THE ROMAN CALLIMACHUS :
STRUCTURE AND COHERENCE IN
THE PROPERTIAN CORPUS[1]

Damien P. NELIS, Dublin

The frequently problematic and obscure text of Propertius has the ability to drive readers to distraction and editors to despair. Apart from the hundreds of individual textual difficulties which hinder accurate interpretation, one big question about the whole corpus has long troubled scholars : did Propertius write four or five books of poetry ? It is not my intention to go through in detail all the evidence which has been thought to be relevant to the solution of this problem. In recent years, Butrica, Günther, Hendry, Heyworth, Lyne and Murgia, for example, have done so in expert fashion, but only to arrive at opposing views[2]. For Günther, Heyworth, Lyne and Murgia, Propertius wrote five books ; for Butrica and Hendry, he wrote only four. What I hope to do in this paper is to suggest that there may be some evidence which deserves more attention than it has received thus far, and which should be taken into account in any future discussion of this divisive issue.

From the *editio princeps* of 1472 up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, editors of Propertius presented his poems in four books, exactly as they are still presented in the editions currently in use today, perhaps with the exception of J. P. Postgate's *Select Elegies of Propertius*[3]. In 1816, however, Lachmann suggested that the book traditionally thought of as the second book in fact contained the remains of two original books,

---

[2] Butrica 1996, Günther 1997, Hendry 1995, Heyworth 1995a, 1995b, Liberman 2002, 53-56, Lyne 1998a, 1998b, Murgia 2000.

[3] Postgate 1881. I have used the text of Goold 1999.

and he went on to present the Propertian corpus in five groups, with Book 3 beginning with the poem usually called 2.10, the traditional Book 3 becoming Book 4, and Book 4 becoming Book 5[4]. For Lachmann, the transmitted text called Book 2 was corrupt and lacunose, and he found strong support for his division at 2.13.25f:

> sat mea sat magna est, si **tres** sint pompa **libelli**
>   quos ego Persephonae maxima dona feram.

He argued that the words *tres libelli* could only make sense if they belonged in an original third book, and so they had to be preceded by a division which had at some stage in the transmission become obscured, a lost division which Lachmann restored between 2.9 and 2.10. He also pointed out other features in support of his argument. Alongside 2.13.25f he put 2.3.4, *et turpis de te iam **liber alter** erit*, which, he argued, could only belong in a second book of poems. He also pointed out that at 1362 verses the book traditionally called Book 2 was around 300 verses longer than any other extant Augustan poetry book[5]. Many have accepted Lachmann's daring thesis, but many have also rejected it, particularly in recent years, which suggests that the question may be worth another look[6].

It is well known that Augustan poets, following the example of their Hellenistic models in particular, developed an exquisite sense of structure and proportion in the construction of poetry books[7]. This aspect of their art is apparent in both small details and in large-scale design. In his *Eclogues*, Vergil places the key word *iuvenem* in the middle of the middle line of the opening poem, and scholars have traced complex structures underpinning the unity of the whole collection[8]. In his *Georgics*, he names Maecenas four times in a symmetrical pattern, at 1.2, 2.41. 3.41 and 4.2. Similarly, it has been pointed out that he names the River Euphrates at *Georgics* 1.509 and 4.561, and again at *Aeneid* 8.726, in each case six lines from the end of the book in question, doing so because Callimachus referred to "the Assyrian river" six lines from the end of his *Hymn to Apollo*[9]. Again in the *Georgics*, the four hundredth line of the fourth book has been shown to rework closely the four hundredth line of

---

[4]   Lachmann 1816.
[5]   It is necessary here to emphasize the word 'Augustan'. The fourth book of Apollonius' *Argonautica* runs to 1 781 verses, Lucretius 5 to 1 457.
[6]   For the most recent discussion of the question, with relevant bibliography, see Miller P.A. 2004, 261 n.44.
[7]   See Morgan 1999, 23-24, Vasaly 2002, with bibliography.
[8]   See Rudd 1976, 119-144, Van Sickle 1978.
[9]   Thomas/Scodel 1984 = Thomas 1999, 320.

