa Stoicorum* as being *hoc parvum opusculum lucubratum his iam contractioribus noctibus* (this small little volume, written by lamp-light over the course of these now shorter nights, *Para.* praef. 5), he speaks to his own focus and self-discipline as one who not only devotes his nights to academic projects, but who does so with an efficiency that

[50] Cf. Ker (2004), 231.
[51] Cf. *OLD s.v.* 7-7b, 10.

renders the fewer available hours of darkness on which to capitalize (*contractioribus noctibus*) equally productive.[52] Couple this with the expressed purpose of his project being to determine of certain Stoic precepts *possentne proferri in lucem, id est in forum* (whether they can be brought to light, that is to say, before the public, *Para.* praef. 4), and the public-private axis negotiated by Seneca and Quintilian in their portrayals of *lucubratio* becomes salient. The direction of his efforts toward edification makes his use of time civically responsible; and the relationship established between private and public—with night as the locus of production and day, metonymized by the *forum*, as the destination for publication—allows for the gap between solitary exercise and social engagement to be closed. Rather than operate in darkness, Cicero, just as Lucretius, works toward illumination; and the assimilation of light to the *forum*—of shedding light through published writing to inhabiting the public domain—[53] renders his activity symbolically and essentially civic, demonstrates his continued participation in the culture of day.

This alignment of *lucubratio* with the work of the day similarly informs Cicero's mention of the practice at *de Divinatione* 2.142, where he concedes that *nunc quidem propter intermissionem forensis operae et lucubrationes detraxi et meriditationes addidi* (now, as it is, on account of the lapse in my legal career, I have done away with working at night and have taken up afternoon naps). Here, *lucubratio* is more explicitly positioned as the nocturnal counterpart to a public career, so closely attending the work of the *forum* as to be contingent upon it. The synchronized suspension of both legal career and *lucubratio* speaks to the conception of the practice as the nocturnal equivalent of diurnal occupation: being busy during the day necessitates finding time at night for other projects, and the evening hours accordingly

[52] Ker (2004), 218 notes the inherent sensitivity of *lucubratio* to seasonal changes in light, whereby "the relative length of winter nights makes it possible … to burn the midnight oil", while "the 'more contracted nights' of spring" to which Cicero here alludes would make the practice more challenging to sustain.
[53] And the phrase *proferri in lucem* can encompass both senses, explication and publication, cf. *OLD s.v. profero* 7.

come to mirror the busyness of the working ones. Counter to this is *meriditatio*, the consort of unemployment, whose observance further alienates the adherent from the culture of the *forum*: by making night of the day, it fails to keep the practitioner engaged in the affairs of the working world, inverting the model of *lucubratio*—wherein the natural impulse to sleep is denied for the sake of productivity—with an equally unnatural cultivation of rest at a time when industriousness is expected.

And so, the characteristics of *lucubratio* fronted by Seneca and Quintilian—the logistics of working at night; the primacy of illumination, both literal and metaphoric; the physical withdrawal and essential engagement; the rod of self-discipline—are equally present in Cicero's invocations of the practice. They are equally detectable in Lucretius' snapshot of himself composing by lamplight. And they are equally available to the elegiac poets as cultural touchstones around which to build their re-presentations of their craft.

There is, of course, plenty of thematic light in Roman elegy. The seething fire of desire familiar from Propertius 1.6, but also the ardent blaze of anger and the glint of the lover's glance; the torrid brand of *Amor* and the fanned flames of torches, whose varying degrees of life track the progression of the night hours.[54] Indeed, the *locus classicus* of erotic experience shares many of the experiential and contextual attributes of *lucubratio*: night; sleeplessness; seclusion; lamplight.[55] And so these elegiac scenes that I approach as lucubratory could fairly be described as merely reproducing an erotic *topos* familiar from Greek poetry.[56] And, to an extent, they are.

---

[54] As at Prop. 1.3.10: *et quaterent sera nocte facem pueri* (and the boys were fanning the torch in the wee-hours of the night), cf. Richardson (2006), *ad loc*. where the shaking of torches is a sign of "the night being far gone", a tactic to "keep them burning when they are nearly spent." For a study of Roman lighting technologies, see Wilson (2018).
[55] For the *topos* of the erotic night: de Temmerman (2018), 260-263 and 274-280 for sex and story-telling happening at night; and Bouquet (1996) for night as an elegiac motif. For erotic sleeplessness: Kanellou (2017), 149; Fernández Contreras (2000), 27-35, Thomas (1979), 195-205. For lamplight: Kanellou (2013), Winiarska (2017), Ker (2004), 227, where Roman culture was "…a culture where the 'lamp' (*lucerne*) could function as a metonym for 'poetry'", and Thomas (1979), 198-199.
[56] On which, see Kannellou (2013) and (2017); Winiarska (2017).

But as much as they recycle the visual language of erotic-poetic discourse, they also tap into the cultural associations with *lucubratio*, with which exercise the tradition of erotic representation happens to have a good deal of visual and practical overlap.

Indeed, incidental reflection on elegy's lucubratory habits—such as R.O.A.M. Lyne's passing observation, in his commentary on the pseudo-Virgilian *Ciris*, that "Devoted lucubration in the composition of poetry is a conventional assumption in the Callimachean tradition; the Augustan Elegists … could humorously play between the ideas of lucubration the product of diligence and lucubration enforced by the cares of love"—[57] speaks to the salience of pursuing a more systematic study of *lucubratio* as an elegiac motif. Couple this sensibility with the vague reports of a solitary collection of prose *Lucubrationes* authored by the neoteric poet Furius Bibaculus—that same Furius, it might be, so affectionately identified as a *comes Catulli* in *c*. 11.1—and the possibility that the representational conceit was in the literary ether becomes all the more likely.[58]

And so I do not think it impossible that the elegists are doing both—instantiating the erotic-poetic tradition while speaking to the ethic of productivity, a participation through non-participation in the culture of *Romanitas*, just as is accomplished with elegy's more recognizable tropes, the figure of the *miles amoris* foremost among them. Here again, elegy need not be doing only one thing: it can recall the poetic tradition of bowered bliss and represent the dominant culture of assiduous activity simultaneously. Are these scenes examples of the typical erotic *topos*? Yes. Are they enactments of *lucubratio*? Yes

[57] Lyne, (1978), 120-121 in discussion of the phrase *dona … vigilata labore* at *Cir*. 46.
[58] Green (1940), 348. Of Bibaculus' *Lucubrationes*, Green goes on to comment (356) that the title speaks to "the fruit of nocturnal labors, not with the scholar's lamp, but with the cup." If Bibaculus was capitalizing on the opportunity to (mis)represent lucifugal behavior as lucubratory, the circulation of a model for the integration of the *topoi* would represent compelling precedent for its development in later Augustan elegy.

Chapter 4

Love's Labors Lucubrated in Propertius

The Conception

Early on in Book II, Propertius' poet-lover defends the extension of his affair with elegy beyond its expected lifespan of a single volume of poetry:

> 'Vix unum potes, infelix, requiescere mensem
> et turpis de te iam liber alter erit.'
> Quaerebam sicca si posset piscis harena
> nec solitus ponto vivere torvus aper
> aut si possem studiis vigilare severis:
> differtur, numquam tollitur ullus amor. (Prop. 2.3.3-8)
>
> 'You've been quiet for barely a month, you wretch,
> and already another book will be your disgrace.'
> I wanted to know if a fish could survive on dry land
> and a wild boar in the surf for which it was not made,
> whether I could devote my nights to serious study:
> love is deferred, never entirely done away with.

The apology shares some functional features of a programmatic *recusatio*, what with its avowal that the *amator* is fit for no pursuit other than this, as out of his depth in anything but *amor* as a fish out of water, as at sea as a boar at sea.

It also, to my purposes here, invites the contemplation of elegy in relation to *lucubratio*. His formulation makes the two practices antithetical: occupying his nocturnal hours with "serious study" (*studiis vigilare severis*) represents the nonnative context to which the poet-lover tests his adaptability—his parching sand, his engulfing surf. It is a practice that has no place for love, that even calls for its abandonment for the duration of the performance, a demand to which the poet-lover can only temporarily bend (*differtur, numquam tollitur ullus amor*). Elegy is implicitly identified as the equal but opposite action to *lucubratio*, the alternative night exercise uneasily replaced by the exacting enterprise: when *studia severa* stand as the analogue to *sicca harena* and *pontus*, *vigilare* (just as *vivere*) emerges as the constant; and the lucubratory

experiment can thus be understood as different from erotic-poetic activity in kind, but not in form—a staying awake for something other than *amor*, but a staying awake all the same.

To recognize night as the domain of elegy is old news; Jean Bouquet's study of the centrality of the nocturnal to the elegiac ethos is notably instructive in this line of inquiry.[1] What I would like to advance here is the particular correspondence between elegy-by-night and *lucubratio*—between the enactment of love and its poetry, on the one hand, and *studiis vigilare severis* on the other—[2] one that Propertius clearly appreciates, and one that he develops beyond the binary into which the two would naturally be placed. For as much as this scenario figures elegy as a parallel to *lucubratio*, inhabiting the same environment while never intersecting, it just as readily complicates their tidy polarization.

The call and response between the voice of derision and the poet-lover logically aligns the pitifully short span of time (*vix unum … mensem*) for which he is able to refrain from elegy (*requiescere*) with his trial of *lucubratio* (*quaerebam … si possem studiis vigilare severis*); and accordingly his period of studious enterprise is also, incidentally, a period of decreased activity. That is to say, both the poet-lover and his antagonist are referring to the same interval of time when they respectively describe his doings as *studiis vigilare severis* and *requiescere*, the implication being that the poet-lover's *lucubratio* is not characterized by productivity, but

[1] Bouquet (1996). Chaniotis (2018), 7 remarks the general association of night with "erotic desire"; and de Temmerman (2018), 276 observes of Latin novels that "the connection between night and sex is especially strong, systematic, and persistent." Ker and Wessels (2020), 8-10 identify night as a period of poetic productivity and point to its centrality in elegiac endeavors. Ramminger (1937), 68 ff. accounts for the association in Catullus. Montuschi (2005), 13-100 provides a treatment of night in Ovid's poetry. Elegy's interest in sleep and dreaming, intimately associated with the temporal locus of night, is the subject explored in Scioli (2015); while Fernández Contreras (2000), 31-35 discusses nocturnal insomnia in Catullus and the elegists within a larger study of the motif in Greek and Latin poetry.

[2] Cf. Baraz (2012), 36 where she notes, in a discussion of the self-representation of the *auctor* of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, that intellectual pursuits "like writing and philosophy" are "summed up in his use of the word *studium* (which he seems to naturally connect with *otium*)", an observation that speaks both to the antithetical relationship between elegy and *studium* (as activities with different social registers), and their complementarity (as activities of *otium*).

dormancy[3]; and that it is in his elegiac engagements, by contrast—the resumption of which is signaled by the publication of his new book of poems—that he is industrious.

And not just industrious, but meaningfully occupied, if we can take our cue from Cicero's extension of *requiesco* to convey cessation of official business when self-consciously comparing his own lifestyle to the habits of Scipio Africanus:

> Ille enim **requiescens** a rei publicae pulcherrimis muneribus otium sibi sumebat aliquando et e coetu hominum frequentiaque interdum tamquam in portum se in solitudinem recipiebat; nostrum autem otium negotii inopia, non **requiescendi** studio constitutum est. (Cic. *de Off*. 3.2.)
>
> He, retiring from his most glorious service to the Republic, occasionally claimed leisure for himself and retreated from the congress and crowd of men into solitude, as if taking refuge; but our leisure has been imposed by a lack of work, not a desire to relax.

Here, the significance of *requiesco* is tied just as much to what is forsaken as what is gained. The emphasis on the logistics, rather than the mechanics, of taking repose—on the rootedness of retirement not in sleep, but society—underscores the social dimension of *requiesco* that exists alongside the physical. To relax is not just to perform an act incidental to restoration, but to leave behind work culture altogether, a nuance reflected in Cicero's anxiety to clarify that his *otium*—forced as it is by the nature of his circumstances (*negotii inopia*)—is decidedly not a retirement (*non requiescendi studio constitutum est*). And so, when the poet-lover of poem 2.3 is taunted for the brief interlude between collections of poetry during which *requiescere potes*—during which he redirected his nighttime energy toward *studiis vigilare severis*—the sense is not just that he has been taking a load off, but that he has been without any engagement and occupation with and within the public domain.

[3] This in light of the primary use of *requiesco* to convey rest-taking (*OLD s.v.* 1), as Propertius himself does in 1.8.33 (*requiescere lecto*); 2.22.25 (*requiverat Arctos*); 2.34.75 (*lassus requiescat avena*).

Indeed, in an ironic twist, the poet-lover's practice of the very activities that should, in the Ciceronian model, represent industrious downtime (*studia severa*) equates to personal nonproductivity and social withdrawal, while his return to elegiac endeavors (through the publication of his new collection) signals his creative and social reengagement. More ironic, still, that in Cicero's narrative, the very drive that should represent the cultivated locus of productive leisure (*studium* as intellectual application)[4] is repurposed as desire (*studium* as zeal) for nonproductivity and social withdrawal (*requiescendi*), the very denial of which (*non ... constitutum est*) signifies his resistance to the corrupting force of *otium*. In each case, Propertian and Ciceronian, *studium* is inverted, only to opposite ends: for the Propertian poet-lover, studied *studia* are undertaken as an antidote to erotica, but fail to deliver the productivity that his pursuits of desire ultimately enable; for Cicero, *studium* itself denotes desire and its forestalling his continued participation in a culture of personal productivity. For both, *studium* is ineffective—for Propertius, it is intellectual *studium* that undermines productive desire; for Cicero, it is desirous *studium* that undermines productivity.

Lucubratio proper, then—in its turn, that is, as *studiis vigilare severis*—does not convey to the Propertian poet-lover of poem 2.3 the merits of discipline and sociality expected of the practice; it does not speak to continued exertion after dark, nor does it offset the aspect of withdrawal inherent in *requiesco*—and, it should be noted, in the *lucubratio* practice itself—[5] with continued social engagement through one's work. These virtues, in a subtle but significant

[4] To point again to Baraz (2012), 36 where *studium*, in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, is shorthand for "writing and philosophy" and identified with *otium*.
[5] Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.22, where the ideal locale for the *lucubratio* practice is described as a *liberum arbitris locum et quam altissimum silentium*, a place without an audience and as steeped in silence as possible). On which see Ker (2004), 215 where the lucubrator benefits from the "secrecy" of the *clausum cubiculum* as a "region in which informal dress, indiscreet or obscene speech, and other informalities were allowed: in short a relaxation of public behavior". This point will be elaborated in the discussion of Ovid's figuration of *lucubratio* in the *Amores* in Chapter 6, below.

twist, are transferred to his elegiac *acta*: if the stint with *lucubratio* is the spell of *requiescere*, then elegiac endeavors necessarily represent the opposite, and the elegiac practice thus acquires the traditional import of *lucubratio*, while traditional *lucubratio* is turned otiose.

A new plane, then, is opened up, in which the lines of elegy and *lucubratio* meet—and more than meet, overlap. The topical play in 2.3 between nocturnal *studia* and elegy-by-night suggests that Propertius is not only aware of the practical and contextual overlap between erotic-poetic endeavors and the *lucubratio* practice, but is interested in inverting the paradigm to make amatory activity embody the attributes of *lucubratio* proper. In this model, elegiac activity becomes not an alternative to the lucubratory practice—the *other* brand of nightwork, the *lucifuga* to the *lucubratio*—but an instantiation of it, subject to the same set of attending associations. By capitalizing on the atmospheric similarities between nocturnal erotic exploits and nighttime erudite endeavors, Propertius is able to fashion an elegiac *lucubratio* that partakes of the visual vocabulary and cultural consequence of the lucubratory custom; and that does so all the more when the metapoetic potential of the elegiac mistress to be a cipher for poetry itself is realized. But all of this in due course. To start, the direct figuration of elegy as *lucubratio*, most readily appreciated, as it happens, in instances of inclusion.

The Contention

With that, let us revisit Propertius 2.15, already noted for its depiction of inclusion in the form of the poet-lover's erotic success. The lines are likely familiar:

> O me felicem! nox o mihi candida! et o tu
> lectule deliciis facte beate meis!
> quam multa apposita narramus verba lucerna,
> quantaque sublato lumine rixa fuit!
> nam modo nudatis mecumst luctata papillis,
> interdum tunica duxit operta moram.
> illa meos somno lapsos patefecit ocellos
> ore suo et dixit 'sicine, lente, iaces?' (2.15.1-8)

> Oh, lucky me! Oh, night bright for me! And oh, you
> little bed you, delighted by my delights!
> How many words we speak when the light is set near us
> and how much contest there was when the light was put out!
> For at one time, with bared breasts, she tussled with me,
> now and then, with cinched dress, she prolonged a pause.
> She parted my eyes as they drooped in sleep
> with her mouth and said, "Well, are you just lying there, lazy man?"

The atmospheric resemblance of the erotic context to the lucubratory is not hard to appreciate:[6] staged at night (*nox*) in a bedroom (*lectule*) illuminated by a lamp (*lucerna*), it partakes of the visual vocabulary of the night-writing scene.[7] No less does it tap into its mechanics: the presence of light attends the production of language (*quam multa apposita narramus verba lucerna*), even while its absence allows the kind of license (*rixa*) associated with the agitated antics of the *exclusus*[8]*;* and the physical exigencies of intimacy—the hour and the effort (*mecumst luctata*) combined—call for the comfort of natural rhythms to be sacrificed for continued performance (*illa meos somno lapsos patefecit ocellos*).

Of no small consequence is that sacrifice, both for its symbolism and for its impetus. However much erotica ostensibly contribute to the pall of ill-repute, here sexual engagement

---

[6] Especially when read against Quintilian's description of the preferred conditions for the practice at *Inst*. 10.3.25: *ideoque lucubrantes* ***silentium noctis*** *et* ***clusum cubiculum*** *et* ***lumen unum*** *velut rectos maxime teneat* (and so, as we do our night work, let **the silence of night** and **a closed-off bedroom** and **a single light** keep us to the utmost, as it were, upright).

[7] Thomas (1979), 201 in discussing Cinna's epigrammatic tribute to Callimachus and Aratus (*multa invigilata lucernis/carmina*, discussed above in the Overview: Lucubratio and its Literary Legacy), ventures that *lucernis* might be erotically charged given the prominence of lamps "in the context of Greek amatory ἀγρυπνία", though he goes on to concede in n. 75 that reading the erotic into *lucernis* "can only be on the level of suggestion, since some mention of lamps would not be out of place in the context of literary wakefulness." His caveat, while calling attention to the equal salience of artificial light in erotic and literary contexts, implies that the two spheres of night activity demand mutually exclusive forms of representation; that a lamp in a setting of literary wakefulness—*lucubratio*—is functionally distinct from one in a scene of erotic sleeplessness. My sense of an elegiac *lucubratio*, in which amatory night work is figured in terms of nocturnal literary activity, obviates this binary. For more discussion of the relationship between the *topos* of erotic wakefulness and what I am styling as elegiac *lucubratio*, see above, Part II, Overview: *Lucubratio* and its Literary Legacy.

[8] For which, cf. Prop. 1.16.5 (*nocturnis potorum … rixis*); 2.19.5 (*ante tuas orietur rixa fenestras*); 4.8.19 (*turpis in arcana sonuit cum rixa taberna*). A reminder, though, of Ker's (2004), 215 attachment of the virtue of the bedroom as locale for *lucubratio* to the permission it grants for "a relaxation of public behavior" will reinscribe the activity of exclusion, when performed in an environment of bedroom inclusion, in the paradigm of acceptable—even desirable—lucubratory conduct.

demonstrates a degree of discipline, from the modulation of the activity itself—now hot and heavy (*nam modo … luctata*), now held in check (*interdum … duxit … moram*), rather than a frenzied free-for-all—to the coercion of the body to resist, rather than succumb to, basic impulse (that *lapsos patefecit ocellos* again). The role the mistress plays in facilitating this display of willpower allows the elegiac relationship to confer on the lover those qualities of restraint and perseverance vaunted in the practitioner of *lucubratio* and otherwise denied the *amator*.[9] The implication being that rechanneling energy spent on the mistress toward nobler pursuits (*studia severa*, for example) would not inculcate in the poet-lover a virgin diligence and bodily mastery; these attributes are already on display in the erotic encounter.

So much so, in fact, that they are applicable to elegiac experiences outside of the poet-lover's own, as when he predicts for his wayward friend Gallus, accused of making eyes at Cynthia, that *non tibi iam somnos, non illa relinquet ocellos;/illa ferox animis alligat una viros* (no sleep for you now, she won't let your eyes rest; relentless, she singlehandedly holds men fast in her will, 1.5.11-12). It is, it would seem, an essential faculty of the elegiac mistress to elicit from the lover the kind of physical discipline on display in the lucubrator—the ability to forsake

[9] A full survey of invocations of the intemperance of the lover is beyond my capacity here, and so some choice words from Cicero and Lucretius will have to be representative. First, Cicero, who notes the impulsivity of *amor*: *impulsio est quae sine cogitatione per quandam affectionem animi facere aliquid hortatur, ut amor … et omnino omnia in quibus animus ita videtur affectus fuisse ut rem perspicere cum consilio et cura non potuerit et id quod fecit impetu quodam animi potius quam cogitatione fecerit* ("Impulse" is what compels us to do something without forethought, in a certain state of mind, as does love … and every condition altogether in which the mind seems to have been so affected that it was not able to reflect with judgment and attention and did what it did out of a particular persuasion of mind rather than out of consideration, *de Inv*. 2.5.17). And now, Lucretius, who observes the voracity of the sexual appetites of *amantes*: *nec satiare queunt spectando corpora coram/nec manibus quicquam teneris abradere membris/possunt errantes incerti corpore toto* (they can neither satisfy their bodies with face-to-face observation, nor are they able to tear away anything with their hands from their delicate limbs, ranging uncertain over the entire body, *DRN* 4.1102-4).

sleep, to keep the eyes open; essential and unique, given the inextricable identification of this compelling force with her person (*animis*), and her person alone (*una*).[10]

We are, then, in this opening pastiche of 2.15, presented with the image of erotic undertakings as an exercise not in abandon, but rigor (conveyed by the resistance of impulse born of dedication to the activity itself); not in idleness, but productivity, as the emphasis on creative engagement (*narramus verba*) and the imputation of sloth to the indulgence of fatigue (*sicine, lente, iaces?*) suggest. In this paradigm, laziness is associated not with the practice of erotic-elegiac intercourse, but with its non-performance. Comparably to the dynamic patterned in poem 2.3, where it was withdrawal from elegiac activity that represented indolence, it is when the poet-lover flags in his engagement in the erotic proceedings that he is accused of being *lentus*—an adjective that, in the Propertian corpus, signals a condition of indifference that precludes elegiac efficacy: as at 1.6.11-12, where those who can remain unmoved by the imprecations of a mistress are foresworn (*ah pereat, si quis lentus amare potest,* ah, may he perish, whoever can be in love and be unmoved); at 1.15.4, where a non-compliant Cynthia is maligned as being *in nostro lenta timore* (unmoved by our anxiety); and again at 2.14.22, where the amatory hopes of other would-be suitors are dashed by Cynthia's preference for the poet-lover (*pulsabant alii frustra…/…lenta puella*, others were knocking in vain … the girl was unmoved). The point being that to be *lentus* is to be hostile to the enactment of elegy, to prevent its realization; and the poet-lover's lassitude in 2.15, encapsulated in *lente* and so couched in the language of elegiac dereliction, reinforces the sense that it is not erotic behavior that represents indolence, but its cessation.

[10] A predication that recalls the singularity of the chosen beloved to the elegiac project familiar from Tibullus 1.5, where Delia was the *sine qua non* of the erotic-poetic experience—on which cf. Gutzwiller (2015), 27 and the relevant discussion in Chapter 2: The Dream Defended.

This conception of erotic-elegiac engagement as productive performance continues to color the account, all the while flirting with the theme of visibility and light. First, in the poet-lover's axiomatic reflection on the appropriate approach to sexual conduct: *non iuvat in caeco Venerem corrumpere motu:/si nescis, oculi sunt in amore duces* (there's no good in compromising pleasure with blind groping: I'll have you know, the eyes lead the way in love, 2.15.11-12). The erotic project is here intimately tied to sight—anatomical, yes, as the platitude in the pentameter makes clear, but equally, if subtly, elemental. Dismissing as deficient moves that are *caeci* exploits the lexicographical overlap between quality of sight—where *caecus* reads as unseeing, blind—and quality of light, where it registers as dark, obscure; and conveys, in the single adjective, both the cause and the effect of the lover's inadequate outreach: unbroken darkness creates functional blindness, which in turn undermines the erotic experience. To declare that love in the dark is incomplete is to suggest that some modicum of light is necessary to allow a full sexual experience—to allow, that is, the lover to perform his night work;[11] and thus the commingling of light and dark (already signaled by the oxymoronic *nox candida* of the opening line)[12] is as essential to elegiac-erotic pursuits as it is to the practice of *lucubratio*.

To highlight the importance of light in the dark to the elegiac project, there comes a reiteration of the motif in the poet-lover's *carpe diem* reflections:

> dum nos fata sinunt, oculos satiemus amore:
> nox tibi longa venit, nec reditura dies.
> atque utinam haerentis sic nos vincire catena
> velles, ut numquam solveret ulla dies! …
> sic nobis, qui nunc magnum spiramus amantes,
> forsitan includet crastina fata dies. (2.15.23-26, 53-54)
>
> While fate allows us, let us feast our eyes in love:
> a long night approaches for you, and daylight will not return.
> And would that you'd lock us up with chain as we clasp each other,

[11] Cf. Bouquet (1996), 203: "La nuit n'est heureuse que lorsqu'elle est illuminée."
[12] Cf. Clarke (2003), 60-61: "*Nox candida* is an oxymoron, playing upon two meanings of *candidus*: 'happy' and 'bright.'"

so no day would ever dissolve the bond! …
So for us, who now draw generous breath as lovers,
perhaps tomorrow's light will bring our lives to a close.

Detectable in these *pro forma* admonitions is a characterization of the end of love in terms of a polarization of darkness and daylight. It is the utter darkness of a night uninterrupted by day (*nox … longa venit, nec reditura dies*, a metaphor for death, but the implications of the light-dark imagery are no less significant for it)[13] that spells the end for productive erotic-elegiac activity. The euphemistic clarion call to persist in the amatory practice by giving the eyes their fill (*oculos satiemus amore*) hearkens back to the poet-lover's predication of efficacious erotic engagement on visibility and the light that confers it (*non iuvat in caeco … motu/…oculi sunt in amore duces*); and reiterates the centrality of light to the elegiac project.

But that very light unbroken by darkness is equally inimical to the erotic performance: it is pure daylight that is recognized as the force that sunders lovers (*ut numquam solveret ulla dies*), reasserting night as the definitive temporal locus of amatory assignation; and it is pure daylight that becomes a corresponding metaphor for death (*includet crastina fata dies*), making sheer light just as salient an element in forestalling elegiac activity as absolute darkness. The conditions for erotic-elegiac productivity require the presence of both—an *apposita lucerna* in a darkened bedroom—and the balance of dark and light accordingly informs the structure of the poem itself. Bookended by *nox* in line 1 (and a *nox candida*, at that, a pairing no longer quite so paradoxical given the mutual implication of darkness and light in elegiac performance)[14] and *dies* in line 54, the poetic action unfolds between the two poles of night and day, inhabiting a literary half-light that replicates on the page the environment experienced when loving through

[13] Cf. Richardson (2006), *ad loc.* where he calls attention to the thematic integrity of the line in its "return to the paradox of the beginning of the poem, where night was called *candida*."
[14] Cf. Richardson (2006), *ad loc*. where he notes its implication in the "play of light and darkness through the poem", a motif that goes beyond play when it is enfolded into the *lucubratio topos*.

the night—both the partial illumination of lamplight in the dark and the gradual incursion of daylight into darkness—and that speaks to the setting of *lucubratio*.

The Conceit

This is to say nothing of the representational dimension of elegy; and indeed, the expression of loving in the terms of *lucubratio* has enough significance on the level of the text that we could reasonably forgo plumbing the sub-text. But factoring in the metapoetic potential of the elegiac mistress to represent poetry itself—a reading advanced by Maria Wyke and embraced by scholarship in her wake—[15] deepens the resonance between amatory and literary night work. For if, as Wyke has compellingly argued, "the title *Cynthia* may be read as a term in the statement of a poetics" that "contributes significantly to the expression of literary concerns"—namely, by doubling as a cipher for the poetic project itself—then the poet-lover's relationship with his beloved becomes a figuration of his relationship with poetry.[16]

To play this out in poem 2.15: when the mistress is read as poetry incarnate, the poet-lover's night with her becomes more than a sexual dalliance—it amounts to a dedication of his after-hours to engagement with and in the poetic craft. The dynamics of their interaction, then, come to chart the vicissitudes of the creative process: their exchange of words (*narramus*) speaks to forthcoming verse; their tussling (*rixa, mecumst luctata*), to a resistant muse.[17] When the poet-lover recounts the teasing pace of the action, it is in language (*duxit … moram*) whose metaphorical capacity to represent the act of composition has been detailed by Kathleen

[15] Wyke (2007), 11-77. See also Gold (1993) for development of Wyke's seminal alignment of "mistress and metaphor."
[16] Wyke, (2007), 28, 45.
[17] The metaphorical capacity of *luctor* to convey the struggle to write will, in fact, be tapped explicitly by Ovid in *Pont*. 1.5.13-14, where he laments that both he and his poetry alike have been derailed by exile: *luctor deducere versum,/sed non fit fato mollior ille meo* (I am struggling to produce poetry, but the poetry comes out no more agreeable than my fate). Note also the use of (*de)duco* to describe the act of composing poetry, an idiom that will presently become central to the discussion.

McNamee: "the literary meaning of *duco* and its compounds," she discerns, "imports a literary subtext into passages that seem to describe only erotic actions."[18] Thus Cynthia's introduction of a pause in the erotic proceedings acquires, through this double valence of *duxit*, poetic significance: it transforms the sex act into an act of literature, suggesting an introduction of a pause not only in the writing process, but even, perhaps, in the poetry itself—a central caesura in a pentameter line, say, as line 6 happens to be.[19]

It is worth introducing a pause of my own, here, to observe the occurrence of similar language in a similar context elsewhere in the corpus that similarly contributes to a meta-depiction of elegiac night activity. There is poem 1.10, which witnesses the poet-lover turned witness to another's erotic success:

> O noctem meminisse mihi iucunda voluptas,
> o quotiens votis illa vocanda meis,
> cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella
> vidimus et longa ducere verba mora!
> quamvis labentis premeret mihi somnus ocellos
> et mediis caelo Luna ruberet equis … (1.10.3-8.)
>
> O the sweet pleasure I take in remembering that night,
> O how often it is mentioned in my prayers,
> when we saw you, Gallus, wasting away in the arms of your girl
> and forming words around a pregnant pause!
> Although sleep was weighing on my drooping eyes
> and the moon was glowing, her horses at midpoint in the sky …

[18] McNamee (1993), 217.

[19] Indeed, *mora* has been marshalled as somewhat of a literary concept in studies of poetic closure, as by Fowler (1997), 16 who, in a discussion of Silver Age poetry, points to "the *morae* of these epics, their refusal to move toward their end" as a device by which the poets can exert control over their material and the experience of consuming it; a phenomenon discussed by Masters (1992), 5-6 in the context of Lucan: "Powerless as Lucan may be to prevent the final catastrophe, he has at least the power, as poet, of delaying it within his poem." A similar effect could be attached to the *duxit … moram* of Prop. 2.15.6 (recapitulated in *oscula sunt labris* ***morata*** *tuis* at 2.15.10)—a prolonging of the amatory act that amounts to a forestalling of poetic closure. Not to go unremarked is the recuperation of erotic idleness as poetic productivity inherent in this kind of literary *mora*, in that by introducing a "pause" in the proceedings—by, essentially, tempering the activity with leisure—the poet-lover is actually advancing his productivity. For more on *mora*'s place in the elegiac orientation: Hunter (2013), 10; Gardner (2008), 68-69; Keith (2001), 310-311; Pucci (1978), 53 where the elegiac *mora* amounts to "A sort of 'detention' within the house" that "assures the continuation of happy love."

The scene and the language in which it is invoked (*o noctem*; *o quotiens*) anticipate the poet-lover's commemoration of his own experience in 2.15 (*nox o*; *quam multa; quantaque*), though here it is the moon that provides the light (*luna ruberet*); and here it is Gallus—that same Gallus accused, in poem 1.5, of making eyes at Cynthia—who is producing the language (*ducere verba*) and injecting the pause (*longa … mora*). McNamee observes in these words the representation of "the slow process of composition as the desultory conversation of lovers and their languid sighs."[20] I would, once more, contend that the *longa mora*, as in 2.15, makes that composition specifically elegiac, referencing the pentameter caesura and thus capturing the metrics of elegy in the metrics of elegy.[21] All the more so considering that *mora* not only occurs, yet again, in the pentameter line, but *longa* even introduces the break.

And there is poem 1.3, which similarly positions the poet-lover as third-party to his mistresses' nocturnal affairs:

> donec diversas praecurrens luna fenestras,
> luna moraturis sedula luminibus,
> compositos levibus radiis patefecit ocellos.
> sic ait … (1.3.31-34)
>
> Until the moon, making its way past the parted windows,
> the moon, eager for its glow to linger,
> opened her shuttered eyes with its delicate rays.
> And this is what she said …

[20] McNamee (1993), 217-18.

[21] That *mora* could signal a metrical break does not seem too much of a stretch if its use to indicate a pause in speech is considered, as at Cic. *Orat*. 53 (*distincta alios et interpuncta intervalla, morae respirationesque delectant*, others are partial to defined and differentiated silences, pauses and breaks to draw breath); and at Var. *gram*. 278 (*longitudinem tempore ac syllabis metimur, nam et quantum morae enuntiandis uerbis teratur et quanto numero modoque syllabarum unumquodque sit uerbum, plurimum refert*, we measure duration in time and syllables, for both how long of a pause is spent when pronouncing words and what number and length of syllables each of the words has is of greatest consequence). Indeed, Ovid deploys it to this end in his breakdown of elegiac metrical possibilities at *Pont*. 4.12.12-14: *fiat ut e longa syllaba prima breuis,/aut ut ducatur quae nunc correptius exit/et sit porrecta longa secunda mora* (see that the first syllable is made from long to short, or the one that now ends in a short is drawn out, and the second syllable becomes long through a protracted pause).

