

Leaving Rome: Alienation from and Attachment to the City in Augustan Literature

Alexandra Kennedy

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2013

Reading Committee:

Alain Gowing, Chair

Stephen Hinds

Catherine Connors

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Classics

©Copyright 2013  
Alexandra Kennedy

University of Washington

**Abstract**

Leaving Rome: Alienation from and Attachment to the City in Augustan Literature

Alexandra Kennedy

Chair of Supervisory Committee:  
Professor Alain Gowing  
Classics

*Leaving Rome: Alienation from and Attachment to the City in Augustan Literature* explores how Roman authors of the Augustan period write about leaving Rome as a way of discussing different levels of attachment to the city. Because the city of Rome holds a particularly important place in the ancient Roman imagination, leaving it is always fraught for the Romans. The Augustan period is especially apt for my study because it features great changes both in Rome's urban landscape and its political and cultural environment. The Augustan age brought about a new cohesive vision of Rome and its physical space which did not exist in the republican period and profoundly impacted how the Romans perceived their city and their connection to it. My dissertation investigates episodes in Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, and Livy which discuss departure, absence, or alienation from Rome in order to reveal how Latin literature of this period reflects this complex connection and responds to these great changes in the city.

A major focus of my dissertation is on the diversity of perspectives on the city and departure from it in these texts. In Ovid's exile poetry, despair and alienation from the city occur as a result of exile. In Livy, upheaval in Rome leads to characters being exiled or feeling that they no longer belong to their city and must abandon it. Propertius characterizes absence from Rome as a hindrance to love and elegiac poetry. In these authors, leaving Rome causes despair and loss of personal or poetic identity. By contrast, Horace and Tibullus' texts feature rejection of the city in favor of life in the country and express relief at being away from the city. Each of these texts thus reveals a unique outlook on the city and the shared experience of departure from Rome.

One relevant body of secondary literature is the study of exile in Latin literature, which currently comprises most of the scholarly discussion of Romans leaving Rome. Claassen, Gaertner, and other scholars who have written about exile in Latin literature have focused on texts written by authors who were themselves exiled, including Cicero, Ovid, and Seneca. I expand on these studies by discussing exile in Livy, who was not exiled himself, but wrote about the exile of important figures such as Camillus and Coriolanus. My project also goes beyond the current scope of exile studies by examining willing departures from Rome, thereby providing a wider variety of perspectives on detachment from the city.

Because my study raises questions of migration, travel, and how people perceive the place they call home, modern theories of space, place, and landscape (see Cosgrove, Gregory, Schama, de Certeau, Williams, et al.) serve as a lens through which to consider the ancient sources. This is an expanding area of research both within Classics and in the social sciences and Geography. Much of this research focuses on the relationship between culture and space, including how space creates identity and memory and how people and authors appropriate and

engage with their physical surroundings. Work of this kind, including studies of how Roman authors use Roman space to create meaning in their work (see Edwards, Jaeger, Welch, Vasaly, et al.), has tended to emphasize how people engage with spaces to which they belong or in which they are present. My dissertation contributes to this work by considering how people engage with spaces when alienated or absent from them. As others have examined how connection to a place creates identity and memory, my project studies how absence and alienation from a place destroy or modify identity and memory. These questions look beyond the immediate field of Classics and therefore make my dissertation interdisciplinary.

The dissertation is organized into four chapters arranged by genre and divided into two parts: *Part I: Present Departures* and *Part II: Past Departures*. *Part I* includes Chapter 1 on Horace's *Satires* and Chapters 2-3 on the love poetry of Tibullus and Propertius and the exile poetry of Ovid, while *Part II* includes Chapter 4 on Livy's first decade. The texts in Chapters 1-3 provide examples of contemporary departures in the first person, while Chapter 4 examines more remote third person departures by famous figures from the Roman past. The final section of the dissertation, entitled, "Epilogue: Future Departures," serves as a conclusion and looks forward to further work on the topic by briefly considering alienation and departure from Rome in the imperial period in Juvenal's third satire.

For Lana, the Beginning

## Acknowledgements

There are many people I would like to thank for their help and support in completing this dissertation. First, I would like to thank my dissertation advisor, Alain Gowing, without whom I never would have had the idea for this study. Thanks are also due to Stephen Hinds and Cathy Connors, the other two members of my dissertation reading committee. The comments and guidance I received from all three members of my committee have greatly improved the project and given me a number of avenues for future study. For their help in the final submission phase of my dissertation, I especially want to thank Cathy for taking on the role of proxy advisor when Alain was out of the country, as well as my team of eleventh hour copy editors, Heather, Amanda, Kellie, Chrissy, and Melissa.

I would also like to thank the other members of the faculty of the University of Washington Classics department, all of whom were a pleasure to learn from and have contributed significantly to my intellectual. In particular, I thank Deb Kamen for her guidance with specific projects and help in matters of professional development. I am thankful that I was able to complete my PhD at the University of Washington, and I could not have asked for a more supportive department or a better program.

I am especially grateful for the invaluable two quarters of fellowship support I received during the writing of my dissertation, which were made possible by the generosity of Meg Greenfield, and the Nesholm Fellowship, which helped make it possible for me to attend the Department of Classics Spring Seminar in Rome program in 2010. The program in Rome was truly a formative experience for me that forever changed the way I think about and read Latin. The experiences I had there also directly led to the idea for this dissertation.

I am also thankful for my fellow graduate students with whom I have had the pleasure of completing this program. All of my graduate student colleagues have greatly added to my positive experience at the University of Washington, both intellectually and personally, and I would especially like to thank Lissa, Melissa, Naomi, and Ashli for being exceptionally good friends who have supported me through victories and trials alike. In particular, I cannot imagine a better or more fitting way to end this process than with a dissertation defense double header with Mel. I would also like to thank my students, who remind me every day of what makes the discovery of the Classical world so fulfilling.

Further thanks are also due to my family and friends, who have all supported me in various ways throughout this process. First among these are my parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and cousins, especially Kristin and her three wonderfully indomitable children, who have all added so much fun and joy to my last six years in the Northwest. Greatest thanks go to Jim and Ruby Hall, who made me who I am today and are particularly missed as I complete this great achievement. I would also like to thank Mike and the Bennetts for recently being my family away from family, as well as Lauren, Sarah, and Kellie, for their contributions to my quality of life outside of work in the last two years. I am especially thankful for my longtime friends Erin, Caitlin, Heather, and Alice for truly being with me for the long haul.

Finally, I must acknowledge my profound debt to Svetlana Lazarova for introducing me to the Latin language and mentoring me throughout my education. I would not have been able to reach this important milestone without her.

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Part I: Present Departures	14
Chapter 1: Satirical Departures: Horace	15
Chapter 2: Elegiac Departures: Propertius and Tibullus	53
Chapter 3: Elegiac Departures: Ovid	106
Part II: Past Departures	147
Chapter 4: Historical Departures: Livy	148
Epilogue: Future Departures	210
Bibliography	223

## Introduction

Almost three years ago, I was on a bus to Ciampino Airport leaving Rome with tears in my eyes after living in the city for ten weeks as part of my department's Classics Seminar in Rome. I was amazed at how personally attached I had become to a foreign city in such a short time, and I reflected on both the general phenomenon of human attachment to place and in particular on the city of Rome's power to captivate its natives and visitors, both ancient and modern. This experience ultimately led to the idea for this study, which explores how Roman authors of the Augustan period write about leaving Rome as a way of discussing different levels of attachment to the city. The authors I consider are Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, and Livy. I focus on episodes in these authors that discuss departures or absence from Rome, including both narratives of exile as a forced departure from the city, as well as willing departures from Rome and the rejection of Roman urban space, in order to explore a variety of perspectives on departure and alienation from the city and elucidate the increasingly complex relationship between the Romans and their city in the Augustan period.

Because the city of Rome holds a particularly important place in the ancient Roman imagination, leaving it is always fraught for the Romans. The Augustan period of Roman history is especially apt for my study because it features great changes both in Rome's urban landscape and its political and cultural environment. After nearly a century of civil wars, Augustus' rise to power results in the end of the Roman republic and the beginning of the empire. Augustus reinforced his power by launching a building program that expanded and transformed the entire city of Rome.<sup>1</sup> He and his friends and family restored temples, extended the republican forum

---

<sup>1</sup> For more details on the physical and topographical transformation of the city of Rome in the Augustan period, see Wallace-Hadrill (1993) 43-62, Favro (2005) 234-263, and Dyson (2010) 117-155.

area by adding an adjacent imperial forum, built up the Campus Martius, and filled the city with images of peace and the return to old Roman values.<sup>2</sup> Unsurprisingly, this period also ushers in a new awareness of urban space in Latin literature.<sup>3</sup> The Augustan age brought many new buildings to Rome, but more importantly, it brought about a new cohesive vision of the city and its physical space that did not exist in the republican period and profoundly impacted how the Romans perceived their city and their connection to it. My study explores how Latin literature of this period reflects this connection and responds to these great changes in the city.

The primary question of my study is how Roman authors of the Augustan period discuss departure from Rome and what this discussion tells us about their perception of the city and their relationship to it. These narratives of leaving Rome reveal different perspectives on the city, including those of authors and characters who feel attached to the city of Rome, and of those who feel alienated from Rome in some way. For those displaying alienation from Rome, an exploration of the sources of this alienation is particularly important. One source of distance or alienation from the city appears in some of Horace's satires and Tibullus' pastoral elegies which reject the city in favor of a life in the country. In Ovid, alienation occurs when the poet is exiled and thus forcibly removed from the city. In Livy's narratives, upheaval in the city can lead to characters being exiled, as in the exile of Camillus in Book 5, or feeling that they no longer belong in their city, as in the secessions of the plebs in Books 2 and 3.

A further important question I explore is how different genres treat absence from Rome. Broadly speaking, elegy and satire tend to be urban focused genres with a strong insider perspective on Rome. For example, Propertius and Ovid see Rome as the locus of elegiac poetry, while departure from Rome compromises the nature of the poet, his beloved, and elegy itself.

---

<sup>2</sup> On the use of visual symbols and propaganda in the Augustan age, see Zanker (1988).

<sup>3</sup> This preoccupation with the physical space of the city also appears in Augustus' own *Res Gestae*, which includes a long list of buildings and monuments that Augustus built or restored (*Res Gestae* 19-21).

There are some exceptions here, though, including Tibullus' elegies with a pastoral setting and Horace's satires expressing a desire to escape the familiar bustle of the city. As a historian, Livy uniquely presents departure and alienation from Rome on a larger scale with national rather than merely personal consequences. The nuances of these shifting attitudes toward the city across different genres play a significant role in my project.

My study also raises broader questions related to migration, travel, and how leaving a place affects the way people relate to it, particularly when the place is one identified with home. I consider the relationship between place and memory and how departure from a place can disrupt the memories associated with it. For example, people who leave Rome in Livy lose their ability to correctly interpret the connection between Roman space and collective Roman memory, i.e. history. Ovid too expresses anxiety over the loss of memory brought on by his long term spatial separation from Rome. I further explore how leaving the place of one's home affects the identity of those departing and how they are perceived by themselves and others. For several authors in my study, departure from Rome coincides with the loss of Roman identity. For example, Livy's characters are alienated from Roman society and their rightful place within it when they are outside the physical space of Rome, while departure from Rome in Propertius and Ovid disrupts their role as poets and lovers.

For these questions it is useful to consult modern theories of travel, space, and landscape as a lens through which to consider the ancient sources. This is an expanding area of research that includes broad studies by theorists, social scientists, and geographers including Tuan, Cosgrove, de Certeau, Schama, Williams, and others.<sup>4</sup> There is also scholarship of this kind in

---

<sup>4</sup> See Tuan (1977), Cosgrove and Daniels (1988), Cosgrove (2008), de Certeau (1984), Schama (1995), and Williams (1973).

Classics that applies ideas of space and place to the study of Greek and Latin texts. Some of the more general studies on space, place, and landscape in Classical authors include those of Edwards on the representation of the city of Rome in Latin literature, Leach and Spencer on landscape in Roman literature and art, Nicolet on Roman space and politics, and other similar works.<sup>5</sup>

A common focus in many of these studies of space and landscape, both within and outside Classics, is on the relationship between culture and space, including how identity and memory become attached to landscape and how people and authors appropriate and engage with their physical surroundings. Examples of these kinds of studies applied to specific Roman authors include Vasaly's *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, Jaeger's *Livy's Written Rome*, Boyle's *Ovid and the Monuments*, and Welch's *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments*, which explore how Cicero, Livy, Ovid, and Propertius, respectively, use references to the topography and monuments of Rome to create meaning in their work.<sup>6</sup> Scholarship of this kind has tended to emphasize how people engage with spaces to which they belong or in which they are present. My study contributes to this work by considering how people engage with spaces from which they are alienated or absent. As others have examined how connection to a place creates identity and memory, I consider how absence and alienation from a place destroy identity and memory or create new ones.

Another body of secondary literature with which I engage is the study of exile in Latin literature, which currently comprises most of the scholarly discussion of Romans leaving Rome. Many scholars have written about exile in Latin literature, most notably Claassen and Gaertner.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See Edwards (1996), Leach (1988), Spencer (2010), Nicolet (1991), Larmour and Spencer (2007), and Rosen and Sluiter (2006).

<sup>6</sup> See Vasaly (1993), Jaeger (1997), Boyle (2003), and Welch (2005).

<sup>7</sup> See Claassen (1999) and Gaertner (2007).

In these studies, “exile literature” traditionally consists of literature written in the first person by exiled Roman authors, including Cicero, Ovid, and Seneca. Because my study focuses on the Augustan period, I consider Ovid’s discussion of exile in his exile poetry, but I additionally examine third person narratives of exiled characters in Livy, who was not an exile himself. In this way I expand the traditional scope of the discussion of exile in Latin literature to reflect the Roman view of exile as a whole rather than only from firsthand accounts.

I also go beyond the current scope of exile studies and provide a new perspective on detachment from Rome by exploring narratives of voluntary departure from the city. Other scholars including Claassen, Gaertner, McGowan, and Williams have previously discussed exile literature in terms of its poetics and the perspective it provides on contemporary politics and culture.<sup>8</sup> I expand on these studies by looking at the perspectives on politics and culture to be found in narratives of willing abandonment of the city. Another way I contribute to this field is by incorporating the aforementioned discussions of space and landscape into my study, which has not been a large focus of existing studies of literature on exile and detachment from the city. My study brings together and expands on different threads of travel, space, and alienation from Rome within Classical scholarship, providing new contributions in a number of areas.

Because my study focuses on the Roman attitude toward the city of Rome during the Augustan period and how authors of this period engage with the physical space of Rome, it is important to consult studies of Roman topography and monuments, as well as studies of the Augustan age itself. Coarelli is an important resource for the general topography of Rome through all periods, while Favro, Dyson, Wallace-Hadrill, and Zanker discuss the vast changes in Roman topography during the reign of Augustus and how these changes both consolidated

---

<sup>8</sup> See Claassen (2008), Gaertner (2007), McGowan (2009), and Williams (1994).

Augustus' power and affected how the Romans used and viewed their city.<sup>9</sup> Among the most relevant discussions of the Augustan age, along with Augustus' rise to power and the formation of a new Roman empire, are the works of Galinsky and Wallace-Hadrill.<sup>10</sup> Another source that sheds light on how Romans move about within the physical space of Rome is O'Sullivan's book, *Walking in Roman Culture*.<sup>11</sup>

It is important here to clearly define what I mean by the terms 'Rome' and 'Roman' in the study. In all of the episodes I discuss, there is a distinction between the space of the city of Rome and the space lying outside of it. For this reason, in my discussions of departures from Rome, I use 'Rome' specifically to mean the physical space of the city. For some authors and characters, leaving this space means traveling to other places in Italy, as Horace does during his trips to his Sabine farm or his journey to Brundisium through small Italian towns. In some cases, withdrawal from Rome involves leaving Italy entirely, such as when Propertius fantasizes about going to Athens or when Ovid must go into exile at the edge of the Roman empire in Tomis. In other cases, the departure from Rome may only be to the outskirts of the city, as in Livy when Cincinnatus goes to live on the Janiculum hill across the Tiber river that constitutes the city limit.

I use the term 'Roman' to refer to the authors and characters in my study that identify with the physical space of Rome. This identification with the city of Rome, however, does not always mean that these authors or characters originally hail from Rome. In fact, none of the authors in the study were born in Rome; they all emigrated there. Nevertheless, they see themselves as Romans and frame their works around their relationship to the city of Rome, not

---

<sup>9</sup> See Coarelli (2007), Favro (1996), Dyson (2010), Wallace-Hadrill (2008), and Zanker (1988).

<sup>10</sup> On the "cultural revolution" of the Augustan period, see Wallace-Hadrill (2008); and Habinek and Schiesaro (1997). For general discussion of this period, see Galinsky (1996) and Galinsky (2005).

<sup>11</sup> O'Sullivan (2011).

their birthplaces. This is not to say that these authors felt no connection to their original homes—they surely must have—but the city with which they are most fascinated and preoccupied in their works is always Rome. The personal background of these authors reveals the unique and complex power of the city of Rome to create Roman identity and captivate both newcomers and natives alike.

The four chapters of this study are organized by genre and divided into two parts: *Part I: Present Departures*, and *Part II: Past Departures*. *Part I* includes three chapters: Chapter 1, “Satirical Departures: Horace,” focusing on Horace’s satires; Chapter 2, “Elegiac Departures: Propertius and Tibullus,” on the love poetry of Propertius and Tibullus; and Chapter 3, “Elegiac Departures: Ovid,” on Ovid’s poetry from exile. The poets in this section all write about departure from Rome as a personal experience that they themselves undergo. *Part II* includes one chapter: Chapter 4, “Historical Departures: Livy.” Here, Livy provides examples of more remote third person departures by figures from the distant past, such as Camillus and Coriolanus, representing a break from the contemporary departures in the first person as discussed in *Part I*. The concluding section, entitled “Epilogue: Future Departures,” briefly considers alienation and departure from Rome in Juvenal’s third satire and how it compares with the perspectives of the Augustan authors in the study. Each chapter focuses on a few passages or poems from each author that feature particularly interesting discussion of departure or absence from Rome, with detailed discussion of these passages often supplemented by references to other complementary areas in the texts. Close readings of specific passages are connected to broader conclusions about the topic of leaving Rome both in individual authors and in Augustan literature as a whole.

The first chapter, “Satirical Departures: Horace,” focuses on Horace’s *Satires* but includes discussion of complementary poems from his other works. Horace displays a

complicated relationship between himself and the city of Rome in his poetry. He often complains about Rome and characterizes it as a place of anxiety, excessive luxury, and tedious obligations. He says he wishes he could leave Rome and go to the country, which he sees as peaceful, simple, and free from cares. At the same time though, Horace also sees the city as a place of refinement and culture that the countryside lacks. Additionally, the towns he visits in his trip to Brundisium in *Satire 1.5* serve as foils to Rome and reveal his view that Rome is the greatest city to be in.

Many of Horace's poems present the preference for the city or country as a personal choice and feature characters that prefer one of these places over the other. Sometimes these characters leave their preferred urban or pastoral setting for the other place, such as the country mouse who goes to the city in *Satire 2.6*, but they are always disappointed with this change and decide to return to their former homes. Horace himself resembles some of these characters in that he is fickle about his preference for the city or the country and longs for both places at different times. In *Satire 2.7*, Horace's slave Davus sums up his master's attitude toward the city and the country, saying, "in Rome you prefer the country; in the country, fickle man, you exalt the faraway city to the stars," (*Romae rus optas; absentem rusticus urbem / tollis ad astra levis*, *Satire 2.7.29-30*).<sup>12</sup> Horace may complain about the city and wish for the country, but in the end he wants not to completely abandon Rome and make the country his permanent home, but to complement his time in Rome with time in the country. Ultimately, the tension in Horace's poetry between wanting to leave Rome and wanting to remain there reflects his persona's oscillating attachment to and alienation from the city at different times.

The second chapter, "Elegiac Departures: Propertius and Tibullus," discusses the departure from Rome of the elegiac lover or his beloved in the elegies of Propertius and Tibullus. In both of these authors, the city of Rome is presented as the necessary place for elegy to occur,

---

<sup>12</sup> All translations are my own.

while departure from Rome disrupts love and elegiac poetry. When the beloved leaves Rome for the country or other cities, it disrupts her romantic relationship with the poet-lover by creating a physical separation of the lovers and ushering in the threat of infidelity. When the lover himself leaves Rome, it too separates him from his beloved and can even undermine his wellbeing and his production of elegiac poetry. In poems in which the beloved or the lover returns after leaving Rome, this return repairs the lovers' relationship and restores the lover to his former role as an elegiac poet, revealing the importance of the presence of the lover and the beloved together in Rome for the success of love and elegy. Although Propertius and Tibullus each write a poem about departing from Rome along with their respective beloveds as the solution to the problems caused by their separate departures, neither of these fantasies ever comes true and Tibullus even admits that he was only imagining these things (*haec mihi fingebam, Elegies* 1.5.36). The only way for love and elegy to truly work is for the lovers to be reunited in Rome.

Many of the poems discussing departure from Rome in Propertius and Tibullus feature disruption of the traditional elegiac framework, including the typical roles of the lover and the beloved. This disruption is especially striking in a genre like elegy that is so self-conscious and aware of generic expectations. Leaving Rome in elegy alters not only the poet's relationship with his beloved, but also the nature of elegy itself and the poet's role within it. One important difference between Propertius and Tibullus is that Propertius embraces the urban environment of Rome more than Tibullus does. For Propertius, there is no better place than Rome to be in, while Tibullus, like Horace, longs for a life in the country and wishes he could transport love and elegy there. Tibullus realizes though that as an urban genre, elegy really belongs in Rome and not anywhere else. Despite the variance in their enthusiasm for the city, both Tibullus and Propertius

connect leaving Rome with the dissolution of love and elegy, presenting Rome as the source of elegiac poetic form and the one true locus of their elegiac pursuits.

The third chapter, "Elegiac Departures: Ovid," examines Ovid's discussion of exile in his exile poetry. In these poems, Ovid portrays exile as depriving him of everything that he loves as he loses his family and friends as well as his home and his beloved city of Rome. Instead, he must live in an inhospitable and dangerous place at the edge of the empire, removed from all the amenities that Rome has to offer. In addition to changing the poet's surroundings, his exile changes how he is perceived in Rome as well. He complains that his friends abandon or forget him when he is forced to leave the city and that his poetry is no longer as favored as it was before his exile. Ovid attempts to maintain his connection to Rome by sending his poetry there in his place and imagining that he himself is in the city, but he always displays an awareness that these attempts are not entirely successful, calling attention to his continued isolation and alienation from Rome in his exile. Ovid's longing for Rome and his loathing of Tomis emphasize that Rome is where he truly belongs and cannot be replaced as his home.

Ovid also depicts his exile as fundamentally altering himself and the way he thinks about and writes poetry. He says he is no longer the same person he was before his exile and represents his life in Tomis as the end of his former life as an elegiac poet-lover. He says he has forgotten how to speak Latin in his exile, reflecting the loss of his connection to Roman society and his Roman identity. Exile changes the way Ovid thinks about writing, causing him to hate the Muses and see his poetry as a way to console himself and restore himself to Rome, rather than as a source of fame and renown. His poetry itself changes while he is in exile as well. He repeatedly asserts that his poetry in exile is not of the same quality as his earlier works and that exile has ruined his poetic talent. He additionally introduces elements into his exile poetry that are not

regular features of his previous elegies, including parallels with epic poetry and a pervasive emphasis on Augustus' role in his suffering. When Ovid is forced to leave Rome, he loses not only the physical and social world to which he is accustomed, but also his identity as a Roman and an elegiac poet-lover, suggesting that the city of Rome creates his personal and poetic identity.

The fourth chapter, "Historical Departures: Livy," focuses on episodes of exile and abandonment of the city by Roman people in Livy's first decade. Some of these feature individual Romans leaving Rome, such as Coriolanus in Book 2, while some involve the departure of groups of the Roman population, such as the secessions of the plebs in Books 2 and 3. In almost all of these episodes, the departure of Romans from Rome arises out of civil conflict, making departure from Rome a physical manifestation of political division in the city. Leaving Rome in these episodes has negative consequences for both the people departing and the city. For those departing, leaving Rome deprives them of their Roman identity and their physical and social connection to the city. For the city itself, the departure of Romans from Rome has the potential to create serious crises. It can threaten the city with civil war by escalating existing discord and can even result in the destruction of the city by enemies, as in the case of the Gallic sack during Camillus' exile. In most of these episodes, however, the eventual return of the Romans who have departed restores their personal Roman identity and resolves the crisis for the state. The damage done by departure from Rome is thus reversible, provided that a reunion of Romans with their city is achieved.

The message Livy sends in all of these episodes is that there is a natural and necessary connection between the Romans and the physical space of Rome that is violated when Romans leave the city. The Romans themselves feel a deep personal attachment to Roman space, while

the city depends on the presence of its citizens for its continued protection and survival. For Livy, memory plays an especially important role in this connection between the Romans and their city as the Romans use the physical space of Rome as a repository for collective memory and history. While the first person narratives of departure from Rome in Horace and the elegists focus on the personal and individual experience of leaving the city, Livy's narratives look beyond this perspective by additionally considering the consequences of leaving Rome for the Roman state and the city itself.

In many ways, the narratives of departure from Rome in this study construct the relationship of Romans to their city along generic lines and reflect the most basic concerns and aims of the genres to which they belong. The urban genre of satire is concerned with exposing and critiquing the wide array of *personae* and personalities to be found in the city. It is thus fitting that departure from Rome in Horace is represented from a number of different perspectives and voices and is used as a means of exploring diversity and multiplicity in the poet's own *persona(e)*. Elegy, on the other hand, is more concerned with engaging with generic expectations and exploring the nuances of an already established elegiac poetic *persona*, rather than with sampling a number of different *personae* as satire does. For the elegists in the study, leaving Rome correspondingly undermines both the typical framework of the elegiac genre and the construction of personal and poetic identity within it. Historiography, particularly for Livy, is concerned with creating a connection to the past and preserving national character and memory. Departure from Rome in Livy thus destroys the connection between past and present and obliterates personal and national Roman identity and collective memory. The diversity of genres here provides a corresponding diversity in the ways in which departure from Rome is conceived in Roman thought.

The goal of this study is to explore a wide variety of perspectives on the concept of departure and alienation from the city of Rome in Augustan literature. The assortment of texts and authors included cites many reasons for leaving Rome, including unwilling departures as a result of exile and willing departures as a result of contempt for the city or preference for the country. It also reveals a variety of reactions to leaving the city, including despair and loss of identity in the face of exile, as well as relief after a willing departure. All of these perspectives provide valuable insight into the complicated and important relationship between the Romans and the physical space of Rome in the Augustan period.

## Part I

### Present Departures

## Chapter 1

### Satirical Departures: Horace

The nature of satire as an urban genre is a major focus of scholarship on Roman satire in general and specifically on Horace's *Satires*. Because satire is typically a genre that discusses life in the city of Rome, there has been much scholarly discussion of the city as the setting of satire and of how it is characterized within this genre.<sup>1</sup> Braund has observed similarities in the description of Rome across multiple satirical authors from Lucilius to Juvenal, suggesting that the portrayal of Rome in satire draws on a literary tradition and is thus somewhat generic.<sup>2</sup> Dyson has similarly noted that Horace often describes urban life in general terms and does not always engage with specific important places in Rome.<sup>3</sup>

In connection to the study of the characterization of Rome in Roman satire, scholars have also discussed how Roman satire represents the countryside. Many have argued that the countryside in satire functions as the landscape against which urban satire defines both itself and the city within which it operates. In this general framework, the country becomes the antithesis of the city,<sup>4</sup> and the descriptions of both places become polarized along moral and symbolic—but not necessarily realistic—lines.<sup>5</sup> The country in Roman satire is often represented as a place of leisure and an escape from the city,<sup>6</sup> which is chaotic and full of obligation.<sup>7</sup> This dichotomy creates a tension between town and country in the satiric genre as individual poems alternate

---

<sup>1</sup> Braund (1989) 23-24, Harrison (2007) 235.

<sup>2</sup> Braund (1989) 36-38.

<sup>3</sup> Dyson (1995) 255-259.

<sup>4</sup> Braund (1989) 28, 40.

<sup>5</sup> Braund (1989) 28, 39-40, 42-43.

<sup>6</sup> Braund (1989) 39-40, Harrison (2007) 244-245.

<sup>7</sup> Braund (1989) 41-42, Harrison (2007) 236.

between discussions of one place or another. The praise of the country or the city is thus always complicated by descriptions of life on the other side.<sup>8</sup>

Another more specific focus of scholarship on Horace's *Satires* has been on their relationship to their Augustan context. Some of this work moves beyond the question of the general role of the city in Roman satire and considers how Horace's works engage particularly with the rapidly changing Augustan city. Scholars have argued that Horace does not concentrate on Augustan building projects in his poetry<sup>9</sup> and that he often privileges republican Roman space<sup>10</sup> rather than creating a new imperial city with his poems as Propertius did.<sup>11</sup> Another related area of study is on the comparison of Horace's satires with those of the republican satirist Lucilius.<sup>12</sup> A number of scholars attribute Horace's comparative lack of invective<sup>13</sup> and avoidance of important topics in favor of trivialities<sup>14</sup> to the new political climate in Rome after the end of the republic.<sup>15</sup> Horace's freedom of speech is more limited than Lucilius' was because of its historical context.<sup>16</sup> In this framework, the country provides the poet with freedom<sup>17</sup> while the city limits it.<sup>18</sup>

For my work on Horace's satires here, I draw primarily on the scholarship related to the characterization of the city and the city-country antithesis in Horace. My focus on narratives of departure and absence from the city of Rome meshes especially well with work on the construct of the country as a physical and ideological escape from the city. My comparison of Horace's

---

<sup>8</sup> Harrison (2007) 237-238.

<sup>9</sup> Dyson (1995) 257-260, 262; Leach (1997) 105-106.

<sup>10</sup> Leach (1997) 106, 109-110.

<sup>11</sup> Leach (1997) 107.

<sup>12</sup> Gowers (1993) 49-50, 52; Reckford (1999) 541; Freudenburg (2001) 52; Gowers (2005) 48-50.

<sup>13</sup> Gowers (2005) 51-52.

<sup>14</sup> Gowers (1993) 49, Freudenburg (2001) 52-53, Gowers (2005) 48-50, Gowers (2012) 193-194.

<sup>15</sup> Freudenburg (2001) 58; Gowers (2005) 48-50, 52.

<sup>16</sup> Gowers (2005) 48-50.

<sup>17</sup> Harrison (2007) 241.

<sup>18</sup> Harrison (2007) 242-243.

narratives of departure from Rome to those of other Augustan authors contributes to the existing scholarship on the role of the city and country in Roman satire by considering its wider implications beyond the satiric genre. I also add interdisciplinarity to the consideration of the city and country in Horace by incorporating work on the modern city and country dichotomy, such as Williams' study of this topic in modern English literature and thought. Another way I contribute to the study of the city in Horace's works is by examining how he constructs alienation from and attachment to Rome. My work considers not only the characterization of the city and country as places, but also how this characterization represents relationship to and outlook on place. The comparison of Horace to other Augustan authors in my study additionally deepens the treatment of Horace within the Augustan background by considering his work in relation to the broader Augustan literary context, rather than only in relation to the political context.

This chapter discusses the attitude toward leaving Rome Horace displays in his poetry, with special attention to his *Satires* (written contemporaneously with his *Epodes* in c. 41-30 BC and published in two separate books in c. 35 and 30 BC). Because Horace does not often write specifically about leaving the city of Rome, I focus on poems in which he discusses Rome in comparison to the countryside to examine his construction of his feelings about the city and his place in it. *Satire 2.6*, which includes a discussion of the poet's view of the city and the countryside as well as the parallel fable of the country mouse and the city mouse, receives the most attention. In addition, several poems are discussed from Horace's *Epodes* (published with the second book of *Satires* in 30 BC), *Odes* (written in c. 30-23 BC and published in 23 BC), and the first book of his *Epistles* (written in c. 23-20 BC and published in 20 BC), providing a more diverse perspective than that of *Satire 2.6* alone. In these poems, Horace's poetry constructs a fraught relationship between himself and the city of Rome in which he often expresses

frustration with Rome and longs for the country, but at the same time conveys an attachment to some features of the city and ultimately a preference for a life that includes aspects of both the city and the country.

Many of Horace's poems feature complaints about the city. Horace expresses annoyance at his many duties and obligations in the city and the lack of freedom he feels because of them. He paints a city full of anxiety and cares. He sees Rome as crowded, noisy, and chaotic, and also full of luxury which he feels is excessive and prefers to avoid. In one poem, *Epode 16*, he goes so far as to cast Rome as a place of endless civil war which the Romans can only remedy by abandoning the city entirely.

As a complement to this rejection of the city, Horace's poetry often expresses a preference for the countryside. In *Satire 2.6* and other poems, Horace presents the country as a place which frees him from obligations and provides him with the calm, peaceful life he longs for when he is in Rome. He also sees the country as a simple, modest alternative to the luxury and excess of the city. In *Epode 16*, he even claims that escaping to a pastoral fantasy world will solve the ongoing political strife in Rome.

In some ways, however, Horace's criticism of the city and praise of the country are more complicated than they seem at first glance. In some poems, Horace acknowledges that the preference for the city or the country is a personal choice and that although he says he prefers the country, there are others who prefer the city. The preference for the city or the country is thus not related to any inherent superiority of one place over the other, but to individual tastes and personalities. He also gives examples of people who decide to switch between the city and country because they have developed unrealistic fantasies of what the city or country is like. In

these cases, these characters ultimately decide to return to their original life after they discover that the reality of life on the other side is not like the fantasy they envisioned.

Even Horace himself often resembles these characters in some of his poems. He is sometimes fickle about whether he prefers the country or the city. He complains about his duties in the city, but readily involves himself in them while he is there. Furthermore, the life in the country which he describes is not an authentic rustic life of work on his farm, but rather a life of leisure including elements which seem to creep in from the city, such as writing poetry and discussing philosophy. Despite his complaints about the city and his longing for the country, we see that Horace does not actually want to abandon Rome or replace it with the country, but rather to enjoy both places at different times. In this way, Horace uses narratives of departure from Rome as a way of exploring a number of different voices and personae in his poetry.

As a corollary to the discussion of the city and the country in Horace's poetry, the final section of this chapter discusses *Satire 1.5*, Horace's description of his journey to Brundisium through a number of small Italian towns. In this poem, he portrays these towns as unlike the country or the city, using them as a foil to both places and especially to the city of Rome. The fact that these towns do not measure up to Rome in a variety of ways highlights Horace's true appreciation for Rome despite the frustrations he describes with it in other poems.

## Part I: The City and the Country

### *Satire 2.6*

Horace's poetry often conveys rejection of the city of Rome. One reason Horace rejects the city is because it is a place of tedious duties and obligations. In *Satire 2.6*, Horace complains about all of the obligations he faces when he is in Rome. He says he must be a legal advocate

(*sponsor*<sup>19</sup>) starting early in the morning and refers to this as a duty (*officium*) (*Sat.* 2.6.23-24), reflecting the bothersome nature of urban business in the poem.<sup>20</sup> He also says while he is in the city, “a hundred matters of others leap through my head and around my sides” (*aliena negotia centum / per caput et circa saliunt latus*, *Sat.* 2.6.33-34), characterizing the city as a place of *negotium*.<sup>21</sup> Some of these duties are personal, such as Roscius asking him to meet him at the Puteal (*Sat.* 2.6.35), a stone curb in the forum near the praetor’s tribunal. Others are more public, such as the scribes asking him to attend their meeting regarding important and new public business (*de re communi...magna atque nova*, *Sat.* 2.6.36). Some people exploit his connections with Maecenas and other powerful people by asking him to procure Maecenas’ signature on documents (*Sat.* 2.6.38) or asking him for information about public business such as news about the Dacians or land confiscations (*Sat.* 2.6.51-56). As Braund notes, Horace here emphasizes the tediousness of being part of the elite,<sup>22</sup> adding to his exasperation with life in the city.