the fourth book of Homer's *Odyssey*[10]. Highly elaborate structural patterns have been discovered in the *Aeneid*[11] and the appreciation of structural patterns has been shown to be vital to the understanding of Vergil's imitative technique[12]. Similarly, complex strucures have been traced in Horace's *Odes*[13] and of course in the work of Propertius himself[14]. One does not have to believe each and every proposition of this kind, or accept the validity of every aspect of all the complex diagrams drawn by scholars to trace numerous links and structural patterns within collections of poems, to agree that this approach to ancient texts has revealed an important element of the artistic sensibility of Roman poets. As Goold has put it in his Loeb edition of Propertius, "[t]hese are literary curiosities, but no less real for that[15]."

It seems likely, therefore, that at the same time as Propertius took care to structure each individual poem and book of poems, he will also have paid attention to the over-arching structure of his oeuvre as a whole. It is generally agreed that the poems we have were written over a fifteen-year period, from around 29 to 15 B.C.[16] Each book was no doubt originally published separately, before they were all gathered together, and the habit of thinking of and referring to the four books we have as a complete collection is deeply ingrained. But there is in fact considerable disagreement about the form in which his poems circulated after their completion. For Williams Books 1-3 were published as a collection and Book 4 added later[17]. On the other hand, Butrica is convinced that Book 1 "circulated by its author's choice as an autonomous work that never formed part of a larger collection", and that "the remaining

---

[10] The line in question is actually numbered *Georgics* 4.401, but 4.338 is generally taken to be an interpolation; see Morgan 1999, 25f, 223-229. To Morgan's discussion of ancient texts marked up with line numbers can now be added the new Strasbourg papyrus of Empedocles, which clearly marks line 300; see Martin/Primavesi 1998, 21-22, 103-104.

[11] See Camps 1969, 51-60.

[12] See Knauer 1964, Nelis 2001.

[13] See Santirocco 1986.

[14] On Book 1 see Skutsch 1963, 238, Goold 1999, 6, Liberman 2002, 50-53; on Book 3, Putnam 1980, Meillier 1985; on Books 1, 3 and 4 Woolley 1967. See also, for example, Cairns 1984 on the remarkably complex web of connections linking poems 1.4 and 1.5. Murgia 2000 argues that 2.12 and 2.13 are actually the single poem which opened the original third book of Propertius, and that a set of close similarities between it and 2.34 creates a pattern of ring composition unifying the book as a whole.

[15] Goold 1999, 7.

[16] See Hubbard 1975, 44, Goold 1999, 1f.

[17] Williams 1968, 480-495.

three books must have been published together in a three-book collection"[18]. Heyworth, on the other hand, has argued that it is "inconceivable that Propertius regarded his first book as an isolated publication, a *Monobiblos*", and that "the five books of Propertius circulated together in antiquity"[19]. I agree with Heyworth that Propertius wrote five books, but I also agree with Butrica that Book 1 should not be lumped together with those which followed it. Therefore, I would argue, following Birt, Richmond and Skutsch[20], that the Propertian corpus was originally composed in two parts, a single book plus a four-book collection[21], and I suggest that this argument is strengthened by the existence of an obvious structural similarity between the books usually referred to as Propertius 2-4 and two four-book works, Callimachus' *Aetia* and Vergil's *Georgics*[22].

In 1983, following the publication of Parsons's work on the papyrus fragments known as the 'Lille Callimachus'[23], Thomas demonstrated that the prologue of the third book of Vergil's *Georgics* is closely modelled on the *Victoria Berenices* which opened the third book of the *Aetia*[24]. There can be no doubt that the placing of Vergil's imitation is important[25]. The opening 48 lines of *Georgics* 3 famously look forward to the composition of a poem recounting the victories of Octavian (*victorisque arma Quirini*, 3.27; cf. *pugnas / Caesaris*, 3.46f), praise of Berenice by a Greek poet giving way to praise of the Roman victor over Cleopatra. Equally, there can be little doubt that Vergil's *Georgics* as a whole is

---

[18]   Butrica 1996, 93f.

[19]   Heyworth 1995a, 177-181.