As in 1.10, it is the moon that provides the illumination; and as in the spirit of *lucubratio*, it is this light that enables poetic activity: it is only once the light source has been introduced that Cynthia, until then ensconced in *ingrato … somno* (ungrateful sleep, l. 25), is roused to deliver her lover's lament and elegy is, in earnest, enacted. And enacted on two levels: for the poet-lover, who, initially denied erotic-poetic relations thanks to that *ingratus somnus*, is now able to experience elegiac inclusion through interaction with his mistress. And for Cynthia, who takes on the persona of the stock elegiac *amator* in her airing of amatory grievances, thus becoming, in this lucubratory context, a *poet*-lover in her own right through her production of elegiac content.[22]

The content of that content, too, is rooted in the *topos* of night work:

> 'nam modo purpureo fallebam stamine somnum,
> rursus et Orpheae carmine, fessa, lyrae;
> interdum leviter mecum deserta querebar
> externo longas saepe in amore moras' (1.3.41-44)
>
> 'Well, the first time I warded off sleep with purple thread,
> and the second, weary though I was, with a verse from Orpheus' lyre;
> but all the while, a woman abandoned, I was quietly grumbling to myself
> that often, in the love of another, the lulls are long'

Cynthia's attestation of her own diligence in her lover's absence nests *lucubratio* within *lucubratio*: here she is, in the image of Penelope and Lucretia (paragons, both, of nocturnal enterprise), dutifully working her loom;[23] and here she is, in the literary version of night work, exchanging the loom for the lyre and the poetic pursuits it signals.[24] All of this carried by the

[22] Cf. Kaufhold (1997), 94 ff.; James (2010), 335; Harmon (1974), 163-164.
[23] For the visual references to Penelope and Lucretia, see: Harrison (1994), 23 and n.22; Tatham (2000), 52; Merriam (2007), 260; Heath (2011b), 74-76; Robinson (2013), 107; et al. And for broader discussion of textile work and its gender and spatio-temporal associations: Öhrman (2020).
[24] And yet, even the prosaic task of wool-working is injected with a tinge of the poetic, if the *purpureum stamen*—tied to the imagery of Ariadne and her guiding thread, cf. Elsner (2007), 26; Richardson (2006), 156—can also convey literary conceits, as Horace's *purpureus pannus* will at *Ars* 15-16. For the poetic uses and significations of purple: Clarke (2003), 126-134, esp. 129-130 for discussion of its appearance in Prop. 1.3.41.

current of her own elegiac outpouring—elegiac both for its nature (*querebar*, that most stereotypically elegiac of utterances)[25] and for its quality (*leviter*, that most elegiac of adverbs). That the outpouring itself alludes to the process of elegiac composition only deepens the resonance: the introduction of *longas … moras*—and their close identification with the erotic experience (*longas … **in amore** moras*)—evokes, as in 1.10, the pentameter caesura at the very point at which the pentameter caesura occurs (*longas*), creating poetry within poetry within the context of nocturnal engagement.

And so the specificity of the poetic activity depicted is not insignificant. When interaction with Cynthia represents not a generic literary event, but the particular composition of elegiac poetry, right down to the variation in meter, the virtues of the *lucubratio* practice are conferred directly on elegy and its devotees. In this framework, the performance of the elegiac poet-lover is not just theoretically analogous to the practice of the lucubrator, but is methodologically equivalent to it. More than a mere shadow of the custom, elegy fully embodies it from context to content. Through the synthesis of loving and composing, the amatory event becomes a literary event, now an in-kind instantiation of *lucubratio*—and equal participant in its culture.

When, for example, the poet-lover pronounces himself *felix* for his night with Cynthia, he capitalizes on the potential of the adjective to mean not just fortunate, but fruitful, not just fruitful, but finely crafted, to convey the quantity and quality of his poetic output—and, accordingly, his own industriousness.[26] And when Cynthia demands vigilance from her flagging lover, when she forces his eyes open and puts an end to his somnolence (*illa meos somno lapsos patefecit ocellos*), it is a vindication of elegiac composition as an exacting exercise—as a

[25] On which, see James (2003b), 108ff. and (2010), 335 for a discussion of Cynthia's speech in 1.3 and its participation in the conventions of elegiac utterance.
[26] *OLD s.v.* 1, 7. Ovid *Am*. 1.3.19 also employs *felix* in this way: *te mihi materiem felicem in carmina praebe* (offer yourself to me as ample material for my songs).

struggle against impulse in the interest of higher literary endeavor—and one need only recall Seneca's description of the rigor of his own *lucubratio* practice (*oculos vigilia fatigatos cadentesque in opera detineo*, *Ep.* 8.1) to appreciate how tailored its fit for elegiac pursuits.

To which end: consider the implications of the poet-lover's claim to the transcendence that erotic success promises:

> quod mihi si interdum talis concedere noctes
> illa velit, vitae longus et annus erit.
> si dabit et multas, fiam immortalis in illis:
> nocte una quivis vel deus esse potest. (2.15.37-40)
>
> but if she is willing to grant to me nights such as this
> from time to time, even a year of life will be long.
> And if she allows many, I will become immortal in their course:
> in a single night, anyone can even be a god.

The programmatic appeal to poetic immortality, conventionally affixed to the endurance of the written word itself,[27] is here directed toward nights spent with the mistress—and redirected, when Cynthia is read allegorically, to nights spent on elegy. By practicing love, the poet is practicing art, and the continued performance of physical intimacy translates into the persistence of poetry. The nocturnal hours devoted to erotic-elegiac activity grant the kind of apotheosis that is typically the domain of literature: it is in in their course that the poet-lover is projected beyond himself, that he ceases to live for the instant (*vitae longus et annus erit*) and is reoriented toward a future in which he is no longer defined by a singular, self-contained experience (as suggests the emphasis on the plural: *si dabit et* ***multas****, fiam immortalis in* ***illis***). He becomes, in other words,

[27] Examples of this device are numerous, but are perhaps most paradigmatically represented by Catullus 1.1.9-10 (*quod* [sc. *libellum*] … *plus uno maneat perenne saeclo*, may this book endure beyond one eternal age) and Horace 3.30 (of which let the first line be representative: *exegi monumentum aere perennnius*, I have wrought a monument more eternal than bronze). Prop. 3.2 directly invokes the immortalizing power of the written word: *carmina erunt … monumenta* (my poems will be monuments, l. 11) and *at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aevo/excidet* (but my name, earned through my talent, will not be lost to time, ll. 25-26); while 2.14.9-10 includes a pronouncement of erotic immortality similar to that in 2.15: *quanta ego praeterita collegi gaudia nocte*/*immortalis ero, si altera talis erit* (how much delight I reaped this past night: I will be immortal, if there will be another such one).

a monument for posterity, unbound from the specificity of the now and representative of more than his singular experience.

Not, perhaps, what we would expect for the elegiac poet-lover, whose *raison d'être* is, ostensibly, the seizing of the day and the gratification of the instant. It is, however, in-keeping with the image of the practitioner of *lucubratio*, the consequentiality of whose efforts, however closely identified with the solitary experience of the individual (the *clausum cubiculum*), is located precisely in their being channeled toward something beyond—*posterorum negotium ago*, to invoke Seneca again (*Ep*. 8.2). So it is that sex, when read as an act of poetic composition, allows the erotic-elegiac project to be, in its own right, a true practice of *lucubratio*, wherein the poet-lover devotes his night to the production of poetry that will effect his transcendence of time and self.

The Convention

It is for this reason that inclusion is so central a state of affairs to the expression of elegiac *lucubratio*. By virtue of the assimilation of loving and writing, the erotic cannot be separated from the poetry that catalogues it—is thematically and mechanically integral to the elegiac poetic craft. In short, the immediacy of being together with the mistress is what gives rise to poetry. Erotic success spells creative success—poetic productivity attends bedding the beloved—and thus the virtue of valuable industriousness conferred by the *lucubratio* practice can be claimed by the poet-lover in the course of an erotic-poetic night.

Such an alignment of loving and composing is not without precedent, nor is its complementarity with the theme of sleeplessness unexamined.[28] The inklings of it are there in the legacy of literary tribute to Aratus passed from Callimachus to Cinna, in which inheritance

[28] See, among others, Fernández Contreras (2000); Bouquet (1996); Segal (1970).

Richard Thomas traces the development of the representation of eroticized sleeplessness as a component of poetic composition.[29] They are detectable in Lucretius, who couches the trope of literary sleeplessness in the context of his collegial desire for Memmius.[30] And they are certainly present in Catullus, specifically in *c.* 50, which models a more explicit marriage of the distinct erotic and productive natures of sleeplessness.[31]

But just as notable as what these poets do—namely, amalgamate the erotic and poetic capacities of wakefulness—is what they do not do. They do not integrate the circumstance of being with the object of desire and that of nighttime composition. Poetry, instead, happens in a state of exclusion. For Lucretius, it is the thought of union to come that enables poetic productivity:

> sed tua me virtus tamen et sperata voluptas
> suavis amicitiae quemvis efferre laborem
> suadet et inducit noctes vigilare serenas (*DRN* 1.140-42)
>
> and yet, your quality and the anticipated enjoyment
> of your pleasant company convinces me to carry out any task
> there is and spurs me to stay up during the silent nights

Here, in *sperata voluptas/suavis amicitiae*, is the injection of the desiderative into the poetic process, that envisioned pleasure of another's company—a pleasure ironically comparable in expression (*sperata voluptas*), if not in essence (*amicitia* rather than *amor*), to that envisioned by the *exclusus amator* Lucretius so maligns—proffered as the fuel that keeps the night light burning and the verse flowing (*tua ... virtus ... et ... voluptas ... suadet et inducit*).

And for Catullus, it is the memory of union past:

> Atque illinc abii tuo leopre
> incensus, Licini, facetiisque,

[29] Thomas (1979), 195 ff.
[30] While Thomas (1979) does not account for Lucretius in his genealogy of the trope of erotic-poetic sleeplessness, Henkel (2011), 181 and n. 5 does locate Lucretius' dedication to Memmius in this lineage and offers a treatment of—and collation of scholarship on—the point of Lucretius' evocation of Callimachus' epigram.
[31] For discussion of which, see Thomas (1979), 201-203.

ut nec me miserum cibus iuvaret
nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos,
sed toto indomitus furore lecto
versarer, cupiens videre lucem,
ut tecum loquerer simulque ut essem.
At defessa labore membra postquam
semimortua lectulo iacebant,
hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci … (Cat. 50.7-16)

And I came away from there inflamed
by your charm, Licinus, and by your wit,
such that neither food could please me, in my condition,
nor could sleep blanket my eyes in rest.
But I, overcome with passion, am tossed about
all over the bed, longing to see the light,
so that I can speak with you and be with you at once.
But once my limbs, wearied by the exertion,
were lying half-dead on the mattress,
I made this poem for you, delightful man

A cause-and-effect relationship is modeled between the experience of loving and the act of writing that casts the enjoyment of togetherness, and the erotic sleeplessness it inspires, as a precursor to poetry, necessary to, but not coterminous with, the literary act. It is the poet's sensual recollection of his time with his friend that creates the conditions for poetic rumination (*tuo lepore/incensus … ut*)—the physical agita of insatiability and insomnia, which in turn give way to the psychic cycle of longing and ideation and, out of it, composition.[32] For it is only after the physical throes of passion have subsided (*at defessa labore membra postquam*/*semimortua lectulo iacebant*) that writing is undertaken (*hoc…tibi poema feci*); and it is, again, in the mold of the *exclusus amator*, who longs for what is not present (*cupiens … ut tecum loquerer simulque ut essem*), that the poet takes to his work.

[32] The desire for future reconnection expressed in *cupiens videre lucem/ut tecum loquerer simulque ut essem* might seem to undermine my characterization of Catullus' erotic-poetic episode as attributable to a past amatory event. A fair point—certainly the desire for reunion contributes to the erotic angst—to which I would say that the longing for togetherness-to-come is, by virtue of the *ut* clause in line 9, rooted in the past amatory experience, and thus that it is the lingering taste of union that engenders a craving for more.

All of this has been to say that the figuration of loving as *lucubratio* in Propertius is neither whole-cloth innovation nor so derivative as to be unremarkable. By playing with the same theme of erotic-poetic sleeplessness explored by Callimachus and developed by Cinna, Lucretius, and Catullus, he participates in a tradition of aligning the amatory and the literary that is germane to both Alexandrian and Republican Roman poetics, whose influence on elegy hardly needs further attestation.[33] But by reworking the trope in terms of inclusion, he makes the physical act of love as integral to the poetic process as its ideation. In this framework, to be engaged in intimacy is to be creatively employed: the mistress quite literally provides the body of work over which the poet-lover, in his nocturnal endeavors, labors—whether or not that body is read metaphorically—and the literary act is not just born of the erotic experience, but is synonymous with it.[34]

The Concordance

The expression of elegiac activity in the terms of *lucubratio* thus comes to constitute its own poetic idiom. There are flashes of it at work in poem 2.14, which plays with many of the same themes that appear in its companion piece, poem 2.15: erotic-poetic efficacy and eternality as contingent on nocturnal intimacy (*quanta ego praeterita collegi gaudia nocte:/immortalis ero, si altera talis erit*, how much pleasure I reaped last night: I'll live forever, if another such night is

[33] All the same, a few sources are in order: Hunter (2012) and (2006); Zetzel (1983); Thomas (1979); Clausen (1970) and (1964) on Callimachus and Catullus; Keith (2008), 45-85 on Callimachus and Propertius; Cairns (1979) on Callimachus and Tibullus; Lateiner (1978) on Callimachus and Ovid.

[34] In this way, the representation of elegiac *lucubratio* can be approached as participating in the *topos* of poetic simultaneity, defined by Volk (2002), 13 as "the illusion that the poem is really only coming into being as it evolves before the reader's eyes, that the poet/persona is composing it 'as we watch'." A representational conceit that notably overlaps with the performative quality of a literary portrayal of *lucubratio*, which Ker (2004), 240 distinguishes as "efficacious as a performance of writing … it makes possible a shared experience of space and time between author and audience". This device is more discussed in Ovid than in his fellow elegists, for which see: Volk (2002), 157-195 on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris* and (1997) on the *Fasti*; and Heath (2011a) on the *Metamorphoses*.

in my future, ll. 9-10); inclusion as a precondition for erotic-poetic productivity (*nec mihi ploranti lenta sedere potest*, she is no longer able to remain indifferent to my pining, ll. 13-14, where we have the recurrence of *lentus* to signal anti-elegiac conditions); the association of utter darkness with erotic-poetic fruitlessness (*ante pedes caecis lucebat nobis*, the path was clear before my feet, but I was blind, l. 17), which again taps into the double valence of *caecus* as lightless/unseeing, the profundity of which condition is made all the more palpable by the juxtaposition of illumination in *luceo*—for all their adjacence on the page, they remain polarized in practice.

And as it employs these familiar themes, it introduces others:

> nunc ad te, mea lux, veniatne ad litora navis
> servata, an mediis sidat onusta vadis. (2.14.29-30)
>
> now it is left to you, my light, whether my ship comes to shore
> safe, or whether it founders, overburdened, in the middle of the surge.

While in 2.15 the mistress enables erotic-poetic productivity as the impetus, literal and metaphorical, that compels the poet-lover to keep at it, in 2.14 she does so as the force governing the success of his endeavors. It is by her hand that he sinks or swims (*ad te*), and thus her centrality to the elegiac project is, between 2.14 and 2.15, enacted on two levels: the external in 2.14, where she represents determinative influence, and the internal in 2.15, where she acts as driving impulsion.

But it is her invocation, in line 29, as *mea lux* on which I would like to focus, the implications of which are likewise layered. To begin with the outer: within the strict metaphor of seafaring, the beloved as *mea lux* operates as a guiding light, a beacon whose presence determines the fate of the lover-cum-sailor as he navigates the depths. When the world of the metaphor is expanded, though, its place in a representation of *lucubratio* can be appreciated. For while Lawrence Richardson, in his commentary on these lines, limits them to the tropal tradition

of the "ship of love",[35] equally germane, to my mind, is the sailing-as-writing metaphor, a mainstay of metapoetics well beyond elegy,[36] and one to which Propertius repeatedly turns throughout his corpus.

An early *recusatio* in Book III makes the terms of the metaphor, as deployed by Propertius, explicit:

> cur tua praescriptos evectast pagina gyros?
> non est ingenii cumba gravanda tui.
> alter remus aquas alter tibi radat harenas,
> tutus eris: medio maxima turba marist. (3.3.21-24)
>
> Why has your page been carried off its prescribed course?
> The skiff of your talent should not be over-burdened.
> Let one of your oars skim the waves, the other the sand,
> and you will be safe: the greatest turbulence is in the middle of the sea.

In language that echoes the plea in poem 2.14—from the freighted vessel (*cumba gravanda* vis-à-vis the *navis ... onusta* of 2.14.29-30) to the fraught distance from shore (*medio ... mari* vis-à-vis the *mediis ... vadis* of 2.14.30)—the poet-lover's verse (*tua…pagina*) is envisioned as a humble craft (*ingenii cumba*) better suited to the shallows of elegy (*alter remus aquas alter tibi radat harenas*) than the depths of more serious composition (*medio maxima turba marist*). In light of this expression of the metaphor, the ship of poetry seems as likely an allegory to be at work in 2.14 as the ship of love; and indeed, both valences can obtain at once. But if we embrace the salience of the sailing-as-writing representation, we can recontextualize the beloved—responsible, as *mea lux*, for the guidance of the ship—as responsible for the guidance of poetry, the light that makes its realization possible.

[35] Richardson (2006), 254. He points to Meleager's use of the allegory in *Anth. Pal*. 12.167 as precedent. The speaker's self-characterization, in line 4 of that epigram, as τὸν ναύτην Κύπριδος ἐν πελάγει (sailor on the sea of love) neatly encapsulates the allegory, but it is the theme of the poem in its entirety.
[36] See Curtius (2013), 128-130 on the sailing-as-writing metaphor in Roman literature; and Harrison (2007a) for a thorough discussion of the figure in the poetry of Catullus, Vergil, and Horace.

And not just any poetry. There is again the specification of elegiac verse in the alignment of capability with the shore (*ad litora navis/servata*) and futility with the open water (*mediis sidat vadis*)—if, that is, we can import the associations from poem 3.3. Bear in mind that these lines conclude a poem that, like 2.15, commemorates a night of love and calls for more to come, and the facets of *lucubratio* surface. By factoring for the poet-lover, in his nocturnal erotic-poetic endeavors, as *mea lux*—as the element governing the course of the poetry—the mistress becomes the very light that enables literary activity in the dark.[37] She becomes, in Quintilian's words, the *lumen unum* in the lucubratory scene, and the elegiac erotic encounter thus an instantiation of the studied practice.

This framework—in which the elegiac relationship and its actualization are remade in the image of a formalized *lucubratio*—thus allows nocturnal engagement with the mistress to represent diligent literary enterprise from multiple angles. She is at once internal to the practice as the very object of the exercise, the literal and figurative *corpus* to which the poet-lover devotes his downtime and energy; and external to it, as the force that compels his effort, as the light that enables his work.[38] Suffice it to say that she is integral to the erotic-poetic project—not just as a source of inspiration (as in the experience of the *exclusus*), but as the very substance of the work (a role she can only play in a state of inclusion). In more abstract terms, attainment makes, and makes for, poetry in a way distinct from aspiration: in the lucubratory way of diligent work and productive use of time.

---

[37] Cf. Prop. 2.3.12, where Cynthia is similarly positioned as a guiding light (*oclui, geminae, sidera nostra, faces*, her eyes, those twin torches, our stars), an assimilation that can acquire broader thematic significance if considered in light of the connection O'Neil (1958) elucidates between Cynthia and the moon.

[38] It is possible to see in this duality of Cynthia as both external force and internal compulsion a marriage of distinct Greek concepts of desire, distinguished by Gutzwiller (2015), 24-25 along the lines of ἔρως, "a desire for another arising from outside oneself", and ἵμερος, "attraction from within to what is present." Her sense that Roman *amor* embraces a wider spectrum of emotions and emotional relationships that Greek tends to delegate to different words (ἔρως, ἵμερος, πόθος, φιλία, στοργή) can thus be seen to be enacted in this positioning of the Roman beloved—the representation of *amor*—as both internal and external to the erotic-poetic project.

It is for this reason that the poet-lover can boast of the legitimacy of his sexploits,

> … haud umquamst culta labore Venus.
> percontere licet: saepest experta puella
> officium tota nocte valere meum. (2.22.22-24)[39]
>
> … hardly ever has tending to Venus been work.
> Go ahead, fact-check it: often has a girl learned
> that my service is good for the whole night.

characterizing his nocturnal habits in language (*officium*) that, while tinged with sexual suggestion,[40] cannot help but evoke Cicero's more stolid admonition to discharge one's duty not only when on the clock, but when off it:

> nulla enim vitae pars neque publicis neque privatis neque forensibus neque domesticis in rebus, neque si tecum agas quid, neque si cum altero contrahas, vacare officio potest, in eoque et colendo sita vitae est honestas omnis et neglegendo turpitudo. (*de Off.* 1.2.4)
>
> For no part of life—neither in public affairs nor private, at the office or at home, whether you're acting on your own or whether you're dealing with another—can be absent one's duty; indeed, every honor in life is found in tending to it, while every disgrace in its neglect.

It is not just the terminology that puts the two in conversation; the contextual markers do, too. Cicero outlines an approach to *officium* that binds it inextricably to one's person—it is not a job that is self-contained, but a responsibility that is always carried—and thus it is just as salient in one's personal time (*privatis*, *domesticis*, *si tecum agas quid*) as in one's professional ventures (*publicis*, *forensibus*, *si cum altero contrahas*). To this end, it is a concern that needs to be attended (*colendo*); and it is the very act of attending—even more so, it seems, than the nature of the service itself—to which respectability is attached (*in eoque … colendo sita … es honestas*). As a barometer of *honestas*, the performance is the thing: the devotion of one's energy to the officiation of one's *officum*—whatever one's *officium*, whenever it is officiated—is the token of

[39] And even here there is a whiff of the wick: *numquam ad formosas*, *invide, caecus ero* (never, you hater, will I be blind to beauty, l. 20) the poet-lover taunts his detractor just prior, aligning, as we have seen before, unbroken darkness (*caecus*) with erotic-poetic ineptitude.

[40] *OLD s.v.* 1c, where *officium* denotes sexual favor. Cf. Platter (1995), 219 who notes that "The sexual sense of duty appears to have been fairly widespread both in poetry and in Roman culture generally", and who suggests (220) that "it is likely that Catullus and the Augustan poets first problematized its ambivalence."

personal value and time well-spent.[41] An approach from which the poet-lover seems to have taken some cues: in his ready attendance to amorous concerns (*culta … Venus*, which incidentally uses Cicero's verb, *colo*, to characterize the ministration), and his assimilation of such erotic activity to civic responsibility (with *officium* as euphemism for *Venus*).

This latter alignment can be, and has been, read as wry—the perversity of painting sex as a moral obligation, the inside joke of such inverted embodiment of cultural norms.[42] It can also lean on the love-as-*lucubratio* lexicon to convey something more earnest than erotic cheekiness. When loving is elegizing and elegizing is *officium* and *officium* is administered *tota nocte*, the poet-lover can participate in the culture of *honestas* that Cicero predicates on performance. See him, doing his duty, even when the exigencies of polite society are not there to enforce it: during the night, in his personal time (*privatis*), in his personal space (*domesticis*). Whether he acts alone (*si tecum agas*) or with another (*si cum altero contrahas*) depends on how the mistress is interpreted—as body or body of work—but either way, he fulfils Cicero's standard.

It is a moment in which the circumstantial whole contributes something more than the sum of its linguistic parts. Charles Platter has pegged the elegiac appropriation of the language of political *officium* as a move "both to destabilize political discourse by connecting it with the *levia* of poetic speech and to make an implicit claim for the privileged status of poetry as opposed to politics",[43] a terminological takeover that sits happily within my contextual coup. For while Platter's discussion is limited to the use of the term *officium* to describe erotic-poetic conceits, the lucubratory milieu in which those conceits play out only contributes to the point he

[41] Cf. Platter (1995), 219 where the operant qualifications of *officium* as, for example, *meretricium* and *puerile* indicate "that there is a duty appropriate to every class."
[42] See Keith (2008), 139-165 for the phenomenon in Propertius; and Sadlek (2004), 24-54 for the phenomenon in Ovid.
[43] Platter (1995), 216.

is making. It buttresses the claim to poetry's parity with political postures—its vindication of the poetic persuasion through its portrayal in the trappings of accepted practices—by making the ethos that Platter localizes in the single word *officium* a more systematic *topos* on which the poetry can capitalize. In its appropriation of the visual vocabulary of *lucubratio*, the scene of erotic-poetic intercourse can make clear the fundamental concordance of elegiac activity with the culture of polite society—not just its annexation of the language, but its embodiment of the customs.

For Platter, this repositioning of erotic poetry "to rival politics as the true *officium* of a Roman" ultimately threatens to destabilize the poetry itself—to compromise its status as an *otium* that signifies "a kind of political dissent", to sacrifice "the jealously maintained separateness of the elegiac world."[44] But the love-as-*lucubratio topos* allows for this bind to be loosened; indeed, the knot can be tied into the elegiac representational thread. For it achieves, in a sense, a kind of formal inclusion, positioning erotic-poetic pursuits not as exterior to social mores—a parallel (read: non-intersecting) set of values—but on the inside of cultural ethics, working within the existing system rather than using its terms to establish a new one, even while doing so makes the differences between them more salient.

Just as Propertius' depiction of inclusion, which rechoreographs the movements of exclusion in the context of union with the beloved, so his figuration of elegiac *lucubratio* turns on the mutual implication of out and in. The poet-lover's satisfaction, however ironic, of the Ciceronian model of *officium* creates a kind of socio-cultural exclusion-in-inclusion: the poet-lover is inside of the dominant culture, but is not fully inhabiting it—*exclusus* while *inclusus*. He need not, then, compromise his poetic otherness to participate in civic discourse; the amatory-

[44] Platter (1995), 216, 218.

cum-lucubratory exercise allows him to retain his erotic-poetic identity *and* demonstrate its viability as a recognizable source of value. Elegy does not have to be a separate but equal system in order to appeal to social standards—does not have to be a new brand of *officium* in order to claim its properties—nor does it have to compromise its integrity in order to perform the dominant culture.

The *lucubratio topos* enables erotic-poetic pursuits to remain what they are—extracurricular affairs, endeavors of *otium*—while slotting into a cultural paradigm that imparts respectability: *otium*, yes, but not otiose; private, yes, but still participatory. For Alison Keith, this notion of the backhanded civic engagement of the elegiac lifestyle is inherently imperialistic: elegiac o*tium* interlocks with the Roman imperial project, a display case, of sorts, for the material and existential gains that the expansion and consolidation of empire brings.[45] Now, in the theater of *lucubratio*, it can be seen to have consequences both *domi militaeque*: by inhabiting the standards that structure home-spun notions of *Romanitas*, not just by donning the *spolia* of the Roman presence abroad. The poet-lover need not exist outside of the system in order to position his practice as socially worthwhile—he can do so from the inside; and he need not lose his sense of self in the process—even on the inside, he can remain, to some degree, an *exclusus*.

The Counterpoint

Assuming, that is, that he is engaged with his beloved. For if erotic fulfilment represents poetic productivity, erotic frustration likewise reflects literary fruitlessness. As it does in poem 1.5, where the experience of exclusion is presented as one of poetic inefficacy:

> a, mea contemptus quotiens ad limina curres,
> cum tibi singultu fortia verba cadent,
> et tremulus maestis orietur fletibus horror,
> et timor informem ducet in ore notam,

[45] Keith (2008), 165 where "military conquest elicits the 'enjoyment of the fruits of *otium*' and elegiac *otium* in turn parades the commemorates the products and processes of military conquest."

et quaecumque voles fugient tibi verba querenti,
  nec poteris, qui sis aut ubi, nosse miser! (1.5.13-18)

ah yes, how often you'll rush to my threshold after you've been denied,
when heroic words will fail you for your sobbing,
and a quaking tremor break out with a flood of mournful tears,
and distress impress its disfiguring seal on your face,
and wherever you hasten, words will escape you for your keening,
nor will you be able to determine who or where you are, poor man!

The scene stars Gallus again, turned away by his mistress (*contemptus*) and turned into an *exclusus* in his turn toward the familiar demonstrations of the spurned lover, albeit at the door of the poet-lover (*mea … ad limina curres*), rather than the beloved. Demonstrations that feature the breakdown of language into inarticulate utterance—words are lost amid weeping (*singultu … verba cadent*) and elude the lover in his lamentation (*fugient tibi verba querenti*)—[46] and the concomitant breakdown of identity as elegiac mourning takes over: the body destabilized by the throes of woe (*tremulus … orietur fletibus horror*) and transformed by the expression of grief (*timor informem ducet in ore notam*), all sense of self obliterated (*nec poteris, qui sis aut ubi, nosse*). A striking counterpoint, this, to the experience of the poet-lover enjoying his mistress, when words are unstinting (*quam multa … narramus verba*, to think back to 2.15.3) and the ego uncompromised (*immortalis ero*, in 2.14.10; *fiam immortalis*, at 2.15.39). What we have, then, is a portrayal of exclusion as poetic unmaking: language is not composed, but decomposes; artistic identity is not formed, but dissolves.

Even purportedly physical defacement takes on possibly literary implications: recast in terms of linguistic activity, *informem ducet in ore notam* speaks as much to the verbal as it does to the visage. Tap into the literary valence of *duco* as the act of writing and *nota* as the written

[46] For the intimate association of *queror* and its relatives (e.g. *querela*) with the speech of the *exclusus*, see Kaufhold (1997), 95; James (2003b), 108 ff. and (2010), 335. Cf. Lucretius *DRN* 4.1182, which is noteworthy for its similar use of *cado* to what we seen in Prop. 1.5.14 (*verba cadent*) in a description of the lover's jolting transition from *exclusus* to *inclusus*: *et meditata diu cadat alte sumpta querela* (and the language of lament, so long meditated upon, so viscerally felt, escapes him).

word,[47] in conjunction with the oral dimension of *os* in its specific reference to the mouth, and the handiwork of exclusion comes to encompass language ill-formed: the production of crude verbiage, the simultaneous corruption of words and the body from which they originate. It is a fate suffered by other lovers before: Sappho's speaker in fr. 31, most canonically, and the Catullan *amator* made in her image in *c.* 51, who both endure the failure of language (γλῶσσα ἔαγε, my tongue breaks, fr. 31.9; *lingua sed torpet*, but my tongue lolls, *c*. 51.9) and of the body (ὀππάτεσσι δ᾽οὐδὲν ὄρημ᾽, my two eyes see nothing, fr. 31.11; *gemina teguntur/lumina nocte*, my two eyes are blanketed with darkness, *c.* 51.11-12) when faced with desire for an inaccessible beloved;[48] and who both do so in the context of darkness conferred by visual blackout (ὀππάτεσσι δ᾽οὐδὲν, *teguntur/lumina nocte*). It is a fate explicitly bound by Catullus to the singular corrupting force of unproductive *otium* (*otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est*, leisure, Catullus, is your problem, 51.13).[49] And it is a fate revisited in the plight of the wayward Gallus, whose figuration as an *exclusus* develops to fuller expression the themes related by Sappho and Catullus: separation, nonproductivity, darkness.

The experience of exclusion has always, in some sense, been one of poetic inefficacy, in that the condition of the *exclusus* is ensured by his inability to finagle admittance.[50] What we have now is its characterization as an unproductive use of the off-hours, in contradistinction to

---

[47] *OLD s.v*. 6.
[48] For discussion of the failure of language/poetry in Sappho and Catullus, see O'Higgins (1990), esp. 160 ff.; and for discussion of the dissolution of self specific to Catullus, see Janan (1994), 74.
[49] Though the nature of this *otium* and its role in the poem, it should be noted, is the cause of much scholarly consternation. For which, see, e.g.: Klentke (2016); Clark (2008), 268-269; Platter (1995), 218-220; O'Higgins (1990), 165-167; Finamore (1984); Itzkowitz (1983); Segal (1970); Frank (1968); Woodman (1966).
[50] Cf. Wyke (2007), 176 where it is "impotence rather than potency that marks the figure of the male lover of elegy, for he is represented as languishing almost perpetually outside his beloved's door"; James (2003b), 137: "Generically, the paraclausithyron must fail at its immediate goal (reception into the *puella*'s bedchamber)"; and Copley (1956), 33 where he identifies certain futility as the primary characteristic that distinguishes Roman from Greek *paraclausithyra*: "while the Greek tradition of the paraclausithyron sometimes left the issue of the lover's plea indeterminate, the Roman paraclausithyron never does: the door is always closed, and the poem is always predicated on its being so." For a treatment of the persuasive techniques of the *exclusus amator*, see James (2003b), 109 ff.

the eroto-poetically profitable night of inclusion spent with the mistress. The contrast is concisely captured by Propertius in our *paraclausithyron*, poem 1.16:

> nunc iacet alterius felici nixa lacerto,
> at mea nocturno verba cadunt Zephyro. (1.16.33-34)
>
> now she lies pillowed on the arm of some other lucky bastard,
> but my words slip away on the night wind.

Here, we see the language of linguistic ineffectiveness (*verba cadunt*) in the context of the poet-lover's nighttime exclusion (*nocturno … Zephyro*) juxtaposed with that of another's creative fertility (*alterius felici*, to invoke the literary dimension of the adjective again) in a concurrent state of inclusion (*iacet nixa … lacerto*). And indeed, the poet-lover's subsequent description of his plight as an *exclusus* imparts the same sense of poetic disappointment:

> ut me tam longa raucum patiare querela
> sollicitas trivio pervigilare moras? (Prop. 1.16.39-40)
>
> that you allow me, hoarse from such prolonged complaining,
> to spend the night in troubled suspense in the street?

The nature of the utterance from exclusion (*longa … querela*) has compromised his ability to produce language (*raucum*, which speaks as much to the kind of sound emitted—rough, inarticulate—as it does to the quality of the voice—rough, raspy)[51]. And the exigencies of the night in exclusion (*patiare … trivio pervigilare*), in turn, have undermined his poetic output, if we can, again, read *sollicitas … moras* through a literary lens as a reference to metrical disturbance (by which I mean, caesura upset).

The poetic repercussions of exclusion, as it happens, are equally endured by the mistress, as in poem 3.6, where the poet-lover presses his girl's detail for details of her activity in his absence: *vidisti … scriniaque ad lecti clausa iacere pedes …?* (so, you saw her *scrinia* lying

[51] Cf. *OLD s.v.* 1-1b.

closed at the foot of her bed, did you?, l. 14). I have left *scrinia* untranslated here principally because of a question of interpretation that attends it—one whose implications for my reading are significant. The word denotes a storage box, and as its lexical properties might suggest, it is typically used of a box for storing written material (books, letters, papers, by way of *scribo*); but it does have a more generic application as a container for personal effects,[52] which is typically adopted in translations of the line (thus G.P. Goold's "toilet-box" in his rendering for the Loeb)[53]. Richardson is unequivocal in his gloss of the word as "toilet boxes," dismissing "any notion that these might be book boxes" on the grounds that "if these contained his poems to her he would be eager to hear that she was reading them" (which urgency the poem, as it is preserved, does not convey) "and that the case was closed would be a sign of indifference" (seemingly out of place in a piece describing Cynthia's despondency in desertion).[54]

Kathleen McCarthy, at least, makes room for script in the *scrinia* of 3.6.14, noting how it "points ambidextrously to elegy's obsessions with writing, cosmetics, and 'making up' women."[55] And it is her lead that I will follow in my own discussion. For if we allow Cynthia's *scrinium* to have literary dimensions alongside its aesthetic ones, the fate it suffers as she suffers rejection speaks to the poetic disappointment that visits the *puella* in a context of separation. Literary activity is literally forestalled: the case is closed (*scriniaque … clausa*, an apposite analogue for the *ianua clausa* that torments the *exclusus amator* and that represents, for him, the

[52] Based primarily, as far as I can tell, on Pliny the Elder's use of it to describe a chest of perfume pilfered from the treasures of Darius (*Darii Persarum regis* ***unguentorum scrinio*** *capto* at *NH* 7.108; *castris Darii regis expugnatis … cepit* ***scrinium unguentorum*** at *NH* 13.3), for both of which references cf. Richardson (2006), *ad loc.*, but see also *OLD s.v.* b. While it is not my aim to correct full-stop the reading of *scrinia* in Prop. 3.6 from makeup case to attaché, I do think that the alacrity with which the former is adopted as the singular interpretation might stand to be checked, given that Pliny's use of *scrinium* to refer to something other than a receptacle for written material seems not to be the conventional usage during the late Republic-early Empire; and, indeed, occurs a good deal later than Propertius was writing.
[53] Goold (1990), 237.
[54] Richardson (2006), *ad loc.*
[55] McCarthy (2010), 184 n. 24.

barrier to poetic productivity) and poetic intercourse cut off. And it lies fallow (*ad lecti … iacere pedes*), its neglect signaling the stagnation of poetic activity (no writing produced or consumed) in language that reprises and reframes that of happier times—back in poem 2.15, when she herself had staved off erotic-poetic frustration by keeping sleep at bay: *patefecit ocellos/ore suo et dixit sicine, lente, iaces*? A faint but forceful echo, only here the experience is inverted: while in 2.15, the threat to literary success—cessation of work, encapsulated in *iaceo*—was thwarted, in 3.6 it triumphs (*scrinia … iacere*); while in 2.15, it was the mouth that prompted erotic-poetic performance (*patefecit ocellos/ore suo*), in 3.6 it is the polar point of the foot that signals its cessation (*ad lecti … iacere pedes*).

