11-21-2019

Propertius 3.3's Summary of Ennius's Annales

Thomas J.B. Cole
Duke University

Propertius 3.3's Summary of Ennius's *Annales*

Thomas J.B. Cole
Duke University

Abstract: In 3.3, Propertius summarizes the third triad of Ennius's *Annales* in such a way as to show that unconventional military tactics, such as deceptive strategies, result in success. Propertius uses this summary to strengthen the elegy–epic antithesis prevalent in the first five poems of Book 3, aligning unconventional military tactics with "a new path" (*nova . . . semita*) (3.3.26) toward poetic success in elegy, which Propertius also portrays with deceptive themes.

The first twelve lines of Propertius 3.3 have generated scholarly debate, specifically over line 8's *Aemilia . . . rate*.

Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra,	1
Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi,	
reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum,	
tantum operis, nervis hiscere posse meis;	
parvaque iam magnis admoram fontibus ora	5
unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit,	
et cecinit Curios fratres et Horatia pila,	
regiaque Aemilia vecta tropaea rate,	
victricesque moras Fabii pugnamque sinistram	
Cannensem et versos ad pia vota deos,	10
Hannibalemque Lares Romana sede fugantis,	
anseris et tutum voce fuisse Iovem.[1]	

Reclining in the soft shade of Mount Helicon,	1
where water of the Bellerophontian horse flows,	
Alba, I seemed able to start to sing of your kings and the deeds of your kings,	
such an effort, with my strength;	
and I had already begun to move my lips to the great fountain,	5

---

[1] Skutsch (1985, p. 3) suggests that Ennius's elegiac works come before his epic. If this is so, Propertius is attempting to follow the same poetic progression as Ennius.

        where thirsty father Ennius drank,
     and he sang of the Curiatii brothers and Horatian spears,
       and royal trophies brought home on Aemilius's ship,
     and the victorious delays of Fabius and the ill-fated battle at
       Cannae and gods turned toward devoted prayers,   10
     and the Lares chasing Hannibal from Rome,
       and Jupiter saved by the cackling of geese.

The general tenor of these lines is that Propertius wishes to drink from a stream on Hippocrene, signaling his desire to compose epic. This move is further depicted as Propertius taking the traditional path through the Muses' grove (*Castalia . . . arbore*) (3.3.13), indicating his intent to follow *pater* Ennius, so called for introducing *heroici versus* to Latin (Porph. ad Hor. *Epist*. 1.19.7).[1] Apollo stops Propertius, returing him to elegy and entrusting him to Calliope (3.3.13–52). There are several historical events mentioned in lines 7–12, but line 8's reference to *Aemilia* has been problematic. Scholars have identified this Aemilius in various ways, but none fits well. I identify him as L. Aemilius Paullus, who in 219 BCE ambushed Demetrius of Pharos yet was killed at Cannae three years later.[2] Propertius uses L. Aemilius Paullus to emphasize his own success in elegy rather than more traditional route of epic.

There are three lines of thought on identifying line 8's *Aemilia*. I will summarize the first two and lay out my objections to them, before bringing forth new evidence in favor of the third. The first line of thought is that *Aemilia* refers to L. Aemilius Regillus's 190 BCE naval victory over Antiochus III's fleet in the Roman–Seleucid War and his subsequent triumph.[3] Both Lawrence Richardson, Jr. and James L. Butrica rightly dismiss this position on the grounds that this victory does not compare in scale or importance with the other battles mentioned in 3.3.7–12.[4] Moreover, as Livy notes, the triumph displayed far less money than one would expect for a victory over a king (*pecunia nequaquam [tanta] pro specie regii triumphi*) (37.58.4). Additionally, it in no way impacted Rome's Mediterranean hegemony. Nor is there any evidence that Ennius mentioned it in the *Annales*.

The second view argues that 3.3.8 refers to Lucius Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus's triumph of 167 BCE.[5] This argument rests on Livy's describing the spoils being carried up the Tiber on a conquered king's ship (*regia nave*) (Liv. 45.35.3).[6] Unlike Regillus's

---

[2] This L. Aemilius Paullus will be referred to as Paullus throughout.

[3] Though Barber and Butler (1933, p. 267) and Martina (1979, pp. 45–61) put forth the best arguments for this position, they do not sufficiently consider L. Aemilus Paullus as an alternative. The following scholars also argue that *Aemilia* represents L. Aemilius Regillus: Rothstein (1966, p. 21); Heyworth (1986, p. 201); Syndikus (2010, p. 225 & n. 64); Flach (2011, p. 129); and Goldberg and Manuwald (2018, p. 43).