Oliensis argues that there is a shift here from Horace’s more leisurely description of the city in his first book of *Satires* to his burdensome description of it in his second book. Now that Horace is an important person, his new routine in the city is “not an aimless ramble but a frantic rush from one obligation to another.”<sup>23</sup> Similarly, in his fable of the country mouse and city mouse at the end of *Satire* 2.6, Horace says the city mouse performs his duties not unslavishly (*nec non verniliter ipsis / fungitur officiis*, *Sat.* 2.6.108-109) while he serves the country mouse dinner, creating a parallel between the *officia* which Horace and the city mouse perform in the city. The city as described in *Satire* 2.6 imposes obligations on both human and animal alike. In

---

<sup>19</sup> The word *sponsor* here is a technical term referring to someone who formally gives surety for another in a legal matter.

<sup>20</sup> Harrison (2007) 236.

<sup>21</sup> Braund (1989) 41-42.

<sup>22</sup> Braund (1989) 41-42.

<sup>23</sup> Oliensis (1998) 46.

this way, the story of the country mouse and city mouse serves as a thematic complement to Horace's first person narrative in the first half of the poem.<sup>24</sup>

Because of its constant obligations, being in the city also represents a hindrance to Horace's freedom. In *Satire 2.6*, he emphasizes that his responsibilities in the city are not only an annoyance, but also that he does not have a choice to avoid them. He addresses the god Janus in the poem and says to him, "at Rome you seize me as a sponsor, saying, 'come on, press on, lest someone else perform your duty first'" (*Romae sponsorem me rapis: 'eia, / ne prior officio quisquam respondeat, urge'*, *Sat. 2.6.23-24*). The verbs *rapio* and *urgeo* here emphasize that Horace is being seized and pushed along, diminishing his freedom to object and make a different choice. Similarly, he later says in reference to someone asking him for Maecenas' seal on some tablets, "you might say, 'I will try,' and he adds and insists, 'if you want to, you can'" (*dixeris, 'experiar': 'si vis, potes' addit et instat*, *Sat. 2.6.39*). The verb *insto* here stresses how insistent the person asking him for the favor is and how difficult it is for him to refuse. Horace also says in this poem that whoever meets him (*quicumque obvius est*, *Sat. 2.6.51*) asks him about public business. The word *obvius* here is a standard way of referring to someone meeting a person, but it can also have the meaning of hindering or blocking someone, suggesting that these people asking Horace for news not only meet him but also obstruct him in a way that gives him no choice but to speak with them. The city as a place of servitude and lack of freedom also appears in the story of the country and city mouse later in the poem, when the city mouse serves the country mouse "not unslavishly" (*nec non verniliter*, *Sat.2.6.108*). Here the obligations and

---

<sup>24</sup> West (1974) 78, Braund (1989) 39-40.

behavior of the city mouse have gone so far as to align him with a slave, rather than a master, serving his guest.<sup>25</sup>

Horace further characterizes the city as full of anxiety and cares in this poem. He says he wants to go to the country because it provides him with pleasant forgetfulness of his anxious life (*sollicitae iucunda oblivia vitae*, *Sat.* 2.6.62), suggesting that his life in the city is one of disturbance and anxiety. Likewise, when the country mouse goes to the city later in the poem, he at first enjoys his stay until, “suddenly a great creaking of doors struck each mouse from his couch. They ran terrified through the whole room and trembled rather lifelessly, as soon as the high house resounded with Molossian dogs” (*subito ingens / valvarum strepitus lectis excussit utrumque. / currere per totum pavidi conclave, magisque / exanimes trepidare, simul domus alta Molossis / personuit canibus*, *Sat.* 2.6.111-115). The words *pavidi* and *exanimes* here in particular portray the city as a place of danger and fear for the country mouse.

Another complaint about the city in the poem is that it is noisy, crowded, and chaotic. Horace says that in order to make his way through the city, he must struggle in the crowd and injure the slow people (*luctandum in turba et facienda iniuria tardis*, *Sat.* 2.6.28). The result of this is that a wicked man presses him with angry curses (*improbis urget iratis precibus*, *Sat.* 2.6.29-30). This makes the city seem like a crowded place with people always pushing each other and arguing. At the end of the poem, the experience of the country mouse in the city with the sudden great creaking (*ingens strepitus*, *Sat.* 2.6.111-112) of the dining room doors opening and the loud barking of the dogs resounding in the house (*Sat.* 2.6.114-115) further represents the city as a noisy and hectic place. As Williams has shown, the perception of cities as places of

---

<sup>25</sup> The adverb *vernilater* here characterizes the city mouse specifically as a *verna*, a slave born in the master’s house. This kind of slave often received more indulgent treatment than others.

noise and disturbance is a commonplace in the Western tradition.<sup>26</sup> Horace's poem thus particularizes this generic idea about the nature of cities in Western thought to the city of Rome.

*Satire 2.6* additionally characterizes the city as a place of excessive luxury. In the story of the country mouse and city mouse, the mice go to the city to find a wealthy house full of red fabric and ivory couches and food piled up from a banquet the night before (*Sat. 2.6.101-105*). Only in the city does the country mouse stretch out on a purple covering (*purpurea porrectum in veste, Sat. 2.6.106*), whereas at his own house in the country he was stretched out on fresh straw (*palea porrectus in horna, Sat. 2.6.88*). The luxury of the city has also made the city mouse more discerning in his taste in food, as shown by his haughty tooth (*dente superbo, Sat. 2.6.87*) and his disdain for the country mouse's simple food (*Sat. 2.6.86-87*).

This luxury and wealth of the city is accompanied by a superficial concern for appearances. Horace says a guest at his country banquet will be free from the mad rules (*solutus legibus insanis, Sat. 2.6.68-69*) of a typical city feast, rejecting the rigid rules of drinking which would normally govern a party in Rome. He also says that at his country banquet, "a conversation arises, not about villas or the houses of others, nor about whether or not Lepos dances well" (*sermo oritur, non de villis domibusve alienis, / nec male necne Lepos saltet, Sat. 2.6.71-72*), showing his avoidance of the petty gossip usually found in city dinner parties. Braund has noted the general portrayal of the city as a place of greed and superficiality in the poem.<sup>27</sup> The comparisons between Horace's country dinner party and a banquet in Rome here underscore this portrayal by emphasizing that the social gatherings of the city are more focused on shallow and petty concerns than on what is truly important in life.

---

<sup>26</sup> Williams (1973) 1.

<sup>27</sup> Braund (1989) 39-40.

Horace's solution to his personal alienation from and frustration with the city in *Satire* 2.6 is to leave Rome for the country. He represents the country as the remedy for all of the ills he identifies in the city. First, the country represents freedom from obligations that bother him in the city. At the end of the description of his duties in the city, Horace says, "amid these things the day is wasted for wretched me not without such prayers: O country, when will I see you?" (*perditur haec inter misero lux non sine votis: / o rus, quando ego te aspiciam?*, *Sat.* 2.6.59-60). He thus characterizes the country as a release from his obligations by immediately following his complaints about them with fantasies about the country.

Similarly, in the story of the country and city mouse later in the poem, the country mouse does not behave like a slave the way the city mouse does when he serves the country mouse in the city. Instead, the country mouse is called the father of the household (*pater domus*, *Sat.* 2.6.88). Nor does the word *officium* appear in the story of the country mouse as it does during the mice's banquet in the city. Furthermore, the country mouse works for his own food and serves it as his own, rather than serving the food belonging to a rich man in the city as the city mouse does. The country mouse, unlike the city mouse, is his own master and is not obligated to or dependent on anyone else. Other scholars have discussed the general theme in Horace of the independence and freedom of the country life versus the dependency of the city life.<sup>28</sup> Williams has additionally shown that this notion of the country as a place of independence also appears in Western thought outside the Classical tradition.<sup>29</sup> Horace's narration of the story of the mice underscores this theme and expands it beyond the particular context of his own lack of freedom in Rome by applying it even more broadly to the world of animals.

---

<sup>28</sup> Leach (1988) 211; Braund (1989) 40, 42; Harrison (2007) 241.

<sup>29</sup> Williams (1973) 130-132.

Horace also characterizes the country as a calm, peaceful, and safe retreat from the physical, mental, and political turmoil of the city,<sup>30</sup> thereby incorporating into the broader theme of escape in his poetry.<sup>31</sup> He describes the country as a place for pleasant forgetfulness of his anxious life (*sollicitae iucunda oblivia vitae*, *Sat.* 2.6.62). He also emphasizes the rest and leisure that the country provides<sup>32</sup> and says he will be able to sleep or spend idle hours when he is in the country (*Sat.* 2.6.61). In this way, the country is the remedy for his troubled mind and lack of sleep in the city. Likewise, the country mouse at the end of the poem abandons the city and returns to his home in the country, saying, “there is no use for this life for me...my forest and cave, safe from traps, will console me with slender vetch” (*haud mihi vita / est opus hac...me silva cavusque / tutus ab insidiis tenui solabitur ervo*, *Sat.* 2.6.115-117). The country mouse, like Horace, escapes the dangers and fear he experiences in the city by returning to the country where he knows he will be safe.

Further, the countryside in this satire offers an alternative to the excessive luxury of the city. Horace opens the poem by saying, “this was in my prayers: a measure of land not so great, where there is a garden and a stream of continuous water near my home, and a bit of forest above these” (*hoc erat in votis: modus agri non ita magnus, / hortus ubi et tecto vicinus iugis aquae fons / et paulum silvae super his foret*, *Sat.* 2.6.1-3). He stresses the moderation and simplicity of his farm in the country, aligning it with the general emphasis on moderation and satiety in his poetry.<sup>33</sup> The country banquet he envisions later in the poem consists of beans, some greens, and bacon (*Sat.* 2.6.63-64), casting his life in the country as a modest departure from the lavish dinner parties found in Rome.

---

<sup>30</sup> Harrison (2007) 242-243.

<sup>31</sup> Reckford (1999) 537.

<sup>32</sup> Braund (1989) 40.

<sup>33</sup> Gowers (2005) 51.

The simplicity and modesty of the country, as well as its moral superiority over the luxury of the city, is a topic frequently discussed by scholars. Williams has examined broader Western representations of the simplicity and morality of the country outside the Classical tradition.<sup>34</sup> Braund has argued that the modesty of the country specifically in Horace's poetry makes it the symbolic and moral antithesis to the city.<sup>35</sup> In this way, Horace fits in well with Varro and Cato, who, as Spencer argues, similarly employ the country landscape as a device for exploring morality, identity, and sociocultural shifts in Rome.<sup>36</sup> Harrison sees a connection between the moderation of the country and Callimachean and Horatian poetics,<sup>37</sup> making Horace's representation of the country also a reflection of his poetic program. Horace thus uses narratives of absence from Rome as a means of defining his poetry and himself as a poet.

The story of the country mouse serving his guest later in the poem similarly reflects this modesty. The country mouse lives in a poor cave (*paupere cavo*, *Sat.* 2.6.80-81) rather than a large house. He reclines on fresh straw rather than an expensive couch (*Sat.* 2.6.88). He too serves simple food at his banquet. Horace says, "he did not begrudge his guest the chickpea he had set aside nor a long oat, and bringing in his mouth a dry berry and half-eaten bits of bacon, he gave them to him" (*neque ille / sepositi ciceris nec longae invidit avenae, / aridum et ore ferens acinum semesaque lardi / frustra dedit*, *Sat.* 2.6.83-86). West has argued that the chickpea and other elements of the country mouse's diet serve as an anthropomorphic comparison to the simple diet of a poor Italian countryman and mirror Horace's own standard of living as advertised in another one of his poems, *Satire* 1.6.<sup>38</sup> The use of the word *lardum* here serves the same purpose by recalling the *lardum* in Horace's own list of foods he will eat in the country in

---

<sup>34</sup> Williams (1973) 1. 17-18, 24, 27-28.

<sup>35</sup> Braund (1989) 40, 42.

<sup>36</sup> Spencer (2010) 70-85.

<sup>37</sup> Harrison (2007) 245-246.

<sup>38</sup> West (1974) 71.

lines 63-64. Once again, Horace uses the story of the country and city mouse to reinforce his own claims about the city and country as set forth earlier in the poem.

Horace's life in the countryside spurns the petty and superficial concerns of the city as well. His country banquet in *Satire 2.6* rejects the rules of drinking that govern dinner parties in the city, instead preferring to allow each guest to choose how he wants to dilute his wine (*Sat. 2.6.67-70*). Similarly, instead of gossiping about other people's property or discussing other petty topics at his country banquet, Horace says, "let us discuss that which pertains more to us and is wrong for us not to know, namely whether men are happy because of riches or courage, or what draws us to friendships, namely usefulness or what is right, and what the nature of the good and its highest point is" (*quod magis ad nos / pertinet et nescire malum est agitamus: utrumne / divitiis homines an sint virtute beati; / quidve ad amicitias, usus rectumne, trahat nos; / et quae sit natura boni summumque quid eius, Sat. 2.6.72-76*). Here Horace chooses philosophy over gossip at his country banquet, connecting the country with philosophical discourse<sup>39</sup> and portraying it as a place of greater interest in the important concerns of life than the city is.<sup>40</sup>

Although Horace does portray the country as a refuge from the problems that alienate him from Rome, he nevertheless does not see this preference for the country over the city as absolute or inherent in the places themselves. Instead, he views the preference for the country or the city as a personal choice and notes that some people, like him, favor the country, while others favor the city.<sup>41</sup> In *Satire 2.6*, he presents himself as preferring the country and lamenting the bothersome life in Rome. The country mouse in the poem similarly prefers the country. He is

---

<sup>39</sup> Braund (1989) 40; Harrison (2007) 236, 240.

<sup>40</sup> It is worth noting here that Cicero too saw landscape removed from Rome as the ideal place for philosophy. See Spencer (2010) 65-68.

<sup>41</sup> Braund (1989) 43.

content with his life in the country until the city mouse convinces him to travel to the city, and, like Horace, chooses to return to the country again after he experiences city life. The city mouse, on the other hand, does not enjoy life in the country, but looks down on the simple food the country mouse offers him. He also chooses to remain in the city even after the dangers he and the country mouse experience during their banquet in the rich man's home, showing that he prefers the excitement and luxury of the city over the simple and modest safety of the country.

Horace sometimes writes about characters who change their minds about their preference for the city or the country. In these cases, the change of heart is often due to a desire for a version of the country or city which is not in line with reality. The country mouse plays this role in *Satire* 2.6. In this case, the country mouse initially is content with his life in the country but is induced to go to the city because the city mouse convinces him that life is better there. The city mouse characterizes his friend the country mouse as suffering (*patientem*, *Sat.* 2.6.91) in his home in the woods and scorns the forest where the country mouse lives, describing it as wild (*ferus*, *Sat.* 2.6.92). He also tells the country mouse that life is too short not to enjoy it (*Sat.* 2.6.97) and encourages him to choose the city instead, telling him to live happily in pleasant circumstances (*in rebus iucundis vive beatus*, *Sat.* 2.6.96).

The message the city mouse conveys to the country mouse is that life in the country is unnecessarily difficult and lacking in amenities, while life in the city is carefree and pleasant. When the country mouse experiences the city for himself, however, he discovers that the image of the city that enticed him to leave his home in the country is more of a fantasy than a reality. The real city life does feature luxury as the city mouse promised, but it also includes unexpected fears and dangers, such as the dogs in the rich man's house, which the country mouse did not experience in his peaceful life in the country. The fantasy of the city life for which the country

mouse leaves his home does not match what he finds when he visits the city in reality. The story of the country mouse and city mouse is a fable and does not describe the experience of being in any specific city, but the inclusion of it in a poem so concerned with Horace's representation of his own feelings about Rome serves to localize the story and align it specifically with the experience of being in Rome. The generic story of the country mouse in the city serves to reinforce the parallel characterization of Horace as someone who longs to escape Rome and live in the country.

In some ways, though, Horace's rejection of Rome in this poem is more complicated than it seems at first glance. Although he claims to be frustrated with his obligations in the city, there are moments in which Horace readily becomes caught up in the activities of Rome while he is there. He complains about the god Janus rousing him in the morning to do favors for his friends, but it is telling that part of Janus' exhortation is the threat, "press on, lest someone else perform your duty first" (*ne prior officio quisquam respondeat, urge, Sat. 2.6.24*). Despite his complaints about not wanting to attend to these duties, this line shows that he must get some enjoyment from helping his friends if the threat of someone outdoing him in his favors sufficiently rouses him to perform them himself. If he truly did not want to perform these tasks, he would be relieved rather than anxious about someone else doing them in his place.

Horace seems similarly annoyed when strangers ask him for information because they know he has connections to Maecenas and other powerful people (*Sat. 2.6.51-58*), but he also openly relishes these connections. When someone angrily points out that he is pushing his way through the crowd because he is on his way to see Maecenas, he says, "this pleases me and is like honey, I will not lie" (*hoc iuvat et melli est, non mentiar, Sat. 2.6.32*). He also immediately

follows his complaints about being asked to procure Maecenas' seal on some tablets by proudly counting the number of years since he has been Maecenas' friend (*Sat.* 2.6.40-42). He claims to be annoyed by the requests which come as a result of his relationship with Maecenas, but he uses these requests as an opportunity to remind us of how proud he is of that privileged relationship.

Horace's professed preference for the country over the city is similarly complex. He often praises the life in the country, but his vision of this life is not entirely representative of that of a true rustic. The life Horace describes on his farm in *Satire* 2.6 is not one of work and farming, but of leisure. He asks himself, "when I have removed myself from the city to the mountains and my citadel, what should I first bring to light with my satires and pedestrian muse?" (*ubi me in montis et in arcem ex urbe removi, / quid prius illustrem satiris musaque pedestri?*, *Sat.* 2.6.16-17), showing that he plans to write poetry when he gets to the country and characterizing the country as a place for writing and poetic inspiration.<sup>42</sup> He also says he will enjoy "now the books of the ancients, now sleep and idle hours" (*nunc veterum libris, nunc somno et inertibus horis*, *Sat.* 2.6.61) on his farm and imagines having dinner parties with his friends involving drinking and philosophical discussion (*Sat.* 2.6.63-76).

All of these are not activities of a true farmer, but those of a man from the city who can afford to come to the country and spend his time there in leisure while others do the actual farm work. Connors has emphasized the productive aspect of *otium* as time spent in reading and learning as opposed to wasteful time spent going to games, baths, and other attractions.<sup>43</sup> Although this type of *otium* makes writing poetry in the country a productive use of Horace's leisure time, it is not an activity related to the work of his farm. Horace's construction of his country experience thus exemplifies two of the broad themes Williams discusses, namely the

---

<sup>42</sup> Leach (1988) 211, Harrison (2007) 244-245.

<sup>43</sup> Connors (2000) 493-494.

extraction of hardship, work, and workers in pastoral poetry,<sup>44</sup> and the tendency of city-dwellers to fantasize more about retreat from the city than participation in the actual country life.<sup>45</sup>

The vision of the country life presented here is also problematic because it is influenced in some ways by life in the city of Rome. Horace rejects the petty gossip and rules of drinking found at banquets in Rome, but his mention of them still reveals his awareness of parties and entertainment in the city and frames his country meals in terms of the city dinner parties which he rejects. In this way, Horace's simple country banquet is also one clearly hosted by someone familiar with the city and knowingly rejecting it in favor of a rustic atmosphere. The inclusion of philosophical discussion in Horace's country feast also reveals its city influence. The concern for philosophy adds sophistication that is not characteristic of the simple rustic life of the country. The modest food may be native to the country, but the presence of philosophy in this dinner reveals that Horace's life in the country is not the authentic life of a farmer, but rather the life of an enlightened man from Rome merely transferred to the less hectic environment of the country. Ultimately, Horace's country fantasy is unrealistic and unattainable, revealing his true characterization of himself in this poem not as a country-dweller, but as a man who belongs in the city.

#### Other Works

A number of poems in Horace's other works construct the relationship between himself and the city of Rome in much the same way as in *Satire 2.6*. They similarly represent the city as a place of bothersome duties. In *Epistle 2.2*, Horace says that one reason he is unable to write poetry in the city is because he is too busy with other obligations. He says that while he is in the

---

<sup>44</sup> Williams (1973) 30-33.

<sup>45</sup> Williams (1973) 46-48.

city, “this person calls me to be his advocate, this person to hear his poetry with all my other duties put aside” (*hic sponsum vocat, hic auditum scripta relictis / omnibus officiis, Epist. 2.2.67-68*), echoing his responsibilities as a sponsor which he mentioned in *Satire 2.6* and adding his duties to other poets as well. He also cites obligations to people who need him in other ways, saying that he must visit sick friends in different parts of the city from the Quirinal to the Aventine (*Epist. 2.2.68-69*). Similarly, in *Epistle 1.14*, he says that his sense of duty and care (*pietas et cura*) have kept him in Rome consoling his friend Lamia whose brother has died (*Epist. 1.14.6-8*) and refers to this duty as a hindering barrier (*obstantia claustra, Epist. 1.14.9*). Later in the same poem, he says that hateful business (*invisa negotia, Epist. 1.14.17*) brings him back to Rome when he is away.

The depiction of the city as a place of anxiety also appears outside of *Satire 2.6*. In *Epistle 2.2*, Horace says he cannot write poetry in Rome amid so many cares and labors (*inter tot curas totque labores, Epist. 2.2.66*). In *Ode 3.29*, he tells Maecenas that a trip to the country will ease his anxious brow (*sollicitam frontem, Ode 3.29.16*) from his worries in the city. Later in this poem he says to Maecenas, “you worry about what condition befits the state and you anxiously fear for the city” (*tu civitatem quis deceat status / curas et urbi sollicitus times, Ode 3.29.25-26*). The repetition of the word *sollicitus* here, just as in *Satire 2.6*, shows that the city is a place of worry and mental disturbance, while the verbs *curo* and *timeo* in this passage reinforce the representation of fear and anxiety as part of life in the city both for Horace and his friends.

Horace’s other poems describe the city as loud and chaotic as well. In *Ode 3.29*, Horace encourages Maecenas to leave Rome for the country to escape the smoke and noise (*strepitum, Ode 3.29.12*) of Rome. In *Epistle 2.2*, he describes the streets of Rome in the following way: “a hotheaded contractor rushes by with mules and porters, a vast crane hurls now a rock, now a

beam, sad funerals struggle with oak wagons, this way a savage dog flees, this way a muddy pig rushes about” (*festinat calidus mulis gerulisque redemptor, / torquet nunc lapidem, nunc ingens machina tignum, / tristia robustis luctantur funera plaustris, / hac rabiosa fugit canis, hac lutulenta ruit sus, Epist. 2.2.72-75*). The emphasis here again is on how crowded the streets are and the lack of order as people and animals push their way through the street together. He also says in this poem that the city of Rome features loud noises throughout night and day (*strepitus nocturnos atque diurnos, Epist. 2.2.79*), reminding us of the *strepitum* in *Satire 2.6* and *Ode 3.29*, and that he is in the middle of waves and storms (*fluctibus in mediis et tempestatibus, Epist. 2.2.85*) while he is in the city, again suggesting that the city is unpredictable and disordered. With all this noise, anxiety, and chaos, it is unsurprising that Horace claims he is not able to sleep in the city (*Epist. 1.10.18*).

The luxury of Rome described in *Satire 2.6* appears in other poems as well. In *Ode 3.29*, Horace invites Maecenas to leave behind the wealth (*copiam, Ode 3.29.9*) and riches (*opes, Ode 3.29.12*) of the city in favor of a simpler life in the country. He also refers to Rome as royal (*regia, Epist. 1.7.44*) in *Epistle 1.7*. Both of these poems view Rome as exceedingly wealthy and lavish, just as the country mouse found the city when he left his home in the country and traveled there in *Satire 2.6*.

One of Horace’s poems, *Epode 16*, takes his criticism of Rome even further by characterizing it as a place of civil war. At the opening of this poem, Horace says, “now another age is worn away by civil wars, and Rome itself is ruined by its own strength” (*altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas, / suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit, Epod. 16.1-2*). Significantly, in these lines Horace does not say that the Roman people are destroying each other, but that Rome itself, the city, is destroying itself. In this way, Horace parallels Livy, who states in his preface that Roman

morals have deteriorated to the point that the Romans of his time can no longer endure their own vices or the cures for them (*Ab Urbe Condita*, Pr. 9).

Horace's solution to this problem is for all of the Romans to abandon Rome entirely. He encourages them to leave by saying, "you, for whom there is courage, do away with womanly grief and fly beyond the Etruscan shores" (*vos quibus est virtus, muliebrum tollite luctum, / Etrusca praeter et volate litora*, *Epod.* 16.39-40). Here he equates the typical Roman value of *virtus* with the abandonment of the city of Rome. By suggesting that the abandonment of the city is the true way of enacting *virtus*, Horace suggests that the city of Rome itself is the source of the Romans' self-destruction, even though it is not the place where the battles of the civil wars have actually taken place. Despite their shared concerns over the dissolution of political stability in Rome, Horace's perspective here starkly contrasts with Livy's portrayal of the city as a unifying force for the Romans. For Livy, even when civil strife threatens to ruin the state, the city of Rome and the shared connection the Roman people have forged with it have the power to bind them together in peace. Horace, however, emphasizes the Romans' ongoing alienation from each other while they continue to inhabit the same divisive city.

This poem has proven to be a difficult one for scholars to interpret and there are a number of different opinions on both its (in)sincerity and how it fits in with the rest of the *Epodes*.<sup>46</sup> In many ways, the poem differs from others in Horace's works. For example, scholars have noted how extremely pessimistic and bleak it is in its outlook and message.<sup>47</sup> One way this pessimism is brought out is through the poem's relationship to Vergil's *Eclogue* 4. Although there has been much debate over which of these poems was written first, the general consensus is that Vergil's preceded Horace's, making *Epode* 16 a more cynical response to the eclogue's optimistic hope

---

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Watson (2003) 479, 485.

<sup>47</sup> Mankin (1995) 245, Watson (2003) 479.

for peace and an end to civil wars.<sup>48</sup> One possible explanation for the epode's pessimism is that it was written early in Horace's career, probably around 39-38 BC (Watson identifies it as one of the earliest poems Horace wrote<sup>49</sup>), and thus is more concerned with the topic of civil war than his later poems, such as the epistles discussed above.

*Epode* 16 also differs from Horace's other poems in its attitude toward the city and its poetic voice. The alienation from the city as a result of civil war in this poem echoes the alienation Horace describes in his other poems about the city as a place of tedious obligation and disorder, but here it is constructed differently. In the satires and epistles discussed above, Horace's alienation from the city is personal, pertaining mostly to him as an individual. In *Epode* 16, however, alienation from the city is constructed as universal, pertaining to all Romans, and has significantly more serious and destructive consequences.

The poetic voice of the poem also diverges from that of Horace's other works. Scholars have argued that the poem features parallels with Sibylline and Oriental prophecies<sup>50</sup> and thus characterizes Horace as a *vates*,<sup>51</sup> giving him a prophetic and divine authority that he does not have in his other poems.<sup>52</sup> Watson has also noticed that the language in the poem parallels that of speakers in a public assembly,<sup>53</sup> making Horace into an *auctor sententiae*, the author of a proposal put forward to the senate or the people.<sup>54</sup> Horace here plays the part of a political figure involved in the management of the state, contrasting with his characterization of himself elsewhere as uninvolved in important political decisions and discourse. Horace's narrative of

---

<sup>48</sup> Mankin (1995) 244-245, Watson (2003) 486-488.

<sup>49</sup> Watson (2003) 2, 487-488.

<sup>50</sup> Macleod (1979) 220, Watson (2003) 481.

<sup>51</sup> Mankin (1995) 270, Watson (2003) 530.

<sup>52</sup> Watson (2003) 530.

<sup>53</sup> Watson (2003) 502.

<sup>54</sup> Watson (2003) 499.

departure from Rome here thus precipitates his assumption of a poetic persona at odds with the one(s) he creates for himself in his later works.

Horace's portrayal of the country as a refuge from the responsibilities and dangers of the city in *Satire 2.6* appears in other poems as well. In *Epistle 1.14*, he says to the steward of his farm, "you know that I am consistent with myself and I depart sadly, whenever hateful business drags me to Rome" (*me constare mihi scis et discedere tristem, / quandocumque trahunt invisita negotia Romam, Epist. 1.14.16-17*). Here, he is sad to leave the country for Rome because it means he must give up his freedom and return to his commitments in the city. Similarly, in *Ode 3.29* he encourages Maecenas to seize himself away (*eripe te, Ode 3.29.5*) and desert (*desere, Ode 3.29.9*) the bustle of Rome and come to his country estate, again stressing that the country is a place free from the city's obligations. Horace also says in *Epistle 1.7* that he wishes to stay in the country longer than he originally planned because he is afraid of becoming sick when he returns to the city (*Epist. 1.7.1-4*), depicting the country as more healthy than the city.

Horace's other works also favor the simplicity of the country. In *Ode 3.29*, he offers Maecenas elegant dinners of the poor under a small Lar (*mundaeeque parvo sub lare pauperum cenae, Ode 3.29.14-15*) while he is in the country trying to convince Maecenas to join him. Similarly, in *Epistle 1.7*, he says, "small things befit a small man: now royal Rome does not please me, but empty Tibur or peaceful Tarentum" (*parvum parva decent: mihi iam non regia Roma, / sed vacuum Tibur placet aut imbelle Tarentum, Epist. 1.7.44-45*). In both of these passages, Horace emphasizes that the country features a simple life with simple amenities and prefers these to the luxury and excess of the city.

Just as Horace sees leaving Rome for the country as an escape from the city's obligations, cares, and luxury, he also presents an idealized country landscape as the solution to the Roman problem with civil war in *Epode* 16. In his proposal to abandon Rome in this poem, Horace suggests that the Romans board a ship and sail for the Isles of the Blessed. There he envisions a new golden age for the Romans in a peaceful world without work, saying, "let us seek the fields, the happy fields, and the Isles of the Blessed, where the unplowed earth puts forth grain every year and the unpruned vineyard thrives continuously" (*arva, beata / petamus arva, divites et insulas, / reddit ubi Cererem tellus inarata quotannis / et imputata floret usque vinea, Epod.* 16.41-44). He also says that this place features olives, figs, and honey (*Epod.* 16.45-47), that the goats there come to be milked willingly (*Epod.* 16.49-50), and that there are no predators or disease to threaten the livestock (*Epod.* 16.51-52, 61). It is significant that the landscape here is pastoral, not urban. Horace does not describe a new city for the Romans to move to, but an idealized version of the country.<sup>55</sup> For Horace in this poem, the way to solve the city's problems and move beyond the era of civil war is not in reinventing the physical space of the city—as Augustus did—but in abandoning it and turning to the country instead.

There are ways in which Horace undercuts the fantasy he has created here, though. As noted above, his identification of himself as a *vates* in the poem links him with the power of prophecy and gives his words divine authority. There is, however, a more insidious side to this connection. Mankin and Watson both note that Horace's role as a *vates* here also ties him to its negative associations with deceit and false prophecy, thereby undermining the true authority of his claims.<sup>56</sup> Mankin additionally argues that the golden age to which Horace looks forward can never actually be achieved, in large part because it is predicated upon an unrealistic fantasy of a

---

<sup>55</sup> Mankin (1995) 263.

<sup>56</sup> Mankin (1995) 272, Watson (2003) 530.

life in the country without toil.<sup>57</sup> Horace thus limits the power of the country to solve Rome's problems by making it impossible to realize. The futility of Horace's proposed pastoral solution to the endless cycle of Roman civil wars further reflects the pessimistic tone and poetic voice of the poem as discussed above, setting it apart from his other poems on the benefits of life in the country.

As in *Satire* 2.6, Horace's other works present the preference for the country or the city as a personal choice. In *Epistle* 1.14 to the steward of his farm, Horace portrays himself as preferring the country, while the steward favors the city. He highlights the differences between the two of them by saying, "I say that the person living in the country is happy, you say it is the person living in the city" (*rure ego viventem, tu dicis in urbe beatum, Epist.* 1.14.10). Here he emphasizes that he and the steward find happiness in different places. He further shows that he and the steward have different perceptions of the city and country when he says, "for what you consider desolate and deserted wastelands, someone who agrees with me calls pleasant and hates what you think is beautiful" (*nam quae deserta et inhospita tesqua / credis, amoena vocat mecum qui sentit, et odit / quae tu pulchra putas, Epist.* 1.14.19-21). Although Horace views the country as a welcome retreat from the city, he is aware that others, including his steward, see it as deserted and lacking in the amenities of the city. He also notes that another servant in the city envies the steward's job in the country (*Epist.* 1.14.41-42), emphasizing that the choice between the city and country is entirely a personal one and not, for example, based on one's status in life, since one servant, the steward, prefers the city while another servant longs for the country.

The differences in preference for the city or country even appear within Horace's own circle of friends. In *Epistle* 1.10, Horace greets his friend Fuscus by saying, "I, a lover of the

---

<sup>57</sup> Mankin (1995) 261.

country, greet Fuscus, a lover of the city, the two of us being certainly very different in this one thing, but in other things being almost twins, with the minds of brothers” (*urbis amatorem Fuscum salvere iubemus / ruris amatores, hac in re scilicet una / multum dissimiles, at cetera paene gemelli / fraternis animis, Epist. 1.10.1-4*). Here we see that Horace and his friend each have a different preference for the city or the country, despite the fact that they are similar in other ways, stressing the personal nature of the choice between city and country. He also highlights their different perceptions of the country and city when he says, “I live and I rule as soon as I have left those places which you bear to the sky with your favorable report” (*vivo et regno simul ista reliqui / quae vos ad caelum fertis rumore secundo, Epist. 1.10.8-9*). These lines emphasize Horace’s sense of freedom and peace of mind in the country, while Fuscus praises Rome beyond all other places. They also draw attention to Horace’s desire to leave Rome, while Fuscus would rather stay there.

Like the country mouse in *Satire 2.6*, there are other characters in Horace’s poetry who switch between the country and the city based on false perceptions. In these cases, the reality of this switch eventually leads to disappointment and a return to the character’s former life. Just as the country mouse in *Satire 2.6* ultimately chooses to go back to his country life when he experiences the reality of the danger of life in the city (*Sat. 2.6.115-117*), Horace similarly notes in *Epistle 1.14* that the steward who now longs for the city actually once wanted to come to the country. He says to the steward, “you, while you were a servant, kept seeking the country with a silent prayer, and now as a farm steward, you ask for the city and the games and the baths,” (*tu mediastinus tacita prece rura petebas, / nunc urbem et ludos et balnea vilicus optas, Epist. 1.14.14-15*). When the steward comes to the country that he used to desire and realizes what it is actually like, he begins to long for his life in the city again.

In *Epistle* 1.7, Horace tells a similar story of the city-dweller Volteius, who praises the country and buys a farm with the help of his patron Philippus. After Volteius leaves Rome for the country, however, he experiences the true hardships of farming when “the sheep were lost to theft, the goats to disease, the crops deceived his hope, and the ox was worn out by plowing,” (*oves furto, morbo periere capellae, / spem mentita seges, bos est enectus arando, Epist.* 1.7.86-87). In response, Volteius goes to Philippus’ house and begs him to return him to his previous life in Rome (*Epist.* 1.7.95). Here, just as the country mouse and the farm steward did, Volteius realizes that his fantasy of a new life was not entirely realistic and learns to better appreciate the life he had before.

Horace’s explanation for these changes of heart, as he explains in *Epistle* 1.14 to the farm steward, is that people always foolishly praise the lives of others over their own (*Epist.* 1.14.11-12). For Horace, the desire to switch between the country and city life is not really about the country or the city themselves or any intrinsic quality of either of them, but rather reflects a generic human dissatisfaction and desire for change. From a poetic perspective, though, each of the attitudes toward the city and the country among Horace’s characters also reflects the particular persona of its speaker. The variety in these attitudes and the personae they represent prompts us to consider Horace’s own opinions on the city and country in his poetry as similarly reflecting the poetic persona he creates for himself.