The *puella* is thus likewise implicated in, and impacted by, the breakdown of poetics that occurs in exclusion. We could, again, read this moment in 3.6 metapoetically and see in her literary-aesthetic "disinterest," to use Richardson's word, a figuration of the non-composition of poetry that obtains when the poet-lover is not engaged with his craft: her failure to make herself up, when the *scrinia* contain makeup, her failure to participate in the process of poetic intercourse, when the *scrinia* contain poetry, both contribute to the sense of verse that fails to materialize on the page.

It is a sense that is only heightened as the report of the *puella*'s actions proceeds to include her utterance:

> rettulit et querulo iurgia nostra sono? …
> 'gaudet me vacuo solam tabescere lecto? …
> poena erit ante meos sera sed ampla pedes;
> putris et in vacuo texetur aranea lecto:
> noctibus illorum dormiet ipsa Venus.' (3.6.18, 23, 32-34)
>
> and she spoke of our imbroglios with a mournful lilt, did she?
> 'Does he take pleasure in my wasting away alone in an empty bed? …
> There'll be a price to pay at my feet, overdue but considerable;
> and a dusty cobweb will be spun around his empty bed:
> Venus herself will be asleep at the wheel on their nights together.'

There is the undermining of articulation in the description of her delivery not in terms of speech, but sound (*querulo … sono*)—a degradation of an already debased elegiac utterance (the *querela*), the prototypically feeble speechifying of the *exclusus amator* further enfeebled in its loss for words.[56] There is the intimation of non-productivity in the characterization of her time not engaging with the poet-lover as wasted (*vacuo solam* ***tabescere*** *lecto*)—a direct invocation of the language of profligate *otium*, as when Cicero complains of *hoc otio quo nunc* ***tabescimus*** (this leisure in which we now waste away, *Att*. 2.14.1). And there is the promise of a reciprocal state for the poet-lover: in the untouched bed that mirrors her own (*in vacuo … lecto*), in the persistence of sleep in place of sex (*noctibus … dormiet ipsa Venus*), when she herself is not present to counteract it (as she was in 2.15). To speak of separation, then, is to speak of the erotic-poetic undoing of both the poet-lover and the beloved: the failure of language, the fruitlessness of activity. The status of the mistress as a metaphor does not change the essence of the observation: whether she withers as a person or as a poem, she withers without the attention of the poet-lover, and their time apart yields no productive output.

No productive output except, of course, poem 3.6 itself, which expresses in efficacious elegiacs the inefficacy of the elegy of exclusion.[57] It is a paradox at the heart of any poetic representation of poetic breakdown—applicable, for example, to any iteration of a *paraclausithyron*, from the figurative song of exclusion of Sappho fr. 31 and Catullus *c.* 51, to the literal lament of the *exclusus* of Propertius 1.16—and it is no less operative here, where the representation of poetic nonproductivity in a state of non-lucubratory separation is itself a

[56] James (2003b), 109 where the *querela* (and, by extension, its compounds) represents "the main task of Roman love elegy—male sexual persuasion", invoking "a whole constellation of standard elegiac themes: sad lover, cruel girl, harsh separation, and so on."
[57] Cf. Damer (2019), 57, where the elegiac conceit is that its speakers "write successful, pleasingly erotic poetry about their erotic failures."

product of successful poetic activity on the extra-textual level.[58] We could see in this a moment of instability—of the structural distinction between productive inclusion and unproductive exclusion beginning to give way, compromising the integrity of the elegiac revaluation altogether. We could also see in it a replication of the very form of exclusion-in-inclusion that the elegiac *lucubratio* paradigm itself models, a reproduction on the extra-literary level of the very dynamics that the poetry itself portrays. While the substance of the poem represents the inefficacious poetry of exclusion, its expression in the type of efficacious poetry born of lucubratory inclusion makes that representation of poetic failure a simultaneous success. Its internal content might reflect poetic futility, but its external context speaks to poetic fruitfulness.

The poetry is, as such, both productive and unproductive at once: internally the ineffective poetry of the *exclusus*, externally the effective poetry of the *inclusus*. We are offered here fractals of inclusion and exclusion—internal exclusion, external inclusion—and thus the paradoxical nature of successful poetry that portrays its own failure becomes a replication of the dynamic of duality on which the elegiac *lucubratio topos* turns. Just as was the case with poetic *officium*, which did not have to compromise the elegiac lifestyle when incorporated into a representational program that allowed for the poet-lover to be simultaneously within and without the dominant culture, so here the contradictory relationship between the poem and its representation can serve to reinforce the central tenets of the elegiac experience, becoming an instantiation of the theme of exclusion-in-inclusion that animates elegiac activity. In this way, the poem itself—not just the poetic creation is represents—can be aligned with the lucubratory

[58] Cf., for example, O'Higgins (1990), 167 who summarizes the paradox as it presents in Sappho fr. 31 thusly: "the poem actually dramatizes its dependence on the vulnerable living organism who must perform it", and yet "its very existence testifies to a considerable degree of emotional and literary control."

model of poetic productivity, and so reified, externally and internally alike, as a product of consequence.

The Convergence

To see these two models of elegiac nocturnal activity—positive and negative, productive and fruitless, lucubratory and otiose—collide, let us (re)turn to poem 4.8, the last in Propertius' Cynthia saga and the site of the poet-lover's final attempt to leave her behind for good. The scene is set for a new love: a night with Phyllis and Teia to cleanse the palate of Cynthia, off on a tryst of her own in Lanuvium. And yet:

> sed neque suppletis constabat flamma lucernis …
> cantabant surdo, nudabant pectora caeco:
> Lanuvii ad portas, ei mihi, totus eram. (Prop. 4.8.43, 47-48)
>
> but the flame was not reliable, though the lamps were well-fueled …
> They were serenading a deaf man, baring their breasts to a blind man:
> all of me—ah me!—was at the gates of Lanuvium.

Separated from Cynthia—and ultimately in an act of exclusion, since it is Cynthia's departure (*mea … avecta est Cynthia*, my Cynthia drove off, l. 15) that precipitates his own course of action—the poet-lover cannot successfully recreate the environment for erotic-poetic productivity. The light is present (*suppletis … lucernis*), but faulty (*neque … constabat flamma*); he is present, but insensate (*surdo*, *caeco*); poetry fails (*cantabat surdo*) together with physicality (*nudabant … caeco*), as it did in Sappho 31, in Catullus 51, in Propertius 1.5 and 1.16. The conditions for elegiac *lucubratio*, then, are approximated but not met: no reliable light in the dark, no true engagement enacted, and thus no erotic-poetic output. It is blind darkness that takes over (*caeco*), that same blind darkness that represented the antithesis of elegiac endeavor in poem 2.14 (*ante pedes caecis lucebat nobis*), in poem 2.15 (*in caeco Venerem corrumpere motu*), in poem 2.22 (*numquam ad formosas … caecus ero*, never will I be blind to beauty, l. 20). And no wonder, for this would-be erotic encounter is, in actuality, an exercise in exclusion: the

poet-lover is not really present at all (*Lanuvii ad portas … totus eram*), indeed is, in his mental projection, still an *exclusus* at Cynthia's door (*ad portas*) and as such is subject to the poetic inefficacy that attends the condition.

But all of this is righted once he and Cynthia are reunited:

> imperat et totas iterum mutare lucernas …
> atque ita mutato per singula pallia lecto
> despondi, et noto solvimus arma toro. (4.8.85, 87-88)
>
> and she ordered a replacement of all the lamps …
> and so, with the bed remade, each and every sheet,
> I gave my word, and we set aside our hostilities on that familiar couch.

Apologies and promises to reform his wayward ways made (before which *vix tangendos praebuit illa pedes*, she barely allowed her feet to be touched, l. 72), their reconciliation proceeds to restage the scene of erotic-poetic futility as one of fruitfulness. The lamps are refreshed (*totas … mutare lucernas*), the bed remade (*mutato … lecto*), and elegiac activity resumes (*noto solvimus arma toro*), which implicitly aligns the enactment of elegiac poetic tropes—the *militia amoris* at the heart of *solvimus arma*—[59] with the return to the longstanding site of erotic-poetic interaction: *novo … toro*. These changes, it should be noted, take place at the bidding of the beloved—it is she who is the subject of *imperat*—and thus we see, once again, the mistress responsible for erotic-poetic productivity: she oversees the administration of light, as she did in 2.14 as *mea lux*; and she determines the progression of their acts, not permitting full access to her body (*vix tangendos praebuit illa pedes*)—and, perhaps, the poetics it represents, to see a

[59] And recalls the constitutional overlap between the figure of the lover and that of the solider in the area of *otium*, with both equally susceptible to its baser seductions—cf. Vickers (1990), 5 and Keith (2008), 140—but both here, in the enactment of *otium otiosum*, reinscribed, through the elegiac *lucubratio* to which that activity amounts, in the culture of productivity, an additional valence of the inclusion-in-exclusion that underlies the *topos*.

metrical reference in the feet that cannot be approached—[60] until her terms have been fulfilled (*mutato … lecto*, *despondi et … solvimus*).

What we are left with is an impression of nocturnal elegiac endeavors, in both the sexual and the poetic sense, as a productive use of one's downtime. By making the mistress internal to the realization of poetry—the force that drives it, the body that enables it—and not just external to it (a source of inspiration for an absent *amator*), the love-as-*lucubratio* paradigm enfolds an otherwise profligate pastime, and the poetry that captures it, into the model of diligent deployment of the off-hours. Elegy comes to constitute a *lucubratio* practice in its own right, not just atmospherically, but substantively; and the poet-lover, in turn, comes to embody the discipline and industriousness associated with the dedication of one's downtime to pursuit of one's craft.

What is more, the turn of the *topos* on the same coextension of internality and externality at work in the scene of inclusion develops a logistical relationship into a cultural one: the poet-lover, in his *otium*, on the inside of values of enterprise and productivity, but still, for his *otium*, outside of the hegemony of the culture of *negotium*. It is a status that defines the poet-lover and his activity, but that comes to distinguish the very poetry that portrays them, the relationship that obtains between the poetic content and the poetic form mirroring the mediation between in and out, productivity and inefficacy, *otium* and *lucubratio* that structures its representations.

[60] Cf. Keith (1999), 56 where she cites the "familiar pun on *pes*, both 'foot' and 'meter'" of which both poets and rhetoricians availed themselves, additionally discussed at 41, 48-49, 59 and nn. 24 and 32. Henkel (2014) unpacks puns on *pes* in Tibullus.

Chapter 5

Light, Dark, and Poetic Productivity in Tibullus

Assuming the Torch

Propertius leaves us with two facets of the elegiac *lucubratio topos* that structure its expression: a schematic delineation of productive and unproductive elegiac endeavors, distinguished along the axes of illumination and inclusion—erotic-poetic proliferation in conditions of union and semi-darkness (*lucubratio*), amatory-creative draught in circumstances of separation and darkness (*lucifuga*); and the sense that a tension can obtain between poetic form and poetic content, that the terms of the representation can be at odds with the context of its expression. It is a tension that, in Propertius, is eased by enfolding the contradiction into the program of exclusion-in-inclusion, making the dynamics that obtain between form and content of a piece with the themes that underwrite the elegiac experience.

But in Tibullus, the tension is itself thematized, the possibility of a disconnect between content and context informing his application of the *lucubratio topos* and ambiguating the picture of elegiac activity elucidated by Propertius. Indeed, while Tibullus activates the same network of lucubratory associations familiar from Propertian elegy—the light and the dark, the consort and the composition—his rendering of the motif is more diffuse than direct, more complicating than clarifying. In Tibullus' hands, the representation is deconstructed, abstracted, the associations of light and dark, poetic productivity and inefficacy isolated and made to problematize the relationship between form and content. The *topos* of *lucubratio*, in short, becomes a vehicle to explore the poetic implications of the contradiction between form and content that emerges in Propertius, a project pursued in the name of Delia and Nemesis.

Assembling the Tableau

Tibullus' preoccupation with the question of the elegiac lifestyle and its relationship to the prevailing Roman culture of contributory activity anchors readings of his poetry. It is a tenet of Tibullan interpretation that manifests in varying registers of language, from Parshia Lee-Stecum's subsumption of the theme in the broader concept of power—of the "world of traditional, official Roman power" in its (uneasy) juxtaposition to "the power structures of the world of elegiac *amor*-relationships"—[1] to Raffaele Perrelli's more direct discussion of the phenomenon in terms of *otium*—of a uniquely Tibullan form of idleness that delivers a more pointed social critique than that of his elegiac compatriots and that, in the process, can be seen to reflect a distinguishing interest in problematizing the same range of social power dynamics that concern Lee-Stecum.[2]

Poem 1.1 is a consistent site of citation in the discussion of the Tibullan elegiac orientation, programmatic as it is in its declaration of what Lee-Stecum characterizes as "a conventional process by which a Roman male citizen might achieve power, a process which is in explicit opposition to the lifestyle desired by the poet."[3] The opposition Lee-Stecum articulates in terms of power dynamics—of tensions between social groups and the cultural structures that reinforce them—can be recast, in Perrelli's model, as one between *otium* and *negotium*, between a dominant ethic of industriousness and a marginalized ethos of nonparticipation; and so the

[1] Lee-Stecum (1998), 25-26 *et passim*.
[2] Perrelli (2019), 1228-1229. Perrelli's notion of the exceptionality of Tibullan *otium*—ultimately implicated in a "diologo continuo con Messalla e Mecenate" and "le pressioni della propaganda augustea" (1229)—among its iterations in the poetry of his fellow elegists is prefigured by Lee-Stecum (1996), 26 : "The interweaving of Messalla's world of traditional, official Roman power (of generals, patrons and magistrates) with the power structures of the world of elegiac *amor*-relationships encourages in Tibullus' first book, more than in the early works of any of the other extant elegists, the examination and direct comparison of the regimes of power which operate in each of these areas."
[3] Lee-Stecum (1998), 27.

issue of elegy's place in a culture of productive engagement is very much operative in Tibullan poetics.

Indeed, the issue has been approached through a consideration of the representation of elegiac composition latent in the statement of his poetic project that Tibullus issues in poem 1.1. David Wray and Michael Putnam, in particular, have between them explicated the metapoetic nuances of Tibullus' elegiac lifestyle, conveying as it does a withdrawal from militaristic exertion (*labor*) and a cultivation of poetic simplicity (*inertia*).[4] They have convincingly teased out of Tibullus' self-effacing *recusatio* a vindication of elegiac *inertia* as a state of poetic proliferation: through his recharacterization of the elegiac experience not as profligate, but productive (per Wray's reading of *facilis manus* in 1.1.8 as a "makerly" hand);[5] through his revaluation of the elegiac *segnis inersque* as an inspired turner of down-to-earth verse (per Putnam's etymological exploration).[6]

In the resulting paradigm, what is claimed at the outset of Book I is not so much a life of leisure as one of ποίησις—of making, generally, and making poetry, specifically—and what is left behind is not so much the demands of working as the conditions that undermine creative pursuits—the physic and psychic agitation of military campaigning and the Roman culture of acquisition. The Tibullan poet-lover can, accordingly, be seen to embrace the elegiac regime without accepting the elegiac sins of languor and luxuriance. The lifestyle may be retiring, but it

[4] Wray (2003) and Putnam (2004).
[5] Wray (2003), 222-233.
[6] Putnam (2004), 125-127 where *iners* "is associated with lack of *ars*", (construed here as a lack of pretense), such that "When looking at the poet's creative enterprise, we find ourselves face to face with an apparently modest maker whose artlessness hides art." Which is to say, with a crafter with a tasteful degree of subtlety for his lack of ornamentation—a crafter who is, to invoke Quintilian's assessment of Tibullus, *tersus atque elegans* (clean and refined, *Inst*. 10.1.93). Similarly for *segnis*, which etymologizes to "missing the 'fire' that is the mark of inborn talent complementing creative intelligence", but that becomes the centerpiece of a program of wordplay that "may serve as camouflage, there is *ignis* doubly in his world, in the fire that distinguishes … his temporal situation and in the *ignis* that … fosters an *ingenium* of consequence."

is no easy retirement; and the primacy of production in the characterization of the poet-lover's experience speaks to a fundamental interest in positioning the elegiac poetic craft as just that—an act of manufacture necessitating an expenditure of effort.

Within this landscape of the programmatic re-presentation of the markers of elegiac *otium* (*inertia, segnitia,* aversion to *labor*) as measures of poetic fabrication (simple style, artistic inspiration, quality of life), it is not hard to see a place for the *topos* of *lucubratio* in the Tibullan representational wheelhouse—a figuration that would only further his expression of elegiac engagement by amplifying the contention of elegiac productivity with an inculcation of the context of production. All the more so, given that independent strains of Tibullan scholarship have identified the equally central role that light plays in his elegies. D.F. Bright, for example, condenses a chorus of arguments over the natures of Delia and Nemesis into an essential identification of the former with light and the latter with darkness—a distinction that comes to structure Tibullus' two books of poetry around the poles of day and night;[7] while Joan Booth and Robert Maltby join forces to further the appreciation of the thematized interplay between light and dark in Tibullus' wordplay.[8]

Both of these treatments reflect the manipulation of light as an interest in Tibullan poetics equally salient to the vindication of the elegiac lifestyle; and yet they also reflect an inclination to sustain an antithetical relationship between light and dark as an organizing principle in the Tibullan poetic universe. Bright's early schematic, which posited an opposition between Delia and Nemesis along the lines of "the venerable contrast between light and darkness, day and

[7] Bright (1978), 118.
[8] Booth and Maltby (2005). Kennedy (2017), 196-197 similarly detects a program of punning on words of light and brightness surrounding Tibullus' name (Albius): "In general, paleness is the colour appropriate to a lover …. In particular, *albus* is used of … the complexion associated with overpowering emotional responses."

night, positive and negative",[9] endures, more or less unchanged, in the language of Booth and Maltby's project of tracing the "systematic patterning of concepts and vocabulary of light and dark … to reflect Tibullus' changing vision of elegiac existence and the differing roles of his two mistresses, the bright Delia of book 1 and the dark Nemesis of book 2."[10] In this model, Delia and Book I represent the light-filled ideal of elegiac existence, eclipsed in Book II by the pall of Nemesis' ill-repute—the halcyon days of free pastoral love with Delia darkened by the incursion of the *quid pro quo amor* of the urban Nemesis.

But if we have learned anything from the Propertian figuration of elegiac activity, it is that pure light is just as inimical to elegiac efficacy as pure darkness, that the lucubratory condition of light in the dark—and its reflection of the elegiac dynamic of exclusion-in-inclusion—is the one that subtends poetic productivity. And so I would like to advance the conversation around Tibullan poetics by uniting these two otherwise unrelated motifs—the light/dark imagery and the figuration of poetic fabrication—in the single concept of *lucubratio*. For the relationship between light and dark, in fact, becomes determinative of the poetic experience itself, and it is ultimately not their clear differentiation that gives the Tibullan elegiac experience its meaning. It is their integration—as per the *lucubratio* model—that enables the very erotic-poetic productivity that Wray and Putnam identify as essential to the program of Tibullan elegy.

Articulating the Terms

Poem 1.1, appropriately enough, is a productive place to start, establishing as it does an association of the presence of the beloved with light and poetic industry that will inform the rest

[9] Bright (1978), 119.
[10] Booth and Maltby (2005), 125.

of the collection.[11] Right from the outset, we see the motifs align: the poet-lover's programmatic declaration in lines 6-7 that *me mea paupertas vitae traducat inerti/dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus* (as for me, may my poverty consign me to a languid life, so long as my hearth glows with continual fire) distinguishes light as essential to his commitment to a life of modest composition;[12] a predication whose operation is, deeper into the reverie, intimately identified with the presence of the mistress: *non ego laudari curo, mea Delia; tecum/dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque vocer* (I don't care to be celebrated, my Delia; so long as I'm with you, I would welcome being known as listless and languid, 1.1.57-58).

In this diptych of avowals, we get a progressive expansion of the valence of the correlation: each, through a parallel proviso clause, establishes an element integral to the elegiac-poetic project—in the case of the first, it is fire and its glow; per the second, the company of the mistress. And both, through the echoic linguistic patterning of those clauses, encourage the assimilation of their contents:

me **mea** paupertas vitae **t**raducat inerti/**dum m**eus **assiduo** luceat **i**gne f**oc**us
non **ego** laudari curo, **mea** Delia; **t**ecum/ **dum m**odo **si**m, q**uaeso** segnis **i**nersque v**oc**er

The basic structural responsion between the lines—the fronting of the subjective personal pronoun (*me/ego*), the inclusion of the possessive adjective (*mea*), the postponement of the proviso to the pentameter, the vocalic chiasmus that occurs between them (***v**itae ... **inerti, iners** ... **v**ocer*)—facilitates a meaningful dialogue between the remaining components. A conversation in which Delia becomes bound to the very nature of the elegiac existence to which the poet-lover

[11] A sensibility shared by Lee-Stecum (2000), 181 ff., who positions poem 1.1 as a kind of Tibullan urtext against which all the other poems in the collection can be read.
[12] Putnam (2004), 126-127, too, observes the centrality of fire to the poetic lifestyle promulgated in 1.1, though for him its services are more connotative than concrete: as the embodiment of the spark of creativity, whose conspicuous inclusion in scenes of humble living undercuts the poet-lover's claim of unremarkable aptitude (that is, by countering *segnis* with *ignis*). My own reading here depends less on the signification of fire as lyric inspiration and more on its function as literal illumination, but the figural dimension that Putnam elucidates is complementary to the material one on which I focus.

consigns himself: she is identified with its humility (*mea paupertas* : *mea Delia*); she is associated with its artistic simplicity (where being with her, *tecum*, maps onto the *vitae … inerti*); she is tied to its functional requirements (*dum meus … luceat … focus* : *tecum dum modo sim*). And so the gleaming hearth that faithfully enables the poetic lifestyle becomes coterminous with the girl whose presence does the same.

It is a moment of specification—the first instance in the corpus of the beloved named—that creates a shared vocabulary for two experiences that were, just moments earlier, presented as separate:

> quam iuvat immites ventos audire cubantem
> et dominam tenero continuisse sinu!
> aut gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster,
> securum somnos igne iuvante sequi! (1.1.45-48)
>
> How nice to lie back and listen to the raging wind
> and to hold one's mistress in gentle embrace!
> or, when the wintry wind discharges its icy waters,
> to seek slumber, safe and sound, with the aid of a fire!

To be with the mistress (*dominam … continuisse*) is here a pleasure distinct from (*aut*) the enjoyment of fireside comfort (*igne iuvante*), even while both are definitive of the envisioned elegiac lifestyle (*quam iuvat*).[13] The lines look independently back and ahead: ahead to the arrival of Delia, when the generalized idea of *dominam … continuisse* will be specified in the *tecum … sim* of lines 57-58; back to glow of the hearth, so the premise of essential light (*luceat igne focus*, l. 6) can be put into practice (*igne iuvante*).

[13] There is, perhaps, an additional specification of the poet-lover's elegiac orientation in his prefatory proclamation in lines 43-44 that *parva seges satis est, satis est requiescere lecto/si licet et solito membra levare toro* (a small crop is sufficient, sufficient to relax on my bed, if it's granted, and to lighten my limbs on my familiar couch). If we take *parva seges* as a reiteration of the programmatic humility of elegiac life conveyed in line 6 by *paupertas* and see in *membra levare* a reference to elegiac poetics, characterized as they are by *levitas*, then the ensuing circumstances can speak directly to the nature of the elegiac experience.

It is only in the naming of Delia that these two experiences can be read as one. The assimilation of her presence to the provision of light achieved by the parallelism of the proviso clauses in lines 5-6 and 57-58 allows the discrete circumstances of union and illumination pictured in lines 45-48 to obtain at once; and Delia becomes the common term to encompass these distinct facets of elegiac activity—its object (*dominam continuisse*) and its environment (*igne iuvante*). We are, then, in this poem programmatically asserting a preference for a life of elegiac retreat (*inertia*) and creative proliferation (*facilis manus*),[14] offered an equally declarative delineation of the context of production. Much as Propertius' *lucubratio* figured Cynthia as both the light that guides the performance of erotic-poetic activity and the object at which that activity is aimed, so here Delia is made synonymous with both the contours of the productive elegiac life and the illumination on which that productivity depends. As much as she focuses the poetic content, she embodies the poetic context, unifying style (*paupertas, iners*) and setting (*luceat igne focus*) in a single word.

The context of the elegiac-poetic practice thus becomes just as integral to the programmatic image of the Tibullan poet-lover as the nature of the work being performed. Indeed, the centrality of Delia and her illumination to the poet-lover's project is most pronounced when their absence is envisioned. To wit: the closing lines of poem 1.1, which introduce a familiar dichotomy between the productive elegiac-poetic practice governed by light and the unproductive one consumed by darkness:

> Interea, dum fata sinunt, iungamus amores:
> iam veniet tenebris Mors adoperta caput,
> iam subrepet iners aetas, nec amare decebit,
> dicere nec cano blanditias capite. (1.1.69-72)

[14] Indeed, Keith (1997), 50 detects literary dimensions to the poet-lover's activity in this quatrain: "The simple enjoyment he finds in his mistress' company is described in sensual diction that simultaneously adumbrates an aesthetic program for his elegiac poetry. Resting in bed, he enjoys taking the weight off his limbs (or trimming his clauses), seeking refuge from the violent winds outside (perhaps avoiding the bombast of Asianist rhetoric), and cuddling his mistress in an erotic embrace."

> So for now, while the fates allow, let's join our passions:
> soon Death will come, her head cloaked in shadows,
> soon feeble old age will creep up, and making love won't be right,
> nor will speaking sweet nothings when our hair is white.

The association of death with darkness is, of course, commonplace, as is the *carpe diem* ethos that suffuses this juxtaposition of a passionate present with a frigid future. But what is worth remarking is the alignment of unbroken darkness with the notion of non-productivity, as we saw in Propertius. Death, the ultimate state of inactivity, is here twice obscured, her hooded head ensconced in shadows (*tenebris … adoperta caput*).[15] It is under the cloak of this all-consuming night that the positive model of elegiac productivity is inverted: the deactivated and deactivating *iners aetas* replaces the creative, active *vita iners* of line 5, divesting the adjective of the connotation of dynamic fabrication with which it had been programmatically imbued and delivering it unto its more expected use as a byword for ineffective.[16] And ineffective is exactly what elegy without Delia's illumination becomes—making love inapposite (*nec amare decebit*) and lover's blandishments improper (*dicere nec … blanditias*)—the descent of darkness accompanying the incursion of anti-elegiac circumstances: the onset of the twilight of old age, when the erotic-poetic lifestyle will no longer be viable.

What poem 1.1 offers, then, as it establishes the terms of the Tibullan elegiac orientation—in which standard states of indolence (*inertia*, *segnitia*) are reclaimed as conditions of elegiac industry—is a vision of the contextual framework necessary for those terms to be met. It is a picture that imports the lucubratory model of poetic efficacy that organized the activity of the Propertian poet-lover—the association of productive illumination (*assiduo … igne*, the poetic

[15] Perhaps even thrice obscured, to follow Lee's (1974), 109 observation that *tenebris* is itself syntactically shadowy: "This ablative could go with the verb and mean 'in the dark' … but it can also be taken with the participle *adoperta*." I have followed the latter course in my translation, though to split the difference, we could understand it with both: death will come in the dark, her head hooded in shadows.
[16] The valences of which are unpacked by Wray (2003), 226.

counterpart-in-kind to the *labor assiduus* that drives the soldier in line 3) with the presence of the mistress, of erotic-poetic disappointment with engulfing darkness; the positioning of the beloved as both internal and external to elegiac actualization, both the light that enables poetic pursuits (*dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus*) and the substance of those pursuits themselves (*tecum/dum modo sim*). In this, we are presented a paradigm of elegiac creativity: the confluence, in the figure of Delia, of light and domestic inclusion;[17] the harmonization, in her figure, of the context and content of elegiac activity; and the activation, in the poet-lover's *assiduus ignis*, of a language that participates in the same idiom of socio-cultural consequence attached to the soldier, whose *labor assiduus* denotes employment that is both sedulous and lucrative.[18]

Indeed, where Francis Cairns registers, in the poet-lover's unstinting fire, a "contrast between the *adsiduus labor* of the soldier and his own hearth with its *adsiduo igne*",[19] I would venture a correspondence. For if *assiduus* carries connotations of wealth, then the *labor* of the soldier becomes monetized—becomes the feature that he exploits to earn his living, his effort also the source of his enrichment—[20] and by the same token, the constant glow of the poet-lover's hearth imbues the conditions of his elegiac project with dimensions that are as much fiscal as functional. Just as the soldier capitalizes on hardiness, so the poet capitalizes on light, and his elegiac undertakings are thus implicitly woven into the fabric of Roman value production, akin to the merits of campaigning both literally (as tireless activity) and symbolically (as the gainfulness that such activity represents). Just as Propertius' *lucubratio* enabled the elegiac practice of the poet-lover to perform cultural value while continuing to operate at a

[17] Cf. Maltby (2002), 122 where "Hearth and home were synonymous in the ancient world."
[18] Cairns (1979), 17 who notes that *assiduus* "was often etymologized so as to mean 'rich' and it also had a special association in etymological contexts with soldiers. …
[19] Cairns (1979), 17.
[20] A reading particularly harmonious with Wray's (2003), 24 suggestion that we understand *labor* here as "the constant endurance of physical, and perhaps especially mental, hardship", the source of any good soldier's bread and butter, to be sure.

distance from the dominant culture that purveys it, so here the lucubratory environment of the Tibullan *amator* trades in the production of cultural value (assiduity, profitability), even while retaining its antithetical ethos (in that it is not money, but poetry, that is prized).[21]

Ambiguating the Theme

And yet, in this ideal are already implanted the seeds of its own instability:[22] in the isolation of the markers of the lucubratory setting (*luceat igne focus*) from those of the lucubratory substance (*dominam … continuisse*). Happy that they should converge in the name of Delia in line 57; but the initial introduction of the two as distinct entities in the elegiac program prefigures a decoupling of these elements of the lucubratory *topos* that will incur incrementally as the collection progresses—and that will come to determine the efficacy of the elegiac activity represented.

To see Delia's figure begin to lose the luster of the integrated *lucubratio* experience beyond the borders of poem 1.1, we can observe the circumstances that attend her portrayal at the close of poem 1.3, where the poet-lover envisions her devotion to him played out in a scene of epic *lucubratio*:

> haec tibi fabellas referat positaque lucerna
> deducat plena stamina longa colu,
> ac circa, gravibus pensis affixa, puella
> paulatim somno fessa remittat opus.
> Tunc veniam subito …
> hoc precor; hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem
> Luciferum roseis candida portet equis. (1.3.85-89, 93-94)
>
> Let her [sc. *anus*, the elderly guardian] tell you stories and, with lamp set near,
> mete out long filaments from the laden distaff,
> and around her, focused on her heavy measures, a serving girl,
> gradually overcome by sleep, lets slip her work.

[21] This sense of Tibullan lucubratory poetics aligns with Keith (2008), 141 who approaches the Propertian poet-lover's "enjoyment of leisure for erotic intrigue and his concomitant employment of leisure for literary composition" as being "predicated on the official business of Roman imperialism", such that "Propertian elegy is itself both the product of Roman imperialism and productive of it."

[22] Cf. Lee-Stecum (2000), *passim* on the inherent instability of the Tibullan text.

> Then, suddenly, I will arrive …
> This my wish; may Dawn, bright with her glowing horses,
> bring us that very Morning-Star, in all its luster.

The echoes of Propertian lucubratory activity are immediately appreciable. The positioning of the lamp (*positaque lucerna*) evokes the light that oversaw the undertakings of Propertius' poet-lover in 2.15.3 (*apposita … lucerna*), where illumination accompanied poetic creation (*quam multa … narramus verba*), just as here poetic utterance (*fabellas refert*) unfolds in the vicinity of light. And the duties of the distaff (*deducat … stamina longa*), so intently, if unsustainably, tended (*pensis affixa … paulatim somno fessa*), shadow the night work of the solitary Cynthia in 1.3.41 (*fallebam stamine somnum*), where the images of the lucubrating Lucretia and Penelope loomed large—with all the attendant associations of duty and industry, propriety and socio-cultural value, that the reference inculcates—just as here they cannot help but to appear again.[23]

But Delia is no Cynthia: she is not the one who performs the action—not the production of language, not the production of yarn—she is the one who governs the performance: for her is language created (*tibi fabellas refert*), in her ambit is the loom plied (*circa*); and so she informs, but does not enact, the very *lucubratio* that becomes reflective of her character. Per the formulation of poem 1.1, her presence, her person, is synonymous with the state of light-suffused inclusion that fosters elegiac productivity—her reunion with the poet-lover (*tunc veniam*), attended by the profuse illumination (*nitentem/Luciferum roseis candida*) of the dawning of day at night's end (*Aurora*), itself representing a return of the conditions necessary for poetic creation to take place. But where the paradigm of 1.1 charged her with the moment of milieu and material

[23] Cf. Booth and Maltby (2005), 124; Maltby (2002), 210; Gotoff (1974), 244. Of *positaque lucerna*, Maltby (2002), *ad loc.* notes its communication of "their assiduity in working on after dark", but connects this to the "common theme of the lamp as a witness to lovemaking", rather than to the literary practice of *lucubratio*.

alike, here she has been hollowed out, divested of her substantive properties as she comes to provision the setting alone.

This is, in a way, to speak of Delia as the repository of poetic form. After her alignment, in poem 1.1, with both the conditions of elegiac productivity (illumination) and the virtues that govern elegiac expression (modesty, simplicity), she becomes, in poem 1.3, craft incarnate, her presence giving shape to the world that is constructed around her. It is as if her poetic association with the conditions of the lucubratory practice have detached themselves from the specificity of the lucubratory representation: her intimate association with light and interiority becomes a categorical condition of her representation, and the substance of the representation can thus fade from view without rupturing the intelligibility of the motif.[24] Where there is Delia, there is light; where Delia, domesticity; and so the canonical contextual markers of the lucubratory scene—the *lucubrum*, the *cubiculum*—can drop away.

Her comings and goings, accordingly, can determine the nature of the elegiac experience, even within the course of a single poem. Where Propertius patterned a clear differentiation of the circumstances of poetic productivity from those of poetic inefficacy—the lamplit *cubiculum* of the *lucubratio* in poem 2.15, for example, against the darkened door-stoop of the *paraclausithyron* in poem 1.16—Tibullus can mingle the two, invoking the context of creativity that attends Delia to render otherwise futile endeavors fruitful.