[4] Richardson (1977, p. 326); Butrica (1983, p. 465). And as noted below, this battle would be in a different triad of the *Annales* than the other related events; see n. 21 and accompanying text below.

[5] Skutsch (1968, p. 139); Richardson (1977, p. 326); Butrica (1983, pp. 464–8); and Heslin (2018, pp. 241–2).

[6] See, e.g., Rothstein (1966, p. 21) and Maltby (1980, p. 83).

triumph, which was small compared to other ones of the same year, this one displayed immense wealth (45.35.6).[7] This argument, however suffers from several faults. First, Macedonicus's triumph in 167 happened two years after Ennius's death. To get around this argument some scholars have rendered line 7's *cecinit* as *cecini*, having Propertius continue Ennius's *Annales*. Putting aside the fact that *cecini* is not attested in any manuscript,[8] Propertius did not actually drink from the stream—signaling that he never tried epic—but as Eric Arthur Barber and Harold Edgeworth Butler note, "he merely stooped to do so and was checked in the act by Apollo."[9] Furthermore, the inclusion of an event in 167 BCE skews the chronological order of events, possibly necessitating a transposition of lines 8 and 12.[10] But even with a transposition, the other three events of recent memory—Fabius's strategy, Cannae, and Hannibal quitting Italy—occur over three decades before Macedonicus's triumph.

I agree with the third stream of thought brought out by Wilhelm A. B. Hertzberg and John P. Postgate, but a stronger argument could be made based on the theme of unconventional battles.[11] Throughout this poem, Propertius expands upon the elegy–epic antithesis by associating elegy with military deception and seduction and epic with traditional, large-scale military battles. As has been noted by other scholars, the first five poems of Book 3 form a cohesive unit.[12] These poems explore elegy and epic's interaction with warfare.[13] With regard to just poem 3.3, Stephen J. Heyworth and James H.W. Morwood persuasively show that this poem proceeds through antithetical pairs, such as the mountain and spring in the first two lines.[14] In his *oeuvre*, Propertius associates his relationship with Cynthia, and by connection elegy in general, with deceptive seduction, such as nighttime rendezvous—what he elsewhere calls deceptions (*furta*) (4.7.15)—and cuckolding husbands.[15] Love as a type of warfare is a well-established, yet flexible, trope

---

[7] For this reason, Heyworth now seemingly supports reading *Aemilia* as Macedonicus, see Heyworth and Morwood (2011, p. 117); cf. n. 4 above. He makes no mention of *Aemilia* being L. Aemilius Paullus.

[8] See Heyworth (1986, pp. 200–1) and Viarre (2005, p. 90).

[9] Barber and Butler (1933, p. 267) and Scioli (2011/2012, pp. 146–7).

[10] Barber and Butler (1933, pp. 267–8).

[11] Both Hertzberg (1845, pp. 257–8) and Postgate (1950, p. 153) summarily rest their argument for L. Aemilius Paullus on the fact that Lucius Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus's triumph occurred after Ennius's death and so the line must refer to 219 BCE; neither addresses L. Aemilius Regillus's 190 BCE victory. Scioli (2011/2012, pp. 145–6) only notes that Propertius recounts Ennius's *Annales*, thus excluding the possibility that Macedonicus is line 8's *Aemilia*. But since *Aemilia*'s identity is not otherwise vital to her argument, she does not delve into the issue further.

[12] Hubbard (1974, p. 71); Frost (1991, pp. 253–4); see also Heyworth and Morwood (2011, p. 133).

[13] Both Hubbard (1974, pp. 74–81) and Frost (1991, p. 254) argue that poems 3.4 and 3.5 present a contrast between war and peace. A more exact contrast would observe that even the life of peace—when one is away from war—still involves conflict: "hard battles with one's mistress" (*cum domina proelia dura mea*) (3.5.2); see Heyworth and Morwood (2011, p. 134).

[14] Heyworth and Morwood (2011, p. 115).

[15] For deception in 4.7 in general, see Hubbard (1974, p. 151) and Maltby (1980, p. 99). For Propertius's use of elegy as a genre to encourage others to deceive husbands, see, e.g., Heyworth and Morwood (2011, p. 125).

in elegy.[16] By using themes prevalent in these other poems, Propertius is overlapping them in 3.3 when he applies the deception prominent in his love affairs to war. More specifically, he likens elegy with unconventional warfare, such as surprise attacks or delaying actions, and epic with traditional, large-scale battles.[17] This dichotomy becomes clear in lines 7–12.