[20]   See Skutsch 1975, Goold 1999, 15. The title of the single book was no doubt *Cynthia* rather than *Monobiblos*, while the four-book collection was probably, but far from certainly, entitled *Amores*; on the question of the titles see Heyworth 1995a, 175-178, Butrica 1996, 89-108, Liberman 2002, 50-53.

[21]   This does not preclude Heyworth's idea that they may *in fact* have circulated together: on the relationship between the *Cynthia* and the other books see the discussion of Liberman 2002, 53-56.

[22]   Servius on *Eclogue* 10.1 records that Gallus composed four books of *amores*; see Ross 1975, 45f, Courtney 1993, 261f. We know so little about Gallus' poetry that it would be a waste of time in this context to speculate about the structure of this collection of poems; in general on Propertius and Gallus see Ross 1975, Cairns 1984, and most recently Miller P.A. 2004, 60-94 and Pincus 2004. Similarly, we know so little about Philetas, with whom Propertius links Callimachus, that it seems wise not to indulge in speculation; on Philetas see most recently Bing 2003. On Propertius and the *Georgics* see Batstone 1992, Parker 1992.

[23]   Parsons 1977.

[24]   Thomas 1983 = 1999 68-100.

[25]   See Conte 1992 on mid-point proems.

deeply influenced by Callimachus' *Aetia*[26]. Following his discussion of Callimachus and Vergil, Thomas goes on to treat their joint influence on two later Roman poets, Propertius and Statius. Concerning the latter, he shows how *Silvae* 3.1 resembles both the *Victoria Berenices* which opened *Aetia* 3, and the prologue to *Georgics* 3. Concerning the former, he points to Wimmel's discussion of the similarities between Propertius 3.1 and *Georgics* 3.1-48. At this point it may be useful to provide evidence of the extent of the links between these two texts[27]:

Propertius, *Amores*(?) 3.1.1-38	Vergil, *Georgics* 3.1-48
primus ego…ferre (3-4)	*primus ego...primus…referam* (10-12)
Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros (4)	*Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas* (11)
Graios (4)	*Graecia* (20)
carmen (5)	*carmine* (3)
Phoebum (7)	*Cynthius auctor* (36)
moratur (7)	*moras* (43)
tenuastis (5), *tenui* (8)	*tenera* (15)
aquam (6)	*aquam.../Mincius* (14-15)
quo me Fama levat terra sublimis (9)	*qua me quoque possim/ tollere humo* (8-9)
a me/ nata...Musa triumphat (9-10)	*deducam Musas* (11)
Fama (9)	*fama* (47)
in curru (11)	*centum quagriiugos...currus* (18)
rotas (12)	*rotam* (39)
certatis (13)	*decernet* (20)
non…lata...via (14)	*silvas saltusque...intactos* (40-41)
via (14)	*via* (8)
finem imperii (16)	*utroque ab litore* (33)
Bactra (16)	*Niphaten/...Parthum* (31)
canent (16)	*canemus* (1)
opus hoc de monte Sororum/detulit	
intacta pagina nostra via (17-18)	*Aonio…deducam vertice Musas* (11)
intacta…via (18)	*silvas saltusque...intactos* (40-41)
mollia (19)	*mollia* (41)
serta...capiti...corona (19-20)	*victor...ipse caput tonsae foliis*
	ornatus olivae (17-21)
invida (21)	*Invidia* (37)
post obitum (22-23)	*modo vita supersit* (10)
nomen (24)	*nomina* (36), *nomen* (47)
in ora (24)	*per ora* (9)

---

[26] See Thomas 1988, 7, Hardie 1998, 40-41. On aetiology in the *Georgics* see Schechter 1975.