As he does in poem 1.2, which would seem, on its face, to be steeped in the darkness of exclusion:

> Adde merum vinoque novos conpesce dolores,
> occupet ut fessi lumina victa sopor,
> neu quisquam multo percussum tempora baccho

[24] As happens, for example, with the *topos* of the *paraclausithyron*, of which Debrohun (2003), 124 observes that "a complete song is not required for the effect of the theme to be realized. Indeed, **the entire picture of lover, locked entrance, and mistress can be evoked by only one or two of the primary topoi**" (emphasis mine).

excitet, infelix dum requiescit amor.
Nam posita est nostrae custodia saeva puellae,
clauditur et dura ianua firma sera. (1.2.1-6)

Bring on the pure stuff and drown my fresh sorrows in wine
so that oblivion can take hold of this weary man's overpowered eyes
and no one can rouse me, struck dumb by the quantity of drink,
while ill-fated love lies fallow.
For an unforgiving guard has been set on our girl,
and her door is closed fast with an unremitting bolt.

We are offered all the signs expected of the poetic failure of the *exclusus*: the blackness (*lumina victa*) of blackout (*neu quisquam multo percussum tempora baccho/excitet*), and the elegiac sterility that results (*infelix dum requiescit amor*), when the poet-lover is kept from his mistress (*clauditur ... ianua*). There is the same obliteration of all sense and sensitivity (*conpesce dolores*, *multo percussum tempora baccho*)—the vehicles for successful erotic interaction—that befell the excluded lovers of Sappho 31, Catullus 51, Propertius 1.10. There is the same vocabulary of amatory-literary dormancy (*infelix ... requiescit*) familiar from Propertius 2.3.1 (*potes, infelix, requiescere*), with both verb and adjective bespeaking a state of inactivity: erotic-poetic disappointment in *infelix*, if it is fair to import the literary dimension of *felix* (prolific, polished) to its opposite;[25] literary-social retirement in *requiescere*, if we recall its implications from Cicero and Propertius, for whom it signaled social withdrawal—through a preclusion of public *negotium*, through a period of poetic non-publication—and accompanied dedication to *studium*.

And there is, accordingly, the same eclipse of poetic productivity that blankets the representation of exclusion. Only this time, its effects are short-lived. For as soon as Delia's name is uttered, the nature of the experience is transformed:

tu quoque, ne timide custodes, Delia, falle;

[25] For which some lexicographical license is needed: the *OLD s.v.* 1 indicates that *infelix* can mean "unproductive" when used of plants or soil; and "infelicitous" in relation to art or literature (5b). Given the overlap between agricultural and elegiac pursuits in Tibullus, it is at least possible that the adjective could here be conveying amatory-literary nonproductivity. (With thanks to P.L.V for facilitating this reference in quarantine.) For discussions of *requiescere* and *felix* in Propertius, see Chapter 4: The Conception (*requiescere*) and The Conceit (*felix*).

audendum est: fortes adiuvat ipsa Venus.
illa favet seu quis iuvenis nova limina temptat
seu reserat fixo dente puella fores.
illa docet furtim molli derepere lecto,
illa pedem nullo ponere posse sono,
illa viro coram nutus conferre loquaces
blandaque compositis abdere verba notis.
nec docet hoc omnes sed quos nec inertia tardat
nec vetat obscura surgere nocte timor.
en ego cum tenebris tota vagor anxius urbe … (1.2.15-25)

You, too, Delia, slip past the guards with no trepidation;
one must be daring: Venus herself aids the bold.
She shows favor, whether some young man makes trial of new thresholds,
or a girl unlocks the doors by inserting a prong;
she teaches how to steal away from a soft bed,
how to move your feet without a sound,
to exchange, before your man's eyes, gestures that speak volumes,
and to encode flirtatious words in agreed-upon signs.
She doesn't teach this to all, just those whom sloth doesn't slow down
and whom fear doesn't discourage from rising under cover of night.
Watch how I wander, tense in the shadows, through the whole city

The mechanics of inclusion at work in this passage have already been discussed—how the vision of union supplants the experience of exclusion, how obstacles bemoaned as insurmountable (the *saeva custodia*, the *ianua sera*) suddenly become surmountable (*ne timide custodes*, *reserat … fores*) when the thought of inclusion takes over.[26] But notice, too, how the change of perspective that Delia's invocation inspires rewrites the elegiac event in terms of poetic productivity: reanimation (*molli derepere lecto*) supplants oblivion (*occupet … Sopor*), recovery of poetic footing (*pedem … ponere*)[27] and communicative capacity (*nutus conferre loquaces*, *compositis abdere verba notis*) undoes sensory breakdown (*lumina victa*, *percussum tempora*), rehabilitation of darkness (***nec vetat*** *obscura* ***surgere*** *nocte*) rights the impairment it induced (*lumina victa …* ***neu quisquam*** *…* ***excitet***).

[26] For which, see Chapter 2: The Dream Defended.
[27] See Henkel (2014); Keith (1999), 48-50 for the significance of foot puns on poetic properties in Tibullus.

What we have before us on the page is a thematized enactment of the principles of *lucubratio*: Delia, in her programmatic alignment with light from poem 1.1, in her embodiment of the environment essential to elegiac creativity, is the contextual marker that transforms the setting and the activity that fills it. She enlightens the scene, both as a literal and symbolic presence: it is union (even if only envisioned) with her person that puts an end to the poet-lover's indolence;[28] and it is the atmospheric shift her presence engenders—the brightening of mood and milieu—that enables poetic productivity. Delia's pronunciation is the spark that catalyzes the erotic-poetic activity that unfolds. Under her auspices, passion (*Venus*) can be harnessed for creative ends: the crafting of poetry, in general, as *pedem ... ponere* punily suggests;[29] and of love poetry, in particular, as the furtive *nutus ... loquaces* and fawning *blanda ... verba* imply. And under her auspices, night can be harnessed for elegiac endeavors: darkness is reasserted as the domain of inspired lovers (*quos ... nec vetat obscura surgere nocte*); and accordingly exploited by the poet-lover himself (*ego en tenebris tota vagor anxius urbe*). The conditions that her figure represents—the gleam of the fire, the elegiac orientation with which her presence is vested in poem 1.1—transform the scene into one of erotic-poetic efficacy, dispelling the obliviating blackout of the opening verse and allowing elegiac interests to advance. In short, Delia makes a *lucubratio* of otherwise ill-spent time.

[28] Cf. Maltby (2002), 155 where *sopor* is "a deep sleep, often induced by alcohol." It is worth noting the association of *sopor* with the indulgent indolence of *otium otiosum*, as in Livy *AUC* 33.45.7, where Hannibal disparages his people for *marcescere otii situ ... et inertia sopiri, nec sine armorum sonitu excitari posse* (wasting away in the torpor of relaxation and languishing in laziness, and that they could not be roused without the clash of weapons). Worth remarking, too, is the parallel deployment of *excito* in the effort to dispel *sopor*.

[29] Henkel (2014), 458-459 credits this as the originary *pes* pun in Roman elegy, noting Tibullus' particular affinity for "metapoetic foot imagery" that "often either imitates or inverts the iambic poets' self-disparaging habit of alluding to the 'limp' of their meter." Allusions, he observes, that "form part of a well-thought-out system, in which the apparent reality of Tibullus' poetic world expresses metaphorically the literary and poetic issues he faces as an elegiac poet."

That this much is achieved is reflected in the poet-lover's ability to replicate, in his nocturnal excursion, the benchmarks of elegiac fulfilment presented in poem 1:

> non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis,
> non mihi cum multa decidit imber aqua;
> non labor hic laedit, reseret modo Delia postes
> et vocet ad digiti me taciturna sonum. (1.2.31-34)
>
> The numbing cold of a winter night does me no harm,
> it doesn't harm me when a storm unleashes a torrent of water.
> This trial does no damage, provided that Delia unbolts the doors
> and silently summons me with the snap of a finger.

As much as these assurances represent the poet-lover's transcendence of the elements of exclusion,[30] they speak equally to his reinsertion into the paradigm of elegiac productivity modeled in 1.1.45-48, where the company of the mistress made inclement weather a pleasure (*quam iuvat immites ventos audire cubantem/et dominam tenero continuisse sinu*). There, successful elegiac enterprise was pursued *gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster*, a tableau revisited in 1.2 in the poet-lover's imperviousness to the cold of night (*hibernae frigora noctis*) and the deluge of rain (*multa … imber aqua*) to which amorous ambling subjects him. The call and response between the atmospheric effects—the wintry chill (*hibernus* : *hibernae*) and the inundating water (*aquas…fuderit* : *multa decidit … aqua*) from which, in both scenes, he is shielded—shapes the poet-lover's nocturnal excursions in the image of his domestic bliss, in each case cosseted from the tribulations of exclusion by the embrace of his amatory practice.

Nature's inclemency is thus enfolded into an image of erotic-poetic success;[31] and it is at Delia's invitation that the script of 1.2 is rewritten (*non labor hic laedit, reseret modo Delia postes*), just as in 1.1 it was enjoyment of the company of the mistress (*dominam … continuisse*)

[30] As discussed in Chapter 2: The Dream Defended.
[31] Bound up, perhaps, in this re-presentation of hibernal exteriority as interiority is the sensitivity to nature attached to *lucubratio*, whose temporal location is clearly defined by the rising and setting of the sun and the seasonal waxing and waning of daylight hours, and to whose practice the winter months are thus more conducive, cf. Ker (2004), 218.

that occasioned shelter from the storm. The effect is the delivery of the poet-lover from a traditional context of exclusion and erotic-poetic frustration[32] to the very one of inclusion and erotic-poetic productivity pictured in poem 1, where adverse conditions were kept at bay, where the beloved was kept close by, where the creative fires were kept burning (*igne iuvante*). All of this, again, effected by Delia and the contextual shift she represents: her name, synonymous with the environment of elegiac proliferation, imposes its attributes on situations otherwise adverse to elegiac activity. Thus darkness can be exploited to further the erotic-poetic agenda; thus the perils of nocturnal exposure can be fashioned as the comforts of a night in; thus an act of *lucifuga* can become an episode of *lucubratio*.

And yet, even in this context of elegiac productivity ushered in by the invocation of Delia, the elegiac content is ever so slightly awry. For the poetic efficacy her name confers is simultaneously, if subtly, undermined. The elegiac ethos is abandoned, first in the *mollis lectus* that is left behind, the art of the nocturnal tryst counterintuitively drawing its practitioner away from the core features of the elegiac experience: *mollitia* and the bed;[33] then in the extension of Venus' province only to those whom *nec inertia tardat*, the exclusion of the *iners* from the circle of love unexpectedly eschewing the very concept of artistic unpretentiousness programmatically attached to the elegiac lifestyle in poem 1.[34]

---

[32] Cf. Maltby (2002), 157: "these adverse conditions are normally suffered by the shut-out lover himself"; and Prop 1.16.23-24: *me mediae noctes, me sidera prona iacentem,/frigidaque Eoo me dolet aura gelu* (these midnights pity me, the sidelong stars, as I lie here, pity me, and the cold air of icy dawn).

[33] For the association of *mollitia* with elegiac poetry and the constitution of its adherents, see Greene (2012), 357; Wyke (2007), 175; Keith (1999), 58, 61, and n.41. For *mollitia* construed more broadly in Roman discourse, see Edwards (1993), 63-97. And for the *mollis lectus* identified with the erotic-elegiac experience as "the bed of love", see Cairns (1979), 102 and Maltby (2002), 161.

[34] Maltby (2002), *ad loc.* explains the inconsistency thus: "It is clear that the *vita iners* T. longs for in the first elegy is not compatible with success in love." We have seen the implications of *iners* in Tibullus complicated before: in 1.1.71, where *iners aetas* loomed as the end point of elegiac engagement. There, it accompanied the onset of utter darkness (*tenebris Mors adoperta*, l. 70) and so was operating in the paradigm of elegiac nonproductivity without light. It is not so much the essence of the adjective that changes, but the change in context that affects its applicability: when the conditions of elegiac success are removed, the qualities of elegiac success no longer obtain. I would venture that a similar phenomenon attends the apparent disavowal of *inertia* here: that the inversion is

And the sensory experience of poetry is curtailed, first in the figuration of verse composed *nullo … sono*; then in the visual obfuscation of erotic language encouraged in *blandaque … abdere verba*. The furtive communication so quintessential of the elegiac relationship of exclusion[35] is shown to entail an adulteration of the process of poetic production and reception: poetry stripped of sound, poetry detached from words. The poetic experience is here incomplete for the absence of the very properties that give shape to poetic expression, much as the glottal failure of Sappho's lover in fr. 31 threatens the integrity of the lyric utterance, much as the bodily incapacitation of Catullus' lover in *c.* 51 curtails the poetic script.[36] The context of elegiac productivity represented by Delia, then, is at odds with content that belies elegiac nonproductivity: lovers are activated, only to be led away from the site of elegiac communion; lovers are empowered, only to want for qualities integral to elegiac performance; poetic creation is enabled, only to lack the full dimensions of poetic experience.[37] She represents the environment of *lucubratio* necessary for creative work to take place—the domesticity, the illumination, the inclusion—but only the environment. And environment alone proves insufficient for true elegiac success.

The force of this insufficiency can be acutely felt in poem 1.5, one of the last in the Delia cycle, when both the significance and the shortcomings of context alone to support efficacious elegiac endeavors come to bear. We open, as in poem 1.2, on a moment of nonproductivity:

> Asper eram et bene discidium me ferre loquebar,
> at mihi nunc longa gloria fortis abest;
> namque agor, ut per plana citus sola verbere turben
> quem celer assueta versat ab arte puer. (1.5.1-4)

indicative of a misalignment between context and content, more so than of a fundamental renunciation of *inertia* as a principle of the elegiac lifestyle.

[35] Cf. Musurillo (1970), 394-395 and n. 17; Copley (1956), 36-40; Day (1984), 6.

[36] O'Higgins (1990), 161, 165.

[37] In this, the effect is not unlike the poetic decomposition that is detailed in Sappho fr. 31 and Catullus *c.* 51, where sensory breakdown represents poetic failure. For which, see O'Higgins (1990), 160 ff.; and Janan (1994), 74; discussed in greater detail above, Chapter 4: The Counterpoint.

> I was harsh in my professions that I was handling separation well,
> but now such stout heroism is far gone from me;
> for I am set off, as a top whirling across a flat surface,
> which a child, deft in his well-practiced art, sets spinning.

The iron curtain of exclusion has come down on the poet-lover (*discidium me ferre*), and the absence of Delia has stymied elegiac activity, the removal of erotic-poetic agency signaled linguistically through the passive *agor*—not doing, but done to—and symbolically through the image of the spinning top—not advancing, but revolving.[38]

The simile returns us, in both language and imagery, to a site of estrangement and elegiac frustration already visited by the Tibullan *amator* in a poem past: the Tartarus of 1.3, where violators of love (*quicumque meos violavit amores*, whoever has my profaned my passions, l. 81) are condemned to profound darkness (*scelerata iacet sedes in nocte profunda/abdita*, the seat of depravity lies buried in deep night, ll. 67-68) and unproductive undertakings: illusive irrigation for the Danaids (*in cava Lethaeas dolia portat aquas*, they fetch water from the Lethe in holey jars, l. 80) and Tantalus (*iam iam poturi deserit unda sitem*, again and again the water deceives him as he goes to slake his thirst, l. 78); unsatiating nourishment for Tityos—who gives of himself—and his flock, which is never satisfied (*assiduas atro viscere pascit aves*, he pastures persistent birds on his black organ, l. 75); and, of course, eternal rotation for Ixion: *versantur celeri noxia membra rota* (his guilty limbs are spun round on swift wheel, l. 74).[39]

---

[38] Cf. Maltby's (2004) identification of rotation and cyclicality as central themes in Tibullan poetics, discussed in detail in Chapter 2: The Dream Defined.

[39] For the significance of Tibullus' Tartarean population as an act of reception, see: Houghton (2007); Kenney (1970b); Henderson (1969). Henderson (1969), 649 notes Tibullus' surprising deviation from the model of the underworld offered by Lucretius in his substitution of Tantalus for Sisyphus—the former having "nothing in his record to warrant inclusion" with sinners against love—and explains it as a mythological development that occurred "at some stage in the transmission." I would not challenge the notion that broader cultural forces might be at work, but would also suggest that a degree of intentionality could be detected in the variation if we consider the nature of the punishment suffered alongside that of the crime committed. Between them, the fates endured by Tityos, Tantalus, and the Danaids represent perversions of agrarian work—futile pasturing (Tityos), failed harvesting (Tantalus), faulty irrigation (Danaids)—and thus speak to erotic-poetic nonproductivity by directly countering the image of agrarian-poetic proficiency championed by the Tibullan poet-lover. For a different angle, see Holm (2013),

It is in Ixion's plight that we get direct correspondence to the poet-lover's condition in 1.5, his hapless and hopeless revolution (*turben/quem* ***celer*** *...* ***versat*****,** 1.5.3-4) mirroring and echoing the interminable rotation of Tartarus' twirling denizen (***versantur celeri*** *... rota*). And in this unhappy coincidence, we can intuit the importation of Stygian significations to the poet-lover's situation: nonproductivity as a sentence suffered in contravention of elegiac activity; utter absence of light as the atmospheric harbinger of elegiac disappointment.

As readily, though, as separation from Delia sets the poet-lover spinning to no end, removing the conditions of light and elegiac accordance that enable erotic-poetic creation, her reinsertion into the picture reintroduces the context of productivity:

> rura colam, frugumque aderit mea Delia custos,
> area dum messes sole calente teret;
> aut mihi servabit plenis in lintribus uvas
> pressaque veloci candida musta pede.
> consuescet numerare pecus; consuescet amantis
> garrulus in dominae ludere verna sinu. …
> illa regat cunctos, illi sint omnia curae,
> at iuvet in tota me nihil esse domo. (1.5.21-30)
>
> I'll work over the fields, and my Delia will oversee the harvest,
> while the threshing-floor winnows the grain in the warming sun;
> or she'll supervise the grapes for me, in their full vats,
> and the must, fresh and bright, pressed by rapid step.
> She'll grow to count the sheep; the babes of the local farmhands will grow
> to babble and play on the lap of an adoring mistress. …
> She'll oversee everyone, everything will be in her care,
> but it will be my pleasure to be nothing in every aspect of the household.

With the arrival of Delia comes the recovery of conditions conducive to fruitful activity—and of the agency to perform it. Light is once again present (*sole calente*) and presented as integral to the accomplishment of work, its warming contribution to the threshing of produce marking its instrumental value in the realization of the task. Acting (*colam*) replaces being acted upon and

389-392 ff. where he discusses Tantalus' ties to the erotic experience through his consignment to a cycle of desire and dissatisfaction.

evolution replaces revolution, each of the tasks immediately envisioned being one of processing and manufacture—of crops to harvest (*frugum*, *messes … teret*), of grapes to wine (*uvas/pressaque … musta*)—and so, symbolically, of productive advancement.

The role accorded Delia in this vision of poetic bounty is central but structural. As in poem 1.3, she gives shape to the activity that unfolds in her ambit, but is not herself implicated in the substance of the work being done. Hence the language of oversight: her figuration as *custos*, her direction to protection (*servabit*), her concern for stock-taking (*numerare*), her designation as foreman (*regat*)—duties all rooted in observation—[40] represent external determinants of activity, supervision over form without involvement in execution. She provides a platform for poetic activity—the literal lap (*in dominae … sinu*) on which language is formed (*garrulus*) and playful experimentation takes place (*ludere*)—but remains at a remove from poetic output; output that is itself only poetically approximate, in the rough babbling and ludic informality of the *garrulus* gamin.[41] And so, as before, a misalignment obtains between context and content. ποίησις, when it occurs, has been depersonalized: the floor that winnows the grain (*area … teret*), the foot that presses the grapes (*pressa … veloci pede*),[42] both reflect a dissociation of creative performance

[40] A designation for the elegiac beloved that Kennedy (2016), 52 similarly sees as marked: "the guard (*custos*) in elegy usually serves to keep the lover out of the beloved's house, whereas here the beloved herself has taken up the role of the *custos* in order to help the lover on the farm." Worth noting of the conventional custodial dynamic is the guard's purpose of forestalling erotic activity by separating its constituent actors (*amator* and *puella*).

[41] For *ludere* and related forms (e.g. *lusus*) as a term associated with writing poetry—and informal poetry, in particular—see Debrohun (2003), 124 where *ludere* is recognized as "a word often used for poetic play among the elegists"; Pucci (1961), 249: "Il verbo lusimus … significa che i due poeti hanno scritto παίγνια, cioè brevi poesie scherzose"; and Scott (1969), 170 where it is contrasted with *cano* and *exprimo* as verbs used of high-brow composition. Cf. Cat. *c.* 50.2: *multum lusimus in meis tabellis*.

[42] On the point of *veloci … pede*, we can detect an internal reproduction of the thematic tension between form and content in a phrase that metapoetically evokes, through *pes*, poetic rhythm: *veloci* is spondaic by position, an unnatural slowing down of linguistic swiftness by the strictures of meter, while the position of *pede* forces a non-coincidence of ictus and accent, the natural stress sacrificed for structural integrity. The point being that the context of the phrase (fleet feet) is at odds with its content (slowed stride); and, even more micro, the form of each word is at odd with the content of its pronunciation. The question of Latin accentuation is too deep for me to address with any satisfaction here, but for a good overview of the general issues at stake in its assessment, see Pulgram (1954), *passim* and esp. 234, where the topic of ictus and accent in Classical Latin poetry is discussed: "There can be no doubt that Vergil and other poets could have chosen, had they wished, to compose their lines with a minimum of clashes. Their not doing so indicates either that they did not care … to avoid clashes, or that they produced them on

from a defined creator. And the poet-lover, the would-be defined creator in this universe of poetic productivity, is reduced to nothing (*in tota me nihil esse domo*).

Abstracting the *Topos*

What we see in Tibullus is thus an abstraction and complication of the lucubratory imagery at work in Propertius. While the terms of Propertian *lucubratio* were cleanly differentiated—inclusion promising illumination and erotic-poetic productivity, exclusion spelling darkness and amatory-literary inefficacy—the practice in Tibullus is less black and white. Yes, Delia fosters an environment of light and domestic security in which erotic-poetic activity can flourish; and yes, it is the provision of her person that allows these conditions to obtain, for elegiac work to be performed. But the picture of light is, as it were, incomplete: the context of successful elegiac ventures is present, but the poetic rendering of those ventures does not entirely realize the success that the context foretells. Something is amiss.

What is missing, it turns out, has just been postponed. While Book I vests Delia with contextual significance, aligning her entity with the light and orientation necessary for elegiac productivity, if not ensuring the efficacy of the poetic content, it is in Book II that the content of the elegiac experience is engaged, albeit at the expense of the context.[43] Already in poem 2.1, this paradigm shift is intimated:

> luce sacra requiescat humus, requiescat arator,
> et grave suspenso vomere cesset opus. (2.1.5-6)
>
> Let the earth lie unworked in consecrated light, let the ploughman retire,
> and let weighty work cease, the tilling blade laid up.

purpose because their verses thereby perhaps gained in solemnity or charm, or in some other manner seemed better for this feature."

[43] This sense of poetic content being central to the concerns of Book II accords with Lee-Stecum's (2000), 193 observation of "a great emphasis on words within the text of Tibullus' second book: their effectiveness, their power, and their function."

Gone is the correlation of light and elegiac activity at the core of Book I, where poetic fabrication was, in the parallel lines of poem 1.1, predicated on the undying glow of the hearth (*vitae traducat inerti/dum … luceat igne focus*, 1.1.5-6). The correspondence of placement—of the couplets within their respective poems, of the poems within their respective collections—speaks to a programmatic reorientation from one book to the other:[44] the basic structure of the lucubratory model of elegiac enterprise has fallen away, the constant glow of the hearth (*luceat*) replaced both in form (*luce*) and in function, as an interdiction of industry[45]; and has taken with it the context of poetic productivity that shaped the pursuits of Book I, the element of successful elegiac lucubratory retreat (*satis est requiescere lecto*, 1.1.43) now turned symptom of creative inactivity (*requiescat humus, requiescat arator*) and literary interruption (*cesset opus*, an operatic hiatus that leverages the lexical elision between manual labor, amatory activity, and manuscript authorship).[46]

Gone, too, is the framework of the lucubratory context of production, the removal of the preconditions for amatory activity to amount to poetic production—the illumination, the interiority that Delia represented—rendering the essence of the exercise inappropriate:

> vos quoque abesse procul iubeo, discedat ab aris
> cui tulit hesterna gaudia nocte Venus.
> casta placent superis … (2.1.11-12)
>
> So, too, do I direct you to keep far away, let him step back from the altars
> whom Venus brought delight last night.
> Purity pleases those above …

[44] Cf. Lee-Stecum (2000), 181 where "The opening (and possibly programmatic) 2.1 can be immediately inter-related to the opening (and possibly programmatic) 1.1."
[45] For the cessation of work in conjunction with *lux* (i.e. *dies*) *sacra*, see Maltby (2002), *ad loc*.
[46] Cf. *OLD s.v.* 1, 1c, 5, 9c. For *opus* used of literary work in elegy: Prop. 2.10.11, 3.1.15, 3.3.15, 4.1.61, 135; Ov. *Am*. pr. 2, 1.1.27, 1.15.2, 3.1.5, 3.9.5 (notably to describe Tibullus' poetry: *ille tui* [sc. *Elegia*] *vates operis, tua fama, Tibullus*, that oracle of your work, your renown, Tibullus). See also Keith (1994), 37; and Sharrock (2002a), 154 on the overlap as exploited in Ovid.

The experience of erotic fulfilment (*cui tulit … gaudia … Venus*) is here incompatible with the form of elegiac expression (*vos abesse procul iubeo*), the supplanting of Delia and the lucubratory context of efficacious erotic-poetic engagement (intimated, perhaps, in *hesterna nocte*: last night's fruitful lover—the lover of Book I, we might say—now today's foresworn layman) making the thematic substance of elegy unfit for elegiac composition (*casta placent*), just as the destabilization of elegy was signaled by Ovid in *Amores* 3.13.3 by the incursion of the *casta …festa* of Juno into the elegiac landscape.[47] Such tension is made all the more palpable if we see in this disjunct between the form and the content of elegiac poetic expression a reversal of the dynamic depicted in 1.5.39-40, where the context of elegiac activity was right (physical inclusion with a *puella*), but the content of the practice was wrong (a *puella* who was not Delia): *sed iam cum gaudia adirem/admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus*.[48]

The essence of the reversal is immediately appreciable: while 1.5 provides the structure of erotic-poetic engagement, the substance is lacking, Venus forsaking (*deseruit*) the very fulfilment (*gaudia*) that she goes on to deliver in poem 2.1 (*tulit … gaudia … Venus*), where the absence of the apposite environment for elegiac activity (the supervision of the *ara*, rather than the *amata*) renders her tender immaterial (*discedat*). In both, there is an approaching of efficacy (*gaudia adirem* : *tulit … gaudia*); in both, a withdrawal of support (*deseruit* : *discedat*); but between them a crisis of supply and demand: elegiac context without elegiac content in 1.5, elegiac content without elegiac context in 2.1.

[47] As discussed in Chapter 3: Innovation. Cf. Lee-Stecum (2000), 183: "The specific exclusion of those to whom Venus granted *gaudia* the previous night suggests a subordination of the sexual *gaudia* which is the (usually thwarted) aim of an elegiac poet/lover such as the persona of 1.1 (or of Book 1 generally…). The specific exclusion of Venus might suggest a radical *break* from (rather than a continuance of) the underlying dominance of Amor/Venus which was seen in Book 1 and dramatized particularly over the course of that book's opening poem. … These lines could be seen as asserting a rejection of the underlying dynamic of 1.1."
[48] Discussed in greater length in Chapter 2: The Dream Deferred.

The effects of this programmatic shift radiate throughout the poem, the loss of the contextual associations attending Delia acutely experienced as material from Book I is, along the way, remade.[49] Here, for example, is the image of diligent *lucubratio* from poem 1.3, reimagined in 2.1 as an etiology of women's work:[50]

> haec tibi fabellas referat positaque lucerna
> deducat plena stamina longa colu,
> ac circa, gravibus pensis affixa, puella
> paulatim somno fessa remittat opus. (1.3.85-88)
>
> Let her [sc. *anus*, the elderly guardian] tell you stories and, with lamp set near,
> mete out long filaments from the laden distaff,
> and around her, focused on her heavy measures, a serving girl,
> gradually overcome by sleep, lets slip her work.
>
> hinc et femineus labor est, hinc pensa colusque,
> fusus et apposito pollice versat opus,
> atque aliqua assidue textrix operata Minervae
> cantat et a pulso tela sonat latere. (2.1.63-66)
>
> From this we get women's work, from this her measure of wool and distaff,
> and the spindle spins its work with a thumb there to guide it,
> and the weaver herself, ever at work for Minerva,
> sings and the warp harmonizes when the weight is struck.

The prime of place given, in Book I, to the conditions of elegiac productivity has been ceded, in Book II, to markers of content: the lucubratory setting of 1.3 (*positaque lucerna*) removed and rescripted as the instrument of creation (*apposito pollice*); the *puella*'s forfeiture of fabrication to the exigencies of the night (*fessa remittat opus*) rewritten as the professional's tireless persistence in her task (*assidue textrix operata*), her constancy in production itself refiguring the context of elegiac creation asserted in 1.1.5 (*assiduo … igne*); the futile rotation of Ixion in his state of inefficacy (*versantur … membra*, 1.3.74)—and the fruitless whirling of the

[49] Cf. Lee-Stecum (2000), 181 where the "interpenetration of poems" both "within an elegiac collection" and "across the sequence of an author's work" encourages "those readers aware of the earlier work to inter-relate the poems and to apply expectations raised by one text to the other."
[50] Though Murgatroyd (1994), 54 points to a different depiction of wool working in Book I, at 1.6.77-80, as referent for this image.

poet-lover in his image (*ut … turben … quem … versat*, 1.5.4)—reworked as the loom's productive spinning of wool (*fusus … versat opus*). ποίησις is here enacted in both its material and its literary senses: the material process of fabrication that renders wool as yarn; the literary output of the *textrix* (*cantat*), whose very identity, as it happens, is quite literally defined by her work product;[51] and the metaphorical singing of the loom (*tela sonat*), which integrates the two in its transformation of an instrument—and a process—of material production into one of poetic composition.

And here are love's lessons in reunion, adumbrated in poem 1.2, now actualized:

> illa docet furtim molli derepere lecto,
> illa pedem nullo ponere posse sono,
> illa viro coram nutus conferre loquaces
> blandaque compositis abdere verba notis.
> nec docet hoc omnes sed quos nec inertia tardat
> nec vetat obscura surgere nocte timor. (1.2.19-24)
>
> she teaches how to steal away from a soft bed,
> how to move your feet without a sound,
> to exchange, before your man's eyes, gestures that speak volumes,
> and to encode flirtatious words in agreed-upon signs.
> She doesn't teach this to all, just those whom sloth doesn't slow down
> and whom fear doesn't discourage from rising under cover of night.
>
> hoc duce custodes furtim transgressa iacentes
> ad iuvenem tenebris sola puella venit,
> et pedibus praetemptat iter, suspensa timore,
> explorat caecas cui manus ante vias.
> a miseri quos hic graviter deus urget, at ille
> felix cui placidus leniter afflat Amor. (2.1.75-80)
>
> with him [sc. Cupid] for a guide, stealthily stepping over her resting attendants,
> the girl comes in the shadows, on her own, to her beau,
> and tests out the way with her feet, hesitating in fear,
> her hand explores the blind pathways before her.
> O, they are unfortunate, on whom this god bears down heavily, but prosperous
> he who feels the gentle breath of love serene.

[51] This, even while it corresponds to the *assiduo … aratro* of man's work described in 2.1.51, on which see Maltby (2002), 377. Do note, though, that the farmer's *assiduum aratrum* similarly reclaims the adjective from a description of the context of production in 1.1.5 and applies it to one of production proper.

The palpable responsion between the two moments makes the divergence of poem 2.1 all the more appreciable. While 1.2 provides the structure of elegiac pursuits—effecting, in its communication of the techniques by which lovers can come together, an imposition of the pattern for elegiac action to follow—poem 2.1 enacts the substance. We see form replaced by function: the *puella* in action, the darkness braved (*tenebris*), the feet positioned (*pedibus*), the rendezvous approached (*ad iuvenem … venit*). But this without the lucubratory framework that Delia offered in 1.2—where her invocation, if we recall, precipitated a contextual shift from benumbed blackout to poetic productivity—and so the content of elegiac experience unfolds without the conditions of elegiac efficacy. Thus the preponderance of darkness (*tenebris*, *caecas … vias*, 2.1.76, 78) and the salience of the fear it instills (*suspensa timore*, 2.1.77) in place of their dismissal (*nec vetat obscura surgere nocte timor*, 1.2.24); thus the tentative poetic advancement (*pedibus* ***praetemptat***, 2.1.77) instead of solid composition (*pedem … **ponere***, 1.2.20). This is elegiac content without elegiac context, a reversal of the model that held sway in Book I, and just as there the material deficiency compromised the realization of the poetic experience, so here the poetic material fails to reflect the experience promised by the lucubratory conditions.[52]

This impression no sooner becomes an inevitability, for the final moments of the poem bring both a call for the removal of light and a warning of the last rays of daylight destined for the coming darkness:

> et procul ardentes hinc, precor, abde faces. …
> ludite: iam Nox iungit equos, currumque sequuntur
> matris lascivo sidera fulva choro (2.1.82, 87-88)
>
> and secret far away from here, I beg, the blazing torches. …

[52] An impression similar to Lee-Stecum's (2000), 195-196 assessment of the theme of substantive linguistic failure in Book II: "But the poet/lover's dependence upon words leaves him open to complete failure and impotence. … His words no longer command respect nor are able to have an effect."

> play on: already Night yokes her horses, and the gleaming stars
> tail the chariot of their mother in wanton chorus

The arrival of Nemesis that these lines portend—Nemesis, who shares at least a name with the etiological daughter of Night—is oft-observed.[53] What is worth additional comment is the dissipation of the context of *lucubratio* that they represent. Not just in the proscription of all sources of light (*abde faces*); not just in the descent of darkness that knells the dying of the light (*iam Nox iungit equos*); not just in the suspension of activity that the end of day obliges—an anxiety implicit in *ludite*, an invitation to, quite literally, seize the day that recalls the poetic output of the ludic babe of 1.5.26, who, in true metapoetic fashion, leveraged the seat of Delian *lucubratio* to form language (*garrulus in dominae ludere verna sinu*); but in the ushering in of an ethos that departs from the model of upstanding lucubratory engagement—artistic-poetic activity that becomes, by the license of darkness, licentious (*lascivo … choro*).[54] In the dark of night, poetic enterprise is no longer so industrious. Our *lucubratio* has become a *lucifuga*.

Applying the Tension

All of this has been by way of programmatic reorientation. But that we are operating in a new landscape of content without form is confirmed with the introduction of Nemesis in poem 2.3, when we see the contextual scaffolding that Delia offered collapse: *O ego cum aspicerem dominam … nec quererer quod sol graciles exureret artus* (O, could I only set sight on my mistress … I wouldn't complain that the sun was burning my delicate limbs, 2.3.5, 9). The removal of the Delian context of domestic *lucubratio* delineated in poem 1.1 inverts the terms of

[53] For Nemesis as the daughter of Night: Hesiod, *Theog*. 223-224. For discussion of the connection between the Tibullan Nemesis and the daughter of Night, both in general and as applies to these lines of poem 2.1, see: Booth and Maltby (2005), 129-130; Lee-Stecum (2000), 192; Bright (1978), 118-119, 190.
[54] Where *chorus* bespeaks song as much as dance, cf. *OLD s.v.*

the elegiac experience:[55] longing for inclusion, *cum aspicerem dominam*, replaces its realization (*dominam ... continuisse*, 1.1.46); abuse of tender limbs (*graciles exureret artus*) replaces their use for tender embrace (*tenero ... sinu*, 1.1.46); light's destructive dimension (*sol ... exureret*) replaces its constructive capacity (*igne iuvante*, 1.1.48). The poetic conundrum of Book I is here played out in reverse: the elegiac content is present—the mistress, the light, the elegiac ethos (those *graciles artus*)[56]—but the lucubratory context is missing, and so the poetic experience falls short.