One poem that particularly highlights this issue is *Epode* 2. This poem features a long praise of the country that is anonymous until the last four lines, when the speaker is revealed to be Alfius, a money-lender from the city. A major focus of scholarship on this poem has been on how out of place Alfius’ praise of the country is for such a typically urban character. Mankin and Watson have both argued that the poem’s surprise ending is not as surprising as we might think

and that there are clues earlier in the poem suggesting that its narrator is not Horace but, in Mankin's words, "a ridiculous imposter."<sup>58</sup>

Many of these clues lie in the elements of the poem that reveal how unrealistic and naïve Alfius' image of the rustic life is. He envisions life in the country as relaxing and full of leisure, without work or toil.<sup>59</sup> For example, he says it is pleasing to see the pastured sheep hurrying home (*iuvat pastas ovis / videre properantis domum, Epod. 2.61-62*). Instead of picturing himself herding the flocks on their way home, he imagines idly watching them from above as they come home on their own, making him an observer rather than a participant in the work of the farm.<sup>60</sup> He also envisions himself watching "the slaves, the crowd of a rich house, smiling around the Lares" (*vernas, ditis examen domus, / circum residentis Lares, Epod. 2.65-66*). The crowd of slaves and the reference to a wealthy house here seems more like what the money-lender would find in the city than what a simple life in the country would truly include. In this way, Alfius' vision of the country more closely resembles life on a wealthy villa than on a modest farm.<sup>61</sup> The life to which the money-lender looks forward in the country is a fantasy, not an authentic version of the rustic life.

In a number of ways, though, Alfius' reasons for desiring the country resemble the ones Horace gives in his other poems about the city and the country. He envisions the country as a place far from business (*procul negotiis, Epod. 2.1*), just as Horace wanted to escape from his obligations in the city. He looks forward to a peaceful country life abounding in flocks, herds, honey, and various fruits (*Epod. 2.11-20, 61-64*). He longs for sleep near a spring (*Epod. 2.27-28*), just as Horace looked forward to better sleep in the country. He rejects the delicacies of

---

<sup>58</sup> Mankin (1995) 63; Watson (2003) 80, 84, 86.

<sup>59</sup> Mankin (1995) 64, 68.

<sup>60</sup> Mankin (1995) 70, 85; Watson (2003) 93; Gowers (2012) 86-87.

<sup>61</sup> Gowers (2012) 86-87.

dinner parties in the city such as shellfish and African birds (*Epod.* 2.49-55), in favor of a more simple country diet of foods such as olives and lamb (*Epod.* 2.55-60), just as Horace longs for a simple country banquet in *Satire* 2.6.

For Mankin, the naivety in Alfius' fantasy indicates that he does not truly belong in the country and consequently differs from Horace in his outlook on the rustic life.<sup>62</sup> But Horace reveals some of the same opinions of the country as Alfius does. Upon first reading, *Epode* 2 seems as if it could be another one of Horace's poems praising the country in his own voice. The surprising revelation that a money-lender is the actual narrator at the end of the poem, though, causes us to wonder if Horace's own descriptions of the country in his other poems may be similarly disingenuous and representative of a poetic persona. If Alfius is able to fool us with his unrealistic portrayal of the country, perhaps Horace too is fooling us with his portrayal of the country all along. By creating a parallel between himself and Alfius in this poem, as Watson argues he does,<sup>63</sup> Horace to some degree aligns himself with the persona of the money-lender, rather than setting himself up against it. Alfius' perspective on departure from Rome here draws attention to the insincerity of the city-dweller's rustic fantasy and suggests that Horace's own praise for the country elsewhere is as much of a poetic construct as that of the money-lender, even if it is more convincing.

There are also moments in Horace's poetry which suggest that his claims of preferring the country over the city are not so reliable. He sometimes changes his mind about whether he likes the country or the city better. In *Satire* 2.7, Horace's slave Davus criticizes him for being capricious about his feelings for the country and Rome, saying, "in Rome, you long for the

---

<sup>62</sup> Mankin (1995) 63.

<sup>63</sup> Watson (2003) 85.

country; in the country, you, fickle, raise the faraway city to the stars” (*Romae rus optas, absentem rusticus urbem / tollis ad astra levis, Sat. 2.7.28-29*). The act of raising the city to the stars here recalls Fuscus bearing the city of Rome to the sky in *Epistle 1.10*, thereby casting Horace as a great lover of Rome just like him.

In *Epistle 1.8*, Horace himself says he has trouble deciding between the country and the city, saying, “being changeable, in Rome I love Tibur, but in Tibur I love Rome” (*Romae Tibur amem ventosus, Tibure Romam, Epist. 1.8.12*). As much as Horace criticizes others for their dissatisfaction with their current lot and their desire to change their surroundings, in these two poems Horace appears guilty of the same behavior himself. He may claim that being in the city annoys him, but leaving Rome for the country also causes him to miss the city. In this way, Horace’s attachment to place is in fact divided between the city and the country, rather than entirely centered on the country.

Horace’s pride in his contacts in the city appears outside of *Satire 2.6* as well. In *Satire 2.7*, Davus says that although Horace purports to be relieved when he is not invited to a dinner party while he is in Rome (*Sat. 2.7.29-32*), as soon as he is invited to a dinner by Maecenas, he immediately begins rushing about in his haste to make it there in time (*Sat. 2.7.32-35*). Davus here exposes the pretense of the frustration which Horace expressed with the city and its social obligations in *Satire 2.6*, the preceding poem.<sup>64</sup> The fact that Horace is so easily enticed by his connections in the city casts doubt on the sincerity of his constant longing for the country and makes him seem like more of a city-lover than he would have us believe. Similarly, while praising the modest rustic life to his steward in *Epistle 1.14*, Horace says that he prefers a simple meal in the country despite the fact that he has previously also enjoyed Falernian wine, worn a toga, and made his hair shiny (*Epist. 1.14.32-35*). He may praise the simple country life in this

---

<sup>64</sup> Harrison (2007) 237.

particular poem, but he still makes a point to mention his familiarity with the toga and other marks of urban importance and luxury, casting him as a man who is comfortable not only in the country but in the sophisticated city as well. The mention of the toga here connects Horace's urban refinement particularly to a Roman context, highlighting that he belongs in the city of Rome specifically, rather than simply in a generic urban setting.

The unrealistic life of leisure in the country that Horace looks forward to in *Satire 2.6* reappears in his *Epistles*. In *Epistle 1.14*, Horace describes his steward doing the real work of the farm, including tilling the fields and caring for the cows (*Epist.* 1.14.26-28), while Horace himself engages in a simple dinner and sleep in the grass (*Epist.* 1.14.35). In *Epistle 1.7*, Horace describes Volteius' experience in the country as one full of toil and grief as he loses his livestock and his crops fail (*Epist.* 1.7.86-88), but these sufferings are absent from his poetry about his own experiences in the country. This reveals that Horace is aware of the hardships of the country, but erases them from his portrayal of what his life in the country is like. Like Volteius in *Epistle 1.7* and the money-lender in *Epode 2*, Horace envisions an unrealistic life of leisure in the country, but unlike Volteius or the money-lender, Horace's poems about his experience in the country suggest that he is actually able to achieve this life of leisure when he leaves Rome and goes to his Sabine farm.

Horace therefore characterizes himself as similar to the other figures in his poetry who switch between wanting to live in the country and the city. The country mouse in *Satire 2.6* does rejoice in his changed lot (*gaudet mutata sorte*, *Sat.* 2.6.110) temporarily when he goes to the city, but eventually tires of the city and decides to leave and go back to his life in the country. Likewise, Horace seems to enjoy some parts of his life in the city for a while, but also grows weary of its obligations and anxieties and wants to leave for the country. The difference between

Horace and the country mouse, however, is that unlike the country mouse, who goes home to the country for good and does not return to the city after his first experience there, Horace continually returns to Rome and leaves it again for the country.

Horace may portray himself as alienated by certain elements of city life, but he also remains attached to Rome and does not think of his departures for the country as permanent. This makes Horace similar to the money-lender in *Epode 2*, who praises the country life and fantasizes about moving to the country, but ultimately does not commit to leaving Rome and goes on with his life there. He is also like Volteius in *Epistle 1.7* and the steward in *Epistle 1.14*, who say they long for the country but also feel an unexpected desire for Rome after they have departed. Horace criticizes others for their fickleness and dissatisfaction with their current lot, but as Davus points out to him in *Satire 2.7*, he himself is susceptible to the same behavior as he appreciates both the country and the city and feels torn between the two of them. As Harrison notes, Horace “is both the town mouse and the country mouse,”<sup>65</sup> and the complicated nature of his presentation of Rome and the country “raises the question of whether Horace...is serious about his rustic idyll.”<sup>66</sup> Just as Horace’s characters exhibit different attitudes toward the city, his own persona also displays different and even conflicting outlooks on the city, rather than a single unified one. His fluctuating perspective on the city is not a sincere representation of his own personal feelings, but rather a poetic construct that serves different purposes at different times.

Horace’s departures from Rome for the country are not meant to replace or abandon Rome entirely, but to complement it with his time in the country. His time away from Rome is always temporary and he does not say that he plans to stay in the country forever or establish it

---

<sup>65</sup> Harrison (2007) 237.

<sup>66</sup> Harrison (2007) 238.

as his permanent home.<sup>67</sup> In *Epistle* 1.7 he tells Maecenas that he is delaying in the country longer than he promised (*Epist.* 1.7.1-2), but he does not say that he plans never to return to the city. In *Ode* 2.6 he expresses his desire to retire in Tibur, saying, “if only Tibur, founded by a Greek colonist, could be my home in my old age” (*Tibur Argeo positum colono / sit meae sedes utinam senectae*, *Ode* 2.6.5-6). Here the use of the word *sedes* does suggest that he plans to go to Tibur permanently, but not until he grows old, implying that until then he plans to live elsewhere, presumably between Rome and the country as in his other poems. It is also important to note that when Horace tires of the city and wants to get away from Rome, his longing is always for the country and not for other cities. Horace may want to escape the city of Rome from time to time, but he does not imagine another city worthy of replacing it. Even for Horace, whose relationship with Rome is fraught and complicated, Rome is the only city worth living in.

## Part II: Italian Road Trip

Horace’s journey to Brundisium in *Satire* 1.5 reinforces this view of Rome and provides a foil not only to the country but especially to Rome as Horace explores the world between the city and the country, namely that of small towns. The towns which Horace and his companions visit in this poem are not quite like the country or the city. First, they are not like the country. While at Aricia, Horace says the wicked gnats and frogs of the swamp prevent sleep (*mali culices ranaeque palustres / avertunt somnos*, *Sat.* 1.5.14-15), making this place quite unlike the country which provides him with restful sleep in his other poems. The arguing of the slaves and the boatmen in Aricia (*Sat.* 1.5.11-13) diverges from the peaceful, calm environment of the country as well. Horace’s health also takes a turn for the worse while on his journey as he suffers

---

<sup>67</sup> In this respect Horace differs starkly from the character Umbricius in Juvenal’s third satire, who does in fact leave Rome permanently. See Epilogue for more specific discussion of this poem in comparison to Horace and the other Augustan authors in this study.

from both stomach (*Sat.* 1.5.7-8) and eye problems (*Sat.* 1.5.30-31), contrasting with his description of the country in *Epistle* 1.7 as a place of good health. Horace may no longer be in Rome, but he has surely not returned to his preferred life of peace and leisure in the country.

Nor are the small towns in *Satire* 1.5 like Rome. Unlike in the city, Horace is not plagued by duties and obligations during his journey through the small towns of Italy and does not mention *officia* or *negotia* in this poem. He does mention Maecenas, Vergil, and other important people who accompany him on the trip, but in this poem he glosses over his relationships with these notable figures and does not utilize them as much as he does in other poems about his urban life. For these reasons, scholars have often characterized *Satire* 1.5 as a “disappointing” poem because it tantalizingly introduces the potential for details about Vergil, Maecenas, and the political events surrounding the journey, but ultimately remains silent on these fronts.<sup>68</sup> It is true that Horace thwarts our expectations in the poem and experiences disappointments of his own during his journey, but his departure from Rome here at least provides him with an escape from the tedium and stress of his duties in the city.

The small towns he visits in this poem also lack the luxury of the city. The modest hospitality (*hospitio modico*, *Sat.* 1.5.2) of Aricia and its terrible water (*aqua deterrima*, *Sat.* 1.5.7) which makes Horace sick signal from the beginning of the poem that this journey will not be one filled with the comfort of the city. The hard as stone (*lapidosus*, *Sat.* 1.5.91) bread in Canusium contrasts with the delicacies to be had at a city dinner party as well. Horace’s attitude toward the lack of luxury in this poem is different from that in his poems about the country, however. In the country, excessive luxury is replaced by healthful and welcome simplicity, but in the small towns of *Satire* 1.5, a lack of luxury equates to an unhealthy and unpleasant lack of the city’s amenities.

---

<sup>68</sup> Gowers (1993) 49, 59-61; Oliensis (1998) 27-29; Freudenburg (2001) 52-58; Gowers (2012) 182-183, 207, 205.

The towns Horace visits in this poem thus serve as a foil to the city of Rome. The first line of the poem, “Aricia received me after I departed from great Rome” (*egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma, Sat. 1.5.1*), establishes right away that Horace is leaving the great city of Rome and implies that the places he is going to will not be comparably great. The beginning of the second line, *hospitio modico*, reinforces this impression as Aricia becomes the first of many towns which are insignificant in comparison to the great city of Rome. There are moments in the poem in which the towns display a pretense of the importance we might find at Rome, but this importance is not genuine and is easily dismissed. For example, the prefect of Fundi takes inordinate pride in his toga and his dish of coal as the implements of his official position (*Sat. 1.5.34-36*), but the travelers do not take him seriously. Instead, they laugh at him for his pretense and are happy to leave the town (*Sat. 1.5.34-35*). Later, the people of Gnatia try to impress the travelers with a miracle of incense burning in their temple without any flame (*Sat. 1.5.99-100*), with a similar result. The travelers laugh and mock the town (*Sat. 1.5.98*), and Horace himself says that he knows better than to believe in signs sent to mortals from the gods (*Sat. 1.5.100-103*).

Despite their attempts to impress the travelers, the towns in *Satire 1.5* are poor comparisons with the great city of Rome because they lack the amenities of Rome, are not populated by important people as Rome is, and do not exert any power over the rest of the world as Rome does. As much as Horace criticizes Rome and longs for the country while he is there, he also emphasizes that the towns he has traveled through in Italy are no match for the sophistication and importance of the great city of Rome. Although he does not directly compare these towns to Rome beyond the first line, Rome is the obvious point of comparison for the places in this poem. The inability of the towns to compete in a comparison with Rome shows

Horace's esteem for Rome and the high position he assigns it within the world. In this way, *Satire 1.5* is not merely an anticlimactic description of a journey through Italy, but also an indirect reflection of Horace's relationship with the city of Rome.

### Conclusion

In some ways, Horace's poetry is consistent with the bigger picture of Augustan literature and the role of the city within it. Horace may characterize himself as alienated from the city because of his frustrations and annoyances there, but he also at times reveals attachment to the city and in particular a deep personal knowledge of Rome which is characteristic of Augustan literature as a whole. He exhibits a sense of belonging in Rome and spends his time with different people in different locations spread out all over the city. He praises Rome as the best city and longs for some aspects of his life there while he is away. He also enjoys his connections with other people in the city and represents himself as an insider among important people in Rome. As part of Maecenas' prestigious circle of poets, Horace is deeply involved in the intellectual and literary world of Rome, making him at home among other urban poets of the Augustan period and thus at home in the urban environment of Rome, despite his claims of rejecting the city and favoring a rustic life in the country.

In other ways, though, Horace's presentation of his relationship to Rome is distinct from that of other Augustan authors. He is more open to the possibility of leaving Rome than Ovid, Livy, and Propertius, who almost exclusively associate negative consequences with departure from Rome. Unlike Ovid, whose grief at being forced to leave Rome is inconsolable, Horace leaves Rome willingly and looks forward to his vacations away from the city. Horace's departures from the city do not undermine his personal connections to the city, unlike Livy's

characters, who lose their Roman identity and their place within Roman society when they leave Rome. Nor does he associate leaving the city with the immediate dissolution of his poetic endeavors as Propertius does. Although he shares his longing for the country with Tibullus, Horace nevertheless displays more outward admiration and appreciation for the city of Rome and embraces its urban space more readily than Tibullus does.

Scholars such as Freudenburg and Gowers have discussed Horace's lack of choice and freedom compared to his satiric predecessor Lucilius.<sup>69</sup> For Horace, the new political environment in Rome under Augustus hinders freedom of speech and leaves no room for the vitriol and invective found in Lucilius' satires from the republic. Although Horace does not have the same literary freedom as his predecessor, though, there are ways in which Horace's narratives of departure from Rome reveal a different kind of freedom that is lacking in these narratives in other Augustan authors. Unlike Ovid, who is forced to leave Rome and can never return, Horace has the freedom to leave Rome and return whenever he wants, making his departures from the city entirely dependent on his own choices and agency. Horace can afford to reject the urban space of Rome because he knows he can always return when he wants to. His departures never run the risk of truly disrupting his connection to Rome because they are always temporary and voluntary. This level of choice and power over departure and return to Rome is unique among the authors in this study and reflects Horace's distinct ability to fashion his relationship to Rome completely on his own terms.

One of the greatest distinctions between Horace and the other authors in this study is his use of diverse voices and perspectives in his narratives of departure or absence from Rome. Because Horace's satires are conceived of as conversations (*sermones*), they involve the poet

---

<sup>69</sup> Freudenburg (2001) 58; Gowers (2005) 48-50, 52.

assuming the voices and perspectives of different characters in addition to his own. Beyond speaking in the guise of others, the satirist can also freely invent different manifestations of his own persona. Another way Horace is different from the other authors in this study is that he has a public face within the city of Rome. Many of Horace's satires are written in the first person, just as elegiac poems are, but unlike elegy, satire is not constructed as personal poetry about the poet's private affairs behind (or just outside of) closed doors. Instead, Horace's satires place him in the public space of the city surrounded by other people. Oliensis argues that Horace presents himself as having a recognizable public face in his satires<sup>70</sup> and that his poems are "complex gestures performed before and for a variety of audiences."<sup>71</sup> Horace himself may not be a powerful person in Rome, but his association with people like Maecenas and Augustus, who are powerful, places him in the public eye and makes him into something of a spectacle. This is especially true in his second book of satires, which reflects his transformation "from a relative nobody into something of a somebody"<sup>72</sup> after the publication of his first book of satires and his admission into Maecenas' circle.

O'Sullivan further argues that there is a connection between a Roman's public face and the act of walking through the city. He notes that, in Roman thought, the way people walk makes them recognizable to others and indicates personal identity and status.<sup>73</sup> As a result, walking in Rome functions as a performance and puts the person walking on display for others to see.<sup>74</sup> Although O'Sullivan's book does not discuss Horace's poetry in any detail, his conclusions are particularly relevant to a 'pedestrian' genre like satire, in which walking in Rome features so

---

<sup>70</sup> Oliensis (1998) 18-19.

<sup>71</sup> Oliensis (1998) 3.

<sup>72</sup> Oliensis (1998) 46.

<sup>73</sup> O'Sullivan (2011) 13-28.

<sup>74</sup> O'Sullivan (2011) 7-8, 51-52.

prominently. The act of walking and physically moving through the city in Horace's satires is crucial for the creation of his persona.

Horace's narratives of departure or absence from Rome bring out these issues of poetic identity and persona in particularly interesting ways. Writing about the countryside allows Horace to explore and present widely varying perspectives on the city and the country in both his own voice and his characters' voices. It also allows him to experiment with different aspects of his own persona as he constructs his attitude toward the city differently at different times. At the same time though, actually being in the countryside can cause Horace to lose the public face that defines him as a satirist because it removes him from the public eye of the city. Although Horace does sometimes refer to writing in the country, the urban nature of satire requires him to maintain his connection to Rome in order to continue writing poetry in this genre. Horace does not explicitly suggest that his intermittent retreats from the city to the country undermine his poetic endeavors, but we do get the sense that he would no longer be a satirical poet if he were to leave the city permanently. Despite his frequent claims that he prefers the country to the city, it is always clear in Horace's narratives of leaving the city that his poetic persona belongs first and foremost in the urban space of Rome.

## Chapter 2

### Elegiac Departures: Propertius and Tibullus

Much of the scholarship on Propertius and Tibullus centers on their poetics and how each author represents the elegiac genre. Some of the more general topics often discussed in scholarship on elegy include the personal nature of elegiac poetry, its self-conscious awareness of literary form, and its place in the tradition of Hellenistic poetry. Scholars have noted that, as poetry that purports to be about personal experiences, elegy privileges private life over public life.<sup>1</sup> One way this is manifested is in elegy's rejection of military and public service in favor of the pursuit of love,<sup>2</sup> although elegy does sometimes appropriate and invert the imagery of war and military service for its own poetic purposes.<sup>3</sup>

The self-conscious nature of elegiac poetry has also been a major focus of scholarship on the genre. Elegiac poets are highly sensitive to generic expectations and how their poetry fits in with existing literary tradition(s). This sensitivity to literary form influences the way the elegiac poet characterizes himself and fashions his poetic persona to reflect the standards of his genre. It is also what drives the poet's *recusatio*, the self-conscious commitment to elegy and refusal to write epic or other serious poetry.<sup>4</sup> Elegy's rejection of epic in favor of more polished poetry places it within the Hellenistic tradition. There has been much discussion of Callimachean poetics in studies of both Propertius and Tibullus, though most scholars see a difference in the way each author deploys these poetics. Propertius, who refers to himself as the Roman

---

<sup>1</sup> Elder (1962) 78-79, Hubbard (1975) 23-24, Sullivan (1976) 116-117, Cairns (1979) 24, Wilson (2009) 176-177.

<sup>2</sup> Elder (1962) 78-79; Hubbard (1975) 93-94; Cairns (1979) 33; Stahl (1985) 93-94, 98; Kennedy (1993) 16-17; Lee-Stecum (1998) 108-109; Keith (2008) 143-146, 162-164; Wilson (2009) 176, 178-180; Bowditch (2012) 123; Miller (2012) 57.

<sup>3</sup> Stahl (1985) 93-94, 98; Kennedy (1993) 47; DeBrohun (2003) 83; Maltby (2006) 158-160; Keith (2008) 141, 144-146, 162-164; Wilson (2009) 177-180.

<sup>4</sup> Sullivan (1976) 138, Wilson (2009) 182-185, Bowditch (2012) 123.

Callimachus, is agreed to be more overtly and candidly influenced by Hellenistic poetry.<sup>5</sup>

Tibullus does not refer explicitly to his literary predecessors,<sup>6</sup> but scholars agree that he too writes in the Hellenistic tradition,<sup>7</sup> even if he is less self-conscious and overt than Propertius is about placing himself in this tradition.<sup>8</sup>

A relatively recent development in the study of elegy is the growing interest in how elegy, a characteristically urban genre, engages with the physical space of Rome.<sup>9</sup> Here, too, scholarship has revealed a difference between Propertius and Tibullus in their perspectives on the city. In studies of Propertius, scholars have shown that he actively engages with the space of Rome and its monuments in complex ways.<sup>10</sup> Studies of Tibullus, however, have focused on his portrayal of the countryside,<sup>11</sup> arguing that Tibullus attempts to replace the city with a pastoral fantasy that can never actually be achieved.<sup>12</sup>

My work is concerned with both lines of inquiry mentioned above and engages with scholarship on both the poetics of elegy and its perspective on the urban space of Rome. By bringing together these two threads that are usually treated separately, I contribute a new perspective to both topics. My discussion of narratives of departure from Rome in Propertius and Tibullus explores not only how elegiac poetics influence the poet's portrayal of absence from Rome, but also how the experience and circumstances of departure affect those poetics. I also contribute to the study of Propertius and Tibullus by considering questions of space and place for

---

<sup>5</sup> Hubbard (1975) 68-80, 92-95, 100-102, 111-115; Ross (1975) 114-115, 120-130; Sullivan (1976) 111-116, 121-122; Maltby (2006) 171-180.

<sup>6</sup> Elder (1962) 70-71, Luck (1969) 83-84.

<sup>7</sup> Luck (1969) 75, 79-81, 83-84, 92; Cairns (1979) 18-20, 21-24; Ball (1983).

<sup>8</sup> Elder (1962) 65-69; Luck (1969) 80, 92; Putnam (1982) 173-174.

<sup>9</sup> Hallett (2012) 274-275, Leach (2012) 135, Welch (2012) 103-105.

<sup>10</sup> Rothwell (1996) 829, 837-838, 841-842; Fantham (1997) 122, 129-135; DeBrohun (2003) 40-50, 82-85, 86-89; Welch (2005) 26-29, 34, 74-76.

<sup>11</sup> Elder (1962) 79-81; Luck (1969) 71-72, 77; Ross (1975) 158; Lyne (1980) 151-155; Ball (1983) 24-25, 30-31, 157-158; Miller (2012) 57-58.

<sup>12</sup> Luck (1969) 72-74, Ross (1975) 160, Lyne (1980) 158-163, Lee-Stecum (1998) 164-165.

both authors together. In this way, I find more common ground between the two authors than has been shown in the existing treatments of them separately.

This chapter considers departure from Rome in the elegiac poetry of Propertius and Tibullus with a focus on poems of these authors in which the elegiac lover or his beloved leave Rome or are absent from the city. Part I, “Departure of the Beloved,” discusses poems featuring the withdrawal of the poet-lover’s beloved from Rome. For Propertius, this includes 1.8 in which Cynthia contemplates leaving Rome on a sea journey and then ultimately decides to stay in the city; 1.11, 1.12, and 2.32, where Cynthia goes to disreputable places such as Baiae; 2.19 in which Cynthia departs for the country; and 4.3, the letter from the bride Arethusa to her husband who is away from Rome on a military campaign. The Tibullus poem in this section is 2.3, where Nemesis leaves Rome for her other lover’s farm in the country.

Part II, “Departure of the Lover,” considers poems about the withdrawal of the poet-lover himself from Rome. The Propertius poems in this section are 1.6, in which Propertius refuses a proposed journey abroad with his friend Tullus; 1.17, where Propertius leaves Rome by sea and suffers a shipwreck; and 3.22 in which Propertius renounces his ties to Rome and travels to Athens. The Tibullus poem included here is 1.3, where Tibullus is stranded on an island after embarking on a voyage with his friend Messalla.

Part III, “Departure of the Lover and the Beloved,” discusses poems in which the poet-lover and his beloved leave Rome together rather than separately. For Propertius, this section includes poem 2.32, where he and Cynthia brave the dangers of a sea journey together. The Tibullus poem in this section is 1.5, which features Tibullus’ fantasy about leaving Rome with Delia and living in the country together.

Leaving Rome in these poems coincides with the loss of love and a break away from the elegiac genre itself, thereby revealing elegy's fundamental attachment to the city of Rome. In almost all of Propertius' and Tibullus' poems featuring the departure of the beloved or the lover alone, this departure disrupts the lovers' affair by creating separation and infidelity in their relationship and causes suffering for the lover or the beloved or both. Some of these poems, including Propertius 1.8 and Tibullus 1.3, ultimately include the return of the beloved or lover who has left. This return restores the lovers' relationship and ends the disruption to it that accompanied the initial departure. In the poems in which the lover and beloved leave Rome together rather than separately, their shared departure alleviates the problems of separation and suffering that would otherwise occur if they left the city individually.

Despite the variations in the circumstances and outcomes of the departures featured in these poems, however, one thing they have in common is that in all cases the withdrawal of the elegiac beloved or lover from Rome, whether independently or together, coincides with the undermining of the usual features of elegiac poetry. These poems often invert the established roles of the lover and the beloved and the way they typically interact with each other. Many of these poems also introduce non-elegiac elements, such as parallels with epic and the pursuit of war and Roman imperialism. Because elegiac poetry is so preoccupied with poetic form and fashions itself so self-consciously as the antithesis of epic and other serious poetry, the epic elements ushered into elegy by the departure of the lover or his beloved from Rome serve to fundamentally undermine the poet-lover's identity as an elegist. The striking implication of this is that the city of Rome creates poetic form and identity for elegiac poets. The connection between the poet-lover, his beloved, and the city of Rome is necessary for both the success of the lovers' relationship and the production of elegy itself.

## Part I: Departure of the Beloved

### Propertius

In poem 1.8, Propertius initially laments his beloved Cynthia's planned departure from Rome by sea and later celebrates her decision to abandon the voyage and stay in Rome with him. When Cynthia is about to leave in the first half of the poem, Propertius represents her withdrawal from Rome as disruptive to their love. One reason for this disruption is that Cynthia's departure creates a physical divide between the two lovers as she sails away and Propertius stays behind. Propertius emphasizes his loneliness and alienation from Cynthia after her departure by saying that he stands calling her on an empty shore (*uacua in ora*, 1.8.15). Later, he refers to Cynthia as shut up in some port (*portu clausa*, 1.8.24), again highlighting her separation from him since she is in a faraway place and cannot come back to him.

Propertius also blames Cynthia's journey on her infidelity, claiming that she leaves because she wants to be with someone else (1.8.3-4). In this way, he connects Cynthia's physical withdrawal from Rome with their internal romantic division as Cynthia betrays her commitment to him. Other scholars have shown that separation is a standard motif in Roman elegy<sup>13</sup> and that the physical proximity and distance between lovers in elegy is used as a metaphor for the state of romantic relationships.<sup>14</sup> In this poem, departure from Rome specifically is connected with this separation and signifies the distance between the lovers both in physical and emotional terms.

Cynthia's departure and the hindrance it causes to the love between her and Propertius creates suffering for Propertius, which ideally should not be a part of love. In the first line of the poem, Propertius claims that Cynthia's care for him does not keep her from departing (*nec te mea cura moratur*, 1.8.1), implying that she no longer cares for him as she once did. He later

---

<sup>13</sup> Gunther (2006) 366-367.

<sup>14</sup> Kennedy (1993) 49.

hopes that the hostile breeze does not scatter his prayers (*neue inimica meas eleuet aura preces*, 1.8.12). Here, the hostility of the breeze that takes Cynthia away and its ability to nullify Propertius' prayers (*preces*) emphasizes its threatening nature, especially because prayers are normally quite important in the relationship between a lover and his beloved. Propertius stresses his suffering as a result of Cynthia's departure by portraying her as cruel (*crudelem*, 1.8.16) and false (*periura*, 1.8.17) for deciding to leave him and later says that he will complain on her threshold while she is away (*ego, uita, tuo limine verba querar*, 1.8.22). The description of the beloved as cruel and lying and the image of the lover at the beloved's threshold are typical of the lover's suffering in Latin love elegy, but here Propertius has explicitly connected these sufferings with Cynthia's departure from him and from the city of Rome.

Propertius also envisions sufferings for Cynthia herself in connection with her exit from Rome. In the first line, he accuses her of being out of her mind (*demens*, 1.8.1), associating her parting from him with madness. He later asks, "Can you tread on the frost set before you with your tender feet, and can you bear unaccustomed snow, Cynthia?" (*tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas, / tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre niues?*, 1.8.7-8), suggesting that she herself will face hardship and unpleasant weather while she is away from him in faraway lands. He implies that her journey itself will be unpleasant and full of suffering because it will require her to lie on a hard ship (*dura nave*, 1.8.6). It is worth noting here that *dura* is a word usually used to describe the mistress in Latin love elegy, but in this case, it is the mistress' ship that becomes *dura*, bringing about hardship and separation for the lover and the beloved alike.

In addition to presenting departure from Rome as disruptive to love and his relationship with Cynthia, Propertius portrays it as disruptive to elegiac poetry as well. The proposed withdrawal of Cynthia from Rome undermines the usual framework of elegiac tropes. The

unaccustomed snows (*insolitas niues*, 1.8.8) awaiting Cynthia are unaccustomed to her not only because she lives in Rome and is unused to a cold climate, but also because she is the elegiac beloved and is unaccustomed to suffering hardships herself. The usual role of the *puella* in elegy, and of Cynthia specifically in Propertius' other poems, is to cause suffering for the lover while not experiencing it firsthand. Cynthia does potentially cause suffering for Propertius in this poem by leaving him behind in her journey away from Rome, but it is unusual here that her journey will bring about hardships for herself, too. Similarly, the image of Cynthia shut up in a faraway port (*portu clausa*, 1.8.24) signifies a break from the usual elegiac image of the *puella* shut up in her house with the lover trying to get in. Cynthia may still be enclosed in a space where Propertius cannot access her, but in this case the distance is much greater and neither the lover nor the beloved can easily initiate a reunion.

Some of the language Propertius uses in the first half of this poem is more suited to the epic genre than to elegy. As Cynthia prepares to leave, Propertius asks her, "Are you able to bravely listen to the roaring of the raging sea?" (*tunc audire potes uesani murmura ponti / fortis*, 1.8.5-6). The description of Cynthia as brave (*fortis*, 1.8.6) in the face of a sea voyage here aligns her with epic heroes more than an elegiac *puella*. Similarly, the raging sea and the winds mentioned in this poem (*uento*, 1.8.4; *uentos*, 1.8.13), are images more often seen in epic journey and shipwreck scenes than in elegiac poetry. The departure of Cynthia from Rome in this poem is problematic for elegy not only because it jeopardizes the relationship between Propertius and his beloved, but also since it creates a break from the traditional elegiac framework and genre.

In contrast, Cynthia's change of heart and decision not to leave Rome in the second half of 1.8 restores the relationship between her and Propertius. It reunites them and restores their physical connection that was threatened by her planned departure. Propertius' proclamation that

“she remains here” (*hic manet*, 1.8.27) emphasizes their closeness, physical proximity, and the reversal of her leaving the city. Propertius later says, “I am dear to her and because of me, Rome is said to be dearest to her” (*illi carus ego et per me carissima Roma / dicitur*, 1.8.31-32). This statement explicitly links the city of Rome with Propertius’ role as lover and highlights the natural connection between the lover, the beloved, and Rome. For Propertius, love is at its best in Rome, not elsewhere. Cynthia’s decision to stay in the city eliminates her infidelity from the first half of the poem as well. At the beginning of the second half, Propertius says he has conquered his rivals, implying that Cynthia has abandoned her other lover with whom she intended to go away (1.8.27-28). At the end of the poem he says, “no rival takes my sure love away from me” (*nec mihi riualis certos subducit amores*, 1.8.45), showing that his relationship with Cynthia is stronger and more faithful after she decides to remain in Rome than when she was considering leaving. Just as the departure from Rome is associated with infidelity, here the abandonment of the departure is associated with fidelity and the reliability of love.

The abandonment of Cynthia’s voyage from Rome alleviates Propertius’ suffering and instead creates success in love for the lover. Cynthia finally heeds Propertius’ prayers (*preces*, 1.8.28), in contrast to the way the winds scattered his prayers in 1.8.12. Propertius describes Cynthia here as keeping her promises (*iurata*, 1.8.27), unlike how he characterized her as faithless (*periura*) in 1.8.17. Instead of making Propertius unhappy with her proposed departure earlier in the poem, here Cynthia makes him happy with her decision to return. At the end of the poem, Propertius says, “that glory will know my old age” (*ista meam norit gloria canitiem*, 1.8.46), signifying that this success in love is now lasting and not fleeting. For Propertius, Cynthia’s return to Rome coincides with new success and happiness in his relationship with her, just as her withdrawal from Rome led to erotic failure and suffering.

Cynthia's return also coincides with a return to the traditional elegiac framework as seen in Propertius' other poems and other Latin love elegy. Propertius rejoices in the second half of 1.8 that "my Cynthia has stopped going on new paths" (*destitit ire nouas Cynthia nostra uias*, 1.8.30). In a literal sense, this refers to Cynthia deciding to stay in Rome and not undertake an unaccustomed journey to faraway lands. From a genre point of view, however, this line suggests that Cynthia has veered away from taking elegy in an unusual direction by creating the long-term separation of lover and beloved which is not part of the usual elegiac repertoire. Cynthia's return to Rome is not only a return to Propertius, but also a return to more typical elegiac poetry and the more typical role of the *puella* herself. The second half of the poem further represents a return to traditional elegy by incorporating non-elegiac language in a more usual way. At the beginning of this half of the poem Propertius says, "My foes are broken! I have conquered them" (*rumpantur iniqui! / uicimus*, 1.8.27-28). The martial language of enemies and conquering here may initially remind us of epic and war, but in this case Propertius appropriates this language for elegiac purposes and turns the language of traditional *militia* into the *militia amoris*, as we often see in elegy, both in Propertius and other elegiac authors.<sup>15</sup> When Propertius uses epic language of voyages and shipwreck in the first half of the poem, it is in a way that subverts our expectations of elegy by casting the beloved in the role of a hero and separating her from the lover. The use of epic language here, however, is more in line with how elegy appropriates epic for its own purposes elsewhere.