[27] Cf. Wimmel 1960, 216-218; Thomas 1983, 101-103 = 1999, 82-85. This is not the place for an extended discussion and explication of the links between these two texts. For the purposes of my argument here I hope it will suffice to display the remarkable extent of the similarities between them. I will return elsewhere to the wider context in which this intertextual pattern must be read.

flumina (26)	*flumina* (18)
Troia (32)	*Troiae* (36)
memorator (33)	*memorande* (1)
interea (3.2.1 = 3.1.39 ?)[28]	*interea* (40)

Vergil here describes a poetic triumph in which the Muses are led from Greece to the banks of the Mincius, where a temple will be founded and sacrifices and celebrations offered in praise of Octavian's victories, another way of saying that he will compose an epic poem which will embrace the victory at Actium and the subsequent triple triumph of 29 B.C. In doing so he faces up to the challenge set by Callimachean criticism of post-Homeric epic, implying that he will write a poem worthy of both Homer and Callimachus. Propertius reacts by rejecting war as a theme and affirming his commitment to Philetan and Callimachean poetics, imagining a poetic triumph in elegiac terms and leaving Roman historical themes to others. But he also likens himself to Homer, predicting comparable poetic immortality. The two poets are in fact dealing with identical subject matter, and given the Callimachean background to the Vergilian passage it is striking that Propertius created this extraordinary collection of parallels for a poem of which the first word is *Callimachi*, a poem which is throughout deeply Callimachean in spirit and which even contains a chariot race (11-14), a poetic triumph to cap Berenice's Nemean victory[29].

On the fact that Propertius opens his third book with such detailed imitation of *Georgics* 3.1-48, Thomas writes: "I follow Lachmann in the view that Book 2 of Propertius is in fact a conflation of two books, and I agree with Birt (1882) 422-26 that at least in terms of publication the *Monobiblos* is to be separated from the rest of the collection. If so, and few now have any doubts, then 3.1 is still to be considered the opening poem of the third book. Skutsch (1975) 229-33 has in fact removed any doubts on the matter, but for those who do not believe in a *Monobiblos* and in the fact that the second book is a conflation, 3.1 will still be 3.1"[30]. Thomas may have been correct in 1983 to say that "few now have any doubts" about the division of Book 2, but since then important voices in Propertian scholarship have expressed disagreement with Lachmann[31]. Nevertheless, Thomas's point about the structural parallel between the

---

[28]   It has been argued that 3.2.1ff belong to the opening poem of the book; see Fedeli 1994, app. crit. ad loc. The allusion to Vergil's *interea* may support this view.

[29]   On Propertius 3.1 and Callimachus see, for example, Thomas 1983, 103 = 1999, 83, Seiler 1997, 92 n.188, DeBrohun 2003, 6.

[30]   Thomas 1983, 102 n.56 = 1999, 83 n.56.

[31]   See especially Hutchinson 1984 and Butrica 1996.

opening of *Georgics* 3 and Propertius 3.1 is impregnable. And further
evidence in support of Lachmann's thesis and of Thomas's assessment of
the relevance to it of the prologue of the third *Georgic* may be provided
by the fact that in addition to the close links between Propertius 3.1 and
Georgics 3.1-48, Propertius 2.34, the final poem of Book 2, contains
close imitation of the closing section of *Georgics* 2.

In famous lines at *Georgics* 2.490-4 Vergil refers to the wisdom and
happiness to be won from knowing and writing about the mysteries of
nature and the countryside and its deities:

> **felix qui** potuit **rerum** cognoscere **causas**
> *atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum*
> *subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari:*
> **fortunatus et ille** deos **qui** novit agrestis
> *Panaque Silvanumque senem Nymphasque sorores.*

At 2.34.71-4 Propertius, writing about Vergil's poetic career, exclaims:

> **felix qui** vilis pomis mercaris amores!
> *huic licet ingratae Tityrus ipse canat.*
> **felix** intactum Corydon **qui** temptat Alexin
> *agricolae domini carpere delicias!*

I find it impossible to believe, given the massive similarities between
Propertius 3.1 and *Georgics* 3.1-48, that this parallel can be considered
both fortuitous and meaningless[32]. Further links support the idea that
2.34 is indeed related to the end of the second *Georgic*. At 2.475-8 Vergil
desires to know about natural philosophy:

> *Me vero primum dulces ante omnia Musae,*
> *quarum sacra fero ingenti percussus* **amore**,
> *accipiant caelique* **vias** *et sidera monstrent,*
> *defectus* **solis** *varios* **lunaeque labores**.