It is with the naming of Nemesis that this new privileging of elegiac material over the circumstances of elegiac production is fully expressed:

> ut mea luxuria Nemesis fluat utque per urbem
> incedat donis conspicienda meis.
> illa gerat vestes tenues quas femina Coa
> texuit, auratas disposuitque vias. (2.3.55-58)
>
> so shall my Nemesis stream with luxury and throughout the city
> make her way, demanding attention with my gifts.
> She'll sport fine-spun clothes that a lady of Cos has woven
> and patterned in channels of gold.

Bright points to these lines in the course of his argument for Nemesis' function within the Tibullan corpus as the quintessential *dura domina* of elegy, representing the harsh reality of elegiac love in opposition to the amatory ideal embodied by Delia. For his purposes, the description equates Nemesis with the urban aesthetic, her lavish raiment reflecting both the acquisitive drive and the built environment characteristic of the city.[57] But it equally positions

[55] Cf. Booth and Maltby (2005), 128: "The opposition between the two mistresses is thematically reflected in the tendency of the Nemesis poems of the second book to invert Tibullus' scenarios and attitudes in the Delia poems of the first."
[56] Which slender limbs, incidentally, are shot through with a vein of metapoetic significance, as elucidated by Keith (1999), 50: "The slender limbs (*artus* is synonymous with *membra*) and soft hands of the lover metaphorically represent the elegant verse that the poet composes and align Tibullan elegy with the rhetorical *gracilitas* characteristic of the plain style" of rhetoric.
[57] Bright (1978), 184-196, 202; echoed by Booth and Maltby (2005), 128: "Whereas Delia is associated with an ideal existence in the country … Nemesis is associated with a life of luxury in the town."

her as a classic elegiac mistress in a different, less discriminatory way: through her evocation of Propertius' Cynthia, whose own donning of such finery proved a source of inspiration for her poet-lover: *sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere vidi,/totum de Coa veste volumen erit* (if I have seen her step out, resplendent in Coan dress, an entire tome will emerge out of Coan cloth, Prop. 2.1.5-6).[58] The reminiscence works to align Nemesis with elegiac content on two levels: in her evocation of another poetic mistress, she embodies the written material of the poetic tradition itself; and in the particulars of her finery, she displays the material wares so closely associated with the elegiac mistress in her inspiration of the content for that tradition (as Propertius' disclosure lays bare).[59]

And yet, at the same time, the portrayal signals the limitations of the operation of content at the expense of context. For it is not so much that Nemesis evinces the failure of the elegiac relationship with its relocation from country to city, as in Bright's reading, but that she signals the detachment of elegiac material—both literally, in her articles of clothing, and figuratively, in her elicitation of other poetic passages—from its context of production. With the removal of the conditions necessary for poetic proliferation—the constructive light snuffed out in line 9 with *sol exureret*, the domestic inclusion ruptured in lines 55-56 by *per urbem*/*incedat*—comes the insufficiency of the poetry created: *vota loquor*, the Tibullan poet-lover complains at the end of his description, the inadequacy of his content making clear that elegiac material, pursued outside of the context of poetic productivity that prevailed in Book I, does not deliver a satisfying poetic experience.

---

[58] A coincidence also observed by Maltby (2002), *ad loc*. While my argument is not dependent on assuming a chronology that would allow Tibullus' portrayal of Nemesis to be a direct response to Propertius' depiction of Cynthia in 2.1, it is worth nothing that the adornment of Cynthia in Coan dress occurs as early as Prop. 1.2.2—certainly precedent to Tibullus' second book of poetry—and thus the association of the elegiac mistress with clothing from Cos was, either way, operating at the time of Tib. 2.3.

[59] On luxury goods in the elegiac economy, see: Damer (2019), 59-60; Bowditch (2006); James (2003), 71-107 and (2001); Griffin (1976).

There is more to say about the voicing of *vota*, though, for in this singular confession lurks an encapsulation of the entire Tibullan lucubratory conceit. Lee-Stecum has shed light on the vesting of *votum*, in Tibulllus, with generic significance, its linguistic mediation between incantation and imploration positioning it as a tidy summary of the nature of elegiac utterance.[60] And so we can hear, in *vota loquor*, the simultaneous instantiation of the elegiac form (where *vota* bespeaks a mode of generic expression) and expression of its substantive inefficacy (where *vota* betrays a material intangibility). *Vota loquor* is thus a locus of tension between form and content: both structurally fruitful and substantively futile, both productive of elegy, but elegy that is unrealized.

Beyond this, if we recognize *votum* as both promise and prayer, both surety and uncertainty, the resonance redounds.[61] The form of the expression is there, but the content has yet to materialize; the structure of the action is determined (promise) but the substance remains indeterminate (prayer). It is the same dynamic that we saw obtain in Propertius 2.6, where the representation of poetic inefficacy chafed against its expression in effective poetics, only here, the conundrum is enclosed within the world of the poem, within the word of *vota*, located in the poet-lover's own represented experience, rather than enacted in the interaction between text and representation. The relational dynamic between poetic form and poetic content has been made a part of the poetic representation.

By the close of poem 2.5, the force of this friction has been applied:

> usque cano Nemesim, sine qua versus mihi nullus
> verba potest iustos aut reperire pedes. (2.5.111-112)

[60] Lee-Stecum (2000), 194-195 where "*Vota loquor* … could be read as a description of all the elegies in Book 2 (and maybe also Book 1)" and where the utterance of the *votum* is enfolded into the poet-lover's attempted program "of persuasion or manipulation."

[61] *OLD s.v.* 1 ("a vow made … to do or offer something in return"), 3 ("a desire, hope"). And in this we can hear the echoes of Tibullan *spes* from poem 2.6, where hope was intimately associated with the beloved in the simultaneity of absence and presence, have and not have, for which, see Chapter 2: The Dream Deferred.

> All the while I sing of Nemesis, without whom no verse of mine
> can find language or the right rhythm.

Just as Delia represented the conditions for poetic productivity, so Nemesis reflects the substance of the poetic act: she is the object of poetic expression (*cano Nemesim*), essentially bound to the nature of that poetic expression, both linguistically (*verba*) and rhythmically (*pedes*). Where Delia's illuminating presence in 1.2 could not confer a complete poetic experience (verse without sound, *pedem nullo … sono*, verse without words, *nutus … loquaces*, *abdere verba*), it is the shadow of Nemesis' absence in 2.5 that attends poetic inefficacy, her fundamental identification with the substance of poetic production representing the element missing from Delia's contextual purview.[62]

Delia and Nemesis, then, even while they embody light and dark, are not so much antitheses as complements. For while Delia may represent the illumination and domestic inclusion necessary for elegiac enterprise, having the conditions alone proves to be insufficient for the realization of successful poetic content. And while Nemesis may represent the realization of elegiac content, doing so without the light and locale suited for creative enterprise makes for an unsatisfying poetic experience. Merciless exposure and jealous enclosure, pure light and unbroken darkness, equally undermine elegiac efficacy.

Bright does, as it happens, suggest that "the two sets of elegies on Delia and Nemesis can shed light on each other", that "the two are intended to be set side by side", but only insofar as doing so can demonstrate that Nemesis is "in effect a separate study of the negative side of Delia."[63] But rather than see in Delia and Book I the elegiac ideal tarnished by the elegiac reality

[62] Cf. Lee-Stecum (2000), 208: "The poet links the security of the poetic process (the production of *iusti pedes* and *verba*) with security within the *amor*-relationship …. Both are determined by the presence of Nemesis."
[63] Bright (1958), 122, 186-187. This is not, in effect, so very different from Baca's (1968), 55 suggestion that Delia and Nemesis are two names for the same woman, chosen "for their appropriateness to the nature of the elegies he was writing", despite Bright's dismissal of the theory. To which I would say that it is productive to retain their

of Nemesis and Book II, better, perhaps, to see in both the simultaneous success and failure of a binarized approach to poetry. If Delia succeeds in offering the context of elegiac experience, but falls short by offering *only* the context of elegiac experience; if Nemesis succeeds in supplying the content of elegiac experience, but falls short by supplying *only* the content of elegiac experience; then reading them together—context paired with content—would deliver the complete poetic experience that each, on her own, cannot provide. Moreover, reading them together—light paired with dark—would result in the enactment of the practice of *lucubratio* itself: light brought to darkness in the application of context for the creation of content.[64]

I will leave us, then, in light of this interpretative twist, with a sense of how such a lucubratory approach to Tibullus might play out. Consider anew the opening lines of poem 2.1, hearing them now in harmonization with, rather than contravention of, their counterparts in 1.1:

> me mea paupertas vitae traducat inerti
> dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus. (1.1.5-6)
>
> luce sacra requiescat humus, requiescat arator,
> et grave suspenso vomere cessat opus. (2.1.5-6)

If we let go the impulse to see in the cessation of industry at the coming of day a failure of the contextual model of Book I in the transition to Book II, we might find, instead, that they are mutually informative. Where 1.1 sets up illumination to accompany the devotion of self to a life of elegiac pursuits, 2.1 fulfils the paradigm: the suspension of labor that allows elegiac activity to proliferate—in the relaxation of the land and its worker (*requiescat*, just as *requiescere* was a cornerstone of the elegiac lifestyle enjoyed at 1.1.43), in the cessation of the *grave opus* that

---

distinction, even beyond Bright's notion that Nemesis is just the dark side of Delia, but that doing so is not necessarily incompatible with taking them to represent different qualities of a single individual.

[64] Cf. Miller's (1994), 57 description of the dynamics of reading ancient lyric poetry: "separate readings qualify each other in such a way that the speaker's projected experience is constantly recycled as a paradigm of that experience's own intelligibility. Each moment is always interpreted in light of the others known to the reader. Thus the action or sentiment described in one poem frequently only becomes intelligible in light of the actions or sentiments described in another poem and vice versa."

represents the antithesis to the elegiac ideal of *levis versus*. All thanks to the presence of light (*luce sacra*). *Assiduus ignis*, indeed.

Appraising the Totality

And so we are, in a sense, delivered back unto that definitive moment in poem 1.1, when context and content were harmonized and elegiac endeavors were productive. However much the linear progression through the collection witnesses an incremental dissociation of form from substance that effects an incomplete poetic experience, we are, by the end, provided the blueprint to rectify it: in the model of reading the content of Nemesis in the context of Delia, of reunifying the constituents of structure and substance through an enactment of the very essence of the *lucubratio* practice that the poetry itself struggles to realize. And yet, even with this concluding impression of poetic complementarity between the two beloveds, by the final line of the final poem, Tibullus has not given a final answer: he has only offered the structure of certainty, but has continued to withhold its substance.[65] Reaching the sequential end of the collection is not sufficient to actualize the poetry; returning to the beginning is necessary.

If linear reading from Book I to Book II necessitates carrying the model of poetic productivity forward from poem 1.1 in order to appreciate the gradual deconstruction of the *lucubratio topos*, the realization of the lucubratoy relationship between the two collections necessitates a backward reading from Book II to Book I in order to implement the model and actualize the poetry. Any ultimate intelligibility is only that the poetry of isolation has been incomplete. The closing revelation does not fix the content of interpretation, it provides the process to approach it.

[65] Lee-Stecum (1998), 4: "The danger of viewing reading as a process", Lee-Stecum warns, "is that it becomes equated with progress. This would imply that all the shifting re-readings … will finally be resolved into certainty when the reader reaches the end."

There is, though, one interpretative possibility that might be worth fixating on, and this, too, will prompt a return: to the early pages of this discussion and Lee-Stecum's reading of Tibullan poetics in terms of a negotiation of power between Roman politics and Roman elegiacs. "The similarities," Lee-Stecum observes, "between the ostensibly *different* processes and between the ostensibly *different* areas of power struggle cause them, again, to merge in a tense, problematic interplay of structures and models which are set for the realisation and operation of power" (emphasis original).[66] We could, in the spirit of Tibullan poetics, abstract Lee-Stecum's notion of the power dynamics at play in his poetry and recast them in the language of form and content, with the Roman system of value becoming the context and the elegiac practice the content. And we could see, in the lucubratory crisis and resolution that obtains in the poetry, a problematization of annexing elegiac culture from Roman.

For if Delia represents the elegiac orientation (pastoral context) and Nemesis the Roman sensibility (urban content); if Delia represents the Roman industrial superstructure (the culture of the day) and Nemesis the elegiac creative expression (the enterprise of the night); then the need for their mutual implication in order to have a complete literary experience speaks to the need of a complementary relationship between the elegiac ethos and the Roman cultural ethic from which it would be divorced. Both, in the end, share the same basic orientation: the *assiduus labor* of the one against the *assiduus ignis* of the other, their ways aligned, even if their means diverge, and the weight of each only appreciable in light of the substance of its counterpart.[67] The consequence being that elegiac culture cannot exist independently of Roman culture, no more can Roman culture exist independently of elegiac culture. A symbiosis between them is needed

[66] Lee-Stecum (1998), 25.
[67] Cf. Keith (2008), 165 on the elegiac lifestyle as styled in Propertius: "Roman imperial and Propertian aesthetic projects are intimately correlated, each framing and reframing the other as military conquest elicits 'the enjoyment of the fruits of *otium*' and elegiac *otium* in turn commemorates the products and processes of military conquest."

in order for each to function fully—a third space that is neither sun-washed nor steeped in darkness, but somewhere in between.[68]

We could call that space the *topos* of elegiac *lucubratio*. Just as the tension between context and content in Propertius 2.6 was resolved in the dynamic of exclusion-in-inclusion that the *lucubratio* practice facilitates, so in Tibullus, the tension between context and content is resolved in the third space of the *lucubratio* practice—as both literary *topos* and poetic process—wherein Delia and Nemesis, darkness and light, form and substance can be reconciled, even if not altogether integrated. Full dedication to the *forum* and the culture of the day (Delia without Nemesis) is counterproductive, but equally counterproductive is full dedication to *lucifuga* and the culture of the night (Nemesis without Delia). Elegy must inhabit the half-light—must be a product of both light and dark, of *otium*, but not *otium otiosum*—to be fully realized. And it is not until their harmonization in the lucubratory act of commingling the two—light and dark, context and content—that poetizing can be truly productive. Tibullan *lucubratio*, then, is more than a *topos* of poetic productivity. It is a metaphor for the nature of poetic creation and the place of that creation within its broader context.

[68] On the notion of *lucubratio* as a "third space", cf. Debrohun (2003), 24 where she identifies the need in elegiac (specifically Propertian) criticism for "a third level of discourse, a 'manipulable space' that operates between the two poles, that is, a place where they might 'meet'" to address the opposites at work in the poetry; and 118 ff. where she discusses the *limen* as visually representative of that "space."

Chapter 6

Lucubratory Practice as Literary Performance in Ovid

Leitmotif, Concept, Advancement

If Propertius bequeaths a visual language for the representation of elegiac activity as lucubratory productivity that Tibullus complicates by isolating its elements, Ovid systematically develops the dimensions of the *topos* as a literary device. Tapping into the network of associations with which Propertius and Tibullus invest the practice, Ovid is able to push the representation to its limits, using its elements to enact elegiac productivity even in circumstances that are not classically lucubratory; and thereby to reimagine the dynamics of poetic productivity altogether. He opens up the scene to new contexts and constituents, building on the base of lucubratory poetic interaction between *amator* and beloved to introduce a paradigm of elegiac *lucubratio* instantiated as much in the readerly act of poetic consumption as it is in the creative process of poetic production—of private event as public performance.

Lucubratio as an exercise inherently blurs the lines between spectacle and secret—it brings before the eyes of an audience an exercise whose essence is its invisibility, but whose value as a token of personal integrity depends on the appreciation of its performance. Indeed, even while Quintilian commends the privacy of the bedroom as a *liberum arbitris locum* (a place without an audience, *Inst*. 10.3.22) uniquely suited to the kind of relaxation of inhibitions that subtends successful writing, it is as a cog in the machinery of oratorical performance, a sequestration exploited for perfection of the craft before one's public unveiling.[1]

[1] Quint. *Inst*. 10.3.2: *scribendum ergo quam diligentissime et quam plurimum. … nam sine hac quidem conscientia ipsa illa ex tempore dicendi facultas inanem modo loquacitatem dabit et verba in labris nascentia* (and so writing must be undertaken as assiduously and as often as possible. … For indeed, without this compunction, the very means of speaking *ex tempore* will offer only empty prattle and words that originate with the lips). Cf. Ker (2004), 215-216: "The paradox of Quintilian's *lucubratio* is that while it is the 'best kind of privacy,' it is still brought before our eyes as a *performance* that lends authority to the hypothetical orator's publicly delivered speech" (emphasis original).

The performative potential inherent in a portrayal of *lucubratio* is a centerpiece in James Ker's elucidation of the value of the practice as a literary device, through which the concurrent presentation, on the page, of the author's person and product to his reader encourages reflection "on the text's conditions of production and especially on the ethos of the writer as a user, or economist, of time."[2] Awareness of this potential is certainly detectable in Cicero's and Lucretius' deployments of the *topos*, which function as metonyms for personal integrity as much as they do barometers of the worth of their work.[3] The same can be said, in a way, of Tibullus, the *assiduus ignis* of whose domestic *lucubratio* practice participates in the same project of gainful industry in which the Roman acquisitive mindset, with its expansionist *assiduus labor*, trades. And it can certainly be said of Propertius, whose own figuration of *lucubratio* is in the service of performing the very set of cultural values claimed by Cicero and Lucretius in an artistic domain—elegiac poetry—not canonically seen to reflect them, but in a physical one—the privacy of the bedroom—that does.

Ovid, though, goes one step further. He not only acknowledges that the strength of the representation to confer value lies as much in its observation as in its execution, he actively accounts for the phenomenon in his portrayal of the practice. This is not performative self-awareness of the kind that Ker attributes to authors who record their own lucubratory habits—or not just of that kind. It does more than encourage audience reflection on the quality of *scriptor* and script; it reflects audience participation in the scripture itself, and thereby acknowledges

[2] Ker (2004), 211-212. This act of reflection, for Ker, is key in mediating between the distanced contexts of composition and reception, such that "the time of writing is rendered significant and efficacious at a time of reading with which it is not simultaneous" (227).

[3] On which see above, Part II, Overview: *Lucubratio* and its Literary Legacy. In his discussion of Cicero, Ker (2004), 228-229 principally remarks the value conferred on the text through the representation of its circumstances of production. His subsequent (229 ff.) considerations of Seneca, Pliny the Elder, and Aulus Gellius, though, do address the implications of lucubratory self-presentation for personal image, in addition to its role in conditioning reception of the manuscript.

elegiac activity as a product not just for, but of, literary consumption.[4] By going public with the elegiac performance, Ovid is able to advance the representation of *lucubratio* as a poetic paradigm—no less powerful for its operation outside of its prescribed *topos* than within it—and to apply it toward a reconceptualization of the nature of the erotic-poetic experience as being equally the province of the culture that consumes it is as the sub-culture that produces it.

Love, Composition, Attestation

The industrious withdrawal synonymous with the *lucubratio* practice is one of the primary axes along which it is distinguished from less respectable nocturnal pursuits. If the disgrace of the *lucifuga* attends his public misbehavior—his eschewal of standards of social conduct—the grace of the lucubrator lies in his discretion, in his non-disruption of the social contract in his after-hours activities. This sensibility is present in Propertian poetics, where lucubratory engagement with the mistress is confined to the bedroom (as in poem 2.15) in distinction to the lucifugal public antics of the *exclusus amator* (as in poem 1.16).[5] It is at the heart of Tibullan elegiac *lucubratio*, with its programmatic association of poetic productivity with domestic inclusion in poem 1.1. And it endures in Ovid's *Amores*, as with the poet-lover's recommendation to his mistress that she reserve sexual license for the bedroom:

quis furor est, quae nocte latent, in luce fateri,
et quae clam facias facta referre palam? …
est qui nequitiam locus exigat; omnibus illum

[4] The relationship between author and audience in Ovid has been well-explored, albeit more so in his later works, for which see: Gibson (1999) on the *Tristia*; Conte (1994b) on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*; Wheeler (1999) and Boyd (2006) on the *Metamorphoses*. Jansen (2012) addresses the issue of modern reading practices in the reception of the *Amores* in the course of a discussion of its proem. Lee-Stecum (1998), 15 comments on elegy's general "performative aspect, what the poet-lover's discourse represents itself as doing or attempting to do," suggesting that "To this might be added … the reception of the poet's performance by the reader."

[5] Cf. Nappa (2007), 58-59: "The image of the *exclusus amator* … publicizes both his desire and his capitulation to it. … The lover is made a spectacle by his literal position outside the door … the *exclusus amator* is perpetually held at bay … and publicly exposed to disapproval of his moral weakness"; and Ker and Wessels (2020), 9-10: "Sitting on the threshold, which symbolizes the transition between the (visible) socio-political sphere and the (non-visible and hard-to-access) private-poetical sphere, the *exclusus amator* … aim[s] at transgressing boundaries and leaving behind the requirements and expectations of the political sphere—and civilization."

deliciis inple, stet procul inde pudor!
hinc simul exieris, lascivia protinus omnis
absit, et in lecto crimina pone tuo. …
illic purpureis condatur lingua labellis,
inque modos Venerem mille figuret amor;
illic nec voces nec verba iuvantia cessent,
spondaque lascivia mobilitate tremat! (*Am*. 3.14.7-8, 17-20, 23-26)

What kind of crazy is this, confessing in the light of day things that,
by night, are concealed, and recounting in public what you've done
in private? …
There's a place that demands debauchery; fill *that* up with
every pleasure, let modesty stay far away from there!
As soon as you leave this place, immediately let all
impropriety go, and put your crimes to bed. …
There the tongue should be thrust between ruby lips,
and love fashion Venus in millions of ways;
there neither vocalizations nor gratifying words be slow in coming,
and the bed should rock with lustful swaying.

In his encouragement of the *puella* to keep her amatory doings under wraps, the poet-lover invokes the same model of lucubratory elegiac activity that shapes the experience of the Propertian *amator* in 2.15. Night and the bedroom are the spatio-temporal locus of erotic pursuits (the Ovidian *nocte* and *lecto* to the Propertian *nox* and *lectule* of 2.15.1-2). And those very erotic pursuits are weighted with poetic significance:[6] through the evocation of elegiac *acta* with *nequitia*, a word used, by both Propertius and Ovid, to signal elegy with the same hint of programmatic self-deprecation that motivates apologies for its *levitas*;[7] through the invitation to

[6] Cf. Sharrock (1995), 158: "Throughout the amatory corpus, Ovid uses and confuses the language of sex and of poetics to create a discourse in which the reader is offered the opportunity of reading poetry 'as' sex and sex 'as' poetry. It is almost as if verbs like *amare* come to suggest 'to write love poetry' as well as 'to love' and 'to make love'."

[7] As at *Am.* 2.1.1-2 (*hoc quoquoe conposui Paelignis natus aquosis,/ille ego* ***nequitiae*** *Naso poeta meae*, this, too, I wrote, the son of the sodden Paeligni, I, Naso, that poet of my own wantonness) and 3.1.15-17 (*ecquis erit … tibi finis amandi,/o argumetni lente poeta tui?/****nequitiam*** *vinosa tuam convivia narrant,/narrant in multas conpita secta vias*, will there be an end to your loving, o poet stuck in your theme? Drunken parties, street corners intersecting many roads are promulgating your wantonness); and Prop. 1.6.25-26 (*me sine .../huic animam extremam reddere* ***nequitiae***, let me render my last gasp unto this wantonness). Cf. Wyke (2007), 174: "The whole constellation of negative values are not lost on elegy's male ego, who describes his condition as one of *nequitia* or moral depravity"; Sharrock (2013), 151: "All four canonical elegists wear this [sc. *nequitia*] and other conventionally reprehensible characteristics as a badge of honour and a positive aesthetic choice. …The aesthetic values of the Hellenistic tradition at Rome are associated with the same side of the equation as the unconventional lifestyle choices summed

lingual manipulation (*condatur lingua*) in language (*condo*) that denotes writing;[8] through the description of sexual techniques as *modos*, which recalls the dimensions of Propertian *morae* in its dual indication of composition ("meter") and comportment ("manner"); through the determination that amatory utterance not cease (*nec voces nec verba iuvantia cessent*), the negation of a verb (*cesso*) that itself betokens *otium otiosum* ("be idle, at leisure"),[9] continuing the conversation around elegy and its lucubratory productivity.

We have, then, a legislation of elegiac protocol that activates the representational argot established by Propertius' instantiation of elegiac *lucubratio*. Indeed, that Propertius' portrayal is an operant paradigm for the poet-lover of *Amores* 3.14 is suggested in the pointed linguistic and imagistic parallels between it and Propertius 2.15. *deliciis inple*, the Ovidian *amator* bids for the bedroom, as if to recreate the Propertian poet-lover's *lectule deliciis facte beate meis* (little bed, delighted by my delights, 2.15.2). *condatur lingua labellis* he encourages, as if to recapture the Propertian poet-lover's *oscula sunt labris nostra morata tuis* (our kisses lingered on your lips, 2.15.10). *modos Venerem mille figuret amor*, he urges, as if to reenact the Propertian poet-lover's *quam vario amplexu mutamus bracchia* (with what shifting embrace we interlaced our arms, 2.15.9). *illic nec voces nec verba iuvantia cessent*, he entreats, as if to echo the Propertian poet-lover's *quam multa … narramus verba* (how many words we speak, 2.15.3). He is, in short, advising the beloved to bedroom behavior that comports with the transmitted *topos* of elegiac lucubratory productivity, from the charge of the environment (*deliciis inple* : *deliciis facte beate*) to the choreography of the entertainment (*condatur labellis* : *labris … morata*; *modos … mille* : *quam vario*; *nec verba … cessent* : *quam multa … verba*).

---

up in the term *nequitia*." And Keith (2008), 141 where she describes "Propertius' programmatic characterization of the elegiac life as defined by *nequitia*, 'idleness' in the moralizing sense of 'depravity'".

[8] Rimell (2015), 40-41. Cf. *OLD s.v.* 12.

[9] *OLD s.v.* 4.

And that comports with the *topos* in spirit, not just in practice. For by asserting so vociferously the need to conceal all of this erotic-poetic activity behind the closed doors of the bedroom (*est qui … locus exigat; illic*; *illic*), the poet-lover upholds the privacy principle on which *lucubratio* turns. Just as Propertius 2.15 is careful to delimit the time-space of the erotic-poetic activity that it chronicles—the orienting assertion of *nox* and *lectus* in its opening two lines aligning the acts that ensue with the lucubratory ethic of private withdrawal as much as with the environment into which the practitioner retreats—so *Amores* 3.14 emphasizes the compatibility of erotic-poetic conceits with polite sensibilities.

In the *amator*'s insistence on invisibility (communicated through the language of concealment in *latent*, *clam*, *condatur*, even *pone*)[10]; in his hard-and-fast determination that the heat of the night should not continue to blaze during the remains of the day (through the pronounced antithesis between *nocte latent* and *in luce fateri*, between *clam* and *palam*); he systematically inscribes erotic-poetic activity in the program of polite self-containment. Proper elegiac practice is here assiduously, if implicitly, differentiated from the model of the *exclusus*, whose public remonstrations redound to not only his own disgrace, but to that of the entire erotic-poetic project. Unlike the public performance of the *paraclausithyron*, which participates in the culture of lucifugal hijinxs in its disruption of civic spaces and sensibilities—and which the *puella* threatens to channel in her blasé broadcasting of her entanglements—elegiac activity here preserves the lucubratory ethos of respectful withdrawal, keeping private that which ought to be kept private, rather than allowing personal affairs to inform public presentation (*hinc simul exieris, lascivia protinus omnis/absit*).[11]

[10] For *pono*, cf. *OLD s.v.* 3 ("to lay (foundations)"), 4 ("to plant (trees, etc.)"), 8b ("to bury"). For discussion of *condo* as verb of both foundation and concealment—and the poetic implications of such—see Rimell (2015), 39-41.
[11] Cf. Sharrock (1994a), 158: "Elegy talks about sex using for the most part language which convention decrees constitutes a veil of modesty over the subject." Sharrock's discussion concerns verbal euphemism, but a similar

But even in its professed privileging of elegiac privacy over public display of affection, poem 3.14 is navigating the nexus between intimacy and openness in a way that mutually implicates the two. For the very word used to signal elegiac activity in line 17, *nequitia*, itself invokes a delicate dance between public and private that is part of the elegiac *amator*'s repertoire. As often as he uses it as a generic signifier, Propertius' poet-lover deploys *nequitia* to capture an uneasy relationship between visibility and obscurity: in the circulation of Cynthia's notoriety at 2.5.1-2 (*hoc verum est, tota te ferri, Cynthia, Roma,/et non ignota vivere nequitia?* Is it fair, Cynthia, that you're spread all over Rome, and living in no secret wantonness?), the metapoetic implications of which are made clear nineteen poems later:

> 'tu loqueris, cum sis iam noto fabula libro
> et tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro?' …
> quod si facilis spiraret Cynthia nobis,
> non ego nequitiae dicerer esse caput,
> nec sic per totam infamis traducerer urbem (2.24.1-2, 5-7)
>
> 'Are you talking, now that you're fictionalized in a well-known book
> and your *Cynthia* is being read throughout the Forum?'…
> But if Cynthia would send us favorable winds,
> I would not be spoken of as the font of wantonness,
> and would not be thus pronounced disreputable through the whole city

As much as the poet-lover denounces the reputation that his love affair has brought him, he predicates his very poetic identity on its circulation. To be called a font of *nequitia* is to be intimately associated with elegy, both as a producer of its themes (the wellspring of content that is wanton) and as a practitioner of its precepts (oneself characterized by wantonness).[12] It speaks to the close identification of poet and poetry that the opening line establishes (*cum sis iam noto*

---

point could be made of the *lucubratio topos* as appropriated by elegy, through which it becomes a kind of visual-contextual euphemism: the presentation of something taboo (erotic-poetic activity) in the trappings of something respectable (*lucubratio* proper). If the kind of linguistic euphemism that Sharrock identifies is central to the elegiac conceit, it is not unreasonable to think that contextual-visual euphemism would be equally operant in the poetry.

[12] Cf. Wyke (2007), 175 where "the lover-poet of Propertius 2.24.1-8 declares that **his frustrated love and his elegiac poetry** have caused him to be accused of *nequitia* and to be labelled *infamis* or 'disreputable' throughout the city of Rome" (emphasis mine).

fabula libro); and captures the paradox that underlies the elegiac experience as one that turns equally on intimacy and publicity. As *nequitia* is only made *nequitiosa* through its public recognition as such, so too does elegiac poetry exist at the crossroads of disguise and display: its essence, like that of *lucubratio*, lies not in its contained performance, but in the visibility of that performance.

All of this is encapsulated in Ovid's *nequitia*—this sense of publication being essential to the production of elegiac intimacy, even while that very publication chafes against amatory impulses to limit the experience to two. It is a tension reflected in the poet-lover's problematization of pronouncement (*in luce* ***fateri***; *facta* ***referre*** *palam*)[13] rather than action, the anxiety to contain both the making and the language of love to the bedroom—where, in contrast, *nec verba iuvantia cessent*—refracting the nature of elegiac *nequitia* as a condition that is speakably unspeakable.[14] As much, then, as the poem upholds the insulation of personal affairs from public display in the pursuit of erotic-poetic activity, it collapses the boundary between the two, in the process advancing an interest in exploiting the duality of the *lucubratio topos* as valuable both for its privacy and for its performativity—and of elegy as equally at home in the broader society that receives and reconstitutes it as it is in the insular culture that conceives and composes it.

---

[13] Which, between them, suggestively recall Cicero's project with the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*: *illa ipsa, quae vix in gymnasiis et in otio Stoici probant, … temptare volui possentne* ***proferri in lucem***, *id est in forum* (I wanted, for those very things that the Stoics only with difficulty demonstrate in gymnasia and in leisure time, …. to explore whether they can be brought to light, that is it say, before the public, *Para*. praef. 3-4). Worth noting, too, is Cicero's own navigation of the public-private axis in his scholarly endeavors, transforming the material of personal leisure (*in otio Stoici probant*) into the content of published literature (*proferri in lucem, id est in forum*), a project itself undertaken as an act of *lucubratio* (*accipies igitur hoc parvum opusculum lucubratum his iam contractioribus noctibus,* so take this this small little volume, written by lamp-light over the course of these now shorter nights, *Para*. praef. 5).

[14] Cf. Sharrock (1994a), n.18, where she points to the concept of "*nefas*, a thing not to be spoken about. It is typically Ovidian to talk about a subject while protesting that it is not a fit subject for words."

Lucubratio, Convivium, Adaptation

In exposing the intersection between private and public in the constitution of erotic-poetic activity, poem 3.14 opens up the model of elegiac *lucubratio* to outside influence, acknowledging the life of the performance outside of the context of its performance—and, concomitantly, the presence of an audience for and, ultimately, in the erotic-poetic event.[15] It is a move that capitalizes on the performative nature of the *lucubratio* practice in and of itself; and that mines the potential of the representation to speak to poetic productivity even as its locus is increasingly made public.

As it is in the scene of sympotic carousal in poem 1.4, the site of the poet-lover's effective inclusion with his mistress through their encoded communication across the distance forced between them at a dinner party:

> me specta nutusque meos vultumque loquacem;
> excipe furtivas et refer ipsa notas.
> verba superciliis sine voce loquentia dicam;
> verba leges digitis, verba notata mero.
> cum tibi succurret Veneris lascivia nostrae,
> purpureas tenero pollice tange genas.
> siquid erit, de me tacita quod mente queraris,
> pendet extrema mollis ab aure manus.
> cum tibi, quae faciam, mea lux, dicamve, placebunt,
> versetur digitis anulus usque tuis.
> tange manu mensam, tangunt quo more precantes,
> optabis merito cum mala multa viro. (*Am*. 1.4.17-28)
>
> Watch me and my gestures and my communicative expression;
> take in my secret messages and send back some of your own.
> I will speak words with my eyebrows that speak without sound;
> you will read words from my fingers, words written in wine.
> When the cheeky doings of our love affair occur to you,
> touch your blushing cheeks with your delicate thumb.
> If there is anything about me to which your sensibilities quietly object,
> let your hand cling soft to the bottom of your ear.
> When something I have done or said delights you, my light,
> your ring should be spun around and around with your fingers.
> Touch the table with your hand, in the way of those offering prayer,

[15] Cf. Sharrock (2002a), 152: "The contradiction of speaking publicly about privacy … in a form full of conventions, is shown as essential to the workings of erotic discourse."

when you bid your man the many misfortunes he has earned.

In its evocation of the poetics of inclusion in Tibullus 1.6—where the poet-lover's instruction of Delia in the elegiac arts achieved their union across space and time—[16] the scenario develops the figure of the *praeceptor amoris* to similar ends: the circumvention of circumstances that separate through activation of a shared base of knowledge. And in its representation of the interaction between *amator* and *puella* as semiotic production, it recalls the poetic intercourse between the Propertian poet-lover and Cynthia in 2.15, where loving amounted to composing in a transformation of erotic activity into literary event.[17] But where Propertius' lovers were enclosed in the private *cubiculum*, Ovid's are exposed at a public *convivium*; and where the tutorial of Tibullus' poet-lover was gestural in its purview—the broad sweeps of tactics *ut sola cubaret* (1.6.11), *quis livor abiret* (1.6.13), *me tetigisse manum* (1.6.26)—that of Ovid's is detailed in its description not just of the moves, but of the messages they convey.