The second half of 1.8 emphasizes the power of elegiac poetry itself in creating reunion and success for the lover. Propertius claims, "I was able to influence her not with gold or Indian pearls, but with the indulgence of an attractive song" (*hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis, / sed potui blandi carminis obsequio*, 1.8.39-40), calling attention to the role of poetry in

---

<sup>15</sup> Kennedy (1993) 47, DeBrohun (2003) 83, Maltby (2006) 158-160, Wilson (2009) 176-181.

convincing Cynthia to return. Elegy is more powerful than gold or other wealth here because it is the key to bringing the beloved back. Just as Propertius explicitly identifies Rome as the correct place for love earlier in the poem, here he sees the true success of his poems in their ability to return his beloved to Rome where she belongs. In this way elegy itself has the power to protect love and reinstate the connection between the lover, his beloved, and the city of Rome that is disrupted by the beloved's withdrawal from the city.

Propertius recounts departures of Cynthia from Rome in other poems as well. In 1.11, Cynthia goes to Baiae and is presumably still there in the next poem, 1.12, in which she is also absent from Rome.<sup>16</sup> Propertius expresses relief at Cynthia's chaste time away from Rome in the country in 2.19, but later accuses her of leaving Rome for illicit reasons again at the beginning of 2.32. Cynthia's departures from Rome in these poems are largely presented in the same way as we saw in 1.8. First, they hinder her affair with Propertius because of the physical separation of the lovers that they induce. Near the beginning of 1.11, Propertius worries that Cynthia disregards her care for him (*nostrī cura*, 1.11.5) while she is at Baiae and hopes she will experience nights of remembering him there (*memores noctes*, 1.11.5). This line highlights the physical distance between the lovers as well as their emotional disconnect. While Cynthia is away, their love is merely a memory rather than a current reality. The word *discidium* (separation) similarly emphasizes the physical divide between Propertius and Cynthia in the

---

<sup>16</sup> There is some dispute among commentators about whether Cynthia is still away from Rome in this poem or has returned but no longer wishes to see Propertius. Butler and Barber (1933) argue that Cynthia has returned from Baiae (171), while Heyworth (2007) argues that she is still there (58). Given the emphasis on physical distance between the lovers and the consistency of this description with Propertius' other poems about travel and separation, I am inclined to agree with Heyworth. Either way, as Richardson (1977) notes, the two poems are clearly a pair and the distance between Cynthia and Propertius in 1.12, whether it be literal because she is still away at Baiae or metaphorical because she has returned and broken up with him, is an implied consequence of 1.11 (175). Cynthia's departure from Rome in 1.11 still creates alienation between her and Propertius in 1.12, even if she has now physically returned to the city.

poem (1.11.28). Propertius further says in this poem, “you alone are my house, Cynthia, you alone are my parents, you are all my times of happiness” (*tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes, / omnia tu nostrae tempora laetitiae*, 1.11.23-24). The link between Cynthia and Propertius’ home and parents not only stresses the closeness they lose while she is away, but also connects Cynthia’s rightful place more directly with Roman space. A Roman’s parents and in particular his home (*domus*) belong in Rome, not elsewhere. Just as a Roman’s true *domus* is immovable from Rome, Cynthia should not be removed from the city of Rome either.

Poem 1.12 too focuses on the separation caused by Cynthia’s absence from Rome. Propertius says, “that girl is separated from my bed by as many miles as Hypanis is distant from Venetian Eridanus” (*tam multa illa meo diuisa est milia lecto, / quantum Hypanis Veneto dissidet Eridano*, 1.12.3-4), underscoring his alienation from Cynthia in physical geographic terms. His metaphor of love fleeing (*fugit amor*, 1.12.12), as opposed to simply disappearing or souring, parallels Cynthia’s flight from Rome. When Cynthia exits Rome, love leaves along with her. His claim that “Cynthia does not nurture my accustomed nights with her embrace” (*nec mihi consuetos amplexu nutrit amores / Cynthia*, 1.12.5-6) reflects the current disruption of his affair with her by contrasting his usual (*consuetos*) enjoyment of her with his recent separation from her. His reference to the long nights he must endure alone (*longas solus cognoscere noctes / cogor*, 1.12.13-14) emphasize his loneliness not only through the use of the word *solus*, but also by reminding us of the elegiac *exclusus amator* trope. Propertius aligns himself with the typical lover of elegy spending the night alone, but in this poem his situation is even more dire because his beloved is not merely inside a house which he cannot enter, but actually outside of the city itself. Cynthia’s absence from Rome amplifies the hindrances to love already present in the

elegiac tradition and creates more of them by causing further division between the lover and his beloved.

Just as in 1.8, the physical parting of the beloved from the lover in these poems is also connected with infidelity. In 1.11, Propertius worries that some rival has stolen Cynthia from him while she is away at Baiae (1.11.7-8) and that she is listening to the flattering whispers of another man there (*alterius blandos audire susurros*, 1.11.13). Cynthia's distance from Rome—and in particular her presence in Baiae, which had a reputation for immorality<sup>17</sup>—allows her to be unfaithful, robbing Propertius of his role as her lover. The use of the word *blandus* to describe the whispers of the other man especially encroaches on Propertius' position because it echoes his claim in 1.8 that he convinced Cynthia to stay with him in Rome by means of a flattering poem (*blandi carminis*, 1.8.40). The power of elegy to safeguard the physical and erotic closeness of Propertius and his beloved in 1.8 belongs to someone else now that Cynthia has in fact left Rome. Similarly, in 2.32 Propertius accuses Cynthia of leaving Rome in order to conceal her unfaithfulness, saying, “you are deceived, that road reveals the deception of your love: insane girl, you flee my eyes, not the city” (*falleris, ista tui furtum uia monstrat amoris: / non urbem, demens, lumina nostra fugis*, 2.32.17-18). Line 18 explicitly links the city of Rome with Propertius' watchful eyes as he attempts to enforce Cynthia's faithfulness, while departure from Rome is associated with her infidelity and removes his check on her indiscretions.

Propertius connects the departure of Cynthia from Rome with his suffering in these poems as well. In 1.12, he describes himself as weighed down (*gravis*, 1.12.14), emphasizing what a heavy burden his suffering in love is because of the loss of Cynthia when she is away. He says that Love rejoices in his tears (*gaudet Amor lacrimis*, 1.12.15), casting him as a victim of love's cruelty and underscoring the suffering that comes with the departing of Cynthia. Just as in

---

<sup>17</sup> Butler (1905) 145, Butler and Barber (1933) 169, Richardson (1977) 175-176.

1.8, Cynthia's departure from Rome leads to the dissolution of her relationship with Propertius and the happiness he might have derived from it.

Poems 1.11 and 1.12 further parallel 1.8 in that they invert many of the usual features of elegiac poetry. In 1.11, Propertius wishes that Cynthia were confined (*clausam*, 1.11.11) in a small boat rather than spending time in Baiae. This represents an inversion of the usual elegiac framework—in which the beloved is shut in her house while the lover attempts to get in—not only because the beloved is now shut in a boat rather than in her house, but also because here the lover wishes for the beloved's confinement rather than trying to undermine it. He compares Cynthia spending time with other men at Baiae to a girl who slips when her guardian is removed (*ut solet amoto labi custode puella*, 1.11.15). Usually the lover himself is the one attempting to get past the guard to spend time with the *puella*, but in this case the lover is instead aligned with the guard who is thwarted so that rivals can gain access to the beloved instead of him, thereby overturning the usual role of the lover in elegiac poetry. The nights he spends alone when Cynthia is away (1.12.13) parallel the nights an *exclusus amator* might spend on his beloved's doorstep, but unlike the usual lover on the doorstep, in this case it is impossible—not just unlikely—for the lover to gain access to the girl because she is physically removed from him and the city. Propertius says in 1.12, “I am not who I was: a long journey changes girls” (*non sum ego qui fueram: mutat uia longa puellas*, 1.12.11), indicating that the physical separation as a result of Cynthia's departure from Rome changes the nature of their relationship. A less literal interpretation of this statement is that the withdrawal of the beloved from Rome actually changes the inherent nature of elegy since it changes the context of the lover's relationship to the beloved and the roles of both of them within it.

The absence of the beloved from Rome can undermine the writing and use of poetry for the poet-lover as well. In 1.11, Propertius asks, “Has some enemy with feigned fires taken you away from my poems, Cynthia?” (*an te nescio quis simulatis ignibus hostis / sustulit e nostris, Cynthia, carminibus?*, 1.11.7-8), emphasizing Cynthia’s separation from not only himself but also his poetry while she is away from Rome. By equating himself with his poems in this way, Propertius suggests that Cynthia’s parting from him coincides with the loss of his poetry’s efficacy. At the same time, the removal of Cynthia from Rome removes her from his poems in the sense that it deprives him of material for his poetry. He may be able to write a poem or two about her absence as he does here, but unless she eventually returns, he will quickly run out of things to recount about her. When Cynthia is away, Propertius’ poems cannot reach her and therefore cannot influence her; similarly, her absence means that she cannot interact with Propertius and therefore cannot influence his poetry. Cynthia’s departure from Rome in 1.11, 1.12, and 2.32 thus divides her from her lover Propertius and threatens the nature of elegy and its future production.

In contrast to these poems in which Cynthia’s departure from Rome leads to the painful separation of Propertius from his beloved and is associated with suffering and infidelity, poem 2.19 portrays the exit of Cynthia from Rome in a more positive light. In this case, Cynthia’s withdrawal to the countryside is portrayed as an escape from the particularly urban challenges to her relationship with Propertius, rather than merely as a detrimental division of the two lovers. Propertius claims that while Cynthia is in the country, “there will be no young corruptor in the chaste fields, who might not allow you to be virtuous with his flatteries” (*nullus erit castis iuuenis corruptor in agris, / qui te blanditiis non sinat esse probam*, 2.19.3-4), representing a

break from his worries about the corrupting nature of a rival's flattering whispers (*blandos susurros*, 1.11.13) at Baiae. Similarly, Propertius says that while Cynthia is in the country, there will be no brawls outside her windows (2.19.5) and no games or temples to corrupt her (2.19.9-10). Instead, he says, "you will be alone, Cynthia, and you will look upon the lonely mountains and the flock and boundaries of a poor farmer" (*sola eris et solos spectabis, Cynthia, montis / et pecus et finis pauperis agricolae*, 2.19.7-8), emphasizing her solitude and faithfulness in the country as well as a lack of wealthy men to corrupt her. Propertius also says that Cynthia will attend a small rustic shrine in the country (2.19.13) and that everything will be safe from potential rivals (2.19.16), both safeguards against potential infidelity.

The reason Cynthia's departure from Rome in this poem prevents infidelity and suffering in love is that here, unlike in the other poems discussed so far, she leaves Rome for the countryside, not for Baiae (as in 1.11 and 1.12) or somewhere on the Via Appia (as in 2.32). Syndikus has discussed both the licentiousness of Rome portrayed at the end of 2.32<sup>18</sup> and the contrast between the towns in 2.32 and the countryside here in 2.19.<sup>19</sup> Even though Baiae and the towns in 2.32 are outside Rome, their character is not like that of the country and they instead function as an extension of this licentiousness in Rome and the negative influence it can have on an elegiac mistress. Baiae and other towns provide all the vice that can be found in Rome, but they also remove the mistress from the presence of the lover and therefore limit his ability to influence her and keep her committed to him. The departure of Cynthia to the countryside, by contrast, does create physical distance between the mistress and the lover, but because it removes the corrupting influences of the city, this separation is not accompanied by infidelity and betrayal of the lover to the same degree as is the departure to towns outside Rome.

---

<sup>18</sup> Syndikus (2006) 312.

<sup>19</sup> Syndikus (2006) 310.

Although poem 2.19 displays a more favorable picture of Cynthia's departure from Rome than poems 1.11, 1.12, and 2.32 do in terms of its impact on her relationship with Propertius, this poem nevertheless inverts some traditional elegiac elements just as in the other poems. Cynthia's trip to the country eliminates the characteristically urban elements of elegy such as the *exclusus amator(es)* and the rich rivals vying for the mistress' attention. Although the elimination of rivals is presented as a boon for Propertius as the lover in this poem, it also marks a break from the typical nature of elegy and its urban obstacles to the lover's success. In addition to deterring rivals, Cynthia's isolation in the country removes her from Propertius' presence and prevents any direct interaction between the lover and the beloved in the poem. Propertius warns Cynthia that he will join her in the country in the future (2.19.27-28), but this moment of reunion never occurs in the poem and the two lovers remain physically and emotionally detached in a way that is unusual for elegy.

There is a further break from the elegiac genre in 2.19 as Propertius announces his plans to pursue activities other than writing poetry while Cynthia is away. He says he intends to take up hunting and the rites of Diana while putting aside his vows to Venus<sup>20</sup> (*ipse ego uenabor: iam nunc me sacra Dianae / suscipere et Veneri<s> ponere vota iuvat*, 2.19.17-18), pursuits more suited for a rustic than an urban elegiac poet, although hunting is sometimes associated with escape from love.<sup>21</sup> He is careful to note that he does not plan to go so far as to hunt lions or

---

<sup>20</sup> The meaning of *Veneri<s> ponere vota* here is disputed. Butler and Barber (1933) note that *ponere vota* usually means "to give offerings," but in this case, because of the contrast with *suscipere sacra*, "to take up the sacred rites," interpret the line to mean that Propertius instead plans to put aside his vows to Venus (223). See also Butler (1905) 210 for the same argument. Richardson (1977), on the other hand, argues that Propertius makes vows to both goddesses here and does not choose Diana exclusively over Venus (268). Heyworth (2007) refers to Propertius as making offerings to Venus in this line, but does not specifically weigh in on the possibility of another meaning for *ponere vota* (191). I think that either of the two interpretations of this phrase is possible here, but am inclined to side with Butler and Barber, given the implied distinction between *suscipere* (to take up) and *ponere* (to put aside) in this line as well as the overall move away from Propertius' usual preoccupation with love and amatory pursuits in the poem as a whole.

<sup>21</sup> Butler (1905) 210.

boars (2.19.21-22), which would place him in the world of heroes and epic, but says he will settle for gentle hares and birds (2.19.23-24), keeping him more in the peaceful pastoral world. The elimination of the urban setting in this poem already moves it away from Propertius' usual elegiac mold, and the poet-lover's abandonment of his poetic endeavors completes the break from elegy. The departure of Cynthia from Rome in this poem, as in poems 1.8, 1.11, 1.12, and 2.32, coincides with a disruption of the personal relationship between Propertius and his mistress and by extension the elegiac poetry derived from it. Propertius' poetry is simply not the same when he and his mistress are not physically connected in the urban space of Rome.

Poem 4.3, in which the young bride Arethusa writes a poem to her husband while he is away from Rome on a military campaign, shares many features with the poems already discussed. In this poem, as in the others, the departure of the beloved (here, the poet-lover's husband) results in the physical alienation of the lover and the beloved. Arethusa says that her vows hang on all the gates of the city (*omnibus heu portis pendent mea noxia uota*, 4.3.17), showing that she is blocked from her lover by the city gates and emphasizing their physical separation. She similarly mentions bringing his arms to the Porta Capena at the end of the poem (4.3.71), again portraying the gates as a barrier between her and her beloved since she is trapped inside the gates and he is somewhere on the outside. The emphasis on the presence of only feminine influences in Arethusa's house, namely her sister and nurse (4.3.41-42), highlights the absence of her husband in the house and the divide this causes between him and his wife.

The absence of Arethusa's husband also raises concerns of infidelity and leads to her suffering. Arethusa says that his potential war-related injuries are better than his receiving love-bites from another girl (4.3.25-26), revealing her anxiety about his faithfulness while he is away.

She refers to her suffering while her husband is gone, saying that her tears may be the cause of any smudges on her letter to him (4.3.3-4) and that her poor penmanship is due to her fainting (4.3.5-6). Her tears here mimic the tears Propertius experienced in 1.12.16 when Cynthia was away from Rome. Additionally, Arethusa experiences bitter nights (*noctes amaras*, 4.3.29) without her husband, reminding us of Propertius' long nights alone without Cynthia at 1.12.13. The suffering Arethusa endures as a result of her husband's departure from Rome is the same as the suffering of Propertius in the absence of Cynthia.

In many ways, though, 4.3 contrasts starkly with the poems dealing with Cynthia's absence from Rome and furthers the break from traditional elegy, which typically features a male poet-lover writing poems in the first person about his relationship with his female beloved in Rome.<sup>22</sup> The form of this poem differs from that of Propertius' other poems. The opening line, "Arethusa sends these instructions to her Lycotas" (*haec Arethusa suo mittit mandata Lycotae*, 4.3.1), establishes that this poem is in the form of a letter, rather than a typical elegiac poem or song. It is also written from the perspective of a woman, not of a man, which is unusual for elegy.<sup>23</sup> The fact that Arethusa and Lycotas are Greek names also sets them apart from the figures of other elegiac poems, who usually have Latin names, thereby distancing them from the Roman context.<sup>24</sup> From the very first line, the unique form and voice of 4.3 signal that this poem will fundamentally differ from traditional elegiac poetry.

The fact that the woman in this poem plays the part of the lover while the man plays the part of the beloved inverts both the gender roles and the generic roles of the *puella* and the *amator* that we usually see in elegy. Arethusa behaves like and reflects the attitudes of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Wyke (1987) 157.

<sup>23</sup> Wyke (1987) 157.

<sup>24</sup> Wyke (1987) 161.

typical *amator* of elegy.<sup>25</sup> The first line of the poem places her in the position of the poet-lover since she is the one writing the poem here, rather than in the position of the *puella* who receives poems from her male lover as Cynthia does from Propertius. Her tears and fainting spells (4.3.4-6), as well as her bitter nights without her husband (4.3.29-30), reflect suffering in love that is usually reserved for the thwarted and excluded male lover.<sup>26</sup> She even wishes for military service in order to be with her husband, aligning her with both male Roman soldiers on military campaigns and typical elegiac lovers who appropriate military language for their own amatory purposes.<sup>27</sup>

Likewise, Arethusa's behavior in this poem contrasts with that of the typical *puella* of elegy. Her rejection of beautiful Punic clothing and expensive gems (4.3.51-52) sets her apart from other elegiac *puellae* who demand gifts and prefer wealthy lovers,<sup>28</sup> as Cynthia does when she has an affair with a wealthy praetor in 2.16. Arethusa is more faithful than elegiac *puellae* usually are<sup>29</sup> and does not have other men vying for her attention. The puppy sleeping on her husband's side of the bed (4.3.56) is the closest thing to a rival for Lycotas. Arethusa is surrounded by women, including her sister and her nurse (4.3.41), rather than other men, and her house is silent (4.3.53), indicating that there are no lovers at her door or windows attempting to gain entry into her house.

On the surface, Arethusa is similar to other elegiac *puellae* in that she is confined in her house, but this similarity does not ultimately hold up because while other elegiac *puellae* are shut in their houses with their lovers trying to get in, Arethusa is inside waiting for a lover who never arrives. Rather than eluding her eager lovers, Arethusa is the eager one who is eluded by her

---

<sup>25</sup> Wyke (1987) 160.

<sup>26</sup> Wyke (1987) 160.

<sup>27</sup> Gunther (2006) 368.

<sup>28</sup> Gunther (2006) 368.

<sup>29</sup> Gunther (2006) 368.

absent beloved. Arethusa's fidelity and longing for her husband in his absence make her an ideal wife, but they make her a poor example of elegy's typical female beloved, especially in conjunction with her alignment with the typical elegiac *amator*. As DeBrohun notes, Arethusa is placed in the role of both the *exclusus amator* and *inclusa puella* at different times in this poem.<sup>30</sup> She cannot completely fulfill either of these roles, however. Her wishes to leave the city and join Lycotas on his campaign (4.3.45) cast her as a girl locked in the city wanting to get out to see her husband, making her not quite like the elegiac *puella* who is shut in while keeping her lovers out, and not quite like the elegiac *amator* who is locked out and trying to get in.

Poem 4.3 also differs fundamentally from Propertius' other poems in that it involves a marriage relationship, rather than an affair as in the poems about Propertius' relationship with Cynthia. As Wyke notes, Arethusa fills a role different from that of Cynthia and the usual elegiac *puella* since she is a wife rather than a mistress.<sup>31</sup> She refers to her wedded faithfulness (*marita fides*, 4.3.11) with Lycotas, which elevates their relationship and makes it more serious than that of Propertius and Cynthia. She says she spends her winter nights working with wool to make clothes for Lycotas while he is away on campaign (4.3.33-34). In this way, Arethusa associates herself with the traditional wife in a traditional woman's gender role, aligning her more with women like Lucretia than Cynthia and other elegiac *puellae*.

Because of this, there is a surprising emphasis on marriage and mainstream love in this poem. Arethusa describes her marriage rites in 4.3.13-16 and although she concludes that these rites must have been tainted since her husband is no longer by her side, the fact that this description appears at all is striking in elegy, which usually does not depict marriage relationships or feature the wedding of the lover and the beloved. Even in poem 2.7 when

---

<sup>30</sup> DeBrohun (2003) 149-151.

<sup>31</sup> Wyke (1987) 157.

Propertius complains that he was almost forced to get married to comply with Augustus' marriage law, the woman he imagines marrying is not Cynthia. Propertius' potential marriage in 2.7 represents the unhappy breakup of his relationship with Cynthia, but in 4.3 Arethusa's marriage to Lycotas is a symbol of their union and her love for him. Arethusa's concern for the preservation of the bonds of her marriage bed at the end of the poem (*incorrupta mei conserva foedera lecti*, 4.3.69) echoes the typical concern in elegiac poetry for fidelity and the sanctity of the lover and beloved's bed, but here the concern is more marked and the stakes are higher since it is a marriage that is being protected, not merely an affair. The marriage of Arethusa and Lycotas is out of place in elegy because elegy is usually about illicit love affairs between the poet-lover and women who are either already married or not marriage material, and because the general ethos of elegiac poetry—as displayed particularly in Propertius 2.7—rejects traditional marriage and state-sanctioned love.

The occupation of Arethusa's husband as a soldier further undermines the generic constructs of elegy by introducing *arma* (weapons) into elegy, producing a tension between *arma* and *amor* throughout the poem. Arethusa asks Lycotas, “Does your breastplate burn your tender shoulders? Does your heavy spear wear away your unwarlike hands?” (*num teneros urit lorica lacertos? num grauis imbellis atterit hasta manus?*, 4.3.23-24), contrasting the martial language of weapons (*lorica, grauis hasta*) with the language of elegy (*teneros lacertos, imbellis manus*). This description of Lycotas in elegiac language aligns him with an elegiac mistress,<sup>32</sup> conflicting with his duties as a soldier. There is a similar blending of martial and elegiac language when Arethusa wishes she could join Lycotas on campaign and remarks that Hippolyte happily “bore weapons on her naked breast and covered her soft head with a barbarian helmet” (*nuda tulit arma papilla / et textit galea barbara molle caput*, 4.3.43-44). The *arma* and *galea barbara* of

---

<sup>32</sup> Janan (2001) 58-59, Wyke (1987) 160.

war here create a stark contrast with the *nuda papilla* and *molle caput* which belong in the world of elegy. Furthermore, Arethusa finds herself kissing her husband's weapons instead of kissing the man himself (4.3.30) and plans to offer them as votives in thanks for his safety when he returns (4.3.71-72). The preoccupation with weapons and concern for the safety of the beloved in this poem are unusual and out of place in elegiac poetry.

This poem also transfers features that are typical of elegy into a martial context, thereby replacing the metaphorical *militia amoris* of elegy with the real *militia* of epic. Arethusa says she would prefer Lycotas to suffer military injuries rather than see the love-bites of another woman on his neck (4.3.25-26), replacing elegy's usual physical marks of infidelity with those of service in war. Similarly, she says to Lycotas, "you are said to have become lean with thinness in your face: but I hope that that paleness is from missing me" (*diceris et macie uultum tenuasse: sed opto / e desiderio sit color iste meo*, 4.3.27-28). The paleness and thinness mentioned here are common of lovers in elegy,<sup>33</sup> but are now caused by war rather than love. Arethusa's wish that his paleness comes from love rather than his military service represents an attempt to reinstate this inverted elegiac trope.

In addition to simply being unusual for elegy, the martial language of this poem is particularly fraught in terms of genre because it belongs more to the world of epic, the genre from which elegy most often seeks to distance itself. The illicit love affairs of elegy are here replaced by the war and absence from home of epic. Lycotas in this poem is more like an epic war hero than an elegiac lover staying home with his mistress, while Arethusa is more like the epic heroine Penelope than Cynthia and other elegiac *puellae* carousing with their lovers. The military aspects of this poem thus usher in a host of generic tensions and inversions that set this poem apart from many of Propertius' other elegies and the elegiac tradition as a whole.

---

<sup>33</sup> Kennedy (1993) 47, Maltby (2006) 153-156.

Furthermore, the martial elements of this poem in a Roman context problematically introduce the pursuit of Roman *imperium* into elegy. The list Arethusa gives toward the beginning of the poem of foreign campaigns her husband has been involved in emphasizes Rome's expanding *imperium* and the wars which achieve it. The fact that this list includes campaigns that were not actually occurring at the time when Propertius wrote this poem exaggerates the picture of the Roman quest for *imperium* conveyed in the poem.<sup>34</sup> Arethusa's prayers near the end that Lycotas not become too caught up in the glory of the conquered Bactrians or the garments of a captured enemy leader (4.3.63-64) serve as a reminder that *imperium* and the glorious defeat of foreign nations do not belong in elegy and should not hold too much weight with her beloved.

In lines 35-40, however, Arethusa describes herself as looking at a map (*tabula*, 4.3.37) to learn more about where her husband is on campaign. She learns about the temperatures and climate of different faraway lands and about the winds for sailing to them (4.3.39-40) and gets information about camels and the Araxes river (4.3.35-36). As geographers have recognized, maps are often used to create a link between knowledge and power and solidify empire.<sup>35</sup> All of this information that Arethusa learns from the map is thus more useful for a Roman general than an elegiac lover. The reference to the Araxes as "to be conquered" (*uincendus*, 4.3.35) and the identification of the camels as Parthian (4.3.36) in particular draw upon the Roman preoccupation with conquering and remind the reader of Rome's ongoing foreign wars. As Keith argues, Arethusa's poem seems to reject Roman military service and imperialism, but it simultaneously reinforces imperialism through its use of Greek names and references, the

---

<sup>34</sup> Butler and Barber (1933) 338, Richardson (1977) 429.

<sup>35</sup> Harley (1988) 278-283.

preoccupation with maps, and the joining of military and elegiac success when the soldier-husband returns safe and victorious.<sup>36</sup>

The language of war in this poem is not only generically martial and related to epic, but also specifically connected to the Roman desire for the expansion of empire, thereby making it out of place in elegy partly because it privileges war over love and additionally because it requires engagement in traditional Roman civic duty through military service. This directly conflicts with elegy's rejection of public life and duties in favor of idleness, a focus on the personal, private aspects of life, and alienation from the rest of society. The military aspects of this poem coopt elegy into the power of the Roman empire, despite the fact that elegy is supposed to stand outside of national power, politics, and *imperium*. Elegy may often appropriate the metaphor of *militia amoris*, but it typically does this as a means of disconnecting itself from true *militia* that is at odds with the ethos of elegy and should not hold a place within it. In this poem, therefore, the departure of the husband-beloved from Rome is especially disruptive to elegiac norms since it is necessitated by Rome's commitment to *imperium*.

On a superficial level, Lycotas' departure from Rome threatens the relationship between the wife-lover and her husband by separating them, just as Cynthia's withdrawal from Rome threatened her relationship with Propertius in 1.8, 1.11, 1.12, and 2.32. On a deeper level, however, departure in this poem contradicts the very nature of elegy by replacing the typical urban love affair (*amor*) with foreign conquest (*arma*). There has been much scholarly discussion of Propertius Book 4 and its relationship to Books 1-3, with varying opinions on the consistency (or lack thereof) between the earlier books and the last book.<sup>37</sup> Poem 4.3 provides a good representation of the poetic shift scholars have noticed from Books 1-3 to Book 4.

---

<sup>36</sup> Keith (2008) 162-164.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Ross (1975) 129-130; DeBrohun (2003) 22-24, 33-34, 83-84; Gunther (2006) 353-355, 364; Wilson (2009) 187-188.

Although it has a romantic setting and premise, 4.3 nevertheless breaks away from the overarching framework of elegy as seen in Books 1-3 and is more consistent with the other poems of Book 4 which display a greater awareness of Roman national and public concerns while focusing less on the private world of Propertius and Cynthia.

### Tibullus

Tibullus presents the departure of his beloved Nemesis in Book 2 in much the same way as Propertius depicts the departure of Cynthia in his elegies. In poem 2.3, Nemesis has left Rome for the countryside with a wealthy lover. Tibullus characterizes this withdrawal as a disruption of the love affair between him and Nemesis and emphasizes his separation from her while she is away. At the beginning of the poem, he mentions that Venus herself has migrated to the country along with Nemesis (*ipsa Venus latos iam nunc migravit in agros*, 2.3.3), drawing attention to the physical departure of Nemesis (and by extension Venus) from the city. Tibullus later laments that the countryside has taken Nemesis away from the city (*Nemesim quae abducis ab urbe*, 2.3.61; *licet formosas tristibus agris / abdere*, 2.3.65-66). The verbs of taking away in these two lines again show her physical motion away from Rome. When Nemesis initially leaves the city, he says he will follow her to the country and toil on the farm so that he can see her (2.3.5) and later complains about his lack of opportunities to look at her (*copia rara uidendi*, 2.3.77), stressing how difficult it is for him to access her while she is away. The fact that Nemesis is in the country with a rival instead of with Tibullus himself (2.3.59) reveals her infidelity to him as well, just as Cynthia's departures from Rome were connected to her infidelity.

Nemesis' departure from Rome also leads to suffering for Tibullus. Tibullus calls attention to the toils he must undergo on the farm if he wants to be near his beloved. He says that

he will be burnt by the sun while he is in the fields (*sol graciles exureret artus*, 2.3.9) and that blisters will hurt his tender hands (*laederet et teneras pussula rupta manus*, 2.3.10). In this way Tibullus is cast as a slave performing demeaning manual labor on the farm for his mistress.<sup>38</sup> At the end of the poem, he says he will not refuse chains and beatings (*non ego me uinclis uerberibusque nego*, 2.3.80), further underscoring his servile status in this poem and the physical suffering it will cause him. His use of the phrase *heu heu* (alas, alas) similarly highlights his lamenting and grief when he loses his beloved as a result of her exit from Rome (2.3.2, 2.3.49).

In addition to threatening her relationship with Tibullus, Nemesis' departure from Rome undermines the features typical of the rest of his elegies. Much of the poem reflects an inversion of the usual framework of elegiac poetry. Tibullus says he will not complain (*nec quererer*, 2.3.9) about his physical labor on the farm since it will allow him to see Nemesis, contrasting with the usual endless complaints of typical elegiac lovers.<sup>39</sup> The physical wounds Tibullus suffers in this poem, namely his sunburn, blisters, and beatings, also differ from the usual psychological or metaphorical wounds that the elegiac lover endures at the hands of his mistress. Toward the end of the poem, Tibullus refers to Nemesis as shut in (*clausa*, 2.3.77). This word is typical for elegiac *puellae*, but here there is a change in the usual trope because the girl is shut up on a farm in the country rather than in her house in the city as we would otherwise expect. Tibullus' change of opinion about wealth in the middle of the poem is striking as well.<sup>40</sup> He initially complains that girls are too interested in wealth and gifts, but then decides to embrace his beloved's greed and describes the lavish presents he will give her, including fine clothes and slaves (2.3.51-58). In this way, he aligns himself with the *diues amator* figure of elegy who is typically the rival of the poor poet-lover. This pursuit of wealth and gifts for the mistress is

---

<sup>38</sup> Lyne (1980) 165-167.

<sup>39</sup> Murgatroyd (1994) 90.

<sup>40</sup> Cairns (1979) 154-155, Maltby (2002) 394, Bowditch (2012) 125-126.

unusual for any elegiac lover, but is particularly striking for Tibullus who especially criticizes greed and wealth in his elegies.<sup>41</sup>

The characterization of the countryside in this poem differs from that of Tibullus' earlier poems as well. Previously in his elegies, especially in 1.1, 1.5, and 2.1, Tibullus connected the country with success in love<sup>42</sup> and portrayed it as a place of virtuous simplicity where he could enjoy a happy peaceful life with his beloved. The country in 2.3, however, is associated with greed and wealth. At the beginning of the poem, Tibullus says that Nemesis is on a large farm (*tenent uillaeque puellam*, 2.3.1). The word *uillae* here refers to the large estate of a wealthy man, in contrast with the small farm Tibullus envisioned for himself in 1.1 (*parua seges*, 1.1.43).<sup>43</sup> He also mentions vast farms in his criticism of the Iron Age later in the poem (2.3.41-42), connecting the type of farm Nemesis is on with the greed and excess for which he condemns contemporary times.

The countryside in 2.3 is a harsh and hostile place full of toil and hardship, unlike in Tibullus' earlier fantasies about the pleasant nature of the country.<sup>44</sup> The work Tibullus imagines performing on the farm of Nemesis' lover is physically demanding and leads to injuries such as blisters (2.3.5-10). He also sees the country here as a place where he is treated like a slave and chained and beaten (2.3.80). The metaphorical wounds of love and the *servitium amoris* of urban elegy are replaced in this poem by literal wounds and slavery because Tibullus has left the city and gone to the country.

This picture of the country as full of suffering and physical toils contrasts specifically with the one Tibullus presents in 1.5. There, he envisions living in the country with Delia and

---

<sup>41</sup> Putnam (1973) 50, Maltby (2002) 116.

<sup>42</sup> Luck (1969) 71-72, 77; Lyne (1980) 151-156; Ball (1983) 24-25, 30-31; Miller (2012) 56-57.

<sup>43</sup> Maltby (2002) 395.

<sup>44</sup> Lyne (1980) 164-167, Ball (1983) 176-177, Murgatroyd (1994) 83-84.

working on the farm, but in that case the work is not physically demanding as it is in 2.3. More importantly, there is a reversal from 1.5, in which Tibullus owns the farm, to 2.3, in which he is a slave on it.<sup>45</sup> Although Delia is in charge of the farm in 1.5 while Tibullus himself has no authority (1.5.29-30), he does not depict Delia's rule as harsh or painful as he imagines his life on the farm with Nemesis will be in 2.3, reflecting the antithesis of characterization between Delia in Book 1 and Nemesis in Book 2.<sup>46</sup> The fact that Tibullus is allowed to be with Delia in 1.5—instead of following her to the country but remaining separated from her—further emphasizes the contrast between his happy quality of life in the country in 1.5 as opposed to his life of unhappy servitude in 2.3.

One of the problems with the country in 2.3 is that it has taken on many of the undesirable features of the city.<sup>47</sup> Just as the elegiac *puella* in Rome spends her time enclosed in her house excluding her lover, Nemesis in the country is shut up on her lover's farm in 2.3. The pervasive greed in this poem recalls both the avarice of the urban *puella* who always wants gifts from her lovers and the wealthy rival in the city who threatens to take the beloved away from the poet-lover. Similarly, the metaphorical *servitium amoris* of Rome here is transferred to the country and becomes literal *servitium* as the lover must work as a slave on a large farm. In Propertius' poems, the problem with Cynthia's withdrawal from Rome was that she was no longer in the city and therefore could not be near him. In this poem, the problem with Nemesis' departure to the country is not merely that she is away from Rome and Tibullus cannot see her there, but also that her arrival in the country with a wealthy former slave as her lover introduces the worst parts of Rome and the worst obstacles to the lover's relationship with his beloved into the innocent, peaceful world of the country where they do not belong.

---

<sup>45</sup> Murgatroyd (1994) 120.

<sup>46</sup> Elder (1962) 91-92, Luck (1969) 75, Cairns (1979) 154, Lyne (1980) 163-164, Murgatroyd (1994) 84-85.

<sup>47</sup> Putnam (1973) 175.