Compare Propertius 2.34.27-30 and 51-4, describing the philosophi-
cal interests of Lynceus:

> *quid tua Socraticis tibi nunc sapientia libris*
> *   proderit aut* **rerum** *dicere possis* **vias**?

---

[32]   Propertius uses *felix qui* on only one other occasion, at 1.12.15, on which see Batstone
1992, 295-296. On the references to the opening of the *Aeneid* in 2.34 and also in 3.4
see Cairns 2003. See also Miller J.F. 2004 on 2.34, 4.6 and Propertius' reception of
Vergil's Actian Apollo.

> *aut quid Cretaei tibi prosunt carmina plectri ?*
> *nil iuvat in magno vester **amore** senex.*
> *…*
> *harum nulla solet rationem quaerere mundi,*
> *nec cur **fraternis Luna laboret equis**,*
> *nec si post Stygias aliquid restabimus undas,*
> *nec si consulto fulmina missa tonent.*

For *rerum causae* and *caeli vias* read *rerum vias* and *ratio mundi*. The *amor* of Vergil differs from that of Lynceus, but their philosophical interests are exactly the same. Each seeks to understand the workings of nature, represented by the interrelated movements of sun and moon, particularly the phases of the moon (*lunae labores* and *Luna laboret*). And just as Vergil in this section of the *Georgics*, albeit implicitly, is aligning his poem with his predecessors in the genre of didactic poetry, Orpheus, Hesiod, Empedocles, Aratus and Lucretius[33], so Propertius goes on to place himself at the end of a long line of elegists, Varro, Catullus, Calvus and Gallus (2.34.85-94):

> *haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro,*
> *Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma suae ;*
> *haec quoque lascivi cantarunt scripta Catulli,*
> *Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena ;*
> *haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calvi,*
> *cum caneret miserae funera Quintiliae.*
> *et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus*
> *mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua !*
> *Cynthia quin vivet versu laudata Properti,*
> *hos inter si me ponere Fama volet.*

Contextualising these similarities will help to delineate them more clearly, and to bring out further links between these two texts.

Propertius 2.34 is a puzzling and problematic poem in many respects, but some aspects are clear enough[34]. First of all, it is indeed one poem, not two as suggested by some editors, and it was indeed the final poem of Book 2, the division between Books 2 and 3 being secure, on whatever reckoning of the nature and structure of the Propertian corpus[35]. It is

---

[33] See Nelis 2004a.

[34] Contrast the fine readings of Stahl 1985, 172-188 and Newman 1997, 220-228. Intriguingly, the latter suspects the presence of Empedocles in 2.34 ; for an argument that Empedocles is a key intertext for the end of *Georgics* 2 see Hardie 2002, Nelis 2004b. But see now especially Cairns 2004 on the poem as a whole.

[35] Goold 1999, 217 n.98 curtly states the poem's unity ; on poem division and book division see Heyworth 1995b, 138 : "it may be historically true that all divisions bar those

addressed to one Lynceus, who is accused of having designs on the poet's *puella*, and is warned not to pursue her (1-24). Lynceus is presented as a poet who hitherto has been more interested in philosophy than in girls; the poet urges him to follow Philetas and Callimachus instead of more lofty and serious epic and tragic poetry (25-42). Write lighter love poetry, the speaker goes on to advise, following my example as a successful elegist, for it is my pleasure to loiter at banquets, unlike Vergil, who is writing a Homeric epic about Actium, Caesar and Aeneas, having completed his *Georgics* and *Eclogues*. In the latter love featured as an important theme and pleased both inexperienced lovers (like Lynceus) and experts (the poet; 43-84). Erotic themes have been the speciality of Varro, Catullus, Calvus and Gallus, and like them I, Propertius, hope to win immortality with my poems about Cynthia (85-94). This is clearly a poem about poetry and genre, about literary history and contemporary politics, with a special focus on the writing of Vergil's *Aeneid*[36]. And these are exactly Vergil's concerns in the middle of the *Georgics*.