This is, to be sure, attributable to the redirection of the poetic address from the *vir* in Tibullus to the *puella* herself in the *Amores*—a focal shift that, for Sharon James, betrays the Ovidian poet-lover's anxiety over his beloved's essential independence, his bald didacticism a symptom of his recognition that she is, ultimately, beyond his control.[18] As much, though, as this surveillance can be read as the *amator*'s attempt to enclose the *puella* in a system of his own design, it also, in a different light, effects a reduction of the room to the two of them, filtering out the intervening context of the party and its goers as it creates a world within a world for the poet-lover and his beloved. The narrow focus of the *amator* on his mistress—and the narrow focus on

[16] For the full discussion of which, see Chapter 2: The Dream Defended.
[17] Discussed in Chapter 4: The Conceit.
[18] James (2006), 232 ff.

himself that he asks of her—allows them to operate with a degree of seclusion otherwise impossible to preserve in the open, remaking a public outing as an intimate interaction, creating a *cubiculum* within a *convivium*.

The poem, then, does more than just evoke the erotodidaxis of Tibullus 1.6: it deploys the conceit to recuperate the interpersonal privacy with the beloved sacrificed by the Tibullan poet-lover in his revelation to the *vir* of his interactions with Delia. If the poet-lover of Tibullus 1.6 publicized elegiac intimacy, exposing the underbelly of the elegiac relationship to the world of the *vir* outside of it, the *amator* of *Amores* 1.4 reclaims the public sphere as a private domain, allowing elegiac intercourse to be enacted in its midst, practiced before the *vir* but unperceived by him, exposed but still unseen. The contextual shift for elegiac interaction—the literalization of the publicly private nature of elegiac intercourse in the effectuation of boudoir seclusion through coded communication—accordingly introduces a shift in the terms of the practice for poet-lover and *puella*. The removal of the curtain of bedroom intimacy that conventionally veils erotic-poetic activity inserts them into a relational paradigm that is decidedly performative.[19]

Consider this: the lesson in clandestine love that, for James, works to reinforce the poet-lover's hold on his-not his *puella* equally establishes poet-lover and beloved as double agents in a coordinated poetic performance, positioning each as both composer and audience for the other. First it is the poet-lover who produces his set of veiled messages and encoded gestures for a *puella* primed to receive them, his suite of signals making a readable text out of his body as visage becomes verbiage (*vultumque loquacem*), eyebrows become expressions (*verba superciliis*), limbs become lyrics (*verba digitis*). Then it is the *puella* who responds in kind, her

[19] Cf. Roman (2014), 243 who makes a similar observation in discussing Ovid's generic redefinition of elegy along the private-public axis in the *Amores*: "In the first place, the lover's 'narrow bed' is no longer as concealed and private as in previous elegy."

role not limited to passive reception of communicative content, but expanded to encompass production of content in her own right: the suggestive stroke of a cheek that spells erotic excitement (*cum tibi succuret Veneris lascivia nostrae/… tange genas*); the telling tug of an earlobe that translates tacit disapproval (*siquid erit de me … queraris/pendet … ab aure manus*); the flirtatious fiddling with a ring that articulates appreciation (*cum … quae faciam … dicamve placebunt,/versetur digitis anulus*). This is elegy written in the body, a poetic *corpus* if ever there was one.[20]

The act of poetic production to which their encoded interaction amounts—and the degree of interpersonal intimacy that their cryptic communication enables them to recover—allows the scene to participate in the lexicon of *lucubratio*, even while the setting would seem to preclude it. Their deployment of a private gestural language that textualizes mute physicality by translating it into "readable" signs reinscribes clandestine convivial intercourse as elegiac composition; and its intelligibility only to a limited audience accordingly transforms the scene from a public party into a private poetic event—even while the clandestine nature of their amatory interaction is, itself, determined by the public context in which it is enacted—and allows poet-lover and *puella* to withdraw from the activities of the *convivium* into an alternative happening sequestered from the profligacy of symposium.

---

[20] There is a way in which this physicalization of elegiac communication can be read as a parallel to rhetorical *actio*—the gestural component of oratorical performance, on which see Gunderson (2000), 29 and Hall (2004), 144—which would further implicate elegiac poetic activity in the culture of *lucubratio*, annexed as it was by ambitious orators and statesmen (cf. Quint. *Inst*. 10.3). Cicero discusses the place of physicality in effective rhetorical performance at *de Orat*. 3.220, *omnes autem hos motus subsequi debet gestus* (all of these emotions, though, should be accompanied by gestures); while *Rhet. Her.* 3.26-27 offers fuller explication of the arsenal of rhetorical gestures and their meanings. Quintilian, at *Inst*. 10.3.22, identifies gesticulation with the creative process, not just the performance*: illa quae altiorem animi motum secuntur quaeque ipsa animum quodam modo concitant, quorum est iactare manum, torquere vultum, stimulare se et interim obiurgare …* (those things that accompany the deeper working of the mind and that themselves provoke thought in a certain way, among which is tossing a hand, screwing up the face, encouraging and occasionally chastising oneself …). For treatments of gesture in rhetoric: Gunderson (2000) and Hall (2004), both of whom offer wider bibliography. For the rhetorical features of Ovid's elegies, Keith (1999), 56 ff.; and the marshalling of those features for purposes of persuasion, James (2003) and Perkins (2014).

Indulgence in heady drink is reined in (*quod tibi miscuerit, sapias, bibat ipse*, be wise and let him have the drink he has mixed for you, l. 29), even while it is facilitated for the *vir* (*dumque bibit … adde merum*, and while he drinks, add more wine, l. 52); consumption of food is regulated (*si tibi forte dabit, quod praegustaverit ipse,/reice … cibos*, if he happens to offer you something he himself has already sampled, discard of the food, ll. 33-34); sexual license is renounced (*nec premat … tua colla*,/*… nec .. pectore pone caput;/nec sinus admittat digitos habilesve papillae;/oscula praecipue nulla dedisse velis!*, don't let him touch your neck,/don't lay your head on his chest; don't grant his fingers access to your lap or the suppleness of your breasts; and as for kisses, in particular, be willing to grant him none!, ll. 35-38). The hallmarks of the languorous dinner party—overindulgence in food and wine, unbridled sexuality—that otherwise consign it to the shadows of *otium otiosum*[21] are foresworn, supplanted by a system of communication that embodies its opposite: self-regulation in the service of literary engagement. Physical release becomes corporal modulation; gustatory consumption becomes literary production; public revelry becomes private enterprise; the activity of *lucifuga* becomes the assiduity of *lucubratio*.[22]

It is a transformation achieved through reciprocal relations of ποίησις with the mistress. For here, in her invocation as *mea lux*, she illuminates the scene—a metaphorical beacon for the *amator*, in the way that Cynthia, as *mea lux*, served as both the guiding light for the Propertian

[21] Cf. Cic. *Cat*. 2.10, *pro Sest.* 138; Sallust *Cat*. 13.3; Livy *AUC* 23.18.12. Discussed by Vickers (1990), 7-8 and above, Part II, Overview: *Otium* and its Discontents.

[22] There is a dash of irony (a buzzword in Ovidian studies) in the lucubratory makeover given to the lucifugal dinner party through the implementation of a secret system of communication and interaction. If we look to Ker's (2004), 219 explication of all-night revelry as one of the more extreme instantiations of behavior that turns on "the exploitation of nocturnal secrecy", then the centrality of concealment to the elegiac project here (cf. *clam*, l.16; *furtivas*, l. 18; *furtim*, ll. 52, 64) would seemingly suggest that it still has one foot in the world of *lucifuga*, even while it displays the characteristics of *lucubratio*. A similar observation could be made of poem 3.14, though there secrecy attended seclusion, and so the context was already one of lucubratory discretion rather than lucifugal debauchery.

poet-lover of 2.14 and as the force that fired his poetic production, her presence the *sine qua non* of his outreach; and she serves as the filter through which physicality is elucidated as poetry, her ascription of amatory significance to the poet-lover's otherwise arbitrary signing making the scene legible as an act of elegy. With all the shades of the lucubratory *lucerna*, she is the light of production and reception both.[23]

So it is that Ovid can be seen to combine the Propertian lucubratory *topos* of the private *cubiculum* with the taste of Tibullan publicity that clings to the disclosure of the elegiac relationship to the *vir* in poem 1.6. This in the interest of developing the potential of the representation to reflect the act of reception in the process of production as it operates outside of its delimited locus. While for Propertius and Tibullus, the context shaped the activity—the light, the domesticity making the elegiac pursuits undertaken in their orbit recognizable as lucubratory productivity—in this augmented paradigm of *lucubratio*, the activity shapes the context. Engaging in elegiac pursuits that literally reconstitute acts of physicality as acts of poetry remakes an environment of indolent indulgence (the dinner party) into one of industrious production, allowing the public *convivium* to be restaged as a private *cubiculum* in which literary composition is undertaken.

In this new climate of public-private relations, the nature of the poetic interaction between poet-lover and beloved becomes increasingly performative, hinging as much on the act of synthesis as on the process of production. For *amator* and *puella* are equally implicated, as both author and audience, in the constitution of elegy: each a creator of amatory content, each a reader of the amatory *corpus* of the other. Composition and consumption are positioned not as distinct, unidirectional processes—a poet here composing for a reader there—but as mutually

[23] Cf. Lucretius *DRN* 1.142-145, where the nightlight of the *lucubratio* practice is a play on philosophical elucidation through published writing. For which, see above, Part II, Overview: *Lucubratio* and its Literary Legacy.

informative acts: a poet whose composition cannot be actualized without a reader, a reader who, in the process of actualization, becomes a poet, and an actualized composition that rebrands the original poet as a consumer of new content, the same and yet not the same.[24]

Elegy, we could say, is being repositioned: its exploits belong as much to the public domain as they do to the poetic demimonde. Indeed, it is their very embedding within the wider framework that allows them to be read as acts of sociality, rather than asociality: it is the off-setting context of the public *convivium* that allows erotic retreat to emerge as an instantiation of lucubratory productivity. What we have is the literalization of the figurative cultural exclusion-in-inclusion that Propertian *lucubratio* effected—the Ovidian elegiac *amator* both physically within and practically without the society beyond the bedroom—and the concomitant realization of the Tibullan model of lucubratory symbiosis: it is the very inclusion of exclusive elegiac pursuits in a broader context of public activity that ultimately allows amatory interaction to be reinscribed as personal industry.

Liaison, Concealment, Audience

We could, in our construal of this conflation, stop at James' conclusion that the poet-lover's elegiac instructions to the audience of his *puella* inevitably determine and delimit her actions, seeing in it a case-in-point for Gian Biagio Conte's principle that "the text's form and intentionality determine the reader's form."[25] But the form the poet-lover imparts to his beloved here is a determinative one as much as a determined one. Determined through her induction into

[24] Compare this to Sharrock's (1994c), 291 assessment of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: "The phrase 'I love you' is always and never a quotation, always and never the same. … In interaction (intercourse?) with the text of Ovid, the acts of reading and loving are collapsed into an identification". A similar dynamic is observed by Lee-Stecum (2000), 197 in Tibullus' poetry: "the dynamic of the *amor*-relationship in Tibullan elegy is twined with the dynamic of reading Tibullan elegy", a nexus that becomes a central theme of Book II, throughout the course of which "The insecurities and fluctuations involved in reading Tibullan elegy make the reader a double of the poet/lover …. The two (reading process and *amor*-relationship, reader and poet/lover) are in fact inter-locked" (211).
[25] Conte (1994), xx.

a communicative system defined by the poet-lover; determinative through her reciprocal provision of content that, even if conditioned by the poet-lover, re-forms him as a reader through whose own act of reception her output is re-formed as elegy. We are dealing not with a singular controlling poet and a singular controlled audience, but with a dyadic, dynamic poet-audience.

The audience is already integral to the success of the lucubratory performance as an attestation of quality, both of character and of composition—no audience, no attestation—and so it is no real stretch for the representation itself to be expanded to include the spectator. We can, then, slip from the world of the poem, with its protagonists who model the mutual implication of production and reception in the creation of elegiac content, into that of the external reader, whose own relationship with the text can be seen to reproduce its choreography. For the poem's provision to the reader of the code for interpreting the encrypted elegiac content contained within it enfolds him or her into the system of elegiac transmission that it represents, allowing him or her to read elegy in and into the poetic encounter, just as the amatory argot shared between poet-lover and *puella* enables each to read the room. And just as is the case for poet-lover and *puella*, whose roles in the interaction are both determined and determinative, so too is the reader equally vested with formative influence.

But we need not be so speculative about it. That Ovid is thinking about the role of the reader in the performance of elegy is reflected in poem 2.5, the companion piece to 1.4, in which the poet-lover witnesses his language of elegiac gesture operating without him:

> ipse miser vidi, cum me dormire putares,
> sobrius adposito crimina vestra mero.
> multa supercilio vidi vibrante loquentes;
> nutibus in vestris pars bona vocis erat.
> non oculi tacuere tui, conscriptaque vino
> mensa, nec in digitis littera nulla fuit.
> sermonem agnovi, quod non videatur, agentem
> verbaque pro certis iussa valere notis.
> iamque frequens ierat mensa conviva relicta;

conpositi iuvenes unus et alter erant. (*Am*. 2.5.13-22)

I saw it myself—though you thought I was asleep,
I was with it—your misconduct, with the booze at your side.
I saw you two speaking volumes with the wiggle of a brow;
in your nods was the better part of your voice.
Nor did your eyes keep quiet, and the table was all
written over with wine, and no letter was missed by your fingers.
I recognized the conversation (not intended to be visible) that you
were conducting, and the words told to operate in place of standard signifiers.
And now the hopping party had disbanded, the table deserted;
save for some young men who were settled there, one and one other.

The echoes of poem 1.4 are immediately appreciable: the earlier scene is here, point by point, replayed, only the script has been flipped to position the *amator* on the outside of the very poetic intercourse he had previously purveyed—a reader, we could say, of the situation presented to him. He watches as his *puella* harnesses the elegiac gestural code for illicit communication with another (*ipse miser vidi/… crimina vestra*), while he has been consigned to the role of the incapacitated dupe (*cum me dormire putares*). And what he sees, in this reassignation of elegiac actors, is his *puella* performing not the signals prescribed for her in poem 1.4—the cheek touching, the ear tugging, the ring twisting—but those he himself had rendered: the discursive arch of an eyebrow (*multa supercilio vidi vibrante loquentes*, vis-à-vis *verba superciliis sine voce loquentia dicam* at 1.4.19); the telling tilt of the head (*nutibus in vestris pars bona vocis erat*, vis-à-vis *me specta nutusque meos vultum loquacem* at 1.4.17); the writing in wine with assiduous fingers (*conscriptaque vino/mensa*, *nec in digitis littera nulla fuit*, vis-à-vis *verba leges digitis, verba notata mero* at 1.4.20).

If poem 1.4 seemed to condition the *puella* in both her reception and production of elegiac content, poem 2.5 sees her break out of her circumscribed performance to inhabit the role once played by the poet-lover. She has, evidently, learned the lessons of poem 1.4 well enough to take the lead in their performance with another; though not so well as to pull off the performance without a hitch. For the poet-lover manages to retain his faculties and remain a surreptitious

spectator (*vidi, cum me dormire putares,/sobrius*) of interaction meant to go undetected (*sermonem agnovi, quod non videatur, agentem*); this in contradistinction to the *vir* of poem 1.4, whose insentience is a specified precondition for elegiac consummation (*si bene conpositus somno vinoque iacebit/consilium nobis resque locusque dabunt*, if he's lying there, well-steeped in sleep and wine, the situation and the setting will determine our agenda, 1.4.53). In his unprovisioned awareness of the *puella*'s engagements, the poet-lover of 2.5 has not so much become the *vir* of poem 1.4, as James construes it,[26] but the audience of poem 1.4, his relationship to the affair that unfolds before him directly correspondent to that of an external reader's to the text.[27]

We can, then, see how the implications for the reader of the *Amores* that we extrapolated from the relationship between poet-lover and *puella* in poem 1.4 are here explicated in the experience of the poet-lover. Just as does the reader of 1.4, he observes a performance of encoded movements between the *puella* and her paramour. Just as for the reader of 1.4, knowledge of the encrypted language they employ allows him to invest literary significance in otherwise arbitrary gesticulation—to see an elegiac program in incidental physicality. And just as in the case of the reader of 1.4, his reinscription of profligate partying as poetic production allows the context to be transformed from wanton carousal to intentioned composition. Much as was accomplished in poem 1.4, the reading of the poet-lover remakes a scene of revelry as a moment of intimacy, dims the lights on the public congregation in spotlighting the private interaction. By identifying in the semiotic gestures of his *puella* and his rival the constitution of a

[26] James (2006), 236: "*Amores* 2.5, the companion to 1.4, flips the coin, placing the lover-poet in the position of the neglected *vir*."
[27] Elsner (2007), 27 detects something similar in Ovid's reworking of Prop. 1.3 in his version of Ariadne's narrative in *Her*. 10, where "the reader is cast in a similar range of potential roles and uncertainties as Propertius' 1.3 casts its narrator."

personal poetics of interaction, the poet-lover reads them out of the *convivium* and into the *cubiculum*, casting their movements as a meaningful language that endows otherwise incidental public interaction with the elegiac significance of private intercourse. He is, in every sense, reading much into the scene.

Suddenly, descriptive subtleties can be substantial signposts. As with the proximity of the wine, weapon of attempted dupery (as it had been for the *vir* in 1.4.52: *dumque bibit … adde merum*), which takes on lucubratory weight when its form, *adposito … mero*, is heard as an echo of Propertius' *apposita … lucerna* of 2.15.3, of Tibullus' *positaque lucerna* of 1.3.85 and *apposito pollice* of 2.1.64 :[28] liquor likened to light and identified with an instrument of ποίησις in the facilitation of elegiac poetic activity, each ensuring an environment—a context—suitable to amatory-literary production, each responsible for the output—the content—of that productive process.[29] A similar effect can be appreciated in the repurposing of drink as ink, when the poet-lover's description of the table as ***conscripta*** *… vino* is situated within the linguistic paradigm for portraying *lucubratio*—"very often associated", Ker notes, "with the finishing or polishing of a task or a text"—as illustrated by Cicero's invocation of the practice in a letter to Varro: ***conscripsi*** *epistulam noctu* (I wrote up the letter during the night, *ad Fam.* 9.2.1).[30] Small

[28] And here I will push back against James' (2006), 236 translation of *adposito … mero* as "with the wine put away" given (1) the unlikeliness of *ad/appono* being used to convey removal (the *OLD* entry for *appono*, in fact, does not attest any such usage); and (2) the possible intertext of Prop. 2.15.3, where *apposita … lucerna* quite certainly means that the lamp has been placed close by, in distinction to the *sublato lumine* of 2.15.4 that describes the opposite condition. Cf. Richardson (2006), 255 who encourages reading Propertius' *apposita … lucerna* "not 'when the lamp was brought in' but 'late into the night'", noting that Propertius, "by using the phrase, is setting the stage for his pentameter."

[29] The suggestion that drink enables poetic production evokes the similar conceit of Cat. 50.4-6, where the poet finds himself with Licinus *scribens versiculos uterque nostrum … reddens mutua per iocum atque vinum* (jotting down, each of us, scraps of poetry … growing red through laughter and wine alike), a poem that itself has lucubratory significance, as discussed above, Chapter 4: The Convention.

[30] Ker (2004), 228. Cf. also Seneca, *Ep*. 8.2, where the object of his *lucubratio* is explained: *illis aliqua, quae possint prodesse,* ***conscribo.***

details, but ones that bolster the reading of lucubratory poetic production in and into a context of profligate partying.

But the poet-lover is not merely privy to this elegiac lucubratory practice that his spectatorship substantiates; he is equally implicated in its performance, an active participant in its inner workings. For unlike the *vir* of poem 1.4, who remains (as far as we know) uninitiated into the elegiac argot and unable to withdraw from the world of the party into that of poetic intercourse, the poet-lover of 2.5 is all the while aware of the tryst transpiring before him, of the meaning being generated around him.[31] He is not overcome by the sybaritic seductions of symposium, his vigilance not undermined by the somnolent caress of wine (*cum me dormire putares,/sobrius*), as in the case of those young men who have attended the *convivium* but have not been attentive to the elegiac activity for which it is a platform (*conpositi iuvenes unus et alter erant*); as in the case of the *vir* of 1.4 who was guilty of the same (*conpositus somno vinoque*).[32]

No: the poet-lover remains an audience sensitive to the elegiac nature of the occasion. He sees the signals that should have gone unseen by a third party (*sermonem agnovi, quod non videatur*) and thus is able to reconstitute them as poetic content. He is, we could say, as much a part of the lucubratory elegiac action as his *puella* and her consort—certainly he has equally retreated from the convivial context into the poetic one, certainly has equally demonstrated the self-regulation attached to the practice of *lucubratio*: the eschewal of drink and festivity for more productive pursuits, the control of the body against the force of sleep familiar from poem 1.4

[31] In this I would question Du Quesnay's (1973), 5 invocation of poem 2.5 to illustrate the aura of ease that he ascribes to the poet-lover of the *Amores*: "Ovid's complacency is illustrated by his ability to drop off to sleep at the party in II.5", given that precisely the opposite seems to be the case. James' (2006) detailing of the poet-lover's essential anxiety in 2.5 similarly chafes against this characterization of Du Quesnay's.

[32] Note, too, the recurrence of the language of composition in the descriptions of *iuvenes* (*conpositi*) and *vir* (*conpositus*) alike, the sense that they have been written into their stupors as much as they have settled into them contributing to the recreation of the party scene as a site of poetic productivity through the observational participation of the poet-audience.

(where the *somnus* of the *vir* furnished the *consilium* of the lovers), from Propertius 2.15 (where the insistence of the *puella* vacated the *somnus* of the *amator*), from Seneca (who himself indulged the advances of *somnus* only begrudgingly in *Ep*. 8.1).

Our sense, then, that poem 1.4 models a relationship between audience and text that allows the reader to participate in the performance of *lucubratio* effected therein is borne out by poem 2.5. Poet-lover, as reader of amatory output, operates just as saliently as he did when figured as composer. In this context of elegiac lucubratory activity—in which physicality is reconstituted as poetry, in which license is exchanged for restraint, in which the act of consumption is simultaneously one of production—the reader is made of a piece with the lucubratory performance, allowed to become, through his own occupation with elegiac content, a practitioner of *lucubratio* in his own right.

And so the sense of elegy's sequestration from ostensibly non-elegiac environments—from a public context purposed with the prevention of any erotic activity—is systematically destabilized. It is the very interaction between the elegiac happening and the non-elegiac habitat that gives shape to each: the public context allows raw physicality to constitute elegiac interaction and confers on said interaction the consequence of literary production; and the elegiac content, in turn, allows its observer—by virtue of the act of observation—to participate in the lucubratory ethic of poetic production, rather than the convivial culture of profligate consumption. Elegy, ironically, reforms its reader, just as the reader is needed to form elegy.

Light, *Cubiculum*, Action

The contours of Ovid's reconfiguration of the *lucubratio topos* thus take shape. The locus of erotic-poetic activity has been liberated from the privacy of the bedroom, but has not lost the essence of personal withdrawal for the sake of literary productivity. And the model has

accordingly been expanded to account for the publication of the poetic event, developed to incorporate the audience directly into the representation and realization of the elegiac *lucubratio* itself, the aim adjusted to impart to the consumption of elegiac material the same consequence achieved for its production.[33] But to appreciate the new representational possibilities born of this expansion of the parameters, both physical and practical, of the *lucubratio* figuration—the confluence of public and private in the lucubratory performance, the implication of the audience in the constitution of the poetic act—we have to return to the more canonical context of the bedroom, where the veil of intimacy is reinstated, but the curtain on the performance is pulled back.

To which end: if poems 1.4 and 2.5 enact a feedback loop between poet and reader that informs the elegiac lucubratory process, we can see both ends of the equation being worked in a singular encounter in poem 1.5, the epiphanic afternoon delight discussed in Part I for its positioning of the Ovidian *amator* as essentially *inclusus*.[34] My earlier treatment of this poem bypassed its opening lines in a bid to hit the highlights of the representation of inclusion that takes hold once Corinna arrives on the scene. But in this new Ovidian paradigm of elegiac *lucubratio*, it is worth giving them their due, not to the tune of divine visitation that scholarship on 1.5 tends to play[35]—and yet my take is not exclusive of the theophanic interpretation—but to that of literary production:

> Aestus erat, mediamque dies exegerat horam;
> adposui medio membra levanda toro.

[33] In this way, the *Amores* can be situated in the orbit of the poetic project that Wheeler (1999), 3-4 ascribes to the *Metamorphoses*—text and meaning together instantiated by the audience in the act of reception—though while for Wheeler, it is in service of recreating the experience of oral poetry in a written medium, in the *Amores* the text is the thing, and it is the literary nature of the exercise that is at issue. Cf. Boyd (1997), 154 where the question of "realism and programmatic considerations" in the text of the *Amores* is central to her reading of a narrator who "uses realism to draw attention to the literariness of his love." See also Hinds (1987) for a detailing of Ovid's profoundly literary poetic project in the *Amores* and elsewhere.
[34] For which, see Chapter 3: Inversion.
[35] As in Papanghelis (1989); Hinds (1987), 9-11; Keith (1994), 29-31; Montuschi (2005), 224-225.

pars adaperta fuit, pars altera clausa fenestrae;
  quale fere silvae lumen habere solent,
qualia sublucent fugiente crepuscula Phoebo,
  aut ubi nox abiit, nec tamen orta dies.
illa verecundis lux est praebenda puellis,
  qua timidus latebras speret habere pudor. (*Am.* 1.5.1-8)

It was hot, and the day had already passed the noon hour;
I laid my limbs to rest in the middle of the bed.
One part of the window was open, the other closed;
the light approaching the sort that the woods tend to display,
the kind of twilight that glimmers when Phoebus is fading,
or when night is past its climax, but day has not yet come.
This is the kind of light that suits modest girls,
in which their shrinking inhibition has a hope of receding into the shadows. …

Gordon Williams described these lines as poetry of excess, finding in the catalogic elaboration of the quality of the light an attempt to "assist the reader to a more complete realization of the exact nature of the light, so he adds in evening at sunset and then dawn before sunrise."[36] Stephen Hinds has since done much to reinvest them with more thematic significance, tying the "confusing *overdetermination* of that half-light" (emphasis original) into a profound program of literary allusion that pivots on the divine materialization of Corinna out of this atmosphere.[37] Divergent as the two may be in their approaches to Ovidian poetics, they articulate between them a basis for seeing in this descriptive overture a tinge of lucubratory significance.

It is not immediately apparent: the temporal setting of midday (*mediamque dies exegerat horam*), while classic for supernatural phenomena,[38] is wrong for a ritual all but synonymous with night, a misalignment that would seem dispositive in light of Cicero's polarization of afternoon dozing (*meriditatio*) and afterhours diligence (*lucubratio*).[39] It is in the context of the former that the poet-lover is initially ensconced (*adposui medio membra levanda toro*); but

[36] Williams (1968), 512.
[37] Hinds (1987), 5 ff.
[38] Cf. Papanghelis (1989), 54 and n. 3 for additional scholarship.
[39] Cic. *de Div*. 2.142: : *nunc quidem propter intermissionem forensis operae et lucubrationes detraxi et meriditationes addidi* (now, as it is, on account of the lapse in my legal career, I have done away with working at night and have taken up afternoon naps)

watch what happens in the course of that detailing of the light that strikes Williams as so overwrought. Through the partial closure of the window—*pars adaperta fuit, pars altera clausa fenestrae*, itself an echo of Propertius 1.3.31, where a half-opened window was similarly a source of poetic half-light: *donec diversas praecurrens luna fenestras*—[40] the day incrementally slips away: into the dappled dimness of a dense forest (*silvae lumen*); into the shadowy dusk of early evening (*fugiente crepuscula Phoebo*); into the dubious darkness of pre-dawn (*ubi nox abiit, nec tamen orta dies*).

So much Williams observed. The effect, though, is an enactment of the change in light captured in Propertius' singular image of the *praecurrens luna*—the moonrise in Propertius answered in the sunset, over the course of three lines, in Ovid—and so the similes do not represent descriptive reiteration as much as they do chronological progression.[41] It is as if the hour grows later in each line, as if the clock advances with each comparison, a poetic time-lapse that ushers the poet-lover through the day, from one temporal locus to another—from the noonday sun in the opening couplet (*aestus erat*) to the suspended darkness of dawn (*antelucum*); from a midday nap to a midnight affair.[42]

We could, then, say that this languid explication of the quality of the light efficiently makes a night of the day; and a lucubratory night at that, displacing the unmitigated brightness of

[40] And where the pattern of the light created a context in which elegiac lucubratory activity could unfold, for which see above, Chapter 4: The Conceit.

[41] Clarke (2003), 127, citing Elder (1951), 121, observes a similar phenomenon with "words in the red/purple range" in Cat. *c.* 64.46, where "the colours … progressively deepen, from the suggestion of colour in *tincta* to the pink of *roseo* to the purple of *conchyli* and *purpurea*, to the deep red or violet of *fuco*. This has the effect of drawing readers in and focusing their attention." Elder (1951), 121—who was less ready to see in this chromatic progression a conscious poetic decision—additionally points to a comparable, but to his mind more decidedly intentional, poetic ombre in Vergil, "in the Aristaeus-episode where the first scene gives us bright and splendid colors, the second one grays, and the final tale of Orpheus and Eurydice is swathed in deep black."

[42] On this point, keep in mind that *lucubratio* was just as readily ascribed to the morning hours before sunrise—*lucubratio antelucana*—as epitomized by the pre-dawn industriousness of the dutiful wife at Verg. *Aen*. 8.408-411: *cum femina primum/…cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignis/noctem addens operi* (when a woman first … stirs the ash and the dormant fire, adding night-hours to the task). On this, cf. Ker (2004), 217-218.

afternoon with the soft glow of darkness illuminated.[43] For Stephen Hinds, this spectral lighting inculcates a supernatural "zone of boundaries and transitions, a time out of time in which normal human rules may cease to apply."[44] The conditions, Hinds reminds us, of theophany; equally so, I would add, of *lucubratio*, which is itself a second zone of activity,[45] a "time out of time" that partakes of both day and night in its recreation of the circumstances of the former in the context of the latter—and that subverts conventional patterns of nocturnal behavior in the process,[46] a practical exigency that underlies the care Quintilian takes to reinscribe the habit of *lucubratio* into natural biorhythms:[47] *cui tamen non plus inrogandum est quam quod somno supererit aut <operi> deerit* (all the same, no more must be invested in this pursuit than what is unnecessary for sleep or is necessary for the task, *Inst.* 10.3.22-23).

A similar phenomenon can be seen to occur for the physical space, as well: the bedroom, envisioned as a woodland in the first simile (*lumen silvae*)—a classic *locus amoenus*, both for its exteriority (*silvae*) and for its canopy (*lumen habere solent*)—[48] is gradually reasserted, through the change in light, as a canonic lucubratory locale, the contours of the *cubiculum* as the elegiac place of pleasure overlapping with those of the pastoral. If the scene opens on a conventional image of the elegiac poet-lover escaping the heat of the height of the workday by lolling *in otio umbratili*, we have, by the end of the analogy, been returned to the built interior, only now it is not a site of repose (as when the intention was *membra levanda*), but one of activity, as the erotic climax of the comparison signals (*illa verecundis lux est praebenda puellis*).

---

[43] Though Hardie (2002), 42-43 prefers to see in this "crepuscularity" "the visual expression of a quality of indecision much relished by Ovid", a "half-and-half condition" that reflects the epiphanic nature of the encounter as "a liminal experience, an absent presence."
[44] Hinds (1987), 9-10.
[45] Recall here André's (1966), 30 characterization of Cato's ideal (read: industrious) *otium* as "une seconde zone de l'activité".
[46] On this point, cf. Ker (2004), 214-215, 218.
[47] Cf. Ker (2004), 218-219.
[48] Cf. Smith (1965), 299-300 for the topography of the traditional *locus amoenus*.

Here again, Quintilian can provide an illuminating intertext, in his advisement against colonizing the *locus amoenus* for one's *locus lucubrationis*—for, instead, setting up shop in the *clausum cubiculum*:

> Non tamen protinus audiendi qui credunt aptissima in hoc nemora silvasque, quod illa caeli libertas locorumque amoenitas sublimem animum et beatiorem spiritum parent. Mihi certe iucundus hic magis quam studiorum hortator videtur esse secessus (*Inst.* 10.3.22-23).
>
> But not so quick to listen to those who believe that groves and woodlands are most suitable for this, on the grounds that, in them, the expanse of the air and the loveliness of the locale furnish an elevated mind and more contented spirit. To me, this pleasantness actually seems to encourage retirement more than application

What we are presented in Ovid is the bedroom as classic *locus amoenus* and canonic *locus lucubrationis* at once, a space that is simultaneously outdoor retreat and indoor theater, ever both secluded and exposed. The advancement of the simile thus remakes both the temporal locus and the physical one, the incursion of the hour for lucubratory activity accompanying the insinuation of its milieu; and the incremental assertion of both energizing a scene of indolence with a shot of productive potential—potential that will go on to be realized with the arrival of Corinna in line 9 and the rebranding of the bedroom as a place of erotic-poetic industry that her presence allows.

There is a certain amount of irony to be appreciated in reading this detailing of the light as an effectuation of a lucubratory makeover for the poet-lover and his environment. And it is this: the remaking of day as night that is achieved through the dimming of the light, as it were, from line to line, simultaneously literalizes the metaphor of *meriditatio* (the making a night of the day that an afternoon snooze represents) and inverts it—the making a *productive* night of the day that the re-presentation of the context of sleep as a context of lucubratory industry accomplishes, a contradiction of terms achieved through their instantiation. The nocturnalization of the day with which the poem opens—the midday nap with its negative implications of working hours misused—is, in the course of the nocturnalization of the day that the description

of the light induces, reinvested with productive potential: *meriditatio* can become *lucubratio*, a transformation of day into night that allows activity synonymous with the wanton transformation of day into night (*meriditatio*) to be transformed into activity that diligently makes day of the night (*lucubratio*). In the course of six lines, everything and nothing has changed.

We can call this irony, but we can also see in it a seam of programmatic earnestness. As wry as the play with the *topos* is, it does allow for a genuine activation of a scene that begins its life decidedly torpid, not *in medias res*, but in *medio … toro*, without any pretense of engagement—not even erotic, much less poetic.[49] But this otiose orientation has changed by the time the light has changed, the spectro-temporal shift from midday to midnight inspiring thoughts of sex (*illa verecundis lux est praebenda puellis*) when before thought had been only for sleep (*membra levanda*). R.O.A.M. Lyne, too, observes that "the half-light, which might have encouraged others to sleep, was for Ovid a stimulus to thoughts of sex", recognizing an alignment of atmosphere and occupation similar to what I am suggesting. Though for Lyne, the starting condition of midday heat was already heavy with erotic possibility, and the starting siesta of the poet-lover was already erotically charged.[50]

Lyne's reading, by his own admission, involves a retrojection of the poet-lover's sexual sensibilities from lines 7-8 back into lines 1-2—by no means an impossibility.[51] I tend, though, to prefer honoring a contrast in the poet-lover's outlook between line 2 and line 7 that Lyne himself initially approaches—"Apparently he did not expect Corinna. That is the clear point of *medio…toro*"—[52] and seeing it implicated in the atmospheric shift from conditions of *meriditatio*

[49] Cf. Lyne (1980), 261: "Those who sleep 'in the middle of their beds' are sleeping alone …."
[50] Lyne (1980), 261: "He was randy. He manages to communicate this in the siesta description. He evokes that occasion with the feelings of the time. He evokes an *erotic* atmosphere" (emphasis original).
[51] Lyne (1980), 262: "That is how he felt it to be at the time (projecting his feelings)."
[52] Lyne (1980), 261.

to conditions of *lucubratio* that obtains in the description of the light in lines 3-6. Once the context becomes that of *lucubratio*, interest in sleep can be supplanted by interest in activity; which is to say, the focus can shift to erotic-poetic pursuits—as it does with the arrival of Corinna in line 9—and the productive potential of the lucubratory light can be realized.