All the conflicts in lines 7–12 are unusual, and a certain few emphasize deception. Line 7's *Curios fratres et Horatia pila* refers to the three-on-three battle of the Curiatii and the Horatii.[18] But even more unusual is the Gauls' near-sack of Rome referred to in line 12. On this point, Ennius observes "at the time for going to sleep, the Gauls furtively climb the citadel's highest walls" (*qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti / moenia concubia*) (*Ann.* fr. 227).[19] But more than this, lines 9–11 concern Rome's battles with Hannibal at the end of the third century: Fabius's delaying tactics (*mora*) (line 9), the defeat at Cannae (line 10), and Hannibal's eventual withdrawal from Italy (line 11). Ennius's *Annales* were thematically grouped in triads, and these three events all occur in the third triad, Books 7–9.[20] In this way, lines 7 and 12, semi-mythical foundation stories, bracket a summary of Ennius's third triad by focusing on unconventional battles that secured the growth of Rome's power.

Reading *Aemilia* as L. Aemilius Paullus completes this picture. In Book 7 of the *Annales*, the first book of the third triad, Ennius mentions L. Aemilius Paullus's defeat of Demetrius of Pharos (*Ann.* fr. 231).[21] Demetrius, an Illyrian king and former dependent of Rome, had turned to pillaging Roman shipping and allies.[22] Rome dispatched L. Aemilius Paullus to subdue him, culminating in a battle on Pharos, an island in the Adriatic (App. *Ill*. 8; Polyb. 3.16,18–19). Polybius recounts that Paullus followed an unconventional strategy. After using his fleet to land the majority of his forces in woods on Demetrius's rear at night, Paullus led a smaller force at daybreak to a nearby harbor, enticing Demetrius to lead out his forces to attack (Polyb. 3.18–19). After Demetrius did, Paullus surrounded him, compelling a surrender. In the *Annales*, Ennius emphasizes L. Aemilius Paullus's ruse: "from there they were feigning to proceed cautiously to Pharos" (*inde Parum <caute*

---

[16] As Gale (1997, p. 80) notes, Propertius "displays some ingenuity in his exploration of various different ways in which the comparison between love and war can be applied." See also Drinkwater (2013, pp. 194–202).

[17] See, generally, Gale (1997, 78–85), who notes that elegy is opposed to conventional pursuits and ideas and that "the conventional evaluation [was] of epic as the highest genre" and thus the one most likely to garner poetic fame. This dichotomy, between large battles and smaller, unconventional ones, is also evident in Apollo's rebuke of Propertius (3.3.15–24). Apollo calls Propertius's poems a little book (*libellus*), his wheels are little (*parvis*), and his boat is a small skiff (*cumba*), whereas epic subject matter is a very great commotion (*maxima turba*). Calliope (3.3.39–46) likewise aligns epic with conventional warfare recalling only large-scale battles; see Heyworth and Morwood (2011, pp. 123–4).

[18] See Skutsch (1985, pp. 275–6). A fragment of this battle remains at *Ann.* fr. 123.

[19] Skutsch (1968, p. 140) notes Ennius's probable description of this battle.

[20] See Skutsch (1985, pp. 5, 552) for the triadic nature of the *Annales*. Regillus's victory would be in Book 11 and therefore outside of this triad; see Goldberg and Manuwald (2018, pp. 286–7).

[21] We have no fragments of the other two suggestions for *Aemilia . . . rate*.

[22] See Wilkes (1992, pp. 162–4) for Demetrius's royal pedigree to rebut Barber and Butler's (1933, p. 267) argument that *regia* could not apply to the spoils taken from Demetrius.

procedere se sim>ulabant) (*Ann.* fr. 231).[23] After the victory, Paullus celebrated a triumph at Rome (Polyb. 3.19.12).[24] Nor was this an unimportant battle, as Barber and Butler as well as Butrica suggest.[25] It solidified Roman control over the Adriatic and made Illyria a buffer that prevented Philip V of Macedon from capitalizing on Rome's focus on Carthage.[26]