The attitude Tibullus displays toward the country has changed in this poem as well. He now criticizes the country instead of praising it.<sup>48</sup> He refers to the crops as harsh (*dura seges*, 2.3.61) and the fields as sad (*tristibus agris*, 2.3.65), showing that his view of these places is less optimistic than it once was. The use of the word *durus* in reference to the crops is particularly pointed, since this is a word usually used to describe the harshness of the urban elegiac *puella*. Tibullus places blame on the fields in this poem for drawing Nemesis away from Rome and does not want them to go without punishment for it (*haud impune*, 2.3.65). Instead of embracing the country as a place of refuge as it was in some of his other poems, he now rejects the country as a hostile place of hardships and says goodbye to its fruits because of their power to draw girls into the country and away from Rome (*o ualeant fruges, ne sint modo rure puellae*, 2.3.67).

Tibullus instead looks to a former Golden Age for comfort in this poem. Previously, he fantasized about farming and the countryside as a way of rejecting and escaping from the city. Now the Golden Age he describes in 2.3 eliminates farming as well and looks back to a time when people fed on acorns (*glans alat*, 2.3.68; *glans aluit*, 2.3.69). He later refers more explicitly to the lack of farms in the Golden Age when he says, “What harm did it do not to have sown furrows?” (*quid nocuit sulcos non habuisse satos?*, 2.3.70). Love, however, was plentiful and easy in this Golden Age fantasy. Tibullus says that people made love freely (*passim semper amarunt*, 2.3.69) and that Venus gave the joys of love easily to those whom Love inspired (*tunc, quibus aspirabat Amor, praebebat aperte / mitis in umbrosa gaudia ualle Venus*, 2.3.71-72). Additionally, he says that there were no guards or doors for lovers to wait outside of during this time (*nullus erat custos, nulla exclusura dolentes / ianua*, 2.3.73-74), eliminating the threats to love that are more associated with the city. Murgatroyd has identified this lack of doors and

---

<sup>48</sup> Putnam (1973) 166-167; Cairns (1979) 155; Lyne (1980) 164-167; Ball (1983) 176-177; Murgatroyd (1994) 115, 116; Maltby (2002) 394, 397, 413; Miller (2012) 56, 65.

guards in the Golden Age as a Tibullan innovation,<sup>49</sup> revealing the particularly elegiac nature of this Golden Age fantasy.

The Golden Age that Tibullus envisions here thus represents an escape from both the city and the country. Because the country has become harmful to him and his previous rural fantasies have deteriorated, he now needs a new fantasy. In this poem, the withdrawal of Nemesis from Rome not only complicates her love affair with Tibullus, but also has the power to overturn his positive imagination of the country that was pervasive in his earlier poems. Departure from Rome and a new mistress have changed the nature of Tibullan elegy.

## Part II: Departure of the Lover

### Propertius

The preceding sections have discussed poems featuring the departure of the elegiac beloved from Rome. This section examines poems featuring the withdrawal of the lover himself from Rome, including Propertius 1.6 in which Propertius refuses his friend Tullus' offer to accompany him abroad, 1.17 in which he attempts to leave Rome and is caught in a shipwreck, and 3.21 in which he abandons Rome and goes on a journey to Athens. This section also discusses Tibullus 1.3 about Tibullus' journey away from Rome with his friend Messalla.

Propertius 1.6 and 1.17 may be seen as counterparts to 1.8 and 1.11-12 because they depict the lover departing from Rome rather than the beloved.<sup>50</sup> As in the poems already discussed, Propertius characterizes departure from Rome in 1.6 and 1.17 as undesirable because it threatens his relationship with Cynthia. In 1.6, he refuses to accompany Tullus on a journey away from Rome since he knows it will create conflict between him and Cynthia. He notes that

---

<sup>49</sup> Murgatroyd (1994) 119.

<sup>50</sup> Manuwald (2006) 233.

Cynthia will feel abandoned (*relicta*, 1.6.8) and deny that she belongs to him (*illa meam mihi iam se denegat*, 1.6.9) if he leaves her behind. She also makes heavy prayers (*graves preces*, 1.6.6) for him to stay and calls him faithless (*infido*, 1.6.18) for leaving her. Propertius describes Cynthia here in the same way he describes himself in his later poems when she departs from Rome and forsakes him, as discussed above. Her feelings of abandonment and fears for the future of their relationship mirror Propertius' own feelings in her absence. Manuwald has commented on how 1.6 reveals the dangers of love and the parting of lovers.<sup>51</sup> Propertius here draws on the general theme of the separation of lovers and particularizes it by linking it specifically with departure from Rome.

Propertius similarly links departure from Rome with his separation from Cynthia in 1.17. He explains in this poem that he has left Rome and become caught in a shipwreck, "because I was able to escape my girl" (*quoniam potui fugisse puellam*, 1.17.1), again showing the link between distance from Rome and the abandonment of Cynthia. He further emphasizes the alienation between himself and Cynthia as a result of his parting when he laments that his departure will deprive him of her love at his funeral (1.17.19-24). The withdrawal of the lover from Rome thus has the potential to dissolve romantic relationships just as that of the beloved did.

The departure of Propertius from Rome in 1.6 and 1.17 also leads to suffering or danger for Cynthia and himself. In 1.6, Propertius refers to Cynthia as a sad girlfriend (*tristis amica*, 1.6.10) because of his potential exit from Rome and calls attention to her complaints (*queritur*, 1.6.8; *querelis*, 1.6.11), revealing how unhappy she is that he is considering leaving the city. He even compares Cynthia to a woman in mourning when he says that she will disfigure her face with her raving hands (*Cynthia et insanis ora notet manibus*, 1.6.16) if he leaves her. Propertius'

---

<sup>51</sup> Manuwald (2006) 232.

actual departure from Rome in 1.17 brings about suffering for himself as well when it leads to a shipwreck. He envisions this shipwreck as the cause of his death, saying, “Will this bit of sand cover my corpse?” (*haecine parua meum funus harena teget?*, 1.17.8). In this case his abandonment of Rome, which he undertook as a way to escape Cynthia and his relationship with her, leads to his own suffering and destruction.

Propertius’ proposed journey abroad with Tullus in 1.6 creates a potential threat to the nature of elegy, too, because it aims to enroll him to a greater degree in public life and the pursuit of Roman *imperium*. Propertius cites Cynthia’s complaints as one reason he will not go away with Tullus, but his other reason is that he wants to continue his life of idleness (*nequitiae*, 1.6.26) and will be unable to do this if he leaves. He spurns civic duty and says that he was not born suitable for praise or arms (*non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis*, 1.6.29), conveying his rejection of military service and a public career.<sup>52</sup> The phrase *natus sum* here implies that Propertius’ avoidance of civic engagement is not merely a conscious choice, but is actually part of his nature.<sup>53</sup> Instead of taking part in true *militia*, he says that the fates want him to participate in a different kind of *militia* (*hanc me militiam fata subire uolunt*, 1.6.30), namely the *militia amoris* of elegy. Propertius appropriates the language of civic duty here but rejects it in favor of his own private pursuits.

Propertius underscores this tension between loyalty to Rome and loyalty to love by making Tullus a foil to himself in this poem. He says to Tullus, “your life has never yielded to love, but you have always cared about your armed fatherland” (*tua non aetas umquam cessauit amori, / semper at armatae cura fuit patriae*, 1.6.21-22), marking the distinction between love (*amor*) and *patria* (or more specifically, *Roma*). Propertius further connects travel away from

---

<sup>52</sup> Keith (2008) 143-144.

<sup>53</sup> Stahl (1985) 93.

Rome with the pursuit of *imperium* when he says to Tullus, “whether you go to hasten over the lands with your feet or the sea with oars, you also will be a part of accepted empire” (*seu pedibus terras seu pontum carpere remis / ibis, et accepti pars eris imperii*, 1.6.33-34). Bowditch defines Tullus here as Propertius’ “alter-ego and foil, a symbol of public imperial service against which the poet-lover defines his art and lifestyle.”<sup>54</sup> For Stahl, the real surprise of 1.6 lies in Propertius’ ultimate judgment of Tullus, since “Tullus represents something which has conventionally been thought in Rome to be a man’s highest possible pride and self-fulfillment and the lack of which has always been thought to prove a man’s unworthiness... Propertius now openly claims this lack as a desirable destiny.”<sup>55</sup> Stahl also argues that Propertius represents his suffering in love as a different source of honor in society to legitimize his rejection of civic norms.<sup>56</sup> Because the *patria* and its pursuit of *imperium* are connected to *arma*, it is fundamentally disconnected from the pursuits of *amor* and must be rejected by Propertius.

There is an explicit connection in this poem between departure from Rome and the involvement in affairs of the state. This connection, beyond the romantic complications with Cynthia, is the real reason Propertius cannot leave Rome, since unlike Tullus, he must remain disengaged from the state in order to maintain his status as an elegiac lover. As Bowditch notes, travel is aligned with epic in this poem, making Propertius’ refusal to leave Rome a symbol of his literary choice.<sup>57</sup> What’s striking and counterintuitive about this is that leaving Rome in this poem corresponds to participation in the state’s imperial agenda, while remaining in the physical space of the city corresponds to a rejection of this agenda.

---

<sup>54</sup> Bowditch (2012) 123.

<sup>55</sup> Stahl (1985) 98.

<sup>56</sup> Stahl (1985) 92-93.

<sup>57</sup> Bowditch (2012) 123.

The space of Rome is important to Propertius for a number of reasons and his use and manipulation of this space has received much scholarly attention. Scholars have argued that the physical world of Rome provides an opportunity for the elegists to create their identity.<sup>58</sup> This is certainly true of Propertius in 1.6, in which the space of Rome allows him the freedom to live as he wants—even if this entails a rejection of the concerns of the Roman state itself—while the abandonment of Rome takes away this freedom and erases his identity as an urban lover and poet. Some scholars have noticed a new urbanism in Propertius in particular that sets him apart from Vergil and Tibullus,<sup>59</sup> indicating that Propertius’ use of the physical space of Rome is not only representative of his status as an elegist, but also specific to his own poetic voice. The status of Rome as the urban head of an empire is additionally important for Propertius in 1.6 and elsewhere because it provides him with a well-defined civic ideal from which to distinguish himself. Propertius’ rejection of participation in imperialism and public life is thus more meaningful in Rome than it would be in any other city.

The description of Propertius’ proposed journey to Athens in 3.21 also represents departure from Rome as leading to the end of his relationship with Cynthia and his role as an elegiac lover and poet, but in this case he displays a markedly more positive outlook on this possibility. In this poem, he envisions leaving love and elegy behind not as a loss, but rather as a welcome escape. Whereas in the poems already discussed he emphasizes the painful longing resulting from the distance between him and Cynthia, here he portrays distance from Cynthia as an escape from his desire of her. He does call attention to the separation his departure from Rome causes between him and Cynthia in this poem. The first two lines refer to the long journey

---

<sup>58</sup> Leach (2012) 134-135, Hallett (2012) 273-275.

<sup>59</sup> Rothwell (1996) 834-837, Fantham (1997) 133-135.

ahead of him (*magnum iter*, 3.21.1; *longa uia*, 3.21.2), while the end of the poem characterizes his departure as one that is lengthy in terms of the number of years and the long distance he will be away (*et spatia annorum aut longa intervalla profundi*, 3.21.31). The advantage of the physical divide between Propertius and Rome in this poem, however, is that it relieves him of his desire for Cynthia since he will no longer be able to see her and desire her.

Propertius emphasizes the role of physical proximity and vision in creating desire in this poem. At the beginning, he says that love for a girl grows by constantly looking at her (*crescit enim assidue spectando cura puellae*, 3.21.3), making the beloved the object of both the lover's desire and his gaze. He later says that the way for love to be away from his mind is for Cynthia to be away from his eyes (*mutatis Cynthia terris / quantum oculis, animo tam procul ibit amor*, 3.21.9-10). Maltby has also discussed the link between vision and love in Propertius and the power of the mistress' eyes to actively ensnare the lover.<sup>60</sup>

Because Propertius' physical proximity to Cynthia leads to them looking at each other, and looking at each other leads to him desiring her, the only way to stop desiring her is to leave her and Rome behind entirely. Toward the end of the poem, he asserts that he will focus his vision on art rather than on Cynthia, saying, "painted pictures will surely capture my eyes" (*certe tabulae capient mea lumina pictae*, 3.21.29). This line, and especially its use of the word *capio*, recalls the first line of Propertius' elegies, "Cynthia first captured wretched me with her eyes" (*Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*, 1.1.1), except that now Cynthia has lost her power to capture Propertius and it is his eyes being captured by works of art rather than her eyes capturing him.<sup>61</sup> His departure from Rome has thus removed Cynthia as the driving force of his poetry. Propertius' farewell in this poem, in which he says, "farewell, Roman towers, and you,

---

<sup>60</sup> Maltby (2006) 164-168.

<sup>61</sup> Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 313.

friends, and farewell to you, girl, however you treated me” (*Romanae turres et uos ualeatis, amici, / qualiscumque mihi tuque, puella, uale*, 3.21.15-16), also explicitly connects the city of Rome to his affair with Cynthia, thereby ensuring that the only way for him to escape *amor* is to escape *Roma* as well.

This poem portrays Propertius’ departure from Rome as an escape from the suffering he formerly experienced in love. In the first few lines, he says that the god of love oppresses him (*me premit ipse deus*, 3.21.6), but his long proposed journey will release him from this burdensome love (*me longa graui soluat amore uia*, 3.21.2). Propertius says he has tried all other means of escaping from the torment of his love for Cynthia (3.21.5), but the only aid (*auxilium*, 3.21.9) or cure left to him is to leave Rome. At the end of the poem, he predicts that his withdrawal will alleviate his wounds (*uulnera*, 3.21.32) caused by love and that when he dies it will be the result of fate, not shameful love (*seu moriar, fato, non turpi fractus amore*, 3.21.33). All the suffering he previously experienced when he was in love will be cured by his trip away from Rome. This offers a different outlook on departure from that of the other poems discussed in this chapter. In other poems, the departure of the beloved or the lover leads to suffering and mourning the loss of their love and relationship, whereas in this case, the true cause of the lover’s suffering is the relationship itself. The cure for the suffering in the other poems is the reunion of the two lovers through the return to Rome. In 3.21, however, the cure for Propertius’ suffering is to abandon love and Rome entirely.

Propertius also connects leaving Rome in this poem with his abandonment of participation in the life of the elegiac lover and the writing of elegy. He says that he is inexperienced (*rudis*, 3.21.17) as he crosses the Adriatic sea, emphasizing not only that the journey to Athens is a new experience for himself, but also that the departure from love

represents a new direction for elegiac poetry and is symbolic of a change in genre.<sup>62</sup> As he embarks on his voyage, he says, “I am now compelled to approach the gods of the sounding waves with a prayer” (*cogar et undisonos nunc prece adire deos*, 3.21.18). As we have seen, prayers (*preces*) in elegy are usually directed from the lover toward the beloved (or vice versa), but now Propertius abandons his prayers to Cynthia and instead transfers her influence to the gods of the sea. He additionally uses words referring to enduring (*sufferre*, 3.21.21) and labor (*laborem*, 3.21.21) in reference to his travels in this poem, whereas these words should more typically describe the lover’s endurance and effort in love. Keith notes that Propertius’ journey to Greece surrounds him with the company of men, symbolizing his abandonment of the feminine world of elegy and the rejection of the elegiac life.<sup>63</sup> Propertius is writing a new kind of poetry here by appropriating the familiar language and imagery of elegy into an unfamiliar scenario.

Another way this poem departs from the norms of elegy is by employing un-Callimachean language and imagery which is more suited to epic or other elevated genres than it is to elegy.<sup>64</sup> In lines 11-14, Propertius narrates the preparations of his ship before his departure, describing it as a *navis* (3.21.11) rather than a *cumba* or other small boat as we might expect from a Callimachean author. The ship features multiple oars (*remorum*, 3.21.12), sails (*lintea*, 3.21.13), a mast (*malo*, 3.21.13), and sailors (3.21.14), further characterizing it as a large sailing vessel that requires a full crew to operate it. Propertius’ address to his comrades using the word *socii* (3.21.11) recalls the way epic travelers address their companions.<sup>65</sup> Similarly, the fact that he refers to the gods of the sea with a compound epithet (*undisonos*, 3.21.18) casts them

---

<sup>62</sup> Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 311.

<sup>63</sup> Keith (2008) 157.

<sup>64</sup> Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 307.

<sup>65</sup> Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 310.

particularly as gods of epic.<sup>66</sup> The references to setting sail on the sea (*aequora*, 3.21.11; *aequoris*, 3.21.17) rather than a small lake, pond, or stream, conflicts with the Callimachean poetics Propertius usually employs in his poetry and raises this poem more to the level of epic than elegy.

There are other echoes of epic in the poem as well. In line 24, Propertius describes the road to Athens as the road of Theseus, which Richardson says he does “only because Athens is the city of Theseus.”<sup>67</sup> This may be true on a superficial level, but on a poetic level, the mention of Theseus serves to introduce an element of epic heroism into the poem that is uncharacteristic of elegy. Propertius’ journey in this poem also places him in the role of a wandering epic hero, such as Jason or Aeneas, preparing his ship for a long journey and praying to the gods of the sea for protection. The characterization of part of his journey as a labor which he must endure (3.21.21) in particular makes him more like the long-suffering epic wanderer Odysseus than the typical elegiac lover (except, of course, for the fact that Odysseus’ goal is to return to his home and wife, while Propertius’ is to escape his home and his overbearing mistress).

In addition to the implicit connections with epic language and imagery, there are explicit references to other genres in this poem. Newman has argued that the list of Greek authors Propertius claims he will study provides insight into the sources of his poetry.<sup>68</sup> Propertius says he will study Plato and Epicurus while he is in Athens (3.21.25-26), introducing philosophy into his poem, a genre at odds with elegy because of its emphasis on the mind rather than on desire. Epicurus is a particularly fitting influence for Propertius here since his philosophy vehemently rejects love and desire.<sup>69</sup> This new interest in philosophy marks a contrast with Propertius’

---

<sup>66</sup> Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 310-311.

<sup>67</sup> Richardson (1977) 402.

<sup>68</sup> Newman (2006) 349.

<sup>69</sup> Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 312.

refusal to go to Athens in poem 1.6, which Keith sees as a rejection of both military service and philosophical inquiry and cultural exploration.<sup>70</sup> The mention of Plato in an elegiac poem brings Plato's *Symposium* to mind, given that its topic is love. However, despite the *Symposium*'s inclusion of anecdotes and vibrant personalities of its interlocutors, the work as a whole—and particularly Socrates' teachings about love as passed down to him by Diotima—nevertheless discusses love in a more objective and detached way than does elegiac poetry which fixates on love as a deeply personal and involved experience. Propertius' pursuit of philosophy in this poem thus reflects his abandonment of elegiac love not only because philosophy is a different genre, but also because it is a genre that views love in a fundamentally different way than elegy does. Propertius additionally says he plans to study the rhetoric of Demosthenes (3.21.27) and the comedies of Menander (3.21.28) while he is in Athens. The study of rhetoric represents another marked break away from elegy in that it is used mainly in the context of public service and the ruling of the state, activities that are usually represented as antithetical to elegy and the elegiac lover.

Propertius' departure from Rome in this poem leads to the end of his career as an elegiac poet. At the end of 3.21, he says that his prolonged absence from Rome will alleviate the suffering caused by love in his silent heart (*tacito sinu*, 3.21.32). The word *tacitus* here is striking because this silence implies that Propertius is no longer writing poetry and has thus given up elegy altogether.<sup>71</sup> He anticipates occupying himself with a wide variety of literature in Athens, but he never mentions meeting a new girl or finding new material for his own poetry. In this way, as Putnam notes, Propertius' journey to Athens becomes the topographical equivalent of

---

<sup>70</sup> Keith (2008) 143.

<sup>71</sup> Heyworth (2007) 398, Heyworth and Morwood (2010) 314.

abandoning the elegiac genre.<sup>72</sup> Athens may be full of art, philosophy, rhetoric, and comedy, but there is no elegy there. Just as love (*amor*) only exists for Propertius in Rome (*Roma*), writing elegy too is only possible in Rome and ceases altogether when the poet-lover leaves the city.

### Tibullus

The outlook Tibullus displays on his departure from Rome in 1.3 more closely resembles that of Propertius in 1.6 and 1.17. In this poem, he has gone abroad with his friend Messalla and has been subsequently left behind on Corcyra (which he identifies as Phaeacia) because he is ill. He portrays his withdrawal from Rome here as detrimental to his relationship with his beloved Delia and stresses his physical separation from her while he is away. At the beginning of the poem, he says, “Phaeacia detains me, sick, in unknown lands” (*me tenet ignotis aegrum Phaeacia terris*, 1.3.3), underscoring his isolation and how far away he is from Rome. He later refers to his beloved Delia sending him away from Rome (*me cum mitteret urbe*, 1.3.9), drawing attention to his motion away from the city. He also warns other lovers not to leave Rome as he did because Love will not approve of their departure (*audeat inuito ne quis discedere Amore, / aut sciat egressum se prohibente deo*, 1.3.21-22). The use of the words *discedere* and *egressum* here emphasize movement away from the city and recall Tibullus’ own departure. Additionally, Tibullus complains in this poem that his beloved Delia is nowhere around while he is on the island (*Delia non usquam*, 1.3.9), stressing her absence and the division of the two lovers caused by Tibullus’ exit from Rome.

Tibullus’ departure also creates hardship for his beloved and himself. When he prepares to leave, Delia consults all of the gods to make sure he will be safe on his journey (1.3.10), showing her concern for Tibullus and the anxiety that his voyage induces in her. She later weeps

---

<sup>72</sup> Putnam (1982) 216.

when he goes away (1.3.14), revealing her sadness at his parting and her separation from him. Tibullus' travels cause distress for himself as well. He avoids leaving by creating delays before his voyage (*quaerebam tardas anxius usque moras*, 1.3.16) and recalls bad omens to himself after he has departed (*o quotiens ingressus iter mihi tristia dixi*, 1.3.19). His unease about his travels recalls Delia's anxiety and exposes his own worries about his safety and his parting from his beloved. The sickness he endures is the worst of Tibullus' sufferings in the poem. It is the reason he is alone on the island, since he was not able to continue on the journey and Messalla was forced to leave him behind (1.3.1). He is even near death and prays that his sickness will not kill him, particularly since he is stranded and has no family or beloved to attend his body if he dies (1.3.4-9). Tibullus later interprets his illness as a result of his sin against Love (1.3.21-22), explicitly connecting his suffering with his withdrawal from Rome.

Tibullus' departure from Rome in this poem undermines the nature of elegy by introducing genres and pursuits that are at odds with it. His voyage aligns him more with epic heroes than with a typical elegiac lover. As a number of scholars have discussed, his detainment on Phaeacia creates a parallel between him and Odysseus, who also landed there on his way home.<sup>73</sup> Lee-Stecum has noticed an alternative parallel between Tibullus and Elpenor in the poem, which also places him in the world of epic, even if it assigns him to the lower rank of epic companion rather than epic hero.<sup>74</sup> Tibullus' travels thus remove him from the world of elegiac poetry and place him in the world of epic in which he does not belong. His journey brings the pursuits of *imperium* and wealth into the poem as well. Since Messalla was a military commander and therefore a symbol of Roman imperialism,<sup>75</sup> a voyage with him is at odds with

---

<sup>73</sup> Putnam (1973) 75, Cairns (1979) 44-45, Murgatroyd (1980) 100, Ball (1983) 51-52, Lee-Stecum (1998) 103, Maltby (2002) 185-186.

<sup>74</sup> Lee-Stecum (1998) 104.

<sup>75</sup> Bowditch (2012) 121.

the ethos of elegy and enrolls Tibullus in activities that elegy normally rejects, namely military service and the seeking of foreign empire.<sup>76</sup> The sickness Tibullus develops during his trip is a manifestation of his incompatibility with the world of *militia* and *imperium* and reveals how foolish it is for an elegiac poet-lover to attempt to join in these pursuits.<sup>77</sup> Because travel in general is associated with the seeking of foreign wealth, his journey additionally coopts him into a world of greed from which his poetry usually distances itself. His praise of the Golden Age in this poem for its lack of battles and violence (1.3.47-48) and sailors seeking wealth on the seas (1.3.39-40) further contrasts this peaceful age with his own time and implicitly connects his current travels with war and avarice.

Tibullus' imagined return at the end of the poem, however, reverses many of the problems caused by his departure, just as the return of Cynthia does in Propertius 1.8. His homecoming creates reunion between him and his beloved Delia as he envisions appearing before her as if sent from the sky (*uidear caelo missus adesse tibi*, 1.3.90). The use of the word *adesse* here emphasizes his physical proximity to her now that he has returned. He imagines that Delia will run to meet him when he arrives (*obuia nudato, Delia, curre pede*, 1.3.92). Her running toward him and the adjective *obuia* similarly highlight their physical nearness to each other.

Tibullus' fantasy of his return also features the fidelity of his mistress and success in his relationship with her. Just before he narrates his return, Tibullus describes Delia as chaste (*casta*, 1.3.83) and says that an old woman sits near her as a guard of her faithfulness (*sanctique pudoris / adsideat custos sedula semper anus*, 1.3.83-84). The fact that her hair is not arranged and she is not wearing her sandals (1.3.90-91) likewise suggests that she is not awaiting any other lovers

---

<sup>76</sup> Lee-Stecum (1998) 102-103.

<sup>77</sup> Lee-Stecum (1998) 109, Wilson (2009) 179-180.

but remains faithful to him while he is away.<sup>78</sup> Tibullus even goes so far as to claim that Delia is weaving in his absence, aligning her with women like Lucretia and Penelope who were famous for their chastity and fidelity to their husbands.<sup>79</sup> The fact that Delia runs to meet Tibullus right away when he arrives and does not keep him waiting outside on the threshold further underscores his amatory success when he returns. His departure created separation from his mistress and illness, but his return reunites him harmoniously with her and coincides with a return to his former health.<sup>80</sup> Notably, the solution to the separation of Tibullus and Delia in the poem is not for Delia to come nurse him back to health in Corcyra, but for him to return to Rome and see her there. The reunion of the lovers in itself will not suffice. It must take place in Rome—not elsewhere—in order to be truly successful.

Additionally, Tibullus' physical return coincides with a return to his usual elegiac pursuit of love as opposed to the pursuit of wealth and *imperium* implied in his departure. Lee-Stecum notes that travel in Tibullus is immoral because it distracts the lover from his commitment to love.<sup>81</sup> By returning and ending his travels, Tibullus thus renews this commitment and regains his identity as an elegiac lover. When he returns to Rome, he goes to his mistress' house which is full of women, including Delia herself and the women who help her with her weaving. This reflects his return to the feminine world of love and elegy and corresponding abandonment of the masculine world of Messalla and his companions. It is true that the alignment of Delia with Penelope through her weaving creates parallels with epic, but the reunion of Tibullus and Delia is not like that of Odysseus and Penelope in that Delia does not test him as Penelope does with

---

<sup>78</sup> Putnam (1973) 87, Murgatroyd (1980) 127, Maltby (2002) 212.

<sup>79</sup> Putnam (1973) 86, Lee-Stecum (1998) 127-128, Maltby (2002) 210.

<sup>80</sup> Ball (1983) 60-61.

<sup>81</sup> Lee-Stecum (1998) 114.

Odysseus.<sup>82</sup> Ball even goes so far as to say that the conclusion of 1.3 serves to characterize Tibullus as an elegiac anti-hero and Delia as an elegiac anti-heroine.<sup>83</sup> In the end, the reunion of Tibullus and Delia is an elegiac one rather than an epic one since it restores Tibullus to his former role as an elegiac lover and ends his enrolment in the pursuits of wealth, war, and *imperium* that accompanied his journey with Messalla.

### Part III: Departure of the Lover and the Beloved

#### Propertius

All of the poems discussed above feature the departure of the beloved or the lover alone. This section considers poems in which the beloved and the lover leave Rome together, including Propertius 2.26 in which Propertius imagines himself and Cynthia on a journey together, and Tibullus 1.5 in which Tibullus envisions his life of love in the country with Delia. In these poems, mutual withdrawal from Rome eliminates the threats to love featured in the other poems, reflecting a more positive outlook on leaving Rome than we have seen thus far.

In the second half of Propertius 2.26, the shared departure of Propertius and Cynthia safeguards their relationship by keeping them physically together. Propertius repeats the word *unus* several times to stress that he and Cynthia are connected by one breeze, one shore, one shelter, one water source, and one boat on their voyage together (2.26.30-33).<sup>84</sup> He imagines that Cynthia will never be away from his eyes while they are away together (*illa meis tantum non umquam desit ocellis*, 2.26.41) and predicts that they will lie together on the same shore (*certe isdem nudi pariter iactabimur oris*, 2.26.43). This use of the words *unus*, *idem*, and *pariter* highlights the physical proximity of the two lovers and the shared space and experience that their

---

<sup>82</sup> Putnam (1973) 87.

<sup>83</sup> Ball (1983) 61-62, 65.

<sup>84</sup> Heyworth (2007) 226.

voyage together provides them. Additionally, there are no rivals mentioned in Propertius' description of the journey with Cynthia, thus connecting mutual departure with fidelity. In this poem, since Propertius and Cynthia leave Rome together rather than independently, their withdrawal from the city creates harmony and union between them, unlike their individual departures which created separation and infidelity.

The voyage described in this poem does invert traditional elegy, however, just as Propertius' other poems about departure from Rome did, because it introduces elements of epic into the poem. Journeys generally are more associated with epic than elegiac poetry, and the fact that this voyage is defined as one over the vast sea (*mare per longum*, 2.26.29) particularly aligns it with the travels of heroes across the seas. Propertius says he will follow Cynthia and endure all things (*omnia perpetiar*, 2.26.35) in order to be with her, likening him to Odysseus who also suffers throughout his epic journey. The references to the winds as harsh (*saeuus*, 2.26.35) and cold (*frigidus*, 2.26.36) similarly recall the trials heroes undergo at sea at the mercy of the fickle winds.

These implicit links with epic are complemented by Propertius' explicit mention of epic figures in the poem. He compares his and Cynthia's experience with the winds to that of Odysseus (2.26.37) and the Greeks returning from Troy (2.26.38), reminding us of Homer's epics and the events following them. He compares their journey to that of the Argo (2.26.39) as well, recalling Apollonius' *Argonautika*. His claim that he will even endure Jupiter's burning of his ship (*incendat nauem Iuppiter ipse licet*, 2.26.42) evokes the general dangers to ships in stories of epic voyages, and specifically the burning of Greek ships by the Trojans in accordance with Zeus' will in the *Iliad*. Propertius' departure with Cynthia may benefit their relationship, but it is out of place in elegy because of its direct and indirect associations with epic.

The departure of Propertius and Cynthia in this poem is additionally problematic since it leads to suffering and danger for the couple. Propertius' mention of the hostility of the harsh and cold winds (2.26.35-36) and his assertion that he is willing to endure all trials (2.26.35) suggest that this journey may not be very safe. The depiction of Odysseus as wretched (*miserum*, 2.26.37) in the comparison between him and Propertius implies that Propertius, too, may be wretched on his voyage. Propertius even raises the possibility that he and Cynthia may die during their travels when he says, "let the wave bear me, as long as the earth covers you" (*me licet unda ferat, te modo terra tegat*, 2.26.44) and when he ends the poem with the lines, "but if I must lay down my life on your body, this will not be a dishonorable death for us" (*quod mihi si ponenda tuo sit corpore uita, / exitus hic nobis non inhonestus erit*, 2.26.57-58). Although Propertius expresses optimism that Neptune will protect him and Cynthia because of his sympathy toward lovers, the poem nevertheless ends with their death.

It is true that the travails of this poem are presented as endurable for Propertius since they coincide with the opportunity to remain with his mistress and are therefore not quite the same as the trials of epic. However, the hardship Propertius faces in this poem marks a break from the usual elegiac scenario in which being with the beloved creates happiness for the lover and being separated from her—whether it be physically because of withdrawal from the city or metaphorically because of a fight or breakup—leads to suffering. The problem with the departure of Propertius and Cynthia in this poem is that we expect it to ensure their happiness and wellbeing since it protects their physical union, but instead it threatens them with misery and even death by removing them from the safety of Rome and exposing them to the dangers of travel.

## Tibullus

Tibullus too sees his departure from Rome with his beloved Delia as a safeguard for their relationship. In 1.5, he imagines a life in the country with her away from Rome. His description of their time together on the farm stresses their unity and commitment to each other. At the beginning of his rural fantasy, he says, “I will till the fields, and my Delia will be present as the guard of my produce” (*rura colam, frugumque aderit mea Delia custos*, 1.5.21). The word *aderit* in this line emphasizes Delia’s physical proximity to Tibullus since they are working together in the same place. This fantasy of love in the country with Delia contrasts with the beginning of the poem in which the couple has had a fight (*discidium*, 1.5.1), making it the antidote to the emotional division between the lovers. The fact that no rivals are mentioned in the country calls attention to Delia’s fidelity while they are in the country as well. For Tibullus, the retreat to the country with Delia creates union and harmony between the two lovers.

Tibullus highlights the happy nature of his retreat to the country with Delia. He refers to his imaginary time in the country with her as a happy life (*felicem uitam*, 1.5.19). He mentions working on the farm, but does not suggest that this work is overly difficult or trying as was his work on the farm of Nemesis’ lover in 2.3. He refers to slave children playing in Delia’s lap while they are away in the country (*consuescet amantis / garrulus in dominae ludere uerna sinu*, 1.5.25-26), suggesting that their work on the farm is not too strenuous or demanding since it still provides them with time for leisure and playing. He says that Delia will work on the farm “with the sun growing warm” (*sole calente*, 1.5.22), creating a contrast between the innocuous sun in this poem and the one that caused sunburn and pain for Tibullus in 2.3. There is no mention of any physical suffering or sickness in the country in this poem, contrasting with Tibullus’ life of physical toil in 2.3 and his life-threatening sickness in 1.3. Tibullus manages to avoid the

sufferings of his other departures from Rome in this poem since in this case he and his beloved go away together rather than separately.

Tibullus' fantasy of leaving Rome for the country with Delia does, however, invert the norms of elegiac poetry. The reference to Delia as the guard of Tibullus' fruits (*frugum custos*, 1.5.21) is surprising given that guards in elegy usually serve 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.<sup>85</sup> Tibullus tells us that Delia "will become accustomed to counting the herd" (1.5.25), highlighting that these pastoral pursuits are new for Delia, not only because she has not previously been to the farm with Tibullus, but also because she is an elegiac *puella* and caring for herds is not in her usual repertoire. Tibullus expresses his wishes that Delia be in charge of the farm, saying, "let her rule everything, let all things be under her care, but let it be pleasing for me to be nothing in the whole house" (*illa regat cunctos, illi sint omnia curae: / at iuuet in tota me nihil esse domo*, 1.5.29-30). The role of Delia here as the one in control is consistent with the role of the elegiac beloved as the lover's mistress (*domina*), but what is unusual here is that her rule is actually agreeable to the lover and does not cause him any harm or pain. This conflicts especially with Tibullus' description of the hardships he endured under his cruel mistress Nemesis in 2.3. When he and his beloved leave for the country together, her rule becomes beneficial rather than harmful and he is happy give up his authority and to serve her in order to gain success and power in love.<sup>86</sup>

The departure from Rome in this poem introduces the pastoral genre into elegy as well. It features the idealization of the countryside and removes toil and hardship from the country life, as is typical of pastoral poetry. The references to tilling the fields (1.5.21), counting the flocks

---

<sup>85</sup> Putnam (1973) 102, Maltby (2002) 247.

<sup>86</sup> Lee-Stecum (1998) 166-168.

(1.5.25), processing grain (1.5.22), caring for the grapevines and wine (1.5.23-24), and making proper sacrifices to country gods (1.5.27-28) are not usual features of elegy. Unlike typical elegy that is situated in the bustling city, this poem transfers love to the peaceful countryside, thereby aligning it more with bucolic poetry. The departure of Tibullus and Delia for the country here safeguards their love and produces harmony between them, but the only way Tibullus can accomplish this is by removing them from the usual urban confines of the elegiac genre.