Williams did well, then, to call out the pains taken, in lines 3-6, to "assist the reader to a more complete realization" of the nature of the light, even if that nature is not, in the end, as "exact" as he would have it be, and even if not for the reason he had in mind. His point is the poet's acute concern to be understood by his audience, manifested in Ovid's recourse to dramatic overstatement in the opening gambit and felt throughout the Corinna encounter that follows, in whose course "so much hinting and winking to the reader becomes absurd."[53] Williams' construal, focused as it is on rhetorical effect, privileges the place of the reader in Ovid's poetic process in a way that Hinds' analysis, for example, does not:[54] as a presence that is front of mind in the process of composition, guiding formal decisions all the while. I would build on this basic awareness of the audience that Williams detects in the description of the light to suggest that the reader, much as in poems 1.4 and 2.5, is actively implicated in the instantiation of the scene.

It is, after all, in the reader's progression through each successive simile—in his or her casting and re-casting of the light line by line—that the poet-lover is transitioned away from the context of an afternoon nap, that the scene is transformed into a lucubratory one. The poetry may be assisting the reader to a more complete realization of the light, but the reader is equally assisting the poem to a more complete realization of its new framework. Similar to the dynamic between text and audience represented in poems 1.4 and 2.5—where it was the audience's

[53] Williams (1968), 512: "The poetic technique is to exhaust all the possibilities, lest any escape the reader."
[54] Though Hinds (1987), 8 does, in his explication of the Catullan allusion in Corrina's entrance at *Am.*1.5.9-10, call attention to the experience of reading when he notes that "The poet's *docti lectores* will have been at their most attentive in the couplet under discussion, crucial as Corinna's arrival is to the *mise-en-scène* of the *Amores*."

inclusion in the elegiac conversation that simultaneously allowed the context of *lucubratio* to be superimposed on that of *convivium* and the reader to withdraw from the world of the *convivium* into the elegiac atelier—so here the reader is charged with poetically constitutive properties, is likewise the site of the scene's transformation from one of indolence into one of elegiac industriousness, is likewise implicated in the instantiation of lucubratory activity.

That so much is expressly at issue in this particular poem, when such are the realities of reading any given text, is indicated in the immediate introduction of Corinna in the form of a vocative phrase—*ecce*, *Corina venit*—an invitation to the reader to conjure the elegiac scene as much as it is a directive to observe an elegiac scene that has been conjured.[55] And it is reinforced in the poet-lover's circumspect perusal of Corinna's form once it has been laid bare:

> quos umeros, quales vidi tetigique lacertos!
> forma papillarum quam fuit apta premi!
> quam castigato planus sub pectore venter!
> quantum et quale latus! quam iuvenale femur!
> singula quid referam? nil non laudabile vidi
> et nudam pressi corpus ad usque meum.
> cetera quis nescit? Lassi requievimus ambo. (*Am.* 1.5.19-25)
>
> What shoulders, what arms I beheld and held!
> The shape of her breasts—how fit it was to cupped!
> How flat the stomach beneath her taut chest.
> How long and how lovely her side! How supple her thigh!
> Why recount each detail? I saw nothing unworthy of praise,
> and I drew her, naked, right up against my body.
> Who doesn't know the rest? Spent, we both lay at ease.

Despite the poet-lover's avowed engagement with the body of his beloved (*vidi tetigique*), it is his detachment that has consistently struck scholars in their estimations of his reaction: the simple surveyance "with his cool and professional eye" at which I.M. le M. Du Quesnay

[55] Cf. McKeown (1987), 67 where he notes the audience-engaging function of *ecce* in his discussion of the *Amores* as a text written, to some extent, for live performance: "The marked dramatic element in the *Amores* is displayed also in small details such as the unusually frequent use of *ecce* (*en*): that deictic interjection occurs fifteen times in the *Amores*."

wonders;[56] his fleeting effort to actualize the erotic in *vidi tetigique* that, for Barbara Boyd, only fizzles out in disconnection by the time of *singula quid referam?*[57]

In Boyd's reading, this failure of the *amator* to sustain his connection is a representation of the poet's struggle to enact a new elegiac relationship while sporting the trappings of the elegiac tradition—a testament to the literary nature of the Ovidian elegiac exercise, always self-conscious of its relationship to the poetry of elegists past.[58] The notion of the encounter as representing the poet's experience in elegiac composition is germane to the lucubratory reading of its dynamics; and the account can equally speak to the role of the reader in that process of poetic production—equally and simultaneously, if we invoke the model presented in poem 1.4 of author as at once audience, audience as at once author.

There is, to begin, the effective positioning of the poet-lover as a reader of Corinna's *corpus* (*vidi*) as much as he is its manipulator (*tetigi*); and indeed it is through his progressive appraisal of her individual features—scanned from top to bottom, shoulders to upper arms (*umeros … lacertos,* l. 19) to breasts (*papillarum*, l. 20) to chest and stomach (*sub pectore venter*, l. 21) to side and thigh (*latus … femur*, l. 22)—that the whole of her literary person (*nudam*, l. 24) emerges. The impact of the corporeal catalogue is not unlike that of the elucidation of the light in lines 3-6: where the temporal locus of activity was mustered through the progressive advancement, line by line, of each phase of the day, so here the body is summoned through a sequential reading of Corinna's form from head to toe—the assemblage, as the eye ranges in linear order each phrase of her figure, of an exquisite corpse.[59]

---

[56] Du Quesnay (1978), 11.
[57] Boyd (1997), 156.
[58] Boyd (1997), 156-57.
[59] Cf. Hardie (2002), 42 where he describes the effect as "an alliance between poet and reader, such that our shared memory and desire conjure up the illusion of the physical presence of Corinna in the text." And Sharrock's (2002a), 152 suggestion that "what Ovidian erotics expose is that the lover's desire for immediacy and transparency is

But just how exquisite none could say, for her body is ultimately as indistinct as the light out of which it materializes. As was the case with the ambiance in lines 3-6, whose *exact* nature could not be conveyed, despite the analogic reiteration—***quale*** *fere silvae lumen*, ***qualia*** *sublucent … crepuscula*—so are her features, for being so overdetermined, strikingly under-defined: ***quos*** *umeros,* ***quales*** *… lacertos,* ***quam*** *… apta,* ***quantum*** *et* ***quale*** *latus*. Exclamatory, yes, but in the inexplicability of the form they bespeak not unlike interrogatives: what *were* they like, the limbs I saw and touched? How lovely *were* her contours? The precise nature of her appearance, unable to be articulated, is left to the imagination—and herein we have the second instance of poetic production ascribed to the audience: the solicitation of the reader to constitute the image of the beloved that the poetry fails to specify.

That tipping point at which Boyd locates the poet-lover's return to dispassion—the *singula quid referam?* that elides erotic excitement—is precisely the point at which the reader is invited to take over the poetic rendering, supplying the details that the poetry has withheld, fashioning an elegiac mistress of his or her own. We can see, in this formative relationship opened up between reader and text, the same give-and-take between poet and audience in the process of composition that obtained in the tacit communication between poet-lover and *puella* in 1.4: poet-lover as both literary consumer and poetic constructor of the elegiac experience that Corinna represents (*vidi tetigique*); reader as both literary consumer and poetic constructor of that same elegiac episode. All the more so if we accept Alison Keith's unmasking of Corinna as a cipher, much like Propertius' Cynthia, for elegiac poetry itself, the perfection of her physique representative of the stylistic refinement characteristic of elegy.[60] The implication being that in

mirrored in the reader's desire to understand, to enter and to belong. Poetic discourse constructs us as readers, just as erotic discourse constructs us as lovers."

[60] Keith (1994), 31-32.

producing the *puella* beyond what the text explicates, the reader is directly practicing elegiac poetics, directly performing an act of elegiac poetic fabrication. And so we have, in this revelation of Corinna, not just the revelation of the amatory encounter as poetic pursuit—of the poet-lover as practicing poetics as he practices erotics—but the concomitant revelation of the reader as poet, producing elegiac content just as readily as he or she consumes the elegiac production.

It is not, though, the mere image of the mistress for which the reader is compositionally responsible, but the very consummation of the elegiac activity that ensues. Or, rather, that is intimated, in the simultaneously evasive and explicit *cetera quis nescit? Lassi requievimus ambo.* For Boyd, the platitude signals the poet-lover's concession that elegiac poetic novelty is not, after all, possible, that "for the reader of elegy, there is no mystery or suspense embedded in the amatory narrative";[61] for Du Quesnay, it is a maneuver intended to tantalize, a calculated frustration of "the curiosity of the audience which he has just deliberately aroused."[62] For me, it does something in between. If it frustrates, that frustration encourages the reader to fill in the gap, to create the moment of elegiac effectuation that ends in the outcome depicted (*lassi requievimus*). If it surrenders, that surrender reflects a new dynamic of textual relations, a sharing of creative control with an audience that is equally implicated in the constitution of the poetic experience.

To recognize that the reader of elegy is sufficiently well-versed in its mechanics as to need no explication of its movements is, in some way, to acknowledge that the audience is equally equipped to craft the elegiac episode.[63] There may be nothing new to add to a prescribed

[61] Boyd (1997), 156.
[62] Du Quesnay (1978), 11.
[63] To Lyne (1980), 264 such a move represents a breach of the elegiac code, a sharing of the hand that "cut at the roots of romance" in its betrayal of the "faith that other people do *not* know the rest" (emphasis original). Lyne's

elegiac interaction, but there is certainly something different in leaving it unprescribed; in, instead, indexing the role of the audience in its constitution, poetic production and poetic reception united in a single elision. Leaving the height of the erotic-elegiac encounter unexpressed makes the reader's constitution of the scene part of the poetic composition itself, just as the poetic composition itself is completed by the reader's creative instantiation of the erotic-elegiac encounter. We are left with an image of the reader reflected in the erotic-poetic productivity that is represented; productivity that, by virtue of the twilight cast over the action in the opening lines of the poem, by the proper placement of the proceedings in the privacy of the *cubiculum*, can be read as *lucubratio*.

The secluded bedroom is, then, in a sense, publicized—is opened up to the same voyeuristic and validating presence from which the scene of *convivium* staged a retreat. The actions might be opposite, but they are equal: where poems 1.4 and 2.5 make a public space private, poem 1.5 makes a private space public, each redesign yielding a space for erotic-poetic activity that is neither wholly invisible nor entirely accessible—one that retains enough seclusion to activate a representation of *lucubratio*, but that entertains enough openness to explore the nature of said representation as performance; and one in which the process of reading elegiac material as an instantiation of poetic productivity equally shapes the act of literary consumption into one of poetic production.

Letdown, Collaboration, Accomplishment

To see this reorientation of the *lucubratio topos* played out to its fullest, let us look again at poem 3.7, noted in Part I as the site of extreme consequential development for the scene of

determination that it is a shock to the poetic system is not inconsistent with my sense that what is being offered here is a new model of poetic creation that accounts for the place of the reader in its instantiation.

inclusion.[64] In that treatment, the poet-lover's inability to perform sexually signaled the banality of union with the mistress as a foregone elegiac state of being. Now, the implications of his impotence can be expanded to encompass the question of the role of the reader in the production of elegy. So to return to the place of disgrace:

> Hanc tamen in nullos tenui male languidus usus,
> sed iacui pigro crimen onusque toro;
> nec potui cupiens, pariter cupiente puella,
> inguinis effeti parte iuvante frui. …
> tacta tamen veluti gelida mea membra cicuta,
> segnia propositum destituere meum;
> truncus iners iacui, species et inutile pondus,
> et non exactum, corpus an umbra forem. (*Am.* 3.7.3-6, 13-16)
>
> And yet I, damnably limp, held her to no purpose,
> but I lay there a crime, a burden on an inert bed;
> and I couldn't—though I wanted it, though the girl was equally eager—
> I couldn't enjoy any gratifying contribution of my enervated groin. …
> But my member, as if tainted with deadening hemlock,
> failed my ambition, the lazy thing;
> I lay there, a listless trunk, a shell, a useless burden,
> and it couldn't be said whether I was substance or silhouette.

We open on a scene of erotic failure, the equal but opposite reaction to the action of poem 1.5. While the locale of the private bedroom is right for lucubratory activity, the poet-lover is no longer pursuing his elegiac program in a context of poetic productivity. Where the auspices of the light in 1.5 had transformed an occasion of indolence (*adposui medio … toro*) into one of erotic energy (*lux est praebenda puellis*) then applied to elegiac endeavors with Corinna, here the poet-lover is mired in inefficacy, his sexual impotence conflated with creative non-industry through the incursion of the language of *otium otiosum* (*languidus*, *pigrus, segnis, iners*)[65] and of literal nonproductivity (*effetus, nec … frui, inutilis*). If the circumstance of union with the beloved has become so routine for the Ovidian poet-lover as to lose its erotic cachet, it has

[64] For which, see Chapter 3: Innovation.
[65] On which, see above, Part II, Overview: *Otium* and its Discontents.

equally lost its ability to effect poetic engagement. The mutual participation of both poet-lover and *puella* (*cupiens, partier cupiente*) that, for Propertius and Tibullus, had spelled elegiac success is no longer sufficient to engender an elegiac experience (*nec potui … frui*) or to support industrious intentions (*propositum destituere*).

But a starting-point of inclusion with the beloved is not the only circumstance that has changed from poem 1.5; the place of the audience relative to the erotic-poetic event has shifted, too. Where in 1.5 the erotic scene is formally constituted by the reader as the action—such as it is—unfolds on the page, the dynamic in 3.7 is different, the erotic account recalled for an audience not positioned to contribute, at least not initially. For the beauty of the beloved, perused more than used in 1.5 and left, in large part, for the reader to specify, is, in 3.7, more prescribed:

> illa quidem nostro subiecit eburnea collo
> bracchia Sithonia candidiora nive,
> osculaque inseruit cupida luctantia lingua
> lascivum femori supposuitque femur (*Am.* 3.7.7-10)
>
> Oh, and she threw those ivory arms around my neck,
> arms whiter than the snow of Sithon,
> and planted insatiable kisses with her sporting tongue
> and thrust her lusty thigh beneath my thigh.

The arms once indescribable—*quos umeros, quales lacertos* (1.5.19)—are agleam with specificity, their quality not just pronounced (*eburnea*), but articulated with newfound analogic precision (*Sithonia candidiora nive*). The thigh once ineffably supple—*quam iuvenale femur* (1.5.22)—is now concretely deployed, its nature succinctly rendered (*lascivum*), its potential quickly realized (*femori supposuitque*). The detailing of amatory activity leaves nothing to the imagination—no *cetera quis nescit?* here—and so poet-lover and *puella* are left to consummate the elegiac performance on their own, in private. That the performance should be truncated by elegiac dysfunction is, then, both unexpected and predictable. The absence of a constitutive and constituting audience at the time of enactment of the would-be erotic encounter removes the

performative aspect from the original context of production, rendering the elegiac exercise one of self-gratification for poet-lover and *puella* alone. The *locus*, we could say, is too private to ignite a powerful performance.

That this much is at issue for the Ovidian *amator* comes across in his later reflections on his incapacity:

> quid iuvet, ad surdas si cantet Phemius aures?
> quid miserum Thamyran picta tabella iuvat?
> at quae non tacita formavi gaudia mente!
> quos ego non finxi disposuique modos!
> nostra tamen iacuere velut praemortua membra
> turpiter hesterna languidiora rosa—
> quae nunc, ecce, vigent intempestiva valentque,
> nunc opus exposcunt militiamque suam. (*Am.* 3.7.59-68)
>
> What good would it do for Phemius to sing to deaf ears?
> What good would a painting do for sorry Thamyras?
> But what pleasures did I not summon up in the quiet of my mind!
> What positions did I not try, did I not orchestrate!
> And in spite of this my member just lay there as if dead before its time,
> more torpid—the shame!—than a rose picked yesterday—
> And now look! It's hale and hearty at the wrong time,
> *now* it's ready for duty and its deployment.

The poet-lover's opining on the implications of insensitivity is telling. No use, he reasons, for artistic creation if there is no audience to appreciate it. The act of reception is positioned as the *sine qua non* in the valuation of artistic production: no audience to hear Phemius, no worth for his singing; no vision for Thamyras, no use to him of a painting. The function of the rhetorical questions is, of course, analogic. The poet-lover, in his imperviousness to physical stimulation, is as the deaf man unable to enjoy song, the blind man unable to take in artwork, reminiscent, in his insensate state, of the poet-lover of Propertius 4.8, who could not appreciate the erotic performance of his substitute Cynthias: *cantabant surdo, nudabant pectora caeco* (they were serenading a deaf man, baring their breasts to a blind man, 4.8.47-48).

But the likening, all the same, posits a paradigm of viewer-performance relations—the uselessness of art in the face of an unreceptive audience—that is projected onto the elegiac scene at hand both literally (poet-lover as unappreciative consumer of the *puella*'s erotic overtures) and metaliterarily (elegiac activity as futile without the constituting presence of an external reader).[66] It is the same dynamic that animated the action of poem 1.4, only extrapolated. There, the *puella* was herself sufficient audience to subtend poetic activity; here, her presence alone is inadequate, as if the increasing publication of the elegiac lucubratory event from poem 1.4 to poem 2.4 has fundamentally altered the erotic-poetic relationship between *amator* and beloved from poem 1.5 to poem 3.7, now not merely reflective of the presence of a reader, but dependent on it—a *pas de deux* turned *ménage à trois*.

So much is reinforced in the exclamatory frustration that follows. The elegiac exercise rehearsed by the poet-lover in the absence of an audience—the erotic delights conceived, but not realized (*quae non tacita formavi gaudia mente*) despite the attempt at erotic-poetic rendition (*quos ego non finxi disposuique modos*, where the manipulation of *modos* again, as in 3.14, suggests composition as much as coitus)—is ultimately unsuccessful, the agent of elegiac fulfilment more otiose than ever (*velut praemortua membra … languidiora*).[67] These frustrated exclamations, though, do more than offer an apology for the poet-lover's impotence; they reintroduce that tinge of vagueness that involved the audience in poem 1.5—that interrogative effect that solicited the reader's active instantiation of the image left incomplete by the poetry.[68]

---

[66] Cf. Sharrock (1994a), 157 who approaches the poem as a metapoetic reflection on "'writer's block'—or rather, the memory of it: the present tense couplet at 67 f. represents the 'present' moment of poetic action—that is, this poem."

[67] Cf. Sharrock (1994a), n.17, where "the sexual member has become identified with the whole man … in a way which almost leads, in this metapoetic reading, to a physical identification between the man and his poetry."

[68] Holzberg (2009), 939 similarly remarks the poetic phenomenon and its functional orientation toward the reader, though for different ends: "By mentioning here his erotic fantasies, but merely hinting rather than drawing a detailed picture, he perhaps now finally manages to reach and fire those readers who have not yet turned to thoughts of the *fellatio* position."

What pleasures? *What* positions? You tell me. And so it is no surprise that a more direct solicitation to readerly participation—*ecce*, an echo of the *ecce* that invoked Corinna at 1.5.3 and the co-authored erotica that ensued—attends the recovery of erotic-poetic capacity (*vigent ... valentque,/nunc opus exposcunt*). It is only when the audience is present to witness and realize the elegiac event that elegiac productivity is possible; and the creative energy accordingly conferred on the reader reiterates the act of literary consumption as, itself, one of literary production. Elegy, it would seem, is now more an animal of the public sphere than it is a creature of the private shadows.

Lector, Creator, Archetype

What ultimately emerges from Ovid's lucubratory poetics is a mutual implication of public super-culture and private sub-culture, in that it is the interrelationship between private acts of elegy and public acts of reception that allows both to be rehabilitated through participation in a culture of lucubratory productivity. If it is by virtue of its inscription in a wider culture of consumption that elegy can operate as a model of *lucubratio*, it is equally by virtue of recognizing in elegiac activity a performance of *lucubratio* that the wider audience can partake of its poetic *otium*—and partake of the social standard of personal industry in the process.

It is the very position of elegy as simultaneously within and without the culture from which it is conventionally represented as being wholly withdrawn that allows both elegiac activity and the wider audience that receives it to embody standards of industrious and efficacious *otium*. For if it is the relief into which elegy is set by its framing within a public context that enables its lucifugal erotics to register as lucubratory poetics, it is the protected space of the elegiac interaction into which its audience can retreat that enables public participation in the poetic productivity that elegy represents. Elegy's very separateness enables

its integration into the cultural superstructure; and the framework of the cultural superstructure enables elegy's instantiation of social standards of industrious conduct. Ovid thus merges the agendas of the Propertian *lucubratio*, with its cultural exclusion-in-inclusion for the elegiac *amator*, and the Tibullan—with its call for a symbiotic relationship between the worlds of elegiac and Roman interests—to produce a paradigm in which elegy's participation in the public system is necessary for it to demonstrate its cultural capital, but in which the very remove of the elegiac experience is what enables a broader social performance of Roman value.

There is an additional sense in which the Ovidian manipulation of the *lucubratio* figure to implicate the audience in the act of ποίησις posits a new model for the elegiac relationship itself—one in which the *puella* has been replaced by the reader as the vehicle for poetic attainment. While for Propertius and Tibullus the lucubratory performance was inextricably linked to the condition of inclusion with the beloved, for Ovid the inclusion of the audience in the representation and realization of the practice redistributes the creative weight: by transferring to the reader some portion of the poetic responsibility of which the beloved is traditionally the sole repository, her willingness to take part in the elegiac performance being the barometer for the productivity of the poetic venture. The effect is a liberation—or at least the inklings of a liberation—of elegy from its validating dependence on the presence of the *domina*: in the light of this new model of creative industry, in which elegiac productivity, as represented in the argot of lucubratory activity, is dependent more on the participation of the literary consumer than the cooperation of the beloved, elegiac time productively spent is no longer contingent on time spent with the mistress. Any poetic venture—even, say, a *paraclausithyron*—can be a productive use of time.

Inconclusion

For what else could such concluding remarks be, in the spirit of false closure, than inconclusive? And so it is a happy coincidence of form and theme that conclusions are also recapitulations, a circling back as much as a looking ahead, and never truly closural at all. Happier, still, that we end with Ovid where we began with Propertius: the *paraclausithyron*, whose closed door has now quite fittingly undergone a revolution.

And so we recycle: back through the scene of inclusion, where the charge of the unreality of elegiac love—its illusory nature, its inextricability from exclusion, its irreconcilability with a state of union with the beloved—is countered with a vision of *amor* on the inside. Physically for Propertius, whose interaction with Cynthia rechoreographed the movements of exclusion, restaging the performance on the far side of the door and recasting the leading roles to validate erotic passion through a kind of rotational symmetry: lover and beloved as mirror images across the span of the threshold,[1] playing through the same score from opposite starting points, hitting the same notes in moments that correspond, but do not synchronize, creating a form of exclusion-in-inclusion. Psychosomatically for Tibullus, whose inclusion was enacted inside of his own head, but whose visions came to constitute a poetic reality that eclipsed the circumstances of his bodily one, engendering an inclusion-in-exclusion in which he was psychologically together with, even while physically separated from, his beloved.[2] Practically for Ovid, whose inheritance of a trope of elegiac inclusion from Propertius and Tibullus left his poet-lover so inured to its pleasures that his experience of habitual union with Corinna divested love of the passion that makes it recognizable as *amor*, effecting an inverted exclusion-in-

[1] On the symbolism of the *limen* in Roman culture and elegiac poetry, see Debrohun (2003), 125-134 and Pucci (1978), both discussed in the Introduction: Inside Job.
[2] Cf. Lieberg (1982a) and (1982b) and the notion of the "*poeta creator.*"

inclusion—his body was in it, but his heart was not—and upending the model of steady intimacy as the elegiac *telos*. Generic routinization, we sense, is the undesirable consequence of generic (re)iteration, and so dissatisfaction in a relationship of familiarity takes on metapoetic moment.

And back through the *topos* of *lucubratio*, which emerged from the forge of inclusion as a locus of erotic-poetic pursuits—a visual idiom through which the representation of elegiac activity could participate in the culture of productivity; through which the impression of elegy as *otium otiosum* could be clarified with a portrayal of amatory activity as literary industry. We saw the Propertian poet-lover enact an elegiac *lucubratio* that appropriates the contextual markers of the formal lucubratory practice and activates the network of associations that attends it: assiduity, industry, propriety, restraint. We saw the Tibullan poet-lover complicate the picture, uncoupling the elements of the *lucubratio topos* to manipulate them independently of one another—light and dark, environment and execution—in a demonstration of the necessity of an integrated elegiac practice that occupies the third space of engaged *otium*: neither child of the laborious day nor creature of the languorous night, but product of the intersection of the two. We saw Ovid embrace the possibilities of the liberation of the *lucubratio* figuration from the tyranny of the *topos*, moving the performance ever closer to the public realm, never sacrificing its essence of poetic industry, all the while expanding the parameters of the representation to account for the audience in the act of elegiac substantiation.

In all three poets, both the state of inclusion and the instantiation of an elegiac *lucubratio* practice that it enables allow the *amator* to be simultaneously *inclusus* and *exclusus*—together with, but at some remove from, his beloved; at once within and without the wider Roman culture, their uneasy juxtaposition ultimately the source of their mutual identification, elegy's otherness the very engine of its cultural value. It could be objected that this only every amounts

to an exercise in elegiac self-congratulation, in that the elegists are writing for other elegists—both literally (for a circle of like poets) and figuratively (for a circle of like minds)—[3] and that their demonstrations of their own inhabitation of the wider Roman culture only ever amount to an inside joke shared among others of similar persuasion, never meant to have an impact in the outside world.

But that Lucretius, before, is likely to have been responding directly to the neoteric erotic poetry of Catullus in his polemic against passionate *amor* indicates that the circulation of the poetry of the counter-culture was not necessarily confined to the underground—that it not only could come to light, but could be taken seriously enough by those outside of its fold to warrant meaningful engagement with its sensibilities.[4] And that the writings of Seneca, later, map so uncannily onto elegiac representations of its own activity suggests that Augustan elegy, too, found a wider audience than its own niche demographic. For the avenues of intertextuality can run both ways: the staid prose can help to situate the sensual poetry, but the sensual poetry can also be seen as a source of influence for the staid prose. Indeed, it is no less possible that Seneca, in portraying his *lucubratio* in *Epistle* 8, with his bodily struggle against the seduction of sleep, was invoking the image of the elegiac lover erotically-poetically engaged than that the elegists, in their portrayals of their amorous entanglements, were invoking the stately model of *lucubratio*. If ever we were inclined to talk of Seneca's work as a labor of love, perhaps a little more reality might lurk in the metaphor than it would seem.

We can chart, in this synopsis, a formal circularity: we started with inclusion, which allowed for the representation of elegiac activity as poetic productivity, which allowed for the

[3] James (2003b), 4 where "elegy anticipates a very specific audience—many of its members known personally to the elegists … —of elite, educated, intellectual Romans", but where "although coterie poetry is not as widely distributed as epic, it is still … designed to be read by others, to be circulated among readers …."
[4] Kenney (1970a), 389.

ultimate separation, in Ovid, of the figure of the mistress from the successful elegiac performance.

And so we cycle on: for the *paraclausithyron* on which we closed is of a rather different tone from the one with which we opened. In rehabilitating the *exclusus*, we have not so much reunited him with his beloved as we have changed the terms of his experience. For the figure of the *inclusus* is more than a mere counterpoint to the fixture of the *exclusus*—it is a challenge to broader notions of the artist as "lonely genius," a shift of the paradigm of poetic production at work in Lucretius and Catullus, for whom writing is inspired by an image of the desired over which the poet-lover labors in isolation (which is to say, a paradigm of exclusion as the condition for creativity).

Propertius posits a model in which poetic productivity is equally tied to the state of togetherness with the source of one's inspiration—the amatory act as the poetic act; a picture that Tibullus complicates—the essentialized beloved makes for an incomplete poetic experience—but does not fundamentally alter (the presence of the integrated beloved remains the precondition of creativity); and that Ovid reworks by opening up the matrix of creativity to a force outside of the inspiration-creator-creation nexus altogether. And yet, he does not so much return to the model of the lonely genius as he does redraft the relationship of productive inclusion to obtain between the poet and his audience, in a sense conflating the beloved and the reader.

If for Lucretius his imagined reader (Memmius) is also his desired/source of inspiration; if for the Catullus of *c.* 50, his desired/source of inspiration (Licinius) is also his imagined reader (*hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci*, 50.16); if for Propertius and Tibullus the beloved as desired/source of inspiration is also the implicit audience for the poetic offerings of the *amator*;[5]

[5] Cf. James, (2003b), 12 on the *docta puella* as the "primary addressee" of elegy; Lee-Stecum, (1998), 12 on "elegy's professed function as a tool designed to persuade a beloved to comply with the poet's wishes, i.e. as the

then Ovid makes the nature of that relationship explicit by transferring the co-creative energy from the *puella* to the *lector*. Where in Part I we saw Ovid reject the model of inclusion, in Part II we see him explain why: limiting the elegiac creative relationship to the mistress alone, as a form of generic *consuetudo*, limits creative possibility. This is why inclusion with the mistress becomes the bed-death of elegy—she was only ever misidentified as the axis of elegiac rotation, never the true heart of the elegiac enterprise at all. If Lucretius, if Catullus, if Propertius, if Tibullus were nominally composing for and by an audience-muse of one, Ovid is disclosing the true elegiac beloved: the reader.

poetry of 'courtship" and (2000), 195 of "the beloved (who might be considered an implied reader of all the poet/lover's elegies)."

Bibliography

Alfonsi, L. “Otium e vita d’amore negli elegiaci Augustei.” *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, Vol.1. 187-210.

Allen, A.W. 1950. “Sincerity and the Roman Elegists.” *Classical Philology*, Vol. 45.3. 145-160.

Ancona, R. 1994. *Time and the Erotic in Horace’s Odes*. Durham: Duke University Press.
————. and E. Greene, Eds. 2005. *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Arkins, B. 1988. “The Freedom of Influence: Callimachus and Latin Poetry.” *Latomus* 47. 285-93.
————. 1990. “The Anxiety of Influence: Ovid’s Amores as κένωσις.” *Latomus* 49. 826-832.

Armstrong, R. 2005. *Ovid and His Love Poetry*. London: Duckworth.

Baca, A.R. 1968. “The Role of Delia and Nemesis in the Corpus Tibullianum.” *Emerita*, Vol. 36. 49-56.

Bachelard, G. 1958. *La poétique de l’espace*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Bailey, C. 1947. *De rerum natura libri sex*, *ed. with prolegomena, critical apparatus, translation, and commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1960. “Auctoritas, Dignitas, Otium.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 60.1. 43-50.
————————. 1969. *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Baraz, Y. 2012. *A Written Republic: Cicero’s Philosophical Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barchiesi, A. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Batstone, W. and G. Tissol, Eds. 2005. *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature*. New York: Peter Lang.

Beardsley, M.C. 1981. “Aesthetic Value in Literature.” *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 18.3. 238-47.

Bernstein, N.W. 2011. “*Locus Amoenus* and *Locus Horridus* in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *Wenshan Review of Literature and Culture*, Vol. 51. 67-98.

Betensky, A. 1980. “Lucretius and Love.” *The Classical World*, Vol. 73.5. 291-299.

Booth, J., and R. Maltby. 2005. “Light and Dark: Play on ‘Candidus’ and Related Concepts in the Elegies of Tibullus.” *Mnemosyne* 58. 124-132.

Boucher, J.P. 1965. *Études sur Properce: problèmes d’inspiration et d’art*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Bouquet, J. 1996. “La Nuit, Le Sommeil et Le Songe.” *Revue des Études Latines* 74. 182-211.

Bowditch, L. 2006. “Propertius and the Gendered Rhetoric of Luxury and Empire: A Reading of 2.6.” *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 43.3. 306-325.

Boyd, B. 1997. *Ovid’s Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the* Amores. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
———. 2006. “Two Rivers and the Reader in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.” *TAPA* 136. 171-206.

Bragova, A. 2016. “The concept *cum dignitate otium* in Cicero’s writings.” *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 22.1. 45-49.

Bremer, J.M. 1975. “The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides’ ‘Hippolytus’.” *Mnemosyne* 28. 268-280.

Bright, D.F. 1978. *Haec Mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in his World*. Leiden: Brill.

Brown, R.D. 1982. “Lucretius and Callimachus.” *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 7.1. 77-97.
————. 1987. *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on De rerum Natura IV*, 1030-1287 *with Prolegomena, Text, and Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Bruckner, P. 2012. *The Paradox of Love*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Butrica, J.L. 1981. “Propertius 3.8: Unity and Coherence.” *TAPA* 111. 23-30.

Cahoon, L. 1983. “Juno’s Chaste Festival and Ovid’s Wanton Loves: Amores 3.13.” *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 2.1. 1-8.

Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
——— . 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
——— . 2006a. *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist.*
——— . 2006b. “Propertius and the Origins of Latin Love Elegy.” In *Brill’s Companion to Propertius*. Hans-Christian Günther, Ed. Leiden: Brill. 69-96.
——— . 2020. “The Terms *komos* and *paraclausithyron.*” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 60. 262-271.

Campbell, C. 2019. “The Shade of Orpheus: Ambiguity and the Poetics of *Umbra* in *Metamorphoses* 10.” *Dictynna* 16.

Canter, H.V. 1920. “The Paraclausithyron as a Literary Theme.” *The American Journal of*

Philology, Vol. 41.4. 355-368.

Chaniotis, A. 2018. "Nessun Dorma! Changing nightlife in the Hellenistic and Roman East." In *La Nuit: Imaginaire et Réalités Nocturnes dans le Monde Gréco-Romain*. A. Chaniotis, Ed. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 1-49.
———— Ed. 2018. *La Nuit: Imaginaire et Réalités Nocturnes dans le Monde Gréco-Romain*. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

Churchill, J.B. 1995. "On the Content and Structure of the Prologue to Cato's 'Origines'." *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 20. 91-106.

Claassen, J.M. 1999. "The Vocabulary of Exile in Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistolae ex Ponto*." *Glotta* 75. 134-171.

Clack, J. 1975. "*Otium Tibi Molestum Est* – 'Catullus 50 and 51'." *The Classical Bulletin*, Vol. 52. 50-53.

Clark, C. 2008. "The Poetics of Manhood? Nonverbal Behavior in Catullus 51." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 103. 257-281.

Clark, M.E. 1983. "Horace, *Ars Poetica* 75-78: The Origin and Worth of Elegy." *The Classical World*. Vol. 77.1. 1-5.

Clarke, J. 2003. *Imagery of Colour & Shining in Catullus, Propertius & Horace*. New York: Peter Lang.

Clausen, W. 1964. "Callimachus and Latin Poetry." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* Vol. 5.3. 181-96.
————. 1970. "Catullus and Callimachus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 74. 85-94.
————. 1986. "Cicero and the New Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 90. 159-170.

Connolly, J. 2000. "Asymptotes of Pleasure: Thoughts on the Nature of Roman Erotic Elegy." *Arethusa*, Vol. 33.1. 71-98.

Conte, G.B. 1974. *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario: Catullo, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano*. Torino: G. Einaudi.
————. 1980. *Il genere e i suoi confini: cinque studi sulla poesia di Virgilio.* Torino: Stampatori.
————. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
————. 1994a. *Latin Literature: A History*. J.B. Solodow, Trans. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
————. 1994b. *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*. G. Most, Trans. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Copley, F.O. 1942. “On the Origin of Certain Features of the Paraclausithyron.” *TAPA*, Vol. 73. 96-107.
————————. 1947. “Servitium Amoris in the Roman Elegists.” *TAPA* vol. 78. 285-300.
————————. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. *APA Monographs*, Vol. 79.2. Baltimore: J.H. Furst Company.