Thanks to the work of Buchheit and Hardie it has become clear that the prologue to Book 3 of the *Georgics* cannot be read on its own, but must instead be taken in close connection with the end of Book 2, the two passages together forming a diptych occupying the central section of the whole poem[37]. The essential unity of the passage from 2.458 to 3.48 is important for our concerns, because I believe that Propertius' imitation in 3.1 of the opening of *Georgics* 3 must be seen in the context of his reworking of the close of *Georgics* 2 in 2.34, and that together these two poems represent Propertius' reaction to "[t]he most extended self-referential discussion of the poet's task in Virgil's *oeuvre*"[38]. Here, in the middle of the *Georgics*, Vergil canvasses poetic alternatives to writing poetry about the countryside, i.e. in his own *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, expresses his ambition to embrace the highest poetic theme, natural philosophy, and at the same time looks forward to the composition of an epic poem which will include Octavian, his Trojan origins and the development of a new Roman *imperium*. In doing so he looks back to both Homer and Ennius as possible epic models, but he also has in mind Aristotelian and Callimachean criticism of second-rate post-Homeric epic poetry. In 2.34 and 3.1 Propertius is dealing with exactly the same topics, Homer and the epic genre, Callimachus, contemporary history and Caesar, Vergil's poetic

---

between books are conjectural." Note, however, Butrica 1997, 201-204, who argues for significant corruption and massive interpolation in 2.34.

[36] On Propertius 2.34 and Vergil see Thomas 1992, 54-58 = 1999, 191-195 and 1996, 241-243 = 1999, 263-266, Cairns 2004.

[37] Buchheit 45-159, Hardie 1986, 33-51; see also Nelis 2004a.

[38] Hardie 1986, 33.

career to date and the writing of the *Aeneid*. Furthermore, Propertius explicitly links his two poems by naming Philetas and Callimachus at 2.34.31f and 3.1.1, as if to recreate the double panel at the centre of the *Georgics*[39]. And it is quite possible that this complex pattern of allusion to the middle of the four books of the *Georgics*, against the background of Callimachus' *Aetia*[40], took place in the middle of the four-book collection of love poems, *amores/Amores*, which Propertius went on to write after the completion of his brilliant *monobiblos*, his *Cynthia*.

Given the state of the available evidence, we may never achieve a satisfactory understanding of the relationship between Propertius and his models, and in particular of the intertextual patterns linking his elegies to the *Aetia* of Callimachus and to Vergil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, not to mention the relationship between Propertian poetics and the concept of Callimacheanism, however such a concept may have been defined in the mind of an Augustan poet. Propertius is a love poet who presents the *Aetia* as a key intertext while knowing that the *Aetia* was not a poem about love[41]. At the same time, he knows that his own elegies could never really be defined simply as love poems and he aspires to Callimachean aetiology as a higher poetic calling, as an alternative to epic[42]. And as a result, his four books of *amores/Amores* represent the first systematic reaction to and rewriting of Vergil's epic and indeed of Vergil's whole poetic career. In recent years, James Butrica has offered a powerful revisionist reading of Propertius' three-book (i.e. the traditional books 2-4) collection of elegies, making little of Vergil and denying the importance of Callimachus before the fourth book, in which the poet explicitly describes himself as *Romanus Callimachus*[43]. But if, from the beginning, a four-book collection could be read against the backdrop of the *Aetia* and the Callimachean *Georgics*, Butrica's impressively argued and invigorating thesis will have to be challenged. DeBrohun has attempted to do so, and has set the question of the Callimachean and Vergilian nature of Book 4 in a new light[44]. But it is only by paying attention to the interrelating themes and structures of the Propertian corpus as a whole that we

---

[39] On Propertius 3.1 and Callimachus see n.25 above; on Propertius 2.34 and Callimachus see Barchiesi 2001, 5-55. On Philetas see Bing 2003.

[40] The very fragmentary remains of the end of *Aetia* 2 make meaningful comparison with either the end of *Georgics* 2 or Propertius 2.34 impossible. On the available evidence I can see no trace of allusion.

[41] In general see Puelma 1982; see also Barchiesi 2001, 123-127, and on love in the *Aetia* see also Harder 2003, 301-302.

[42] On the dangers of viewing Latin elegy entirely as love elegy see Fantham 2001.

[43] Butrica 1996.