In the end, Tibullus must admit that the world he has created for himself and Delia in the country is merely a fantasy. He mentions that he is dreaming all of this up (*fingebam*, 1.5.20) before he details his life in the country with Delia, and again admits that he was imagining all of it (*haec mihi fingebam*, 1.5.35) at the end of his description. He even calls himself mad (*demens*, 1.5.20) for thinking up such an outlandish scenario. The reality of Tibullus' relationship with Delia is revealed especially in line 67 when he says, "alas, I sing in vain, nor does the door open conquered by my words" (*heu canimus frustra nec uerbis uicta patescit / ianua*, 1.5.67-68), and we realize that this poem is in fact an example of the elegiac *paraclausithyron*.<sup>87</sup> The closed door and the powerlessness of Tibullus and his poetry reveal that his pastoral life with Delia is merely a delusion and cannot be realized. As many scholars have noted, these themes of the infringement of reality upon imagination<sup>88</sup> and the ultimate failure of fantasies—especially pastoral fantasies<sup>89</sup>—are recurring ones in Tibullus' poetry.

Instead, the typical urban elements of elegiac poetry reappear in the poem after Tibullus ends his description of his country fantasy. He complains about his failure in love with Delia and blames it on a wealthy rival (*diues amator*, 1.5.47) and a conniving madam (*callida lena*, 1.5.48),

---

<sup>87</sup> Putnam (1973) 107, Murgatroyd (1980) 184, Maltby (2002) 258.

<sup>88</sup> Elder (1962) 85, Ross (1975) 160.

<sup>89</sup> Luck (1969) 72-74, Lyne (1980) 158-163, Lee-Stecum (1998) 164-166, Lee (2008) 207-208.

both stock characters of urban elegy.<sup>90</sup> Near the end of the poem, Tibullus describes a lover on Delia's doorstep as a warning to his rival who is currently with her. He casts this lover as an *exclusus amator* in typical elegiac fashion, saying that he stands on the threshold (*in limine perstat*, 1.5.71) and paces back and forth outside the house (1.5.72-73) and characterizing him as alone in front of Delia's doors (*solus et ante... fores*, 1.5.74). He also warns his wealthy rival to beware the wheel of fortune that could overturn his luck at any time (1.5.69-70), calling attention to the fickleness of Delia as an elegiac *puella*. Despite Tibullus' attempts to mentally escape from Rome and the challenges it poses to love, ultimately his fantasy fails and he finds himself back in the city with its guarded doors, shut out lovers, and wealthy rivals. For Tibullus, just as for Propertius, love and elegy cannot actually be removed from the space of Rome and the urban nature of elegy must ultimately reassert itself whether the poet-lover enjoys it or not.

### Conclusion

As their poems about departure from the city of Rome display, both Propertius and Tibullus see Rome as the necessary locus of elegiac poetry. Propertius is especially engaged with the urban space of Rome and all of his poems about the departure of the elegiac lover or beloved from the city deal heavily with the relationship between love (*amor*) and Rome (*Roma*). Scholars have argued that love in Propertius is at odds with Rome because Rome is predicated on weapons (*arma*) and weapons are antithetical to both love and the elegiac rejection of civic duty.<sup>91</sup> As DeBrohun puts it, Propertius "set[s] up a conflict between *Roma* and *amor* over the value of *arma* without offering any resolution for that conflict."<sup>92</sup> These interpretations of *amor* as conflicted with *Roma* focus on *Roma* as a symbolic construct for Roman imperialism. It is true

<sup>90</sup> Putnam (1973) 105.

<sup>91</sup> DeBrohun (2003) 22-24, 34-35, 82-85; Welch (2005) 22, 63-65, 76.

<sup>92</sup> DeBrohun (2003) 85.

that *Roma* is a symbolic construct of the seat of empire and militarism and that *amor* is at odds with this construct, but we must keep in mind that *Roma* is also a literal physical place and that the physical site of Rome, i.e. the place itself, is a crucial element of elegy. When the lover or the beloved in Propertius' elegies leaves Rome, their love cannot thrive and therefore neither can elegiac poetry. In her discussion of Propertius' poem about Tarpeia in Book 4, Welch argues that Tarpeia's situation is "a commentary on the relationship between elegiac poetry and the Roman cityscape. Elegy, like Tarpeia, dwells in Rome's margins and is vulnerable to the city."<sup>93</sup> This is true, but it is important to remember that elegy is also intimately connected with Rome.

Propertian elegy may not place itself in the middle of Roman politics and *imperium*, but it does place itself immovably in the urban space of the city. Poems 4.3 and 1.6 call attention to the tension between *amor* and *Roma* as empire, but both of these poems, as well as 1.8, 1.11-12, and 3.21, intimately link *amor* and *Roma* the place. As Propertius notes in 3.21, he will always desire Cynthia as long as he is in Rome. At the same time, the other poems show that the departure of elegiac lovers and beloveds from Rome threatens love and love poetry. For Propertius, you cannot have *Roma* without *amor*, and more importantly, you cannot have *amor* without *Roma*.<sup>94</sup>

Propertius' outlook on attachment to the city of Rome thus shares similarities with that of Ovid and Livy. As elegists, Ovid and Propertius both see Rome as the necessary place for love and elegiac poetry to take place. It is true that Propertius, as an elegist, generally focuses on the personal, private aspects of the experience of Rome and is less concerned with Roman nationalism than Livy is. Nevertheless, his work does include poems with more nationalistic leanings, especially those in Book 4. He also embraces the physical space of the city as Livy

---

<sup>93</sup> Welch (2005) 78.

<sup>94</sup> The fact that *Roma* is *amor* spelled backwards (and vice versa) adds particularly poignant wordplay to this idea.

does and sees departure from Rome as a removal of something inherently necessary in elegy, just as Livy sees leaving Rome as detrimental to the necessary and natural connection between the Romans and the physical space of their city. Although Propertius and Horace both exhibit a sense of familiarity with and belonging in the urban space of Rome, Propertius differs from Horace in that he does not also continually fantasize about another life outside the city.

Tibullus, however, shares Horace's longing for the countryside and wishes he could have a peaceful rural life there. He does connect elegy with the city of Rome as Propertius and Ovid do, but he does not display the same attachment to the city and belonging within it that we see in Propertius, Ovid, and Livy. Tibullus' ties to Rome seem to come more from the requirements of his genre than from a personal connection to the city. Like Horace, he imagines that the country would be more enjoyable than the city, but elegy, like satire, is an urban genre by nature and therefore eliminates the possibility of his fantasies about love in the country coming true. Tibullus, unlike Propertius, would readily choose pastoral love over urban love if he could, but must grudgingly accept the fact that this option is not open to him in reality.

One possible reason for the difference in outlook on the city in these two elegists is that Tibullus displays less poetic self-consciousness in his work than Propertius does. Tibullus does incorporate Alexandrian and Callimachean elements into his poetry, but unlike Propertius he does not do it ostentatiously or make explicit references to his Hellenistic predecessors. In Propertius' elegies, the poet-lover persona knows he is a poet and has a heightened awareness of this role in addition to his role as a lover. Tibullus' poet-lover, on the other hand, seems less overtly aware of his role as a poet and is focused more exclusively on his role as a lover. Propertius' poet-lover embraces Rome more readily because he is more concerned with the construct of elegy and the role the city plays within it, while the lover in Tibullus' elegies is less

prepared to do this since he is more concerned with his relationship with his beloved and its outcome. Propertius' persona sees the city as a venue for exploring elegiac poetry and its possibilities. Tibullus' views Rome as a hindrance to successful love<sup>95</sup> but knows he cannot escape it, causing him to display a greater sense of alienation from the city than we see in Propertius.

Propertius and Tibullus both display varying levels of choice and agency in their narratives of departure from Rome. When his beloved leaves Rome, the lover has no choice or power to stop her, but instead must wait for her to return or attempt to bring about her return through his poetry. When the lover himself leaves Rome, the choice is his own, and he may even ignore the protests of his beloved if he chooses. In both scenarios, though, the result of departure is the same: leaving Rome coincides with the end of love and elegiac poetry. Even when the lover exercises his own agency and chooses to leave Rome or fantasizes about doing so, he is still ultimately drawn back to Rome because of the connection between the city and his poetry. The poet may be able to make his own travel plans, but he does not have the power to override elegy's dependence on the urban environment of Rome and thus cannot fully dictate his relationship to the city on his own terms. In the end, both authors come to the conclusion—reluctantly or not—that Rome is the proper place for love and the writing of elegy and that departure from Rome coincides with the end of these pursuits.

---

<sup>95</sup> Elder (1962) 83.

## Chapter 3

## Elegiac Departures: Ovid

Much of the existing scholarship on Ovid's works from exile focuses on what these works can tell us about Ovid as a poet. Some scholarship focuses on how Ovid represents himself and his suffering in his exile poetry,<sup>1</sup> or on how he characterizes Tomis, his place of exile, and utilizes it as a foil to Rome.<sup>2</sup> Another area of research has been on Ovid's representation of his poetry written from exile, with special focus on scrutinizing Ovid's claims of poetic decline in these works.<sup>3</sup> Scholars have also paid much attention to how Ovid's poetry from exile interfaces with his earlier works,<sup>4</sup> including how it inverts many of the tropes of his *Amores*,<sup>5</sup> how its epistolary format draws on his *Heroides*,<sup>6</sup> and how it reinterprets his *Ars Amatoria*, the work that led to his exile.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, scholars have noted how Ovid's exile poetry draws on a number of literary genres,<sup>8</sup> especially epic and its tradition of wandering epic heroes.<sup>9</sup> Most Ovid scholars have now abandoned the interpretation of Ovid's exile works as factual autobiography and instead view them as a fictionalization of exile that draws on existing literary

---

<sup>1</sup> Dickinson (1973) 158, 161-163, 174, 179; Evans (1983) 74, 90; Wilkinson (1955) 315; Claassen (1999) 202, 238-239; Holzberg (2002) 195; Williams (2002a) 342-344, 349; Williams (2002b) 234; Claassen (2009) 179; McGowan (2009) 150.

<sup>2</sup> Dickinson (1973) 174; Evans (1983) 63-64, 137; Williams (1994) 7-15; Edwards (1996) 117, 125; Habinek (1998) 154-158; Claassen (1999) 191-196; Williams (2002b) 236; McGowan (2009) 135.

<sup>3</sup> Williams (1994) 52-54, Claassen (1999) 214-219, Williams (2002a) 359-360, Williams (2002b) 238-239, Gaertner (2007b) 161.

<sup>4</sup> Claassen (1999) 32-33, Barchiesi (2001) 26-28, Claassen (2009) 173.

<sup>5</sup> Evans (1983) 77; Williams (1994) 31; Edwards (1996) 118; Claassen (1999) 213; Hardie (2002) 286; Holzberg (2002) 176-177, 197; Williams (2002a) 350-352; Sharrock (2012) 72; Welch (2012) 103.

<sup>6</sup> Dickinson (1973) 159; Rosenmeyer (1997) 29, 31-35, 38, 45-48; Smith (1997) 193; Holzberg (2002) 176-177.

<sup>7</sup> Barchiesi (2001) 90ff.

<sup>8</sup> For how Ovid draws on the tradition of exile literature, see Dickinson (1973) 158-159, Gaertner (2007a) 14-18, and Gaertner (2007b) 157-160. For similarities between Ovid's exile works and Greek epistolary novels, see Holzberg (2002) 177-178.

<sup>9</sup> Evans (1983) 37, 40, 47-48; Edwards (1996) 121; Smith (1997) 193; Hardie (2002) 289-290; Holzberg (2002) 181; Williams (2002a) 350-352; Williams (2002b) 236; Claassen (2009) 174-175; Galasso (2009) 204.

forms.<sup>10</sup> As Rosenmeyer says, Ovid's portrayal of his exile is "a construction of the self, not a reflection of any lived reality. 'Reality' takes a back seat here to representation."<sup>11</sup> Most of this work on Ovid is more concerned with Ovid himself and his poetry than specifically with exile. Even scholars who discuss Ovid's fictionalization of exile chiefly use this approach as a way of studying Ovid and the way he approaches poetry.

There are some scholars, however, who have examined Ovid's exile poetry as a way of studying exile in Classical literature. Most notably, Gaertner and Claassen have both treated exile literature as a whole tradition, examining exile in several authors rather than focusing on one author.<sup>12</sup> Although I draw on much of the scholarship that focuses specifically on Ovid in my discussion of Ovid's departure from Rome here, my goal is more in line with those of Gaertner and Claassen in that I am interested in not only how Ovid in particular represents exile in his exile poetry, but also how his exilic works fit into a broader framework of departure from Rome in the Augustan period. In this way, my study expands on previous scholarly treatments of Ovid's exile poetry by considering it in relation to other narratives of exile from the same period rather than in isolation.

This chapter discusses Ovid's poetic representation of his exile from Rome. In both parts of the chapter, "Part I: External Changes," and "Part II: Internal Changes," the discussion focuses on three poems: *Tristia* 1.1, the opening poem of Ovid's exile works in which he sends his book to Rome in his place; *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.4, in which Ovid addresses his wife; and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 in which Ovid fondly recalls memories from home. These three poems are complemented throughout by discussion of parts of other poems, including: *Tristia* 1.3,

---

<sup>10</sup> Evans (1983) 48; Rosenmeyer (1997) 49-51; Smith (1997) 194; Claassen (1999) 10, 30-31, 130; Holzberg (2002) 176; Williams (2002a) 340-341; Williams (2002b) 235; Claassen (2008) 5-6, 29, 38-39, 185, 215.

<sup>11</sup> Rosenmeyer (1997) 49.

<sup>12</sup> Claassen (1999), Gaertner (2007).

Ovid's description of his last night in Rome; *Tristia* 1.5 in which Ovid compares himself to the hero Odysseus; *Tristia* 3.1 in which Ovid's latest book of poetry tours Rome; *Tristia* 3.4b on his longing for his friends; *Tristia* 3.14 on the loss of Ovid's poetic talent; *Tristia* 4.1 on Ovid's love-hate relationship with poetry in his exile; *Tristia* 4.2 in which Ovid imagines Tiberius' triumph over the Germans; *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2 on the dangers of Tomis; *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.10 to Macer in which Ovid remembers the time they used to spend together as friends; and *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4 on the celebration in Rome of Sextus Pompey's consulship.

Part I argues that Ovid sees exile as fundamentally changing the world around him and his role within it. In physical, spatial terms, it causes him to lose the city of Rome that he loves and forces him to live in a new environment that is dangerous and inhospitable. Socially, it deprives him of his beloved friends and family who must stay behind in Rome after he departs and removes him from the poetic culture of Rome that he used to enjoy. Ovid's exile and the resulting stigma attached to him because of it similarly changes the way he is perceived in Rome in his absence. His friends abandon him and strangers look down upon him. His poetry is also received differently in Rome as his readers begin to reject his poems and no longer favor them as they used to.

Despite these changes, Ovid attempts to preserve his connection to Rome in his absence by means of his poetry. He views his poetry as an extension of himself that has the power to return to Rome on his behalf. He also employs his imagination frequently to place himself in Rome with his friends and family and participate in public events, using his mind to transport him where he cannot physically go. These attempts to access Rome through poetry always fall short, however, and in the end serve to further emphasize the transformation of Ovid's life as a result of his exile.

Part II argues that these changes in the poet's environment and his relationship to the city of Rome and his fellow Romans result in a fundamental change in the poet himself and in the way he thinks about and writes poetry. Ovid claims that he is no longer the same person he was before his exile, reflecting a shift in his identity after he leaves Rome. He no longer characterizes himself as the poet-lover he was in his previous elegiac works. His outlook on poetry changes dramatically as well, as he comes to hate the Muses and the poetry he formerly cherished for the way they have ruined him. He now no longer sees poetry as a way to gain fame, but instead as a way to restore himself to Rome and console himself in his sorrow.

Ovid also represents his exile as causing a change in the nature and quality of his poetry. He asserts that the poetry he writes in exile is not as good as the poetry he once wrote because his talent has been ruined by the hardships he must endure. The poems he writes in exile feature elements of epic that are uncharacteristic of elegiac poetry, reflecting a break away from his earlier work. The pervasive presence of Augustus and his role in bringing about Ovid's exile also marks a break from the elegies he wrote previously, which are not as outwardly concerned with Augustus or his role in the poet's life. Ovid's departure from Rome turns his world upside down and transforms him into a different person and subsequently into a different kind of poet than he was before.

## Part I: External Changes: The Poet's World

### Things Lost

In Ovid's exile poetry, exile changes the world around the poet and his relationship to it by depriving him of what is most dear to him. Exile changes his physical world because it forces him to leave the city of Rome and live a life of hardship in a distant foreign land. In *Tristia* 1.3,

the recollection of his last night in Rome, Ovid laments the loss of the city of Rome and his home there. In the opening lines, he says, “when the saddest image of that night comes to my mind, on which I spent my last time in the city, when I recall that night, on which I left behind so many things dear to me, even now a tear falls from my eyes” (*cum subit illius tristissima noctis imago, / qua mihi supremum tempus in urbe fuit, / cum repeto noctem, qua tot mihi cara reliqui, / labitur ex oculis nunc quoque gutta meis, Tr. 1.3.1-4*). Ovid here emphasizes the sadness he felt at leaving Rome and the precious things lost as a result. He later laments that he is forced to leave Rome behind (*Roma relinquenda est, Tr. 1.3.62*) and explains that he delays his departure because he is held back by a love of his country (*blando patriae retinebar amore, Tr. 1.3.49*), showing his despair at losing Rome itself. He laments the loss of his house in the city as well. When he attempts leave his house, he states, “three times I touched the threshold, and three times I was called back” (*ter limen tetigi, ter sum revocatus, Tr. 1.3.55*). He says he is deprived of his house and the members of his household (*et domus et fidae dulcia membra domus, Tr. 1.3.64*), revealing that it is not only the people in his house he is sad to lose, but also the physical space of the house itself.

In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, Ovid longs for the city and gives some indication of what his new environment in Tomis is like. He recalls his former urban life in Rome (*urbanae commoda vitae, Pont. 1.8.29*) and says that the pleasures of the city have been taken from him in his misery (*urbis misero est erepta voluptas, Pont. 1.8.39*). He even recalls specific places in Rome that he misses, including the fora, temples, and theaters (*Pont. 1.8.35*), the porticoes (*Pont. 1.8.36*), and the Campus Martius with its grass and gardens (*Pont. 1.8.37*). In contrast, at the beginning of the poem, he says, “I, accustomed to peace, live among constant warfare, with the quiver-carrying Getae stirring up harsh wars” (*vivimus assiduis expertes pacis in armis / dura pharetrato bella*

*movente Geta, Pont. 1.8.5-6*), characterizing the place of his exile as dangerous and hostile, unlike the peaceful city of Rome. McGowan notes that this portrayal of Tomis as lacking laws and safety makes it a foil to Rome,<sup>13</sup> drawing attention to the profound change in Ovid's surroundings after his exile.

He also contrasts his surroundings in exile with the city of Rome in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2. Near the beginning, he says that he lives amid enemies and dangers and that peace has been taken away from him along with his country (*hostibus in mediis interque pericula versor, / tamquam cum patria pax sit adempta mihi, Pont. 1.2.13-14*). He highlights the constant warfare in Tomis by stating that the roofs there are covered with arrows fixed in them and the city gate scarcely prohibits weapons (*tecta rigent fixis veluti velata sagittis, / portaque vix firma summovet arma sera, Pont. 1.2.21-22*). The emphasis on danger and warfare in Tomis here characterizes Ovid's place of exile as harsh in itself and especially in contrast to the peace and safety he enjoyed in Rome. Ovid further adds that Tomis has no foliage or trees and that it is in a state of continuous winter (*adde loci faciem nec fronde nec arbore tecti, / et quod iners hiemi continuatur hiems, Pont. 1.2.23-24*). He draws on existing descriptions of Scythia here,<sup>14</sup> giving his harsh depiction of Tomis further weight by aligning it with the well-known literary tradition of another frozen desert. As Habinek notes, the primitive nature of Tomis in Ovid's exile works contrasts generally with the development and progress found in Italy.<sup>15</sup> At the same time, the lack of beauty and pleasantness in Tomis contrasts particularly with the picture Ovid presents of Rome as full of beautiful buildings and gardens in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8.

---

<sup>13</sup> McGowan (2009) 135.

<sup>14</sup> See Williams (1994) 9-10 and Evans (1983) 63-64.

<sup>15</sup> Habinek (1998) 158-159.

For Ovid, Tomis represents the true opposite of Rome.<sup>16</sup> Geographically, it lies at the unstable edge of the Roman Empire, while Rome is at the center.<sup>17</sup> The influence of previous literary descriptions of Scythia on Ovid's description of Tomis further emphasizes its remoteness and foreignness.<sup>18</sup> The epistolary format of his exile poetry likewise calls attention to the physical remoteness and isolation of his place of exile.<sup>19</sup> For Ovid, there is a proportional relationship between his physical distance from Rome and the extremity of his sufferings.<sup>20</sup> The representation of Tomis as the geographical antithesis of Rome thus serves to reinforce how miserable exile is for the poet. Tomis also functions as the antithesis of a golden age,<sup>21</sup> while Rome enjoys the peace and prosperity of a new golden age under Augustus. Ovid even aligns Tomis with the underworld<sup>22</sup> and his life there with death.<sup>23</sup> Ovid's exile is unbearable not only because it deprives him of his home, but because his home is Rome, the best possible city to be in. The loss of this incomparable city as his home is made even worse by the fact that he must now live in a place that contrasts so starkly with the stability and urban amenities the city of Rome provided him.

Ovid also highlights the changes in his social and interpersonal world brought on by his exile. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, he says he remembers his sweet friends in his mind and that he is thinking about his daughter and wife (*vos animo dulces reminiscor amici, / nunc mihi cum cara coniuge nata subit, Pont.* 1.8.31-32), stressing the loss of his friends and family as a result

---

<sup>16</sup> Helzle (1989) 106.

<sup>17</sup> Williams (1994) 11, Helzle (2003) 401.

<sup>18</sup> Williams (1994) 8-13.

<sup>19</sup> Williams (1994) 11; Hinds (2006) 420-421 (reprint of Hinds, S. (1985) "Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 31, 13-32.).

<sup>20</sup> Williams (2002a) 344.

<sup>21</sup> Williams (1994) 13-15, Williams (2002b) 236.

<sup>22</sup> Williams (1994) 12-13, Edwards (1996) 125, Williams (2002b) 236.

<sup>23</sup> Gaertner (2005) 145, 445-446; Claassen (2008) 44-45; Williams (1994) 12.

of his exile. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.4, he addresses his wife and wishes that he could see her, kiss her, and embrace her (*Pont.* 1.4.49-51). He also wants to have a conversation with her (*Pont.* 1.4.54). These wishes demonstrate his longing for his loved ones and his desire for familiar human contact and social interaction. Edwards sees an alignment between Ovid's longing for his wife and his longing for Rome,<sup>24</sup> creating an explicit link between the poet's familial relationships and the site of Rome.

*Tristia* 1.3 similarly recounts the pain of Ovid's parting with his family and friends as he prepares to leave Rome. He repeatedly refers to the loss of his wife, friends, and family. He speaks to his friends (*Tr.* 1.3.15), weeps while he embraces his wife (*Tr.* 1.3.17), regrets that his daughter is far away in Libya and does not know about his exile (*Tr.* 1.3.19-20), and recalls his friends that are like brothers to him (*Tr.* 1.3.65). While emphasizing his delay in leaving, he says, "I often said many things again with my goodbyes already said, and I gave my last kisses as if I were departing" (*saepe 'vale' dicto rursus sum multa locutus, / et quasi descendens oscula summa dedi, Tr.* 1.3.57-58). Later, he describes the clamor and grief of his family and friends at his departure (*Tr.* 1.3.77). The emphasis throughout the poem on embraces, kisses, conversation, and shared grief highlights Ovid's human connection to the city and his loss of intimate human contact when he goes into exile. Rosati argues that this poem draws on the elegiac theme of the separation of lovers to underscore Ovid's separation from his wife<sup>25</sup> and that the parallels here with *Heroides* 13 suggest that Ovid, like Protesilaus, is going to his death.<sup>26</sup>

Ovid stresses the loss of the poetic environment and audience he enjoys in Rome as well. In *Tristia* 3.14, he says that Tomis has weapons instead of books and there is no one in that land who would understand his poems if he recited them (*pro libris arcus et arma sonant. / nullus in*

---

<sup>24</sup> Edwards (1996) 118.

<sup>25</sup> Rosati (1999) 789-790.

<sup>26</sup> Rosati (1999) 790-796.

*hac terra, recitem si carmina, cuius / intellecturis auribus utar, adest, Tr. 3.14.38-40*). He makes similar claims in *Tristia* 4.1 where he says there is no one in Tomis to whom he could read his poetry or who would comprehend the Latin words he uses (*sed neque cui recitem quisquam est mea carmina, nec qui / auribus accipiat verba Latina suis, Tr. 4.1.89-90*). He later mockingly asks if the barbarian Getae are to read his poetry (*Tr. 4.1.94*). Here he calls attention to the lack of the Latin language in Tomis, which alienates him from his native language and the learned culture of poetry he enjoyed in Rome. He also says, “I myself write and read to myself (for what else could I do?), and my poetry is safe by its own judgment” (*ipse mihi (quid enim faciam?) scriboque legoque, / tutaque iudicio littera nostra suo est, Tr. 4.1.91-92*). Because no one in Tomis can understand his poetry, there is no one to help judge Ovid’s poetry and he loses the valuable feedback he might have gotten from other poets and critics. This is especially damaging for a poet during the age of Augustus, when poetry is particularly viewed as a communal activity rather than a solitary one.<sup>27</sup> Ovid’s departure from Rome thus isolates him from his city, his family and friends, and the poetic community to which he formerly belonged.

Ovid’s exile also changes his status in Rome and the way he and his poetry are perceived by others. The fear of being abandoned and forgotten by friends is a common one in Ovid’s exile works.<sup>28</sup> He complains that people in Rome have forsaken him and no longer pay attention to him during his time of need in exile. In *Tristia* 1.5, he says, “scarcely two or three of my friends out of so many remain” (*vix duo tresve mihi de tot superestis amici, Tr. 1.5.33*). He later explicitly connects this abandonment with his exile when he states, “my companions have deserted me in my banishment” (*me profugum comites deseruere mei, Tr. 1.5.64*). In *Epistulae*

---

<sup>27</sup> White (2005) 328-330.

<sup>28</sup> Gaertner (2005) 140-141, 292-293.

*ex Ponto* 1.4 too he says that everyone has deserted him in his flight (*nostram cuncti destituere fugam, Pont. 1.4.34*). He also tells his wife at the beginning of the poem that she would not recognize him if she saw him (*nec, si me subito videas, agnoscere possis, Pont. 1.4.5*), revealing his anxiety about being forgotten in Rome while he is away.

Ovid revisits this fear of abandonment in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.10, in which he worries that his friend Macer might be forgetting him. He begins the poem by saying, “do you recognize at all from the image on the pressed wax that Ovid writes these words to you, Macer? And if my ring is not an indicator of its author, was my handwriting recognized?” (*ecquid ab impressae cognoscis imagine cerae / haec tibi Nasonem scribere verba, Macer? / auctorisque sui si non est anulus index, / cognitane est nostra littera facta manu?, Pont. 2.10.1-4*). Ovid here shows his worry that the usual tokens of recognition might not work while he is in exile and his friend might not be able to recognize them. He worries that if Macer forgets his seal and his handwriting, he might also forget about his affection for him (*sic licet oblitus pariter gemmaeque manusque, / exciderit tantum ne tibi cura mei, Pont. 2.10.7-8*), explicitly connecting the loss of Macer’s memory of him to the loss of the personal bond between them. Ovid cites the passage of time (*mora temporis, Pont. 2.10.5*) in his absence as the cause of this forgetfulness, suggesting that he becomes more and more alienated from Rome the longer he stays in exile. Although the memories his friends and family have of him help keep him connected to Rome even though he is so far away, these memories are precarious. If they are lost because of the spatial and temporal distance caused by exile, then the poet’s connection to Rome and the people he loves there is lost too and he is no longer part of his old world at all.

Furthermore, Ovid complains that his poetry is received differently in Rome after his exile. In *Tristia* 1.1 he says that his poems no longer enjoy the favor they once had (*non sunt ut*

*quondam plena favoris erant*, *Tr.* 1.1.64). He warns his new book that there will be people in Rome who throw his poetry from their laps because they think it should not be read (*siquis erit, qui te, quia sis meus, esse legendum / non putet, e gremio reiciatque suo*, *Tr.* 1.1.65-66), further indicating the negative opinion people in Rome have of his poetry after his exile. Ovid's explanation for this is that his ruined reputation as a result of his exile has spread to his poetry and is giving it a bad reputation too. Just as his *Ars Amatoria* ruined the reputation of its author, the author's reputation is now ruining that of his other poetry.

In *Tristia* 3.4b, Ovid comments on the new negative reception of his poetry even among his friends. Here he claims that he wants to name his friends in the poems he addresses to them in the *Tristia*, but he is afraid that he will get them into trouble (*Tr.* 3.4b.63-64). He then says to his friends, "I think that you yourselves do not wish to be put in my poetry. But you wanted to before, and it was a mark of a pleasing honor for your names to be read in my verses" (*ipsos / in nostro poni carmine nolle puto. / ante volebatis, gratique erat instar honoris, / versibus in nostris nomina vestra legi*, *Tr.* 3.4b.65-68). He makes clear in this poem that his exile and the ruin of his personal reputation has made his poetry less valued in Rome and has even changed its reception among his closest friends who now want to avoid being associated with him through his poetry.

His poetry is similarly received at the libraries of Rome in *Tristia* 3.1. Here, his new book of poetry goes to Rome and tries unsuccessfully to find a place for itself there. The book of poetry speaks to the audience directly and says it went to Rome looking for its brothers (*quarebam fratres*, *Tr.* 3.1.65), namely Ovid's earlier poetry, but when it arrived at a library, it states, "the guard stationed in front of the sacred place ordered me, seeking in vain, to go away from that place" (*quaerentem frustra custos e sedibus illis / praepositus sancto iussit abire loco*, *Tr.* 3.1.67-68). The book is then rejected in the same way from two other libraries in the city (*Tr.*

3.1.69-72). Here the poet's book suffers the same fate of being excluded from its home in the library as Ovid suffers being excluded from his home in the city, connecting the negative reception of the poetry in Rome with the disgrace of the poet in his exile.

### The Limitations of Imagination and Memory

Ovid responds to the loss of his city by using his poetry as a way of maintaining his connection to Rome. A number of scholars have argued that Ovid sees his exile poetry as an extension of himself and sends it to Rome in his place because he cannot return to the city personally.<sup>29</sup> In the first lines of *Tristia* 1.1, he says, "you will go without me, little book (I do not begrudge you) into the city, since, alas, it is not permitted for me, your master, to go" (*parve (nec invideo) sine me, liber, ibis in urbem: / ei mihi, quod domino non licet ire tuo, Tr. 1.1.1-2*). He later claims that he will be able to touch the places in the city where his book can go (*Tr. 1.1.16*). He makes his conflation of himself with his book more explicit later in the poem when he says, "nevertheless, you go in my place, and you, for whom it is permitted, see Rome. May the gods make it that I now could be my book" (*tu tamen i pro me, tu, cui licet, aspice Romam: / di facerent, possem nunc meus esse liber, Tr. 1.1.57-58*). Because Ovid's poetry is an extension of himself, a part of him is able to go to Rome when he sends his poems there. Ovid's exile thus opens up a new way of employing the personification of poetry as a reflection of its author.<sup>30</sup>

It is also important to notice, though, that Ovid does not fully achieve the satisfaction he seeks by sending his poetry to Rome in his place. *Tristia* 1.1 highlights the special privileges the book enjoys that are denied to the poet, since it can travel to Rome while he must stay in Tomis. The wordplay Ovid employs here with the word *liber* emphasizes the differences between him

<sup>29</sup> Edwards (1996) 119, 123-124; Claassen (1999) 179; Hardie (2002) 297-300; Claassen (2008) 47-48.

<sup>30</sup> Luck (1977) 11-12.

and his book because the book (*liber*) is free (*liber*) to go where he cannot, even though he is the master (*dominus*) of the book and should have freedom that the book does not.<sup>31</sup> Ovid also describes the book of poetry as being received into the innermost part of his house (*in nostrum fureris penetrare receptus*, *Tr.* 1.1.105) and into its own home, namely Ovid's bookcase (*contigerisque tuam, scrinia curva, domum*, *Tr.* 1.1.106). The book is thus able to access both the poet's house and its home (*domus*), in contrast with the poet himself who is permanently excluded from his house in Rome. Ovid's assimilation of himself with his poetry here allows him to access Rome vicariously since the poem travels there in his place, but it ultimately draws further attention to the true exclusion of the poet since we are always aware that the book is going to Rome while he is left behind. Sending the book in his place is not enough for the poet who wants his whole self to return to Rome, not merely a part of himself.

Another book of Ovid's poetry goes to Rome in his place in *Tristia* 3.1. Here, the poem speaks for itself and remarks that it has been sent to Rome nervously as the book of an exile (*missus in hanc venio timide liber exulis urbem*, *Tr.* 3.1.1). Again the use of the word *liber* highlights the book's freedom to go where its exiled author cannot. Later in the poem, the book asks its readers where it should go and what home it should seek as a book and a newcomer in the city (*dicite, lectores...qua sit eundum, / quasque petam sedes hospes in urbe liber*, *Tr.* 3.1.19-20). The word *sedes* here implies that the book seeks a permanent place in the city, in contrast with its author who will not have a permanent or even temporary place in the city again. The book then goes on to make this contrast between itself and its author more explicit when it says that the gods have not given its author the right to live in his own country (*Tr.* 3.1.23-24).

Although the book is able to go to Rome, Ovid's goal of using it to place himself in the city is not entirely successful. He is still unable to go to the city personally, and even his book,

---

<sup>31</sup> Hinds (2006) 416-417.

which is supposed to be his alternative means of accessing the city, is excluded from parts of it. The book's exclusion from Rome's libraries thus mirrors Ovid's exclusion from the city itself. In this way Ovid replays the *exclusus amator* topos from his earlier elegiac poetry, but now the stakes are much higher because the inaccessible object of his desire is not his mistress but the city of Rome.<sup>32</sup> The fact that the book sees itself as a newcomer (*hospes*, *Tr.* 3.1.20) in Rome and requires a guided tour of the forum area and the Palatine from a friendly reader (*Tr.* 3.1.27-32) also reveals its failure at sufficiently taking Ovid's place in the city. Unlike Ovid, who knows Rome intimately, the book is a stranger there and does not even know enough to recognize its major sites and buildings. The book's presence in Rome is a poor substitute for that of the poet himself who feels a greater sense of belonging, knowledge, and intimacy with the city.

In addition to sending his poems to Rome as a way of vicariously visiting the city, Ovid also frequently attempts to bridge the divide between himself and Rome by using his imagination. Scholars often emphasize the power of Ovid's mind to overcome the isolation of his exile.<sup>33</sup> In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8, he remembers (*reminiscor*) his friends and family in Rome despite being so far away (*Pont.* 1.8.31-32). He then pictures the rest of the city, saying, "I turn to the places of the beautiful city, and my mind sees everything by using its own eyes" (*pulchrae loca vector ad urbis, / cunctaque mens oculis pervidet usa suis*, *Pont.* 1.8.33-34). He gives a specific list of the places he sees in the city, including the fora, temples, theaters, and Campus Martius (*Pont.* 1.8.35-38). In this way the poet uses his imagination to see all of the parts of the city that he cannot physically visit, giving him access to the city from which he has been banished.

---

<sup>32</sup> See Edwards (1996) 118, Holzberg (2002) 176-177, Sharrock (2012) 72, and Welch (2012) 103.

<sup>33</sup> Edwards (1996) 124, Claassen (1999) 178, Hardie (2002) 307, Claassen (2008) 46-47.

Less scholarly attention has been paid, however, to the ways in which Ovid's imagination fails at linking him with the people and places he longs for in Rome. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.4, Ovid pictures a reunion with his wife. He imagines that she has now grown old because of their shared sufferings and wishes he could see her and kiss her now in her changed state (*credibile est nostris insenuisse malis. / o, ego di faciant talem te cernere possim, / caraque mutatis oscula ferre comis, Pont. 1.4.48-50*). As Gaertner notes, there are parallels between Ovid's imagined reunion with his wife here and the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope in *Odyssey* 23.<sup>34</sup> Despite these parallels, though, Ovid differs from Odysseus in that he is limited to imaginary reunions and never achieves the real thing. The comparison with Odysseus thus serves to undercut the power of Ovid's imagination to affect a real change in his situation.