Courtney, E. 1968. “The Structure of Propertius Book I and Some Textual Consequences.” *Phoenix*, Vol. 22.3. 250-258.

Culler, J. 2015. *Theory of the Lyric*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Curtis, L. 2019. “Elegiac Women and the Epiphanic Gaze: The Case of Propertius’ Cynthia.” *Classical Philology* 114. 406-429.

Curtius, E.R. 2013. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. W.R. Trask, Trans. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dalzell, A. 1980. “Homeric Themes in Propertius.” *Hermathena* 129. 29-36.

Damer, E.Z. 2014a. “Recent Work on Tibullus.” *Classical World* 107.4. 443-450.
————————. 2014b. “Gender Reversals and Intertextuality in Tibullus.” *The Clasical World*, Vol. 107.4. 493-514.
————————. 2019. *In the Flesh: Embodied Identities in Roman Elegy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Davis, J.T. 1979. “Amores 1,4,45-48 and the Ovidian Aside.” *Hermes* 107. 189-199.
————————. 1989. *Fictus Adulter: Poet as Actor in the* Amores. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Davis, P.J. 1995. “*Praeceptor Amoris:* Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria* and the Augustan Idea of Rome.” *Ramus* Vol. 24. 2. 181-195.

Day, A.A. 1984. *The Origins of Latin Love Elegy*. New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

DeBrohun, J. 2003. *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Dee, J.H. 1978. “Elegy 4.8: A Propertian Comedy.” *TAPA* 108. 41-53.

De Temmerman, K. 2018. “Novelistic Nights.” In *La Nuit: Imaginaire et Réalités Nocturnes dans le Monde Gréco-Romain*. A. Chaniotis, Ed. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 257-285.

Dominik, W.J. 1992. “Roman Poetry and Rhetoric: A Reminder of the Affinity Between the Two Arts.” *Akroterion* 37.2. 61-67.

Döpp, S. 2005. “*Iam Modo, Iam Passim Contentus Vivere Parvo!* Die Struktur von Tibulls Elegie 1,1.” Hermes 133. 458-474.

Drinkwater, M. 2013. “The Woman’s Part: The Speaking Beloved in Roman Elegy.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 63.1. 329-338.

Durling, R. 1958. “Ovid as *Praeceptor Amoris*.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 53.4. 157-167.

Edmunds, L. 2003. *Intertextuality and the Readings of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elder, J.P. 1951. “Notes on Some Conscious and Unconscious Elements in Catullus’ Poetry.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 60. 101-136.

Elsner, J. 2007. “Viewing Ariadne: From Ekphrasis to Wall Painting in the Roman World.” *Classical Philology*, Vol. 102.1. 20-44.

Fabre-Serris, J. 2005. “L’élégie et les images romaines des origines: les choix de Tibulle.” In *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne*. Ed. Jürgen Paul Schwindt. Heidelberg : Universitätsverlag Winter.

———. 2013. “Genre et Gender: usages et enjeux de l’emploi de ‘durus’ chez les élégiaques.” *Eugesta : Revue sur le Genre dans l’Antiquite* 3. 209-239.

———. 2014. “La réception d’Empedocles dans la poésie latine : Virgilie (*Buc*. 6), Lucrèce, Gallus et les poètes élégiaques.” *Dictynna* 11.

Fantham, E. 1972. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2013. *Roman Literary Culture: From Plautus to Macrobius, 2nd Edition*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Farrell, J. 1999. “The Ovidian Corpus: Poetic Body and Poetic Text.” In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*. P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society. 127-141.

———. 2002. “Greek Lives and Roman Careers in the Classical Vita Tradition.” In *European Literary Careers: The Author From Antiquity to the Renaissance.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2003. “Classical Genre in Theory and in Practice.” *New Literary History*, Vol. 34.3. 383-408.

———. 2014. “The Poet in an Artificial Landscape: Ovid at *Falerii* (*Amores* 3.13).” In *Lire la Ville: fragments d’une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique*. D.P. Nelis and M. Royo, Eds. Bordeaux: Éditions Ausonius. 215-236.

Fear, T. 2005. “Propertian Closure: The Elegiac Contestation of the Liminal Male and Ideological Contestation in Ancient Rome.” In *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. R. Ancona, E. Greene, Eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 13-40.

Fedeli, P. 1984. *Sexti Properti Elegiarum libri IV*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Ferguson, J. 1956. "Catullus and Horace." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 77.1. 1-18.

Fernández-Contreras, M.A. 2000. "El Insomnio como Motivo Literario en la Poesia Griega y Latina." *Habis* 31. 9-35.

Finamore, J.F. 1984. "Catullus 50 and 51: Friendship, Love, and 'Otium'." *The Classical World*, Vol. 78.1. 11-19.

Fineberg, B. 1993. "From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: The Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy." In *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*. M. DeForest, Ed. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci.
————. 1999. "Repetition and the Poetics of Desire in Tibullus 1.4." *The Classical World*, Vol. 92.5. 419-428.

Fish, J. 2004. "Physician, Heal Thyself: the Intertextuality of Ovid's Exile Poetry and the 'Remedia Amoris'." *Latomus* 63. 864-872.

Fitzgerald, W. 1992. "Catullus and the Reader: The Erotics of Poetry." *Arethusa*, Vol. 25.3. 419-443.

Flaschenriem, B. 1997. "Loss, Desire, and Writing in Propertius 1.19 and 2.15." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 16.2. 259-277.
————. 1998. "Speaking of Women: 'Female Voice' in Propertius." *Helios* 25.1. 49-64.

Frank, R.I. 1968. "Catullus 51: Otium versus Virtus." *TAPA,* Vol. 99. 233-239.

Fränkel, H. 1945. *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Frederick, D. 1997. "Reading Broken Skin: Violence in Roman Elegy." In *Roman Sexualities*. J.P. Hallett and M.B. Skinner, Eds. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 172-194.
————. 1999. "Haptic Poetics." *Arethusa*, Vol. 32.1. 49-83.
————. 2012. "The Gaze and the Elegiac Imaginary." In *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. B. K. Gold, Ed. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell. 426-4

Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: an introduction to the theory of genres and modes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fowler, D. 1989. "First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 2. 75-122.
————. 1994. "Postmodernism, Romantic Irony, and Classical Closure." In *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*. Leiden: Brill. 231-256.
————. 1997. "Second Thoughts on Closure." In *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, Eds. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 3-22.

————————. 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fulkerson, L. 2016. *Ovid: A Poet on the Margins*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
————————. 2018. "*Credula spes*: Tibullan Hope and the Future of Elegy." In *Intratextuality and Latin Literature.* S. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis, and T. Papanghelis., Eds. Berlin: De Gruyter. 55-66.

Fyler, J.M. 1971. "Omnia vincit amor : Incongruity and the Limitations of Structure in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 66.3. 196-203.

Gaisser, J.H. 1983. "'Amor, rura' and 'militia' in Three Elegies of Tibullus: 1.1, 1.5 and 1.10." *Latomus* 42. 58-72.

Gale, M. 1997. "Properitus 2.7: *Militia Amoris* and the Ironies of Elegy." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 87. 77-91.
————. 2001. *Lucretius and the Didactic Epic*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
————. 2007. "Lucretius and previous poetic traditions." In *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. S. Gillespie and P. Hardie, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 59-75.

Gardner, H.H. 2008. "Women's Time in Ovid's Remedia Amoris." In *Latin Elegy and Narratology*. G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell, Eds.. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press. 68-85.

Garrison, D.H., Ed. 2012. *The Student's Catullus, Fourth Edition*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Gärtner, T. 2006. "Properz IV 3 und die Gattungsgenese der ovidischen Heroidenbriefe." *Hermes* 134. 211-236.
————————. 2011. "Das Erlebnis der Impotenz: Zur Genese, Struktur und Rezeption von Ov., am. III,7." *Latomus* 70. 103-123.

Gerber, D.E., Ed. and Trans. 1999. *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Loeb Classical Library 258. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gold, B.K. 1993. "'But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place': Finding the Female in Roman Poetry." In *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. N.S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin, Eds. New York: Routledge. 75-101.
————————. 2007. "The Natural and Unnatural Silence of Women in the *Elegies* of Propertius." *Antichthon*, Vol. 41. 54-72.
——, Ed. 2012. *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Goold, G.P. 1967. "Noctes Propertianae." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 71. 59-106.
————————, Ed. and Trans. 1990. *Propertius*: *Elegies*. Loeb Classical Library 18. Cambridge:

Harvard University Press.

Gotoff. H.C. 1974. “Tibullus: Nunc levis est Tractanda Venus.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 78. 231-251.

Graver, M. 2002. *Cicero on the Emotions: Tusculan Disputations 3 and 4*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Green, E.H. 1940. “Furius Bibaculus.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 35.6. 348-356.

Greene, E. 1995. “Fantasy, Materia, and Male Desire in Propertius 1.3 and 1.11.” *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 116.2. 303-318.
————. 1998. *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
————. 2000. “Gender Identity and the Elegiac Hero in Propertius 2.1.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 33.2. 241-261.
————. 2005. “Gender and Genre in Propertius 2.8 and 2.9.” In *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature*. Ed. W. Batstone and G. Tissol. New York: Peter Lang.

Grewing, F.F., B. Acosta-Hughes, and A. Kirichenko, Eds.. 2013. *The Door Ajar: False Closure in Greek and Roman Literature and Art*. Heidelberg: Winter

Gibson, B. 1999. “Ovid on Reading: Reading Ovid. Reception in Ovid Tristia II.” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 89. 19-37.

Griffin, J. 1976. “Augustan Poetry and the Life of Luxury.” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 66. 87-105.
———. 1981. “Genre and Real Life in Latin Poetry.” *The Journal of Roman Studies,* Vol. 71. 39-49.
———. 1985. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. London: Duckworth.

Gross, N.P. 1979. “Rhetorical Wit and Amatory Persuasion in Ovid.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 74.4. 305-318.

Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Gurd, S.A. 2007. “Cicero and Editorial Revision.” *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 26.1. 48-80.
————. 2012. *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gutzwiller, K. 2007. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
————. 2015. “Eros and Amor: Representations of Love in Greek Epigram and Latin Elegy.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, S. 125. 23-44.

Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: from Ritualized Speech to Social Order*.

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J. 2004. “Cicero and Quintilian on the Oratorical Use of Hand Gestures.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 54.1. 143-160.

Hallett, J. 1973. “The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-cultural feminism.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 6.1. 103-124.

Hamilton, J. 2003. *Soliciting Darkness: Pindar, Obscurity, and the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hanchey, D. 2013. “‘Otium’ as Civic and Personal Stability in Cicero’s Dialogues.” *The Classical World*, Vol 106.2. 171-197.

Hardie, P. 2002. *Ovid’s Poetics of Illusion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2007. “Lucretius and later Latin literature in antiquity.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. S. Gillespie and P. Hardie, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 111-127.
——, Ed.. 2006. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
——., and H. Moore, Eds. 2010. *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harmon, D. 1974. “Myth and Fantasy in Propertius 1.3.” *TAPA*, Vol. 104. 151-165.

Harrison, S.J. 1994. “Drink, Suspicion and Comedy in Propertius 1.3.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 40. 18-26.
————. 2002. “Ovid and genre: evolutions of an elegist.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. P. Hardie, Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 79-94.
————. 2007a. “The Primal Voyage and the Ocean of Epos: Two Aspects of Metapoetic Imagery in Catullus, Virgil and Horace.” *Dictynna* 4.
————. 2007b. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heath, J. 2011a. “Poetic Simultaneity and Genre in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 107.2. 189-211.
———. 2011b. “Women’s Work: Female Transmission of Mythical Narrative.” *TAPA*, Vol. 141.1. 69-104.

Henderson, A.A.R. 1969. “Tibullus, Elysium and Tartarus.” *Latomus* 28. 649-653.

Henkel, J. 2011. “Nighttime Labor: A Metapoetic Vignette Alluding to Aratus at ‘Georgics’ 1.291-296.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 106. 179-198.
———. 2014. “Metrical Feet on the Road of Poetry: Foot Puns and Literary Polemic in Tibullus.” *The Classical World*, Vol. 107.4. 451-475.

Heyworth, S. 2010. “An Elegist’s Career: From Cynthia to Cornelia.” In *Classical Literary*

Careers and their Reception. P. Hardie and H. Moore, Eds. New York: Cambridge University Press. 88-104.

Hinds, S. 1987. "Generalizing About Ovid." *Ramus* 16. 4-31.
———. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holm, S. 2013. "The Specter of Tantalus: Didactic Latency in *De rerum natura*." *TAPA*, Vol. 143. 385-403.

Holzberg, N. 2002. *Ovid: The Poet and his Work*. G.M. Goshgarian, Trans. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
————. 2009. "Ovid, 'Amores' 3,7: a Poem Between Two Genres." *Latomus* 68. 933-940.

Hose, M. 2008. "'Der Leser Schneide dem Lied Länge ab.' Vom Umgang mit Poesie im Hellenismus." *Hermes* 136. 293-307.

Houghton, L.B.T. 2007. "Tibullus' Elegiac Underworld." *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 57.1. 153-165.

Hunter, H.G. 2013. *Gendering Time in Augustan Love Elegy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunter, R.L. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
————. 2012. "Callimachus and Roman Elegy." In *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. B.K. Gold, Ed. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell. 155-171.

Huntingford, N.P.C. "Ovid 'Amores' 1.5." *Acta Classica*, Vol. 24. 107-117.

Itzkowitz, J.B. 1983. "On the Last Stanza of Catullus 51." *Latomus* 42. 129-134.

James, S. 2001. "The Economics of Roman Elegy: Voluntary Poverty, the *Recusatio*, and the Greedy Girl." *American Journal of Philology,* Vol. 122.2. 223-253.
——— . 2003a. "Her Turn to Cry: The Politics of Weeping in Roman Elegy." *TAPA*, Vol. 133.1. 99-122.
———. 2003b. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 2006. "A Courtesan's Choreography: Female Liberty and Male Anxiety at the Roman Dinner Party." In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*. C.A. Farone and L.K. McClure, Eds. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 224-251.
———. 2010. "Ipsa Dixerit: Women's Words in Roman Elegy." *Phoenix* vol. 64.3-4. 314-344.

Janan, M. 1994. *"When the Lamp is Shattered": Desire and Narrative in Catullus*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
———. 2001. *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jansen, L. 2012. "On the Edge of the Text: Preface and Reader in Ovid's *Amores*." *Helios*, Vol.

39.1. 1-19.

Johnson, W.R. 1990. “Messalla’s Birthday: The Politics of Pastoral.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 23.1. 95-113.
————. 1997. “Final Exit: Propertius 4.11.” In *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Ed. D. H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 163-180.

Kanellou, M. 2013. “Lamp and Erotic Epigram: how an object sheds light on lover’s emotions.” In *Eros in Ancient Greece*. E. Sanders, Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 277-292.
————. 2017. “Eros and the Erotes: From the Archaic Erotic Poetry into Hellenistic Epigram and Beyond.” In *Past and Present in Hellenistic Poetry*. M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, Eds. Leuven: Peeters. 137-159.

Kaufhold, S. 1997. “Propertius 1.3: Cynthia Rescripted.” *Illinois Classical Studies,* Vol. 22. 87-98.

Keith, A.M. 1992. “*Amores* 1.1: Propertius and the Ovidian Programme.” *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Vol. 6. 327-344.
————. 1994. “Corpus Eroticum: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac Puellae in Ovid’s ‘Amores.’” *The Classical World*, Vol. 88.1. 27-40.
————. 1999. “Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory.” *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 52.1 41-62.
————. 2001. “Etymological Wordplay in Ovid’s ‘Pyramus and Thisbe’.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 51.1. 309-312.
————. 2008. *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*. London: Duckworth.

Kennedy, A. 2016. “‘Haec Nobis Fingebamus’: Tibullus, Ovid, and the Power of Imagination.” *The Classical Outlook*, Vol. 19.2. 52-54.

Kennedy, D.F. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
————. 2008. “Elegy and the Erotics of Narratology.” In *Latin Elegy and Narratology*. G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell, Eds.. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
————. 2012. “Love’s Tropes and Figures.” In *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. B. K. Gold, Ed. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell. 187-203.
————. 2017. “What’s in a Name?: Delia in Tibullus 1.1.” *The Classical Quarterly* 67.1. 193-198.

Kenney, E.J. 1962. “The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid’s *Amores, Ars Amatoria, and Remedia Amoris*.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol.12.1. 1-31.
————. 1969. “Ovid and the Law.” *Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. 21. 241-263.
————. 1970a. “Doctus Lucretius.” *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 23.4. 366-392.
————. 1970b. “Tityos and the Lover.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 16. 44-47.

Ker, J. 2004. “Nocturnal Writers in Imperial Rome.” 215-216. *Classical Philology,* Vol. 3. 209-242.
—— and A. Wessels, Eds. 2020. *The Values of Nighttime in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.

King, J.E., Trans. 1945. *Cicero: Tusculan Disputations*. Loeb Classical Library 141. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Klentke, S. 2016. “Catullus’ *Otium*: A Transgressive Translation?” *Past Imperfect* 19. 55-75.

Knox, P. 1985. “Water, Wine, and Callimachean Polemics.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98. 107-19
———. 2004. “Cynthia’s Ghosts in Propertius 4.7.” *Ordia Prima* 3. 153-169.

Konstan, D. 1972. “Two Kinds of Love in Catullus.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 68.2. 102-106.

Kuhlmann, P. 2006. “Odysseus, Theokrit und Tibull: Die Ironisierung des sprechenden Ich bei Tibull am Beispiel der Elegie I,3.” *Hermes* 134. 419-441.

Laidlaw, W.A. 1986. “Otium.” *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 15.1. 42-52.

Lavency, M. 1965. “L’ode à Lesbie et son Billet d’Envoi (Catulle, L et LI).” *L’Antiquité Classique* 34. 175-182.

Leach, E. 1978. “Vergil, Horace, Tibullus: Three Collections of Ten.” *Ramus* 7. 79-105.
———. 1980a. “Poetics and Poetic Design in Tibullus’ First Elegiac Book.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 13.1. 79-96.
———. 1980b. “Sacryl-Idyllic Landscape Painting and the Poems of Tibullus’ First Book.” *Latomus* 39. 47-69.
———. 2003. “Otium as Luxuria: Economy of Status in the Younger Pliny’s Letters.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 36.2. 147-165.

Lee, B. 2008. “The Potentials of Narrative: The Rhetoric of the Subjective in Tibullus.” In *Latin Elegy and Narratology*. Ed. G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Lee, G. 1974. “*Otium cum indignitate*: Tibullus 1.1.” In *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. T. Woodman and D. West, Eds. London: Cambridge University Press. 94-114.
———, Ed. and Trans. 1995. *Tibullus: Elegies*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns.

Lee-Stecum, P. 1998. *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies Book One*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
————————. 2000. “Poet/Reader, Authority deferred: Re-Reading Tibullan Elegy.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 33.2. 177-215.

Le M. Du Quesnay, I.M. 1973. “The *Amores.*” In *Ovid*. J.W. Binns, Ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1-48.

Lenz, F.W. 1958. “Junofest (Ovid Amores III, 13). Eine Studie zu Ovids elegischer Erzählungskunst.” *Fabula*, Vol. 1.3. 255-262.

Lieberg, G. 1982a. *Poeta Creator: Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
————. 1982b. “Virgile et l’idée de poète créateur dans l’Antiquité.” *Latomus* 41.2. 255-284.

Lindheim, S.H. 2021. *Latin Elegy and the Space of Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lively, G. 2010. “*Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit*: Time and Narrative in Propertius 4.” *Helios*, Vol. 37.2. 111-127.
————. 2012. “Narratology in Roman Elegy.” In *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. B.K. Gold, Ed. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell. 410-425.
———— and P. Salzman-Mitchell, Eds. 2008. *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of a Story*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Lowrie, M. 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Luck, G. 1969. *The Latin Love Elegy*. London: Methuen.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1970. “Propertius and Cynthia: Elegy 1.3.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, No.16. 60-78.
————, Ed. 1978. *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
————. 1979. “Servitium Amoris.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 29.1. 117-130.
————. 1980. *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace.* New York: Oxford University Press.
————. 2007. *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Maguinness, W.S. 1944. “The Singular Use of Nos in the ‘Corpus Tibullianum’.” *Hermathena* 63. 27-46.

Maltby, R. 1999. “Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. J.N. Adams and R. Mayer, Eds. New York: Oxford University Press. 377-398.
————. 2002. *Tibullus: Elegies*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns.
————. 2004. “The wheel of Fortune, Nemesis and the central Poems of Tibullus I and II.” In *Middles in Latin Poetry*. Ed. K. Strates and F. De Martino. Bari: Levante editori. 103-122.
————. 2006. “Major Themes and Motifs in Propertius’ Love Poetry.” In *Brill’s Companion to Propertius*. H.C. Gunther, Ed. Leiden: Brill. 147-181.

Martinengo-Cesaresco, E. 1911. *The Outdoor Life in Greek and Roman Poets, and Kindred Studies*. London: Macmillan.

Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, K. 1998. "*Servitium amoris: Amor servitii*." In *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. Ed. S. Joshel and S. Murnaghan. New York: Routledge.
————————. 2010. "Lost and Found Voices: Propertius 3.6." *Helios*, Vol. 37.2. 153-186.

McKeown, J.C. 1988. *Ovid, Amores*: *text, prolegomena, and commentary in four volumes*. Wolfeboro: F. Cairns.
————————. 2002. "The Authenticity of Amores 3.5." In *Vertis in Usum: Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney*. J.F. Miller, C. Damon, and K.S. Myers, Eds. Leipzig: K.G Saur.

McNamee, K. 1993. "Propertius, Poetry, and Love." In *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*. M. DeForest, Ed. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci. 215-248.

Merriam, C.U. 2007. "Sleeping Beauty: Propertius, Elegies 1.3." In *Beauty and the Abject: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*." L. Boldt-Irons, C. Federici, and E. Virgulti, Eds. New York: Peter Lang.

Michalopoulos, C.N. 2011. "Feminine speech in Roman love elegy: Prop. 1.3." *Leeds International Classical Studies* 10.4. 1-14.

Miller, J.F. 1997. "Lucretian Moments in Ovidian Elegy." *The Classical Journal,* Vol. 92.4. 384-398.

Miller, P.A. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. New York: Routledge.
————————. 1999. "The Tibullan Dream Text." *TAPA*, Vol. 129. 181.224.
————————. 2001. "Why Propertius is a Woman." *Classical Philology* 96. 127-146.
————, Ed. 2002. *Latin Erotic Elegy: An Anthology and Reader*. London: Routledge.
————————. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
————————. 2019. "Assuming the Puella." *TAPA*, Vol. 149.2. S201-S226.

Montuschi, C. 2005. *Il Tempo in Ovidio: Funzioni, Meccanismi, Strutture*. Florence: L.S. Olschki.

Morgan, K. 1977. *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the Amores*. Leiden: Brill.

Murgatroyd, P. 1975. "*Militia amoris* and the Roman Elegists." *Latomus* 34. 59-79.
————————. 1981. "*Servitium amoris* and the Roman Elegists." *Latomus* 40. 589-606.
————————. 1989. "The Genre and Unity of Tibullus 2.6." *Phoenix*, Vol. 43.2. 134-142.
————————. 1991. *Tibullus I*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
————————. 1994. *Tibullus: Elegies II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Musurillo, H. 1970. “Furtivus Amor: The Structure of Tibullus 1.5.” *TAPA*, Vol. 101. 387-399.

Mutschler, F.-H. 1985. *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls: Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum*. Frankfort am Main: Verlag Peter Lang.

Nagle, B.R. 1980. *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto *of Ovid*. Brussels: Latomus.

Nethercut, J. 2018. “The Alexandrian Footnote in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*.” *Mnemosyne* 71. 75-99.

Nappa, C. 2007. “Elegy on the Threshold: Generic Self-Consciousness in Propertius 1.16.” *The Classical World*, Vol. 101.1. 57-73.

Newman, J.K. 2013. “Tibullus and Augustan Politics.” In *Art, Intellect and Politics: A Diachronic Perspective*. Ed. G.M.A. Margagliotta and A.A. Robiglio. Boston: Brill.

O’Higgins, D. 1990. “Sappho’s Splintered Tounge: Silence in Sappho 31 and Catullus 51.” *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 111.2. 156-167.

Öhrman, M. 2020. “Work Gendering Space? Roman Gender, Textile Work and Time in Shared Domestic Space.” In *Textiles and Gender in Antiquity: From the Orient to the Mediterranean*. M. Harlow, C. Michel, and L. Quillien, Eds. New York: Bloomsbury Academic. 135-149.

O’Neil, E.N. 1958. “Cynthia and the Moon.” *Classical Philology*, Vol. 53.1. 1-8.

O’Neill, K. 2005. “The Lover’s Gaze and Cynthia’s Glance.” In *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. R. Ancona and E. Greene, Eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

O’Rourke, D. 2014. “Lovers in Arms: Empedoclean Love and Strife in Lucretius and the Elegists.” *Dictynna* 11.

————. 2016. “The Madness of Elegy: Rationalizing Propertius.” In *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational*. P. Hardie, Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Otis, B. 1965. “Propertius’ Single Book.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 70. 1-44.

Papanghelis, T.D. 1987. *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1989. “About the Hour of Noon: Ovid, ‘Amores’ 1,5.” *Mnemosyne* 42. 54-61.

Pasco-Pranger, M. 2009. “Sustaining Desire: Catullus 50, Gallus and Propertius 1.10.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 59.1. 142-146.

Perkins, C.A. 2014. "*Corinna Dubitans*: Rhetorics of Seduction and Failure in Ovid, *Amores* 1.11." *The Classical World*, Vol. 107.3. 347-365.

Perrelli, R. 2019. "Tibullo, l'otium e l'elegia latina." *Paideia*, Vol. 74.2. 1217-1229.

Pillinger, H.E. 1969. "Some Callimachean Influences on Propertius, Book 4." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 73. 171-199.
————————. 1971. "Tibullus 1.10 and Lucretius." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 66.3. 204-208.

Pinchon, R. 1902. *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores.* Paris: Hachette.

Platter, C.L. 1995. "*Officium* in Catullus and Propertius: A Foucauldian Reading." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 90. 211-224.

Pucci, P. 1961. "Il carme 50 di Catullo." *Maia* 13. 249-256.
————. 1978. "Lingering on the Threshold." *Glyph* 3. 52-73.

Pulgram, E. 1954. "Accent and Ictus in Spoken and Written Latin." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 71. 218-237.

Putnam, M. 1973. *Tibullus: A Commentary*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
————————. 2005. "Virgil and Tibullus 1.1." *Classical Philology,* Vol. 100. 123-141.

Quinn, K. 1982. "The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 30.1. 75-180.

Racette-Campbell, M. 2016. "Death Becomes Her: Women's Speech Haunting Propertian Elegy." *Helios*, Vol. 43.2. 109-131.

Rambaux, C. 1997. *Tibulle ou la Répétition*. Brussels: Latomus.

Ramminger, A. 1937. *Motivgeschichtliche Studien zu Catulls Basiagedichten: mit einem Anhang: Aus dem Nachleben der catullischen Basiagedichte*. Diss. Würzburg: K. Triltsch.

Rand, E.K. 1925. *Ovid and His Influence*. Boston: Marshall Jones Co.

Richardson, L. Jr., Ed. 2006. *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Rimell, V. 2015. *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics: Empire's Inward Turn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, D.H., F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, Eds. 1997. *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Robinson, M. 2013. "Propertius 1.3: Sleep, Surprise, and Catullus 64." *Bulletin of the Institute of*

Classical Studies, Vol. 56.1. 89-115.

Roman, L. 2014. *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosivach, V.J. 1986. "Love and Leisure in Roman Comedy and the Amatory Poets." *L'Antiquité Classique* 55. 175-189.

Rubino, C.A. "The Erotic World of Catullus." *The Classical World*, Vol. 68.5. 289-298.

Sadlek, G.M. 2004. *Idleness Working: The Discourse of Love's Labor from Ovid through Chaucer and Gower.* Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Schwindt, J.P. 2005. "Zeiten und Räume in augusteischer Dichtung." In *La Représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne*. J.P. Schwindt, Ed. Heidelberg: Winter. 1-18.

Scioli, E., Ed. 2015. *Dream, Fantasy, and Visual Art in Roman Elegy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Scott, W.C. 1969. "Catullus and Calvus (Cat. 50)." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 64.3. 169-173.

Segal, C. 1970. "Catullan 'Otiosi': The Lover and the Poet." *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 17.1. 25-31.
———. 1974. "More Alexandrianism in Catullus VII?" *Mnemosyne* 27. 139-143.

Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. 1983. "Cicero and Early Latin Poetry." *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 8.2. 239-249.

Sharrock, A. 1990. "Alternae Voces-Again." *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 40.2. 570-571.
————————. 1994a. "Ovid and the Politics of Reading." *Materiali e discussion per l'analisi dei testi classici* 33. 97-122.
————————. 1994b. *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's* Ars Amatoria II. New York: Oxford University Press.
————————. 1995. "The Drooping Rose: Elegiac Failure in Amores 3.7." *Ramus* 24. 152-180.
————————. 2002a. "Ovid and the discourses of love: the amatory works." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. P. Hardie, Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 150-162.
————————. 2002b. "Looking at Looking: Can You Resist a Reading?" In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*. D. Frederick, Ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 265-295.
————————. 2002c. "An A-Musing Tale." In *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. E. Spentzou and D. Fowler, Eds. New York: Oxford University Press. 207-227.
————————. 2013. "The *poeta-amator*, *nequitia* and *recusatio.*" In *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. T.S. Thorsen, Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 151-165.

Showerman, G., Trans. 1977. *Ovid: Heroides, Amores*. G.P. Goold, Revis. Loeb Classical Library 41. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Shulman, J. “Te Quoque Falle Tamen: Ovid’s Anti-Lucretian Didactics.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 76.3. 242-253.

Smith, B.H. 1968. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, P. 1965. “‘Lentus in Umbra’: A Symbolic Pattern in Vergil’s ‘Eclogues.’” *Phoenix*, Vol. 19.4. 298-304.

Smith, R.A. 1997. *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Solmsen, F. 1961. “Propertius in his Literary Relations with Tibullus and Vergil.” *Philologus*, Vol. 105.3. 273-289.

Solodow, J.B. 1988. *The World of Ovid’s* Metamorphoses. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Stahl, H.-P. 1985. *Propertius: “Love” and “War”: Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Starr, R.J. 1987. “The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World.” *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 37.1. 213-223.
———. 1991. “Reading Aloud: Lectores and Roman Reading.” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 86.4. 337-343.

Stirrup, B. 1981. “Ovid: Poet of imagined Reality.” *Latomus* 40. 88-104.

Sullivan, J.P. 1961. “Two Problems in Roman Love Elegy.” *TAPA* 92. 522-536.
————————. 1972. “The Politics of Elegy.” *Arethusa*, Vol. 5.1. 17-34.
———, Ed. 1962. *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tatham, G. 2000. “‘Just as Ariadne Lay …’: Images of Sleep in Propertius 1.3.” *Scholia: Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 9. 43-53

Theodorakopoulos, E. 1999. “Closure and Transformation in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.” In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*. P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society. 142-161.
————————————. 2019. “Closure and the Book of Virgil.” In *The Cambridge Companion in Virgil* 2nd Edition. C. Martindale and F. Mac Góráin, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 226-240.

Thomas, R.F. 1979. “New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 83. 179-206.
————————. 1988. “Turning Back the Clock.” *Classical Philology*, Vol. 83.1. 54-69.

Thomson, D.F.S. 1967. “Catullus and Cicero: Poetry and the Criticism of Poetry.” *The Classical World*, Vol. 60.6. 225-230.

Thorsen, T.S, Ed. 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tracy, V.A. 1977. “Dramatic Elements in Ovid’s ‘Amores’.” *Latomus* 36. 496-500.

Trypanis, C.A., Ed. 1958. *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Other Fragments.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Valladares, H. 2005. “The Lover as a Model Viewer: Gendered Dynamics in Propertius 1.3.” In *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. R. Ancona and E. Greene, Eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Vessey, D.W.T. 1981. “Elegy Eternal: Ovid, *Amores*, 1.15.” *Latomus* 40. 607-617.

Veyne, P. 1979. “The Hellenization of Rome and the Question of Acculturations.” *Diogenes*, Vol. 27. 106. 1-27.
——— . 1983. *L’élégie érotique romaine: l’amour, la poésie et l’Occident.* Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Vickers, B. 1990. “Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the ambivalence of otium.” *Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 4.1-2. 1-154.

Volk, K. 1997. “Cum carmine crescit et annus: Ovid’s Fasti and the Poetics of Simultaneity.” *TAPA*, Vol. 127. 287-313.
———. 2002. *The Poetics of Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. New York: Oxford University Press.
———. 2005. “Ille Ego: (Mis)Reading Ovid’s Elegiac Persona.” *Antike und Abendland*, Vol. 51.1. 83-96.

Von Albrecht, M. 1981. “Ovide et ses lecteurs.“ *Revue des etudes latines* 59. 207-215.

Vretska, K. 1955. “Tibullus ‘Paraklausithyron’.” Wiener Studien 68. 20-49.

Wallis, J. 2016. “Ghostwriting Elegy in Propertius 4.7.” *The Classical Quarterly* Vol. 66.2. 556-572.
——— . 2018. *Introspection and Engagement in Propertius: A Study of Book 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinlich, B. 2010. “The Story of a Poet’s Apologetic Emancipation: The *Recusatio*-Narratives in Propertius 3.3, *Amores* 1.1, 2.1, and 3.1.” *Helios*, Vol. 37.2. 129-152.
————. 2011. “Puella and Poeta in Propertius‘ Elegey 3.10.” *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici* 67. 21-49.

Welch, T.S. 2005. *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Wheeler, A. 1910. "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources, I." *Classical Philology* 5. 440-450.
————. 1911. "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources, II." *Classical Philology* 6. 56-77.

Wheeler, S. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's* "*Metamorphoses*". Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

White, P. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
————. 1980. *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
————. 2018. "From Grave to Rave: Reading 'Reality' in Propertius 4.7 and 4.8." In *Life, Love, and Death in Latin Poetry*. S. Frangoulidis and S. Harrison, Eds. Berlin: De Gruyter

Wilson, A. 2018. "Roman Nightlife." In *La Nuit: Imaginaire et Réalités Nocturnes dans le Monde Gréco-Romain*. A. Chaniotis, Ed.. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 59-89.

Wilson, K. 2020. "The Astronomer-Poet at Night: The Evolution of a Motif." In *The Values of Nighttime in Classical Antiquity*. J. Ker and A. Wessels, Eds. Leiden: Brill. 131-149.

Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom; die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
————. 1968. *Der frühe Tibull*. Munich: W. Fink.
————. 1976. *Tibull und Delia, I.* Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
————. 1983. *Tibull und Delia, II*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Winiarska, R. 2017. "The Motif of the Lamp in Book V of the *Palatine Anthology*." *Classica Cracoviensia*, Vol. XX. 227-236.

Wirszubski, C.H. 1954. "Cicero's *cum dignitate otium*: A Reconsideration" *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 44. 1-13.

Woodman, A.J. 1966. "Some Implications of otium in Catullus 51.13-16." *Latomus* 25. 217-226.

Woodman, T. and D. West, Eds. 1974. *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Wray, D. 2003. "What Poets Do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 98.3. 217-250.

Wyke, M. 2007. *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zetzel, J. 1983. “Re-Creating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian past.” *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 10.1. 83-105.