[44] DeBrohun 2003.

will be able to grasp the complexities of his meditations on genre and literary history, on the relationship between Latin literature and Roman life, between poets and rulers, poetics and politics, Callimachus and Augustus. And without carefully contextualizing Callimachus and the reception of Callimacheanism in Augustan Rome (e.g. can Propertius' use of the *Aetia* be separated from his reading of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*?)[45], and without further research into the complex intertextuality of all his poems, taking into account the dialogue between the single-book *Cynthia* and the four books of *amores*/*Amores*, we are unlikely to make much progress in our attempts to define exactly what he meant when he hoped for his native Umbria to swell with pride at his poetic achievement (5[sic].1.63-64):

> *Ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,*
> *Umbria Romani patria Callimachi!*

Bibliography

Barchiesi, A. (2001) – *Speaking Volumes. Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*, London.

Batstone, W.W. (1992) – "*Amor improbus*, *felix qui*, and *tardus Apollo*: The *Monobiblos* and the *Georgics*", *Classical Philology* 87, 287-302.

Bing, P. (2003) – "The unruly tongue. Philitas of Cos as scholar and poet", *Classical Philology* 98, 330-348.

Buchheit, V. (1972) – *Der Anspruch des Dichter in Vergils Georgika*, Darmstadt.

Butrica, J. (1996) – "The *Amores* of Propertius: Unity and Structure in Books 2-4", *Illinois Classical Studies* 21, 87-158.

Butrica, J. (1997) – "Editing Propertius", *Classical Quarterly* 47, 176-208.

Cairns, F. (1984) – "Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the Gallus of the *Monobiblos*", *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4, 61-103.

Cairns, F. (2003) – "Propertius 3.4 and the *Aeneid* incipit", *Classical Quarterly* 53, 309-311.

Cairns, F. (2004) – "Varius and Vergil: Two Pupils of Philodemus in Propertius 2.34?" in Armstrong, D. / Fish, J. / Johnston, P. A. / Skinner, M. B., *Philodemus, Vergil and the Augustans*, Austin, 299-321.

---

[45]   On the *Georgics*, Callimachus and Augustan literary history see Farrell 1991, 275-324. On book numbers and literary history see now Merli 2004.

Camps, W.A. (1969) – *An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford.

Courtney, E. (1993) – *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.

Conte, G.B. (1992) – "Proems in the middle", *Yale Classical Studies* 29, 147–159.

Debrohun, J.B. (2003) – *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*, Ann Arbor.

Fantham, E. (2001) – "Roman Elegy: Problems of Self-definition and Redirection", in Schmidt, E. A., *L'Histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*, Genève, 183-211.

Farrell, J. (1991) – *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic*, Oxford.

Fedeli, P. (1994) – *Propertius*, Stuttgart/Leipzig.

Goold, G.P. (1999) – *Propertius, Elegies*, Cambridge, Mass.

Guenther, H.-C. (1997) – *Quaestiones Propertianae*, Leiden.

Harder, A. (2003) – "The Invention of the Past, Present and Future in Callimachus' *Aetia*", *Hermes* 131, 290-306.

Hardie, A. (2002) – "The *Georgics*, the mysteries and the Muses at Rome", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 48, 175–208.

Hardie, P.R. (1986) – *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford.

Hardie, P.R. (1998) – *Virgil*, Oxford.

Hendry, M. (1995) – http://www.curculio.org/lachmann.html.

Heyworth, S. J. (1995a) – "Propertius: Division, Transmission, and the Editor's Task", *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8, 165-85.

Heyworth, S. J. (1995b) – "Dividing Poems", 117-148 in Pecere, O. / Reeve, M. D., *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, Spoleto, 117-148.

Hubbard, M. (1975) – *Propertius*, London.

Hutchinson, G. (1984) – "Propertius and the Unity of the Book", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 74, 99-106.

Lachmann, K. (1816) – *Propertii Carmina*, Leipzig.

Liberman, G. (2002) – "Remarques sur le premier livre des *Elégies* de Properce", *Revue de Philologie* 76, 49-100.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1998a) – "Propertius 2.10 and 11 and the Structure of Books 2A and 2B", *Journal of Roman Studies* 8, 21-36.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1998b) – "Introductory Poems in Propertius: 1.1 and 2.12", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 44, 158-181.