Ovid's imagination of his wife may not coincide with what she now looks like in actuality, though. He cannot in fact see her and can only conjecture what she looks like after time has passed, revealing the inherent disconnect between imagination and reality. At the beginning of the same poem, Ovid says that his wife might not recognize him if she saw him (*Pont. 1.4.5-6*), so it stands to reason that he might not recognize her if he saw her either. Ovid's imaginings of Rome and his family allow him mental access to the city since he cannot go there physically and allows him to stay connected with his old physical and social world in some way, but it does not keep him connected to the reality of what is happening in Rome as the city and the people within it change over time without him. His imagination reflects his fantasy of Rome, not the reality of the city, and thus ultimately underscores his separation and alienation from the city rather than his continued connection to it through his mind.

Ovid similarly attempts to recreate his connection to his friend Macer through his memory and imagination in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.10. He fondly remembers previous times he

---

<sup>34</sup> Gaertner (2005) 298-299.

spent with his friend, including their travels together through the Mediterranean and Asia Minor (*Pont.* 2.10.21-34). He says they often made their journeys seem shorter by exchanging conversation together (*saepe brevis nobis vicibus via visa loquendi*, *Pont.* 2.10.35). Likewise, their days seemed shorter because of their chatting and they exhausted even the long summer days with talking together (*saepe dies sermone minor fuit, inque loquendum / tarda per astivos defuit hora dies*, *Pont.* 2.10.37-38). He says the two friends feared the dangers of travel together (*pariter*) and made joint prayers (*iuncta vota*) to the gods of the sea (*Pont.* 2.10.39-40). The description of their journeys emphasizes their togetherness and how they were able to pass time more quickly and face dangers more bravely because they had each other. These memories highlight the difference in the current living conditions of the two friends,<sup>35</sup> however, as Ovid must endure the dangers of travel and life among the Getae by himself and spend his long span of time alone without friendly conversations to make it go by faster.

Ovid pretends that Macer is there with him once again, a fantasy aimed at restoring the bond between them that has been destroyed by exile.<sup>36</sup> At the end of the poem, he says, “nevertheless I look upon you with my mind, the only way I can, and I often talk with you under this icy pole. You are here, though you don’t know it, and you are very often present, though you are absent” (*te tamen intueor quo solo pectore possum, / et tecum gelido saepe sub axe loquor. / hic es, et ignoras, et ades celeberrimus absens*, *Pont.* 2.10.47-49). Ovid uses his imagination to recreate his previous memories with his friend, including their conversations together. His fantasy that Macer is with him in Tomis reflects his awareness that none of it is real, however. The word order of line 49 reflects the emptiness of his hopes. *Hic es* (you are here) is immediately followed by *ignoras* (but you do not know it), while *ades celeberrimus* (you are

---

<sup>35</sup> Galasso (1995) 438.

<sup>36</sup> Galasso (1995) 438, Helzle (2003) 391-392.

very often present) is immediately followed by *absens* (but you are absent). Ovid's memories and imaginary reunion with Macer bring the two friends together in his mind and maintains their connection mentally, but it is also insidious because his memories remind him of the harshness of his exile by comparison with the pleasant times he had with his friend. Ovid's anxiety about Macer forgetting his seal and handwriting at the start of the poem additionally reminds us that memories can be lost over time, particularly when they are tied to physical tokens.<sup>37</sup> This potential for the loss of memory further weakens the true effectiveness and benefit of using memory to reconnect with loved ones in exile.

In addition to pretending that his friends are with him in exile, Ovid also imagines himself traveling back to Rome. In *Tristia* 4.2, he envisions the triumph of Tiberius over Germany. He asserts that he will be able to see the spectacles of the triumph with his mind even though he is far away and that his mind has the power to access places that he himself cannot (*haec ego summotus qua possum mente videbo: / erepti nobis ius habet illa loci, Tr. 4.2.57-58*). He says his mind will bring his eyes into the city (*illa meos oculos mediam deducit in urbem, Tr. 4.2.61*) and that in this way he will be in his homeland for a brief time (*sic certe in patria per breve tempus ero, Tr. 4.2.64*). His mind thus has power that he lacks, not only in that it can overcome the physical distance and is free (*libera, Tr. 4.2.59*) to travel to the city itself, but also in that it can bring the poet along and transport him to the city as well.

The power of the poet's mind to combat the isolation of his exile is not entirely successful, however. The poet must admit to himself that, "nevertheless the happy populace will comprehend the true spectacles...but for me this boon must only be grasped by imagining and by my ears far removed" (*vera tamen capiet populous spectacula felix, / ... at mihi fingendo tantum*

---

<sup>37</sup> See Hardie (2002) 318-324.

*longeque remotis / auribus hic fructus percipiendus erit*, Tr. 4.2.65, 66-67). These lines highlight the discrepancy between the real spectacles that the people in Rome will see and the imaginary ones that Ovid must create in his mind. For the poet, unlike the people in Rome, the triumph is only pretend and must be artificially constructed (*fingendo*) by the poet himself.

The distance between Ovid and Rome adds another element of inauthenticity to his vision of the triumph because he must learn about it second-hand. Early on in the poem, he says that the shared joys of the people at the triumph deceive him (*communia gaudia fallunt*, Tr. 4.2.17) and that only a small rumor of the event comes to him from so far away (*famaque tam longe non nisi parva venit*, Tr. 4.2.18). The appearance of the verb *fallere* and the use of *fama* as a source of information underscore the potential inaccuracy of the report he receives about the details of the triumph. Near the end of the poem he again says that anyone who brings him news of the triumph must be sent far from Latium (*procul Latio missus*, Tr. 4.2.69) and will bring him the information too late, when the triumph is already old news (*is quoque iam serum referet veteremque triumphum*, Tr. 4.2.71), again emphasizing the possibility for the incorrectness of the report because of the gap in time and space. Despite his fantasy of being in Rome in person for the triumph, the reality is that the poet must wait for a small piece of Rome to come to him since he cannot go there to witness the event or get information about it himself. Ovid asserts that his mind has the power to transport him to Rome and reassert his connection to the city mentally, but in fact he must remain in Tomis and accept whatever second-hand report of the triumph he is able to obtain.

Ovid similarly imagines the celebration of the consulship of his friend Sextus Pompey in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.4. As in *Tristia* 4.2, Ovid here says that he seems to see (*cernere iam videor*, *Pont.* 4.4.27) the people filling Sextus Pompey's house in celebration. Later he uses the

same phrase as he used in *Tristia* 4.2, *qua possum mente videbo* (*Pont.* 4.4.45), to say that he will be able to see the face of the consul with his mind though he is absent (*Pont.* 4.4.45-46). At the same time though, he laments his physical absence from the celebration, stating, “wretched me, since I will not be seen in that crowd, nor will my eyes be able to enjoy those things,” (*me miserum, turba quod non ego cernar in illa, / nec poterunt istis lumina nostra frui, Pont.* 4.4.43-44). He must again admit that he will not be present in reality and the power of his mind can only take him so far.

The role of *fama* as the source of his information about the event is also prevalent in this poem. He describes how *Fama* comes to him and tells him about the celebration early in the poem, saying, “when I was walking alone on the yellow sand, a wing seemed to have made a noise behind my back. I looked back, and there was no body that I could see, but nevertheless these words were heard by my ear” (*mihi, cum fulva solus spatiarer harena, / visa est a tergo pinna dedisse sonum. / respicio, nec erat corpus, quod cernere possem / verba tamen sunt haec aure recepta mea, Pont.* 4.4.11-14). The fact that Ovid is alone (*solus*) here highlights his true isolation in exile, despite his attempts to return to Rome in his mind. The fact that *Fama* is only heard and not seen also emphasizes the discrepancy between the news he hears and the tangible reality of the events in Rome. Now that Ovid is in exile, *fama* has become reality and what happens in Rome has become imaginary, underscoring his distance from Rome.<sup>38</sup> Just as in *Tristia* 4.2, Ovid tries to overcome the limitations of his exile here with the power of his mind, but ultimately he must rely on incorporeal rumors to substantiate what he imagines and must admit that his presence in Rome for the celebration is only a ruse and not truly possible.

---

<sup>38</sup> Helzle (1989) 106-107.

## Part II: Internal Changes: The Poet and His Poetry

### The Poet

In addition to changing his surroundings and the way he is perceived in Rome, exile in Ovid's poetry also changes the poet himself and the nature of his work. The circumstances of the poet's exile change his identity and make him not the same person he used to be. This idea is present from the beginning of the exile works. Near the end of *Tristia* 1.1, Ovid mentions his *Metamorphoses* in his bookcase in Rome (*Tr.* 1.1.117-118) and says that he now can be counted among the characters that underwent transformations in that work (*Tr.* 1.1.119-120). He elaborates on this comparison and states that his fortune is now different than it was before (*dissimilis priori*, *Tr.* 1.1.121), since it formerly was happy but now is lamentable (*flendaque nunc, aliquo tempore laeta fuit*, *Tr.* 1.1.122). The comparison between the poet and the characters from the *Metamorphoses* implies a fundamental change in the nature and identity of the poet over time, especially given that many of the characters transformed in the *Metamorphoses* become animals or inanimate objects and are not even human anymore.

This contrast appears in *Tristia* 4.1 as well. In this poem, the poet's sadness in exile leads him to recall who he is and who he was (*qui sim fuerimque, recordor*, *Tr.* 4.1.99). He also thinks about where and whence his fortune has brought him (*tulerit quo me casus et unde*, *Tr.* 4.1.100). Scholars have already noticed a contrast between the poet's past and present in the exile works.<sup>39</sup> Ovid's musings here about his changed circumstances and identity reinforce this contrast between the poet before and after his exile, stressing how he himself has changed as a result of his time and distance away from Rome.

---

<sup>39</sup> Claassen (1999) 187-188, Tola (2008) 53.

Old age is another prominent theme in Ovid's exile works.<sup>40</sup> Ovid identifies his premature aging in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.4 as another change in himself brought on by his exile. At the beginning of the poem, he says that old age has come upon him and wrinkles have appeared on his face (*Pont.* 1.4.1-2). In addition, he has lost his youthful vigor and strength (*Pont.* 1.4.3). He even goes so far as to claim that the ruin of his youth is so complete that his wife would not recognize (*Pont.* 1.4.5-6). He connects this loss of his youth with the miseries he faces in exile. He admits that the passing of time is partly to blame, but the primary reason for his aging is the anxiety of his mind and his constant toil (*anxietas animi continuusque labor*, *Pont.* 1.4.8), both of which are consequences of his exile. Later in the poem, he similarly says that a great series of hardships ruins him and forces him to become old before his proper time (*me quoque debilitat series immensa malorum, / ante meum tempus cogit et esse senem*, *Pont.* 1.4.19-20), further stressing that the suffering he faces in exile is to blame for the changes in himself.<sup>41</sup> Ovid suggests in this poem that although time would still pass and he would age eventually, he would be more youthful and more like his former self if he were in Rome rather than in exile.

In *Tristia* 3.14, Ovid claims that being so far away from Rome is causing him to lose his command of the Latin language. He says he often tries to think of some word or name or place (*saepe aliquod quaero verbum nomenque locumque*, *Tr.* 3.14.43), but he cannot remember it because there is no one to help remind him (*nec quisquam est a quo certior esse queam*, *Tr.* 3.14.44). He later states that he tries to speak but the words fail him (*verba mihi desunt*, *Tr.* 3.14.46) and he has unlearned to speak Latin (*dedidicique loqui*, *Tr.* 3.14.46). McGowan sees

---

<sup>40</sup> See Evans (1983) 74 and Claassen (1999) 202.

<sup>41</sup> See Gaertner (2005) 277.

Ovid's loss of the Latin language as a symbol of his spatial separation from Rome.<sup>42</sup> Ovid does highlight his physical distance from Rome as the cause of him forgetting Latin here, but he also attributes this forgetfulness to his personal isolation from other Romans. The corollary to Ovid losing his ability to speak Latin is his learning of new languages including Thracian and Scythian (*Tr.* 3.14.47). He even says he could now write Getic poems (*Tr.* 3.14.48). The problem with Ovid writing Getic poems is that it means he is now a Getic poet, distancing him from his identity as a Roman poet. Ovid's exile thus brings about a "crisis of cultural identity"<sup>43</sup> for him because he is alienated both from the people in Tomis and his fellow Romans. The fact that his new neighbors in Tomis do not understand him alienates him from them, but if he assimilates and becomes more like them, he furthers his complementary alienation from the world of Rome and his Roman identity, making him part Roman and part foreigner but not wholly either.<sup>44</sup>

The poet's experience in exile also necessitates a farewell to the elegiac poet-lover persona that he created for himself in his earlier amatory works. In *Tristia* 4.1, Ovid recalls his former life as an elegiac poet-lover and contrasts it with his current life in exile, saying, "as a young man I avoided the harsh struggles of military service and I did not wield weapons except with a playful hand; but now as an older man I put a sword on my side, a shield on my left hand, and a helmet on my white head" (*aspera militiae iuvenis certamina fugi, / nec nisi lusura movimus arma manu; / nunc senior gladioque latus scutoque sinistram, / canitiem gelea subicioque meam, Tr.* 4.1.71-74). Now that he is in exile in a dangerous place, the poet can no longer afford to reject military service for a life of leisure and playfulness as he did during his former life as an elegiac lover. The ironic *militia amoris* of elegy has now been replaced by real

---

<sup>42</sup> McGowan (2009) 149-150.

<sup>43</sup> Williams (2002a) 349.

<sup>44</sup> Claassen (1999) 202-203, Williams (2002b) 234.

*militia* as the poet-lover is no longer employed in his elegiac pursuits and must become a real soldier in his old age.<sup>45</sup> Ovid says the reason he takes up weapons is because the guard (*custos*) of the city gives a signal that enemies are coming (*Tr.* 4.1.75-76). The use of the word *custos* here especially contrasts with Ovid's previous elegiac poetry, in which the *custos* was a figure who guarded the elegiac *puella* and kept her away from her lover. Now that he is in exile, the *custos* in Ovid's poetry takes on a very different role in forcing the poet to become a soldier and abandon his life as a lover entirely.

Ovid further discusses his new life as a soldier in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8. Near the beginning of the poem, he defines himself as accustomed to peace but says he now lives amid constant warfare (*Pont.* 1.8.5). He asserts that he alone of so many exiles is a soldier (*deque tot expulsis sum miles in exule solus, Pont.* 1.8.7) and even claims that his poems are now written during battles (*haec in procinctu carmina facta, Pont.* 1.8.10). As in *Tristia* 4.1, Ovid here characterizes himself as a real soldier now that he is in exile, contrasting with his portrayal of himself as an elegiac lover who rejected military service and only waged wars in love. The war surrounding him in his exile also disrupts his former elegiac life by depriving him of the peaceful urban backdrop he enjoyed when he was in Rome. His exile exposes him to new dangers on the outskirts of the empire that did not exist in the peaceful city of Rome, thereby making it impossible for him to continue living the elegiac lover's life of play and leisure.

*Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.4 underscores the hindrances to Ovid's former elegiac life caused by the toils he faces in exile as well. While discussing his premature old age in exile at the beginning of the poem, he says he no longer enjoys the games which pleased him as a young man (*nec, iuveni lusus qui placuere, iuvant, Pont.* 1.4.4). He claims he lacks his former youthful strength as he grows older (*Pont.* 1.4.3) and that his exile has caused him to grow old before his

---

<sup>45</sup> See Evans (1983) 77, Williams (1994) 31, and Williams (2002a) 351-352.

time (*Pont.* 1.4.19-20). His exile has thus made him no longer young and playful, ending his involvement in the frivolous pursuits of a youthful elegiac lover. The fact that his leisure (*otia*, *Pont.* 1.4.21) has been replaced by toil (*labor*, *Pont.* 1.4.22) in exile also prevents him from acting as an elegiac lover because he no longer has the time or luxury of engaging in these pursuits. The lover in elegy often complains about the hardships he must endure, but here the suffering in love has been replaced by actual labors and miseries during the poet's life in exile.<sup>46</sup>

Ovid's exile also gives him a new, more complicated outlook on his poetry and the purpose it serves. This change in outlook appears from the beginning of the exile works, starting in *Tristia* 1.1, in which Ovid now sees his previous poetry as harmful to him and has negative feelings toward it. He asserts that his exile was caused by his talent (*ingenio sic fuga parta meo*, *Tr.* 1.1.56) and says about his previous poems, "now let it be enough if I don't hate my poems and the pursuit of them, which harmed me" (*carmina nunc si non studiumque, quod obfuit, odi, / sit satis*, *Tr.* 1.1.55-56). Instead of enjoying his poems, he now almost hates them and sees them as an obstacle to him. He tells his current book of poetry to go to Rome and join his other poems, but he warns it to avoid his *Ars Amatoria* (*Tr.* 1.1.113), and not show it any love (*Tr.* 1.1.116). He also worries both about the harm that his previous poems might do to his new book (*Tr.* 1.1.63) and the further harm that his current book of poetry might do to him as his other poems did (*Tr.* 1.1.100). Ovid's outlook on poetry has changed in his exile in that he now sees the negative power of his poetry to ruin him in addition to its previous power to benefit him.

He reveals a new purpose for his poetry in *Tristia* 1.1 as well. He admits that before his exile, he was touched by a love of glory and desired to seek a name for himself through his poetry (*tituli tangebar amore, / quaerendique mihi nominis ardor erat*, *Tr.* 1.1.53-54), but now

---

<sup>46</sup> See Edwards (1996) 118, Claassen (1999) 213-214, and Williams (2002a) 351-352.

he is no longer concerned with this pursuit. Instead, he sees his poetry written in exile as a tool to help him return to Rome. He instructs his book to tell anyone who asks about him that he is alive but not doing well (*Tr.* 1.1.17-19), indicating that he now sees his poetry as a way of communicating with people in Rome and keeping them informed of how he is doing. He additionally tells the book to find someone in Rome who will sigh at his banishment and weep while reading his poems (*invenies aliquem, qui me suspiret ademptum, / carmina nec siccis perlegat ista genis, Tr.* 1.1.27-28). In this way, Ovid uses his poetry to stay connected to his lost loved ones and keep him in their minds while he is away. He also imagines that these sympathetic readers will take pity on him and wish for a more lenient punishment for him (*Tr.* 1.1.29-30), which could eventually lead to his return to Rome.

*Tristia* 4.1 displays a similar attitude toward Ovid's previous poetry and the purpose of writing. As in *Tristia* 1.1, Ovid sees his old poems as harmful and feels hatred toward them. Now that he is in exile, he regrets the poetry he wrote before, saying, "surely I would wish that I had not applied my hand to the sacred things of the Muses, since they would later harm me" (*non equidem vellem, quoniam nocitura fuerunt, / Pieridum sacris inposuisse manum, Tr.* 4.1.27-28). Near the end, he even claims that he has begun burning the poems he writes because of his anger at his poetic pursuits (*Tr.* 4.1.101-102). In contrast to the positive associations he had with his poems before his exile, he now does not want to publish them and seeks to destroy them as they have destroyed him.

Despite his hatred for his poems and the pain they have caused him, however, Ovid confesses that he also still loves them. He calls himself out of his mind (*demens*) for loving poetry even though he was ruined by it (*Tr.* 4.1.30). Similarly, he says that his books still delight him although they harmed him and that he loves the weapon that made his wounds (*nos quoque*

*delectant, quamvis nocuere, libelli, / quodque mihi telum vulnera fecit, amo, Tr. 4.1.35-36*). His love for poetry still remains, but now it is an unhealthy, self-destructive love rather than a beneficial one. This poem thus represents a new, more complicated attitude toward poetry than we have seen in Ovid's previous works. He now has conflicting positive and negative feelings toward his poetry and writing has become a compulsion that he always finds himself drawn to, even when he no longer wants to do it.

*Tristia* 4.1 identifies another new purpose for writing poetry, namely the consolation of the poet's despair. At the beginning of the poem, he claims that as an exile, he now seeks rest rather than fame so that his mind does not focus too much on his misery (*requiesque mihi, non fama petita est, / mens intenta suis ne foret usque malis, Tr. 4.1.3-4*). The poetry that brought him glory before is now a source of comfort during his difficult time in exile. Ovid here draws on a literary tradition of consolatory letters to friends in exile, including those written and received by Cicero,<sup>47</sup> but he inverts the tradition by writing letters to his friends in Rome to console himself rather than writing letters to people in exile to console them. He portrays the Muses not merely as sources of inspiration but also as companions in his sad flight from Rome (*sola comes nostrae fugae, Tr. 4.1.20; comites fugae, Tr. 4.1.50*) who assuage his troubles (*me Musa levat, Tr. 4.1.19; deas mala nostra levantes, Tr. 4.1.49*). He says they protect him during his exile and do not fear any swords, winds, or seas that he might face (*Tr. 4.1.21-22*), stressing the help and aid he gains from them during his troubles. This reliance on poetry as a source of fortitude sets Ovid apart from wandering epic heroes who are not themselves poets. Montiglio notes that while Odysseus' fortitude derives from his "self-restraint in speech and action," Ovid's

---

<sup>47</sup> Claassen (1999) 77-83.

derives from his poetic voice and his choice *not* to stay silent.<sup>48</sup> As Odysseus has Athena to help him through his trials, Ovid has his Muses.

Through writing poetry, Ovid is able to forget his suffering in exile. He says that writing poetry in exile, “always keeps my mind from gazing upon my troubles, and makes me forgetful of my current misfortune” (*semper in obtutu mentem vetat esse malorum, / praesentis casus immemoremque facit*, *Tr.* 4.1.39-40). He further compares the writing of poetry to drinking from the river Lethe, causing him to lose his senses and forget his unhappiness (*Tr.* 4.1.47-48). Ovid now sees the consolation and forgetfulness of hardship as a new purpose of poetry that he did not express in his earlier poetry. As Claassen shows in her comparison of Ovid and modern exile literature, the use of writing and mental activity as a source of salvation in exile becomes a standard part of the literary tradition of exile after Ovid.<sup>49</sup> This link between writing poetry and forgetfulness particularly complicates the typical role of Greek and Latin poetry, however, in that it is usually tied to memory and is seen as a way to record and remember human life, not forget it. In this way, Ovid’s new purpose for writing counters not only the way he previously viewed poetry, but also the way poetry was broadly viewed in the Greek and Roman imagination.

### The Poet’s Work

Beyond changing the poet himself and his identity, exile also changes the nature of the poet’s work. Ovid repeatedly asserts that the poetry he writes in exile is of lower quality than what he wrote before. He introduces this idea as early as his first poem from exile, *Tristia* 1.1. In this poem, he describes his new book of poetry as unpolished by the pumice stone (*nec poliantur pumice*, *Tr.* 1.1.11), signifying that he has not given it the care and attention that he gave his

---

<sup>48</sup> Montiglio (2008) 200-202.

<sup>49</sup> Claassen (2008) 226-227.

other poetry. He calls the book shaggy with scattered hair (*hirsutus sparsis comis*, *Tr.* 1.1.12), indicating that it lacks the polish and refinement of his previous poetry. He also implies that his current poetry is of a lower standard than before when he says that a fair judge (*iudex aequus*, *Tr.* 1.1.45) of the poems will read them with pardon (*cum venia*, *Tr.* 1.1.46) for their faults.

Later in the poem, he explicitly connects this decline in poetry with the circumstances of his exile. He says that poems only arise for someone with a calm mind (*carmina proveniunt animo deducta sereno*, *Tr.* 1.1.39) and that writing poetry requires leisure and retreat for the author (*carmina secessum scribentis et otia quaerunt*, *Tr.* 1.1.41). While Ovid's exile certainly constitutes a physical retreat (*secessum*) from Rome, this retreat is hardly enjoyable or full of leisure, preventing him from writing poetry as well as he did before. He even asserts that Homer himself would lose his talent if he were exposed to the hardships he has experienced in exile (*Tr.* 1.1.47-48). Ovid argues in this poem that because exile creates misfortune for the poet and worsens his life, it also ruins his poetic talent and worsens his poetry. In this way, the content and quality of the poet's work is a reflection of his life and circumstances.

*Tristia* 3.14 similarly points out the decrease in quality of his work. He ends the poem by asking the reader to give his poems pardon (*venia*, *Tr.* 3.14.51) and to excuse them on account of the poor condition of his life (*Tr.* 3.14.51). Earlier in the poem, he similarly says, "whoever will read this, if anyone will, let him first consider the time and place in which it was written" (*quod quicumque leget (si quis leget) aestimet ante, / compositum quo sit tempore quoque loco*, *Tr.* 3.14.27-28). He then identifies exile as the time when the poems were written and a barbarian land as the place and notes that a fair reader will take these circumstances into account in his judgment of the poems (*Tr.* 3.14.29-30), indicating that his talent and the poetry it produces are

of lesser quality as a result of his exile.<sup>50</sup> He goes on to make this more explicit when he says that his misfortunes have ruined his talent (*ingenium fregere meum mala*, Tr. 3.14.33) and that it is a wonder he is able to write poetry at all in these difficult circumstances (*inque tot adversis carmen mirabitur ullum / ducere me tristi sustinuisse manu*, Tr. 3.14.31-32). Previously, Ovid sought to write excellent poetry, but now that he is in exile he lowers his standards and considers it an accomplishment to write poetry at all, be it good or bad.

Ovid cites his failing language abilities in exile as another source of his poetic decline. When he complains that there is no one in Tomis to whom he might recite his poetry (Tr. 3.14.39-40), he connects the decline in his work with his lack of contact with other Latin speakers, making his alienation from the Latin language a manifestation of his alienation from the physical space of Rome.<sup>51</sup> For Ovid, writing poetry and using the Latin language is a social act that requires interaction with other Romans and therefore cannot be done satisfactorily so far away from Rome. His learning of new languages causes him to fear that barbarian words might make their way into his poetry (*timeo ne sint inmixta Latinis / inque meis scriptis Pontica verba legas*, Tr. 3.14.49-50), thereby contaminating it and making it less valuable as Latin poetry. Furthermore, the use of the word *dedisco* in Ovid's claim that he is forgetting Latin (*dedidicique loqui*, Tr. 3.14.46) is connected with the loss of memory and learning, suggesting that Ovid is losing his powers of memory that are so inherent to the pursuit of poetry and the learnedness that helps define him as a poet in the Hellenistic tradition.

Many scholars have discussed this trope of poetic decline in Ovid's exile works. Most now view Ovid's assertions of his poetry's deterioration as disingenuous and have shown that his

---

<sup>50</sup> Luck (1977) 227.

<sup>51</sup> Hinds (2011) 59-60.

poetry from exile is of the same quality as that of his earlier works.<sup>52</sup> Hinds has characterized Ovid's claims of poetic deterioration as part of a widespread topos of 'decline' in the Latin literary tradition.<sup>53</sup> Others have seen Ovid's negative comments on the quality of his exile poetry as a new form of poetic *recusatio* in which Ovid insincerely denies his true poetic talent, just as he denied his ability to write epic and defended his writing of elegy at the beginning of his *Amores*.<sup>54</sup> Another purpose of Ovid's criticism of his exile poetry, though, is to further his portrayal of exile as a source of suffering and destruction in his life. His exile ruins his poetry not only because his sorrows ruin his talent, but also because it may cause him to lose the ability to write Latin poetry at all as he himself becomes less Roman and more like the barbarians around him. For Ovid, the quality of his poetry is thus directly dependent on his physical connection to Rome, and the loss of this connection leads to the deterioration of his work.

Another theme of Ovid's exile poetry often discussed by scholars is its parallels with epic.<sup>55</sup> As many scholars have noticed, Ovid often characterizes himself as an epic hero or compares himself with specific epic heroes in his exile works.<sup>56</sup> For example, when he describes his departure from Rome in *Tristia* 1.3, he portrays himself as a martial hero by saying he took up his shield too late to defend himself against Augustus' punishment (*sero clipeum post vulnera sumo*, *Tr.* 1.3.35). He brings another element of epic into the poem by explicitly comparing his last night in Rome to the fall of Troy,<sup>57</sup> stating, "if it is permitted to use lofty examples in small

---

<sup>52</sup> See Williams (1994) 52-59, Williams (2002a) 359-360, Williams (2002b) 238-230, and Gaertner (2007b) 161.

<sup>53</sup> Hinds (1998) 83-91.

<sup>54</sup> Williams (1994) 53-54, Claassen (1999) 214-219.

<sup>55</sup> See Williams (2002a) 350-353, Gaertner (2005) 144, and Claassen (2009) 174-175.

<sup>56</sup> See Evans (1983) 37, 40, 48-49; Edwards (1996) 121-122; Holzberg (2002) 181-182; Williams (2002b) 236; Gaertner (2005) 137-138; and Galasso (2009) 204.

<sup>57</sup> Luck (1977) 36, Evans (1983) 47-48, Rosati (1999) 789, Hardie (2002) 289-290.

circumstances, this was the appearance of Troy when it was captured” (*si licet exemplis in parvis grandibus uti, / haec facies Troiae, cum caperetur, erat, Tr. 1.3.25-26*).

The poet’s delaying in the city and not wanting to leave throughout the poem parallels Aeneas’ delay in leaving Troy in *Aeneid 2* as well.<sup>58</sup> As Huskey notes, the comparison between Ovid and Aeneas serves to reinforce how terrible Ovid’s plight is because unlike Aeneas, who brings his people and the remnants of his civilization with him after his city is destroyed, Ovid must depart alone and leave his homeland while it is still thriving.<sup>59</sup> Ovid’s alignment of himself with an epic hero here brings epic into his elegiac poetry in a way that underscores only his exile and loss rather than any success or happiness he may achieve later.<sup>60</sup>

He similarly characterizes himself as a wandering epic hero in *Tristia 1.5*. He recalls his trials during his exile from Rome, asserting that he has endured as many evils as there are stars shining in the sky or small particles of dust (*tot mala sum passus, quot in aethere sidera lucent / parvaque quot siccus corpora pulvis habet, Tr. 1.5.47-48*). He goes on to say that he could not describe all of his sorrows even if he had an unbreakable voice (*Tr. 1.5.53*), a heart stronger than bronze (*Tr. 1.5.53*), and many mouths with many tongues (*Tr. 1.5.54*). This description of countless trials that are impossible for the poet to recount also appears in *Tristia 4.1.55-60* and draws on the motif of the epic poet requiring the help of the muse to recall all the details of his story.<sup>61</sup>

The size and number of the misfortunes Ovid suffers in exile and his lack of strength to relate them on his own aligns his struggles with those found in epic poetry and aligns his writing of them with the monumental task of writing epic. Because elegy is a genre that distinguishes

---

<sup>58</sup> Evans (1983) 37, Edwards (1996) 121-122, Huskey (2002) 88-94.

<sup>59</sup> Huskey (2002) 96-98, 102.

<sup>60</sup> Huskey (2002) 104.

<sup>61</sup> Williams (2002a) 352-353.

itself so self-consciously from epic, Ovid's inclusion of these epic elements in his elegiac exile poetry reveals a change in the nature of his poetry and makes it less like the poetry he wrote before his exile. Most of Ovid's previous literary career was spent writing elegy and rejecting epic. Even when he did write an epic, the *Metamorphoses*, it was not one about martial or wandering heroes in the tradition of Homer and Vergil. This new use of epic in Ovid's poetry thus reflects a profound change in his poetic identity as a result of his exile.

Ovid even goes so far as to compare himself with Odysseus in *Tristia* 1.5. He casts himself as the hero of a new epic, saying, "learned poets, write about my trials instead of the hero Odysseus. For I have endured more trials than him" (*pro duce Neritio docti mala nostra poetae / scribite: Neritio nam mala plura tuli, Tr. 1.5.57-58*). This new heroic role complicates his role as a poet in that he asks other poets to write about him, aligning him more with a character in poetry than a poet himself. It is standard for an elegiac poet to write about himself as a lover since elegy is an inherently personal and private genre, but in epic poetry, the hero and the poet should not be the same person. Ovid's identification of himself as an epic hero in his own poem overturns his usual description of himself as a poet-lover in his elegiac poetry as well as the usual epic framework of the hero undergoing the trials with the poet writing about them.

Ovid uses this comparison between himself and Odysseus to draw attention to the severity of his misfortune by claiming it is worse than Odysseus'. One reason he says his lot is worse is that he is less equipped to endure suffering than Odysseus was. Odysseus was blessed with a body strong enough to withstand toil (*corpus erat durum patiensque laborum, Tr. 1.5.71*), while Ovid's physical strength is sorely lacking (*invalidae vires ingenuaeque mihi, Tr. 1.5.72*). Odysseus was accustomed to warfare (*saevius agitatus in armis, Tr. 1.5.73*), while Ovid formerly spent his days in gentle endeavors (*adsuetus studiis mollibus, Tr. 1.5.74*). The use of *studiis*

*mollibus* here recalls Ovid's former elegiac life, emphasizing that an elegiac lover is not made to be an epic hero. Ovid points out the real tragedy of his situation when he says, "add the fact that for the most part his labors were made up, but no fiction lies in my sufferings" (*adde, quod illius pars maxima ficta laborum / ponitur in nostris fabula nulla malis, Tr. 1.5.79-80*). It is one thing for a hero like Odysseus to undergo legendary labors because he is strong and his labors are not actually real, but Ovid presents himself not as a hero but as a real person—and a former elegiac lover at that—who therefore should not be expected to endure trials of the same legendary proportions. As Montiglio argues, Ovid cannot live up to Odysseus' standard of endurance, so he rejects it as a positive model of behavior.<sup>62</sup>

The circumstances and outcome of Ovid's exile are worse than those of Odysseus' wanderings as well. Ovid's trials are worse since Odysseus had his companions with him, while Ovid went into exile alone (*Tr. 1.5.63-64*), reminding us of the solitude and isolation exile has imposed on the poet. Ovid characterizes his story as an inversion of Odysseus' in that Odysseus begins his journey as a successful victor in war (*Tr. 1.5.65*), while Ovid leaves Rome in sorrow and disgrace (*Tr. 1.5.60*). Ovid also says his lot is worse because he is forced to leave Rome, the home of empire and gods (*inperii Roma deumque locus, Tr. 1.5.70*), while Odysseus merely left Greece. In this way Ovid makes clear that the real reason his exile is so difficult is not only that he must leave his home, but that he must leave the city of Rome specifically. For Ovid, there is something special about Rome that makes it more painful to leave than any other place in the world. The biggest difference between Ovid and Odysseus of course is how their stories end. Odysseus eventually reaches his fields which he sought for so long (*quaeque diu petiit, contigit arva, Tr. 1.5.82*), while Ovid must be banned from his homeland forever (*mihi perpetuo patria tellure carendum est, Tr. 1.5.83*). Ovid thus falls short of a true wandering epic hero both

---

<sup>62</sup> Montiglio (2008) 196-200.

because his former training as an elegiac lover did not in fact prepare him for a life of real labor, and because he cannot complete the epic cycle of wandering and eventually returning home to be reintegrated into his family and society.

A similar comparison between Ovid and the epic hero Jason appears in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.4. Here he again casts himself as a new epic hero and claims that his lot is worse than Jason's. He portrays Jason's labors as lighter and smaller than his own (*labor illius nostro leviorque minorque est, Pont. 1.4.25*) and says that his own toil is more difficult (*durius est igitur nostrum... / illo, quod subiit Aesone natus, opus, Pont. 1.4.45-46*). Jason was not forced to travel as far as Ovid was (*Pont. 1.4.32*), emphasizing how far away his place of exile is since it is even more remote than Colchis. Jason was able to bring companions with him (*Pont. 1.4.33*), whereas all of Ovid's companions have abandoned him in his exile (*at nostram cuncti destituere fugam, Pont. 1.4.34*). Jason had the advantage of traveling on the Argo, a sturdy ship (*densa carina, Pont. 1.4.36*), while Ovid had to brave the seas in a flimsy boat (*fragili lingo, Pont. 1.4.35*), revealing that Ovid is not as prepared for a real heroic journey as Jason is because he is not properly outfitted. Ovid's situation also differs from Jason's in that Cupid helps Jason during his labors (*illum furtivae iuvere Cupidinis artes, Pont. 1.4.42*), whereas Cupid and the love poetry he induced Ovid to write led to his ruin. As in the comparison with Odysseus in *Tristia* 1.5, the biggest difference between Ovid and Jason is that Jason is able to go home after his labors are over, while Ovid must remain far from Rome until his death (*ille domum rediit: nos his moriemur in arvis, Pont. 1.4.43*) and cannot complete the epic cycle of wandering and return. The circumstances of the poet's exile infuse his poetry with epic elements that are out of character for his genre and force him to assume the role of an epic hero for which he is not actually well-suited.