The reference to L. Aemilius Paullus also provides greater coherence to Propertius's use of the *Annales*'s third triad by emphasizing military success through unconventional strategies. After Hannibal had invaded Italy, Roman leaders were split on whether to force a direct battle with Hannibal in Italy or bleed his forces by delaying actions.[27] Political pressure often forced generals into traditional, large-scale engagements, in which they were routed at Trebbia, Lake Trasimene, and Cannae. As a result, Roman leadership reverted to unconventional tactics, most effectively used by Quintus Fabius, draining Hannibal's army through indirect harassing attacks and "risking no direct confrontation."[28] Though L. Aemilius Paullus defeated Demetrius of Pharos, he was far better known to the Roman mind for his role in the defeat at Cannae. In the biography of L. Aemilius Paullus's son, Plutarch only notes L. Aemilius Paullus to the extent that he was known for the disaster at Cannae (Plut. *Aem*. 2.2). Moreover, the Roman historians give far more space to his role at Cannae than his other actions,[29] though, as Plutarch here and historians elsewhere have observed, Paullus exhorted his co-consul against open battle, preferring to continue Quintus Fabius's strategy (Polyb. 3.108–12; Liv. 22.38, 44). Nevertheless, Paullus was drawn into supporting his co-consul in the large-scale battle. For these reasons, the *Aemilia* of line 8 is inexorably tied to line 10's *Cannensem*: traditional avenues of attack are unavailable. The connection between these two ideas is further underscored by the fact they are both on dactylic pentameter lines.

In a reverse fashion, line 9 refers to Fabius's victorious delays (*victrices moras Fabii*). After Fabius's strategy was abandoned in favor of large-scale battles, leading to the disaster at Cannae, Roman generals resumed his strategy. The roving Roman forces required Hannibal to provide garrisons for his Italian allies, stretching his forces thinner; all the while he was unable to secure fresh manpower from home, a problem Rome did not have.[30] As Ennius said of Fabius, "one man by delaying recovered the state for

---

[23] Goldberg and Manuwald (2018, p. 230). Skutsch (1985, p. 411) observes that the *p* was an aspirate in Ennius's time, making *Parum* sound *Pharum*.

[24] This was a battle on an island, and Polybius notes that Demetrius kept galleys stationed around it (3.19.8). Aemilius's ship bearing royal trophies would then be either one of the ships he used in his sea-based attack or a captured galley.

[25] Barber and Butler (1933, p. 267) and Butrica (1983, p. 465).

[26] Wilkes (1992, pp. 164–7).

[27] Zimmermann (2011, pp. 284–5).

[28] Zimmermann (2011, p. 288).

[29] See, e.g., Polyb. 3.108–16; Liv. 22.38–50. Paullus's memorable death speech in Livy illustrates where the memory of Paullus lies.

[30] Zimmermann (2011, pp. 288–9).

us / for he did not value his reputation above our safety" (*unus homo nobis cunctando restituit. / noenum rumores ponebat ante salutem*) (*Ann*. fr. 363–4). For Ennius, Fabius's unconventional tactics and his willingness to deviate from the better-regarded approach forced Hannibal to abandon Italy. In this manner, we see that the two dactylic hexameter lines agree as well. As with lines 8 and 10, Fabius's delays (line 9) resulted in Hannibal's flight from Italy (line 11).

Lines 8–11 are a metaphor for taking an unusual path through the Muses' meadow to poetic success. Though Ennius was the first to use the elegiac couplet in Latin (Isid. *Orig*. 1.39.14–15), he was far better known in antiquity, as he is now, for introducing epic verse to Latin and for his epic poem, the *Annales*.[31] Ennius's renown for the *Annales* is tied to epic's lofty status in the poetic cannon, which provided the conventional path for poetic renown, a point Propertius makes elsewhere (see, e.g., Prop. 1.7).[32] This explains Propertius's urge to follow Ennius as a poet of both elegy and epic, until checked by Apollo, who tells Propertius that he is moving off his destined course (*praescriptos . . . gyros*) (3.3.21) by trying epic. Propertius must follow a new path (*nova . . . semita*) (3.3.26) across the Muses' meadow. Trying to follow Ennius into epic contrary to Apollo's dictate would be like L. Aemilius Pallus's return to conventional tactics at Cannae.

The connection between unconventional battles and success is further underscored in Calliope's speech at the poem's end. She remarks that it is not for Propertius to write about how Rome destroyed Germanic forces (*Teutonicas Roma refringat opes*) (3.3.44). Even this battle, the battle of Aquae Sextiae, echoes L. Aemilius Paullus's victory over Demetrius of Pharos: Marius deposited forces behind the numerically-superior enemy, baited them to attack, then closed the trap (Plut. *Mar*. 18.3–21.2).[33] We can see the connection between unconventional battles and elegy even more strongly when Calliope instructs Propertius what he will write about:

> quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantes   47
>   nocturnaeque canes ebria signa morae,
> ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas,
>   qui volet austeros arte ferire viros.   50

> You will sing of wreathed lovers at another's doorway   47
>   and the drunken signs of nighttime tarrying,
> so that, through you, he who wishes to trick austere husbands with skill
>   will know how to charm forth their inaccessible girls.   50

---

[31] Bessone (2013); Elliot (2013, pp. 163, 193); and Goldberg and Manuwald (2018, p. xxvi).