Martin, A. / Primavesi, O. (1999) – *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg (P.Strasb.gr. Inv. 1665-1666), Introduction, édition et commentaire*, Berlin.

Meillier, Cl. (1985) – "La composition numérique du livre III des *Elégies* de Properce", *Revue des Etudes Latines* 63, 101-117.

Merli, E. (2004) – "On the number of books in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *Classical Quarterly* 54, 304-307.

Miller, P.A. (2004) – *Subjecting Verses. Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*, Princeton.

Miller, J.F. (2004) – "Propertian Reception of Virgil's Actian Apollo", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 52, 73-84.

Morgan, L. (1999) – *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics,* Cambridge.

Murgia, C. E. (2000) – "The division of Propertius 2", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 45, 147-242.

Mynors, R.A.B. (1990) – *Virgil: Georgics*, Oxford.

Nelis, D.P. (2001) – *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, ARCA 39, Leeds.

Nelis, D.P. (2004a) – "From Didactic to Epic: *Georgics* 2.458-3.48", in Gale M. R., *Latin Epic and Didactic. Genre, tradition and individuality*, Swansea.

Nelis, D.P. (2004b) – "*Georgics* 2.458-542: Vergil, Aratus and Empedocles", *Dictynna* 1: http://www.univ-lille3.fr/portail/index.php?page=Dictynna.

Newman, J.K. (1997) – *Augustan Propertius. The Recapitulation of a Genre*, Hildesheim.

Parker, H. (1992) – "The Fertile Plains of Umbria: Propertius 1.22.10", *Mnemosyne* 45, 88-91.

Parsons, P.J. (1977) – "Callimachus, *Victoria Berenicis*", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25, 1-50.

Pincus, M. (2004) – "Propertius' Gallus and the Erotics of Influence", *Arethusa* 37, 165-196.

Postgate, J.P. (1881) – *Select Elegies of Propertius*, London.

Puelma, M. (1982) – "Die *Aitien* des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie", *Museum Helveticum* 39, 221-246, 285-304.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1980) – "Propertius' Third Book: Patterns of Cohesion", *Arethusa* 13, 97-113.

Ross, D.O. Jr (1975) – *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge.

Rudd, N. (1976) – *Lines of Enquiry*, Cambridge.

Santirocco, M. (1986) – *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*, Chapel Hill.

Schechter, S. (1975) – "The *aition* and Virgil's *Georgics*", *Transactions of the American Philological Asociation* 105, 347-391.

Seiler, M. A. (1997) – *Ποίησις Ποιήσεως. Alexandrinische Dichtung κατὰ λεπτόν in strukturaler und humanethologischer Deutung*, Stuttgart/Lepizig.

Skutsch, O. (1963) – "The Structure of the Propertian *Monobiblos*", *Classical Philology* 58, 238-239.

Skutsch, O. (1975) – "The Second Book of Propertius", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79, 229-233.

Stahl, H.-P. (1985) – *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'. Individual and the State under Augustus*, Berkeley.

Thomas, R. F. (1983) – "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry", *Classical Quarterly* 33, 92-113.

Thomas, R.F. / Scodel, R.S. (1984) – "Virgil and the Euphrates", *American Journal of Philology* 105, 339.

Thomas, R.F. (1988) – *Virgil: Georgics*, Cambridge.

Thomas, R. F. (1992) – "The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virgil. *Geo.* 4.116-48", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 29, 35-70.

Thomas, R. F. (1996) – "Genre through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius", *Hellenistica Groningana* 2, 226-246.

Thomas, R.F. (1999) – *Reading Virgil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor.

Van Sickle, J. (1978) – *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics*, Rome.

Vasaly, A. (2002) – "The Structure of Livy's First Pentad and the Augustan Poetry Book", in Levene, D. S. / Nelis, D. P., *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, Leiden, 275-290.

Williams, G. (1968) – *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford.

Wimmel, W. (1960) – *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, Wiesbaden.

Woolley, A. (1967) – "The Structure of Propertius Book III", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 14, 80-83.