[32] See also, generally, Frost (1991, pp. 251–9).

[33] See Maltby (1980, p. 88) for connecting Propertius's reference to the Battle of Aquae Sextiae. Not enough detail survives of the other battle Calliope mentions to understand the commander's strategy; see Maltby (1980, p. 88), Caes. *BGall*. 1.52–53, and Dio 51.21.

Calliope associates Propertius's elegiac path with deceitful methods, such as teaching lovers how to trick (*ferire*) husbands.[34] Additionally, her instructions echo Propertius's summary of the *Annales* through the use of *mora*. Just as Fabius's *morae* were causes for victory, so here the lover's *morae* too are victorious conquests of inaccessible girls.

In 3.3, Propertius combines military and amatory themes—such as *morae* above—prominent in the first five poems of Book 3. Understanding *Aemilia* as L. Aemilius Paullus is important to this undertaking since it allows the reader to see that Propertius recounts, in lines 8–11, the third triad of the *Annales* to emphasize that success often comes in unconventional ways. This summary is bracketed within other legendary battles that used unconventional tactics (lines 7, 12). By mentioning these battles, Propertius is connecting unconventional strategies to success in poetry and traditional ones to failure, a connection he makes explicit in the poem's last lines. And in this connection, he is foreshadowing his own success in elegy—a path far less conventional than epic.[35]

Works Cited

Barber, Eric A. and Harold E. Butler, eds. *The Elegies of Propertius: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Bessone, Federica. "Latin Precursors," pp. 39–56; in *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. Thea S. Thorsen, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Butrica, James L. "Propertius 3.3.7–12 and Ennius." *CQ* 33 (1983): 464–8.

Drinkwater, Megan O. "*Militia Amoris: Fighting in Love's Army*," pp. 194–206; in *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. T.S. Thorsen, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Elliott, Jackie. *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Flach, Dieter, ed. *Sextus Propertius, Elegien*: *Kommentar*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011.

Frost, Christopher P. "Propertius 3.3.45–46: Don't Go near the Water," *AJP* 112 (1991): 251–9.

Gale, Monica R. "*Militia Amoris* and the Ironies of Elegy," *JRS* 87 (1997): 77–91.

Goldberg, Sander M. and Gesine Manuwald, eds. *Fragmentary Republican Latin*, *Volume 1*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Hertzberg, Wilhelm A. B., ed. *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum Libri Quattuor*, *Tomus III*. Halle: Schmidt, 1845.

Heslin, Peter J. *Propertius, Greek Myth, and Virgil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Heyworth, Stephen J. "Notes on Propertius, Books III and IV." *CQ* 36 (1986): 199–211.
———, ed. *Sexti Properti Elegos*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Heyworth, Stephen J. and James H.W. Morwood. *A Commentary on Propertius, Book 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Hubbard, Margaret. *Propertius*. London: Duckworth, 1974.

Maltby, Robert, ed., *Latin Love Elegy*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1980.

Martina, Mario "Ennio *Poeta Cliens*," in *Quad. di Fil. Class. dell'Univ. di Trieste* 1 (1979): 13–74.

Postgate, John P., ed. *Select Elegies of Propertius*. London: MacMillan, 1950.

Richardson, Lawrence, Jr., ed. *Propertius Elegies I–IV: Edited with and Introduction and Commentary*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977.

Rothstein, Max, ed. *Propertius Sextus Elegien: Zweiter Teil*. Zurich: Weidmann, 1966.

Scioli, Emma. "The Visual Dreamscape of Propertius 3.3," *Amer. Acad. Rome* 56/57 (2011/2012): 137–75.

Skutsch, Otto. *Studia Enniana*. London: The Athlone Press, 1968.
        _____, ed. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1985.

Syndikus, Hans P. *Die Elegien des Properz: Eine Interpretation*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2010.

Viarre, Simone, ed. *Properce: Élégies*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2005.

Wilkes, John. *The Illyrians*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992.

Zimmermann, Klaus. "Roman Strategy and Aims in the Second Punic War," pp. 280–98; in *A Companion to the Punic Wars*. Dexter Hoyos, ed. Malden: Wiley, 2011.