Ovid additionally incorporates the genre of pastoral poetry into his elegies in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.8 in which he longs for a peaceful country life instead of the dangerous one he must face in exile. His fantasy rustic life includes feeding his goats and sheep (*Pont.* 1.8.51-52) while leaning on his staff (*baculo nixus*, *Pont.* 1.8.52) and leading his cattle under the yokes (*Pont.* 1.8.54). These activities—and specifically the phrase *baculo nixus*, a literary commonplace in pastoral poetry<sup>63</sup>—cast him as the typical herdsman from pastoral literature. He dreams of engaging himself in agriculture, including using a plow (*Pont.* 1.8.57), sprinkling seeds in the ground (*Pont.* 1.8.58), and tending to his gardens (*Pont.* 1.8.59-60). All of these are standard undertakings of people living in the country as portrayed in pastoral poetry. In particular, there are parallels here with the pastoral poems of Vergil and Tibullus.<sup>64</sup> For Ovid, though, these pastoral elements represent a departure from the kind of poetry he has previously written. His previous elegiac poetry always took place in the city of Rome, giving it a characteristically urban color, but now he writes about life in the country rather than life in the city. The pastoral elements in this poem may connect him to Vergil, Tibullus, and other pastoral poetry, but they disconnect him from many of his own works.

There are differences between the country life Ovid imagines here and that of Vergil and Tibullus, however. Ovid's takes place in inhospitable Tomis, not the pleasant Italian countryside. The contrast between the pleasures of country life and the hardships of Tomis in the poem,<sup>65</sup> along with its polarization of pastoral and martial elements,<sup>66</sup> remind us that Ovid cannot actually enjoy a peaceful pastoral life there. When Ovid mentions his dream of herding his cattle, he says, "I will learn the words which Getic cows know, and I will apply their accustomed

---

<sup>63</sup> Gaertner (2005) 457-458.

<sup>64</sup> Gaertner (2005) 453.

<sup>65</sup> Evans (1983) 137.

<sup>66</sup> Williams (1994) 32-33.

warnings to them” (*discam Getici quae norunt verba iuveni, / adsuetas illis adiciamque minas, Pont. 1.8.55-56*), further revealing that the pastoral fantasy he envisions here will require him to learn and use a barbarian language. This departure from Ovid’s former life is especially striking considering his claims in other poems (*Tr. 3.14.47-52, Tr. 5.12.57-58*) that he forgets how to speak Latin as he learns new languages, resulting in a decline in the quality of his poetry and a fundamental change in his identity as a Roman. In this poem, Ovid reinvents himself as a pastoral poet in the Greek and Roman tradition, but the location of his exile complicates this reinvention of himself by simultaneously requiring him to become less Roman and more like the barbarians around him.

The pervasive presence of Augustus is another feature of Ovid’s exile poetry that breaks away from his earlier erotic works. As other scholars have already argued, Ovid’s frequent praise of Augustus in his exile works often reveals bitterness and criticism lurking beneath the surface.<sup>67</sup> In *Tristia*, 1.1, Ovid identifies the punishment he received from Augustus as the cause for his exile (*Tr. 1.1.30*) and refers to the anger of Augustus (*principis ira, Tr. 1.1.33*) as what is preventing him from ending his life in his homeland, a theme that recurs throughout the exile poetry and implicitly criticizes the emperor.<sup>68</sup> He also compares Augustus to a god in this poem, saying that the lightning (*fulmen*) that struck him came from the Palatine where Augustus lives (*Tr. 1.1.72*) and that he now fears the gods who harmed him (*timeo qui nocuere deos, Tr. 1.1.74*). He identifies Augustus with Jupiter and continues to fear his wrath even after his exile, stating, “I confess that I also fear the weapons of Jove, which I have felt; when it thunders, I think that I am sought by the hostile fire” (*me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iovis arma timere: / me reor infesto,*

---

<sup>67</sup> See Williams (2002a) 366-373, Williams (2002b) 239-241, and Claassen (2008) 31-35.

<sup>68</sup> Gaertner (2005) 189-190, 290.

*cum tonat, igne peti*, *Tr.* 1.1.81-82). Ovid negatively characterizes Augustus as angry and destructive in this and many other poems in his exile poetry.

A similar outlook on Augustus is featured in *Tristia* 3.1. When Ovid's book of poetry reaches the Palatine in Rome, it identifies Augustus' house as the house of Jupiter (*Tr.* 3.1.35-38). Toward the end, the poem addresses Augustus directly and calls him the greatest god (*Caesar, maxime dive*, *Tr.* 3.1.78), further linking him to Jupiter. The theme of Augustus' cruelty appears in this poem as well. The poem mentions that some Roman citizens have been helped by Augustus' aid (*Tr.* 3.1.48), but this reminds us that Ovid himself is not among these citizens as long as he must remain in exile because of Augustus' anger. The poem also describes its fear at approaching Augustus' house (*Tr.* 3.1.53-56), emphasizing the destructive and dangerous nature of Augustus' power.

Ovid's description of his life in exile in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1.2 features another ambivalent portrayal of Augustus.<sup>69</sup> After recounting the constant war and dangers of Tomis, the poet says that Augustus does not know what kind of place he has sent him to, even though he is a god and should know everything (*nescit enim Caesar, quamvis deus omnia norit, / ultimus hic qua sit condicione locus*, *Pont.* 1.2.71-72). On one hand, Ovid identifies Augustus as a god here, which seems complimentary, but he simultaneously points out his glaring lack of knowledge about the outskirts of his own empire. He later states that Augustus does not rejoice in him or any other Roman being captured by an enemy (*nec me nec quemquam Romanum gaudet ab hoste, / ...capi*, *Pont.* 1.2.89-90), but he has nevertheless sent Ovid, a Roman citizen, to a place where, according to Ovid's account, being captured by enemies is a real danger. Finally, he refers to Augustus as the most just (*iustissimus*, *Pont.* 1.2.97) of the gods who hurls his lightning bolts rarely and with an unwilling hand (*iacit invita fulmina rara manu*, *Pont.* 1.2.126). The

---

<sup>69</sup> Gaertner (2005) 168-169, 212.

anger of Augustus (*ira*, *Pont.* 1.2.96) appears again in this poem as his reason for sending Ovid into exile, though, making the hurling of his lightning bolt at Ovid seem particularly malevolent and unjust, especially given how much Ovid suffers from this punishment.

Representations of Augustus of this kind are littered throughout Ovid's exile poetry, marking a departure from his previous amatory poetry, which does not discuss Augustus so outwardly or frequently. Even in the *Fasti*, in which Augustus plays a much greater role than in the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and other erotic works, Augustus is not so explicitly characterized by anger and ruthlessness that leads to the extreme suffering of the poet himself. Ovid's exile and Augustus' role as the one who forces him to leave Rome thus changes Ovid's poetry and opens it up to new topics and themes that were not as important in his earlier works.

### Conclusion

Ovid's love for the city of Rome is apparent even from his early amatory works. As Luck notes, Ovid "loves Rome, the city; Rome, not Corinna, is in a sense the real protagonist of the *Amores*, and his true love."<sup>70</sup> Williams calls Rome "the stabilizing center of [Ovid's] entire existence."<sup>71</sup> This intimate attachment that Ovid feels to Rome makes exile the worst possible fate for the urban poet. When he is forced into exile, he loses not only his home, family, and friends, but also the city he loves and knows so well. It is no surprise that a poet so attached to Rome would feel that his world has been overturned and that he himself and the poetry he writes is forever altered when he departs from the city to the outskirts of the Roman Empire. Ovid's exile poetry serves as a reflection of his alienation from Rome and the transformation he experiences in both the world around him and within himself.

---

<sup>70</sup> Luck (1959) 150.

<sup>71</sup> Williams (2002a) 344.

One way Ovid is unique among the authors in this study is that he provides the only example of a first-person narrative of a Roman forced to leave Rome against his will. While Livy's discussion of departure from Rome features many episodes of exile, Ovid's represents a more personal account rather than one told from a historical or national perspective as we see in Livy. Ovid differs from Horace in that he leaves Rome unwillingly and only sees his departure as a source of sorrow and trials. Horace chooses to leave and looks forward to his vacations away from Rome as a way to find the peace and relaxation that eludes him in the busy city. Ovid, on the other hand, finds no peace or rest in his exile on the dangerous outskirts of the empire. For Propertius and Tibullus, the departure of the lover from Rome is an idea that never actually comes to fruition, but in Ovid's exile poetry, the lover's withdrawal from Rome and all of the undesirable consequences that come with it are a harsh and irreversible reality. Ovid is forced to play out the scenario of the urban poet-lover removed from Rome that is only proposed in his elegiac predecessors.

For Ovid, there is a total lack of choice in his departure from Rome. He leaves the city not because he decides to do it on his own, but because he is forced to do so by an emperor whom he has no power to override or dissuade. Unlike in the other narratives of departure from Rome in this study, Ovid also has no option to return to Rome, but instead must stay away from the city for the rest of his life. This lack of choice and agency in his departure may explain why his description of it is entirely negative and bleak. Ovid sees no possible positive outcome from his departure from Rome as Horace, Propertius, and Tibullus sometimes do, but only sees it as a source of misery. Unlike the others who can return to Rome, Ovid does not have the luxury of taking the city for granted and is always reminded of what it is like to lose Rome and have no

hope of ever regaining it. It is precisely his forced absence from Rome that most strongly reinforces the importance of the city for him.

There are ways in which Ovid is consistent with the portrayal of withdrawal from Rome found in the other authors of this study, however. Like the others, Ovid sees Rome as full of memories and thus intimately familiar and known to him,<sup>72</sup> making it impossible for him to accept any other place as his home. Like Livy, Ovid connects his presence in Rome with his personal identity both as a Roman and as a poet. As the Romans who leave Rome in Livy lose their former Roman identity, Ovid too transforms as completely as the subjects of his *Metamorphoses* when he is forced to leave the city. Ovid also shares the connection he draws between the elegiac genre and the city of Rome with Propertius and Tibullus. For all three of these authors, the genre of elegy is no longer the same if the poet-lover leaves Rome and goes somewhere else. Departure from Rome changes the nature of the poet's work as surely as it changes the poet himself, implying that the city of Rome is the true source of poetry and literary form.

I have argued in this chapter that Ovid characterizes his forced departure from Rome as a (de)formative experience for him both as a person and as a poet, but it is also true that in some ways Ovid's exile poetry project mirrors what he has always done in his poetry. Scholars have shown that Ovid's exile poetry draws on existing literary traditions, including his own *Heroides*<sup>73</sup> and the exile literature of authors from Theognis to Cicero.<sup>74</sup> In this way, his exile works emulate his amatory works, which expanded on the existing tradition of elegiac poetry, and his *Metamorphoses*, which reinvented epic poetry against the backdrop of earlier epics. His

---

<sup>72</sup> Claassen (1999) 179-180.

<sup>73</sup> See Dickinson (1973) 159 and Rosenmeyer (1997) 29-48.

<sup>74</sup> See Dickinson (1973) 158-159, Claassen (1999) 32-33, Gaertner (2007a) 14-20, and Gaertner (2007b) 157-160.

inclusion of epic elements in his elegies from exile similarly mimics his inclusion of elegiac elements in his epic *Metamorphoses*.

There has been much discussion among scholars about the historical truth or fiction of Ovid's exile. Most now read Ovid's exile poetry not as a factual documentation of the author's experience with exile, but rather as a poetic representation of the experience of exile just as Ovid's love poetry was a poetic representation of his erotic activities.<sup>75</sup> Scholars likewise see the poet depicted in Ovid's exile poetry as a poetic persona rather than a reflection of the author himself.<sup>76</sup> Here too there is continuity with Ovid's previous works. In his earlier amatory poetry, he explored the many poetic possibilities of being excluded from his mistress as the *exclusus amator* in Rome, and now he explores exclusion from Rome itself. His experiments with all of the tropes of elegiac poetry within the city of Rome have now turned to the experiment of writing poetry about the poet-lover's life away from Rome. Exile for Ovid becomes his latest fictionalization in a series of fictionalizations, and his poet-lover banished from Rome becomes the latest persona in the list of personae he has adopted throughout his works.

---

<sup>75</sup> See Rosenmeyer (1997) 49-51; Williams (2002b) 235; and Claassen (2008) 5-7, 215.

<sup>76</sup> See Rosenmeyer (1997) 49; Smith (1997) 193-194; Claassen (1999) 31, 130; and Holzberg (2002) 176.

Part II  
Past Departures

## Chapter 4

### Historical Departures: Livy

Within scholarship on Livy, there are two primary lines of inquiry. One is concerned with the value and nature of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* as a history, that is, an accurate factual account of the events of the past. The other is concerned with its value as a work of literature. Most scholarly treatments of Livy privilege one of these lines of inquiry over the other, rather than treating both of them equally. Scholars who focus on the value of Livy's work as a history are primarily interested in how competent Livy is as a historian and how accurately his history reports the events included in his work. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these efforts were dominated by source criticism (*Quellenforscher*). Although this trend was later followed by work with more sensitivity to literary issues, many scholars interested in Livy's value as a historian have still necessarily devoted attention to the historical value of Livy's sources, what his methods are for employing them, and how transparent he is in which ones he chooses and prefers.<sup>1</sup>

Much of this work has criticized Livy as a historian,<sup>2</sup> and scholars studying Livy from a historical perspective have often argued that he does not always use his sources reliably.<sup>3</sup> Many have also argued that Livy privileges his history's moral message over the historical facts and that he is more interested in the moral interpretation of events from the past than in what really happened.<sup>4</sup> Forsythe says that Livy is cautious about the sources of early Roman history,<sup>5</sup> but nevertheless "is not interested in evaluating the historicity of every detail or claim associated

---

<sup>1</sup> Collingwood (1956) 36-38; Syme (1959) 64-69; Walsh (1961) 117-123, 139-151; Forsythe (1999) 12-13, 52-64.

<sup>2</sup> Walsh (1961) 107-109, 141-147, 151, 153-168; Forsythe (1999) 66, 90.

<sup>3</sup> Collingwood (1956) 38, Walsh (1961) 141-147.

<sup>4</sup> Collingwood (1956) 37; Walsh (1961) 107-109, 151; Forsythe (1999) 43, 66, 90.

<sup>5</sup> Forsythe (1999) 40.

with early times. Rather, he concerns himself with what he considers to be the larger moral themes.”<sup>6</sup> Since modern scholars use Livy’s work as a historical source, this evaluation of his merits as a historian is crucial for our understanding of Roman history and interpretation of the account he gives us.

The other branch of scholarship in Livy looks more closely at the literary value of Livy’s work, rather than its historical value. Some scholars see literary value in Livy’s historical plan.<sup>7</sup> These scholars focus on how Livy uses his sources, not as a way of evaluating his historical accuracy, but as a way of investigating the deliberate and thoughtful way he arranges episodes and books.<sup>8</sup> In some ways this work seeks to rehabilitate Livy in response to scholarship that criticizes him as a second-rate historian.<sup>9</sup> As Miles says, “the message of this orientation is that ideological relevance and consistency rather than factual reliability serve as the essential criteria by which the narrative has been organized and should be judged.”<sup>10</sup>

Other scholars consider how Livy’s history serves as a comment on contemporary issues in addition to a narration of prior events.<sup>11</sup> In this way, Livy contributes to our understanding of his own time as well as that of earlier periods. There are also scholars who embrace the thematic nature of Livy’s work and investigate the ways in which Livy creates moral and patriotic meaning in his work.<sup>12</sup> In these interpretations, the value of Livy’s work again lies more in its ideology than in its historicity. Some of these scholars have examined the role of monuments<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Forsythe (1999) 43.

<sup>7</sup> Luce (1977) 240-244, 246-247; Miles (1995) 75-76, 89-98, 120-121.

<sup>8</sup> Burck (1964); Luce (1977) 6-7, 26-29, 74.

<sup>9</sup> Luce (1971) 301-302; Miles (1995) 18-19, 60-62, 66-68; Feldherr (1998) 7-9.

<sup>10</sup> Miles (1995) 67.

<sup>11</sup> Walsh (1961) 10-14; Luce (1977) 290-295; Miles (1995) 100-109, 132-136; Jaeger (1997) 13-14; Feldherr (1998) 3, 35, 49; Chaplin (2000) 169-170, 173, 192; Cornell (2003) 75, 77.

<sup>12</sup> Luce (1971) 301-302; Miles (1995) 18-19, 66-68.

<sup>13</sup> Jaeger (1997) 11, 16-17, 25; Feldherr (1998) 23-28.

and historical exempla<sup>14</sup> in Livy, as well as the way Livy uses memory<sup>15</sup> as a link to the past. Others examine Livy's use of physicality, including the roles of vision<sup>16</sup> and space and place,<sup>17</sup> in creating meaning in the narrative. Many of these questions, especially those concerned with literary plan and arrangement and the literary role of vision and space, have already been extensively applied to poetic texts, but studies of this kind in Livy expand the scope of this work to include prose as well, which has received less attention.

Although I recognize the importance of historical criticism in Livian scholarship and agree that Livy may privilege certain themes in his work over historical accuracy, it is these themes that I am primarily interested in investigating. My work is thus more in line with that of the second branch of scholarship on Livy mentioned above. I am more concerned with the literary value of Livy's work and how he conceives of history and the Romans' relationship to the past than with the historical accuracy of his work. In particular, I draw heavily on existing work on exempla, memory, and monuments in Livian scholarship.

My study contributes to scholarship on Livy in a number of ways. I expand on works that consider the role of space and place in Livy, such as those of Jaeger and Kraus, by focusing on the role of the city of Rome and the Romans' relationship to it in Livy's history. I also link these studies with work on memory in Livy by considering the connection between memory and place. My discussion of departure from Rome additionally considers the role of exile in Livy, which has not been a major focus in existing treatments of Livy's history or of Latin exile literature. In this way, I bring together two previously disparate areas of Classical scholarship.

---

<sup>14</sup> Feldherr (1998) 35; Chaplin (2000); Cornell (2003) 77-78.

<sup>15</sup> Miles (1995) 18-19, 68-71; Jaeger (1997) 11; Feldherr (1998) 47-49.

<sup>16</sup> Feldherr (1998) 1-3, 7-9, 23-28, 47-48.

<sup>17</sup> Kraus (1994) 271-273, 278-280, 287; Jaeger (1997) 13-14, 17, 45, 89-93; Feldherr (1998) 47-49.

This chapter explores the role of place and space in seven narratives of Romans departing from the city of Rome in the first decade of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. By looking at a number of episodes dealing with this theme together rather than separately in isolation, a fuller perspective is offered on Livy's treatment of departure from Rome and the relationship he posits between the Romans and their city. The first part of the chapter, "Part I: Exile and Individual Departures," considers the departure of individuals from the city in the form of exile. The episodes in this section are the exile of Coriolanus in Book 2, the exile of Camillus in Book 3, and the quasi-exile of Cincinnatus on the other side of the Tiber in Book 3. The second part of the chapter, "Part II: Secession and Group Departures," discusses the departure of whole groups of the Roman population, often in the form of secession. The episodes in this section are the first secession of the plebs in Book 2, the second secession of the plebs in Book 3, the mutiny of the Roman soldiers at Capua in Book 7, and the proposal to abandon Rome and move to Veii at the end of Book 5.

In all of these episodes, Livy's history displays an intimate connection between the Romans and the physical space of their city. Departure from Rome seriously disrupts this connection and threatens the wellbeing of the state as a whole, in part because it is a physical manifestation of political and ideological division within the city. Departure from Rome is invariably caused by conflict in the city. In almost all cases, this conflict consists of civil strife. Coriolanus, Cincinnatus, and Camillus are all exiled because of political conflict in Rome. Likewise, the secessions of the plebs and the sedition of the soldiers occur as a result of civil conflict between different groups in Rome. These episodes feature similar language describing the civil strife in the city, including words referring to the anger of the people (*ira*), the exchange of injuries and threats (*iniuria*, *minae*, and related words), words referring to sedition, secession,

and conspiracies (*seditio*, *secessio*, *coniuratio*), and words describing harsh and hostile behavior (*atrox*, *ferox*, and similar words).

The language describing the civil strife in these episodes also often recalls the language used in military contexts, casting the Romans as hostile enemies fighting each other. In these episodes, the political conflict becomes increasingly dangerous as it escalates from squabbling in the city to virtual or actual civil war. The one exception to this tendency is the proposal to move to Veii in Book 5, which occurs not as a result of internal conflict in the city, but as a result of an external conflict, namely the Gallic sack of Rome. Although this episode does not feature the civil discord present in the other episodes, it still occurs as a result of serious conflict for the city.

In almost all these episodes, the departure from Rome results in a crisis or threat to the wellbeing of the state. The exile of Coriolanus in Book 2 and the secession of the soldiers at Capua in Book 7 both escalate into a military attack on Rome by the Romans who have departed, while Camillus' exile leads to the Gallic sack of Rome because Camillus is no longer present to save the city. The secessions of the plebs in Books 2 and 3 pose a threat to the city because they make the city vulnerable to a potential attack by foreign enemies or the plebs themselves. The proposal to move the entire Roman population to Veii at the end of Book 5 threatens to erase the entire Roman state from existence.

Besides creating problems for the state, departure from Rome is also problematic for the individual Romans who leave the city. The departure from Rome often results in a loss of identity for these Romans, making it different from the trope Claassen discusses of exile as equivalent to death.<sup>18</sup> Coriolanus and Camillus must become members of new communities in exile. Cincinnatus loses his ties to the community and his role as a statesman when he leaves the city. The soldiers at Capua attempt to become inhabitants of Capua instead of Romans. The

---

<sup>18</sup> Claassen (1999) 20-22.

proposed move of the Roman population to Veii would turn all Romans into citizens of Veii and eliminate Roman identity *en masse*. The consequences of Romans departing from Rome are thus quite serious in Livy's history, for both the city and those leaving it behind.

For nearly all of the episodes, there is an eventual return to Rome after departure. Camillus and Cincinnatus are recalled to the city to assume the office of dictator. The plebs return peacefully to the city after both of their secessions. The soldiers at Capua abandon their attack on Rome and are reintegrated into Roman society. While the Romans at the end of Book 5 do not actually move to Veii and as such have no need for a physical return to the city, their rejection of the proposal to leave Rome acts as a reversal of their initial intentions to depart and thus represents an ideological return to the city. The exception to the norm of returning to Rome after departure among the episodes I discuss is Coriolanus, who gives up his military attack on Rome but is not actually reintegrated into Roman society and must go back into exile.

In all of these cases in which return to the city occurs, however, the return results in the resolution of conflict or crisis for the state. When Camillus returns to Rome, he saves the city from the Gauls. Cincinnatus' return leads to the defeat of the Aequi who have besieged a Roman camp. The return of the plebs after both of their secessions leads to the restoration of concord in the state and the expansion of the rights of the people. When the soldiers at Capua give up their attack on the city and return to Rome, the city escapes from civil war and concord in the state is restored. The rejection of the proposal to move to Veii saves Rome from oblivion and leads to a rebirth and rebuilding of the city.

Return to the city also restores the identity of the individual Romans who have returned. Cincinnatus and Camillus take back their rightful places in the Roman community and resume their roles as leaders of the state. The soldiers at Capua resume their roles as Romans instead of

the role they have taken up as foreign enemies attacking the city. The Romans maintain their identity as Romans and not Veientes when they decide to stay in their city. Although departure from Rome poses threats to the city and obscures the identity of the Romans who leave it, Livy presents these issues as reversible and shows that return to the city corrects the problems which arise as a result of departure.

The consistent message Livy sends in these episodes of departure and return to the city is that Rome and the Romans are a natural unit, the division of which is unnatural. For Livy, the essence of Rome lies in an intimate connection between Roman people and Roman space. Rome must be inhabited by Roman people in order to survive as a city. Meanwhile, the Roman people feel a deep personal attachment to Roman space and landscape. Livy also presents memory as another important element in the connection between Roman people and Roman space. In Livy's history, Romans perceive events in their history as creating a collective memory of Roman identity and character, and continuously look to their past to determine how to behave in the future.<sup>19</sup> These memories of the past are often tied to specific places in Rome.<sup>20</sup> The physical space of Rome thus connects Romans to their past and becomes a repository of memory and exempla for behavior which they can continuously draw from and add to. This feature of Livy's history reflects a general preoccupation with exempla during the Augustan age, which Augustus himself was actively promoting.<sup>21</sup> The Romans' memory of the past helps give places in the city meaning beyond their physical construction. At the same time, seeing and engaging with these places activates the memory of those meanings for the Roman people.

Therefore, the problem with departure from Rome in Livy's work is that it disrupts this intimate connection between the Roman people, their memories, and the physical space of their

---

<sup>19</sup> Luce (1977) 241-245; Miles (1995) 18-19, 68-70.

<sup>20</sup> Edwards (1996) 29-30.

<sup>21</sup> Feldherr (1998) 35-37, Chaplin (2000) 169-178.

city. This causes difficulties not only for the wellbeing of the departing Romans themselves, but also for the state as a whole. Because these departures from Rome occur as a result of civil conflict in the city, departure becomes the physical representation of political division already occurring in the city. The physical return to Rome, however, reverses this cycle as it achieves and symbolizes renewed political unity in the city.

## Part I: Exile and Individual Departures

### Coriolanus

The first instance of exile in Livy's first decade considered is that of Coriolanus in Book 2. In this episode, Coriolanus, a renowned Roman soldier, is indicted and exiled for his hostility to the plebs during a grain shortage in 492 BC. Angered by his ejection from the city, he then joins his former enemies, the Volsci, in a military attack on Rome. After the senate fails to dissuade him from his attack on the city, his mother approaches him with his wife and the other women of Rome and finally convinces him to spare the city and return to his exile peacefully.

At the beginning of the episode, Livy depicts civil strife as the cause of Coriolanus' exile. He is exiled for being hostile to the plebs during a grain shortage. In a speech to the senate, Coriolanus casts the shortage as a consequence of the first secession of the plebs which takes place earlier in the book. He claims that the plebs caused the shortage by their own recklessness when they seceded and stopped tilling the fields (2.34.10-11), and that they should suffer the famine as the consequence of their actions. Before Coriolanus' speech, Livy tells us that many of the other senators also see the famine as a way to gain back the rights they lost because of the secession and force of the plebs (*secessione ac vi*, 2.34.8). As Chaplin relates, there are a number

of connections between the first secession of the plebs and the story of Coriolanus.<sup>22</sup> The language of the passage and Coriolanus' own emphasis on the struggles between the senate and the plebs make civil discord a part of his story from the very beginning. Civil strife causes the secession of the plebs, and the same strife is still continuing as Coriolanus attacks the plebs by connecting the secession and the grain shortage.

The reaction of the plebs to Coriolanus' speech continues the discord. The people see Coriolanus as harsh (*atrox*, 2.35.1) and hostile (*inimicus*, 2.35.2). They call him an executioner (*carnifex*, 2.35.1) and accuse him of subjecting them to death or slavery. Several times, Livy characterizes them by anger (*ira*, 2.35.1, 2.35.2, 2.35.5). Coriolanus sees the tribunes' indictment of him as threats (*minae*, 2.35.3) and he himself is threatening (*minitans*, 2.35.5) as he goes into exile. The language of civil strife is pervasive throughout the beginning of the episode and casts the story of Coriolanus as part of a series of civil conflicts in Book 2, beginning with the secession of the plebs and then moving on to conflict over the grain distribution and ultimately the exile of Coriolanus.

Some of the language in the sections leading up to Coriolanus' exile even resembles that of war. Coriolanus is an "enemy of the power of the tribunes" (*hostis tribuniciae potestatis*, 2.34.9). In response to his speech, the plebs nearly take up arms in their anger (2.35.1) and claim that they are being treated as enemies (*hostes*, 2.35.1). As he goes into exile, Coriolanus is "threatening to his homeland" (*minitans patriae*) and bears "the disposition of an enemy," (*hostiles spiritus*, 2.35.6). The use of the word *hostis* to describe both Coriolanus and the plebs in this episode casts them not as part of the same community but as belonging to two different enemy forces fighting a war against each other. This not only foreshadows Coriolanus' later attack on the city of Rome, but also reveals how divisive civil strife is in Livy's narrative as it

---

<sup>22</sup> Chaplin (2003) 200-210.

turns members of the same community against each other and in this case leads to the forced removal of Coriolanus from the city. As a number of scholars have argued, the presence of this strife from the beginning of Livy's history represents civil conflict as a phenomenon inherent in the foundation of Rome and early Roman history.<sup>23</sup>

Coriolanus' exile results in a serious escalation of the civil conflict when he joins forces with Rome's enemies, the Volsci. Although Coriolanus is now joining with foreigners as part of an external attack on the city, the language Livy uses as he describes the attack on Rome is similar to that of the internal conflict in Rome before Coriolanus' exile. When Coriolanus arrives among the Volsci, he is full of anger (*ira*), complaints (*querellae*), and threats (*minae*, 2.35.6), just as both he and the plebs are full of anger and threats during the conflict over the grain distribution before his exile. When he begins making plans with Attius Tullius, the leader of the Volsci, Livy again mentions his anger twice as a complement to Tullius' hatred (*odium*) toward the Romans (2.35.7, 2.35.8). Coriolanus' anger toward the plebs, which begins during the civil conflict in Rome, now becomes threatening to all of Rome by attaching itself to the external hatred of Rome by her enemies.

The representation of Coriolanus' actions as an escalation of previous civil strife in the city continues during his attack on Rome. When Coriolanus begins the attack against Roman territory with the Volsci, he makes sure to spare the fields of the patricians because he is "hostile to the plebs" (*infensus plebi*) and because he wants to create discord (*discordia*) between the senate and the plebs in Rome (2.39.6). His actions during his attack on Rome thus have the power to create further conflict within the city. When the senate asks Coriolanus to end his attack on the city, he is harsh in his refusal (*atrox*, 2.39.10), just as the plebs perceive him as being *atrox* to them during the grain shortage. Later, when his mother Veturia approaches him, she

---

<sup>23</sup> Konstan (1986) 206-210, Miles (1995) 65-66.

refers to him as an enemy twice (*hostis*, 2.40.5, 2.40.6) and asks him, ““did your anger not subside as you crossed into Roman territory, even though you had entered with a hostile and threatening mind?”” (*non tibi, quamvis infesto animo et minaci perveneras, ingredienti fines ira cecidit?*, 2.40.7). The thread we have seen of anger and threatening behavior during Coriolanus’ conflict with the plebs in the city still continues in his mother’s plea to dissuade him from attacking the city.

All of these verbal echoes create parallels between the civil conflict leading up to Coriolanus’ departure from the city and the external conflict he creates between the Romans and their former enemies after his departure. This not only casts the external attack on the city as a continuation of the previous internal conflict, but it also shows how dangerous internal conflict can become when it escalates to the point of civil war and threatens the city with destruction. The parallels between the Coriolanus story and the history of the late Republic, including the conflicts involving Sulla, Marius, Catiline, Pompey, and Caesar,<sup>24</sup> particularly help Livy underscore this point. In the Coriolanus episode, departure from the city is deeply tied to division within the city, and this division ultimately assimilates internal and external threats to the city into one interconnected problem.

In addition to causing a threat to the safety of the city, Coriolanus’ exile also causes him to lose his former identity as a leading Roman citizen. When he goes into exile, Coriolanus becomes more like one of the Volsci than a Roman. His feelings toward Rome coalesce with those of Attius Tullius as they band together in a shared plot against the city (2.35.7). Just as Livy initially introduces Tullius as “always hostile to the Romans,” (*Romanis semper infestus*, 2.35.7), Veturia later uses the same adjective *infestus* to describe Coriolanus during his march against Rome (2.40.7). The very act of attacking Rome aligns Coriolanus with the Volsci, who

---

<sup>24</sup> Cornell (2003) 75-77, 84.

are notorious in Livy's early books for attacking the city on a nearly annual basis. His own title Coriolanus, which he receives for his role in the Roman capture of the town Corioli, no longer fits him as he now attacks the city for which he previously fought. Coriolanus' departure from Rome and in particular his betrayal of the city make him no longer a Roman.

Ultimately, Coriolanus ends his attack on the city and goes back into exile peacefully. This only occurs when he turns his mind to his relationship with the whole city rather than his volatile relationship with the people who exiled him. His sparing of patrician land during his attack on Roman territory shows that he sees the plebs as the target of his attack, not the whole Roman people. Instead of thinking of his homeland as a whole and his connection to it, he only remembers the conflict within it and his own injuries at the hands of his fellow citizens (*memorem...civium iniuriae*, 2.39.11). The Coriolanus story thus illustrates well the themes in Feldherr's argument that the overall structure of Book 2 "highlights the individual's struggle between family loyalty and state loyalty" and negotiates the changing relationship between Roman citizens and their state after the founding of the Roman Republic.<sup>25</sup> Instead of being a good Roman citizen, Coriolanus is like a mythical or epic hero who focuses on his own personal struggles and ignores the good of the community.<sup>26</sup>

His mother's plea, however, helps him refocus on his connection to the city rather than on his alienation from it. She reminds him that his family, his home, and his *penates* are within Rome (2.40.7-8). More importantly, she says that his homeland bore and nourished him (*hanc terram quae te genuit atque aluit*, 2.40.6), drawing on the characterization of the homeland as mother in the Classical world.<sup>27</sup> Finally, Livy says, "then the wife and children who embraced

---

<sup>25</sup> Feldherr (2009) 416-422 (reprint of Feldherr, A. (1997) "Livy's Revolution: Civic Identity and the Creation of the Res Publica" in T.N. Habinek and A. Schiesaro eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.).

<sup>26</sup> Cornell (2003) 80-84.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Cornell (2003) 80.

him, and the weeping that arose from the whole crowd of women and the wailing of his homeland finally broke the man” (*uxor deinde ac liberi amplexi, fletusque ab omni turba mulierum ortus et comploratio sui patriaeque fregere tandem virum*, 2.40.9). Coriolanus returns to the right state of mind when he remembers his personal attachment to the city rather than his injuries and thinks of his homeland as a whole, rather than focusing on the conflict between the plebs and the senate.

The emphasis on Rome as Coriolanus’ true mother here does not appear in the accounts of this story in Plutarch or Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In Plutarch’s version in his *Life of Coriolanus*, Coriolanus’ mother emphasizes their family ties and does not mention the sight of Rome or its walls. She particularly focuses on herself—not the city of Rome—as his mother, and censures him for his ingratitude toward her as the woman who raised him (*Life of Coriolanus*, 35-36). Her speech in Dionysius of Halicarnassus similarly calls attention to her role as his mother and criticizes him for endangering her with his attack on Rome (*DH*, 8.51). She also complains that he mistreated the previous ambassadors from the city and should have been more conciliatory to them (*DH*, 8.50), privileging his connection to other important Romans over his connection to the city itself. These differences reveal that Livy favors or even invents a version of Veturia’s speech that assigns greater importance to Coriolanus’ relationship to Roman space than to his relationship with his peers, his family, and even his own mother.

While Coriolanus’ first departure from the city brings about external war and potential destruction for the city, his second departure restores the safety of the city and ends the conflict that resulted in his exile. Not only does his retreat from Roman territory end the immediate threat to the city, but Livy also tells us that shortly after this event, the Volsci remove Attius Tullius as their leader and then “sedition, and then a harsh battle arose,” (*seditio, deinde atrox proelium*

*ortum*, 2.40.13) between the Aequi and Volsci and both enemy armies perish. The Romans may be able to recover from the strife which threatens their city, but when the same strife occurs between the Aequi and Volsci, it ruins them. In this way, the peaceful departure of Coriolanus from Roman territory ensures stability in Rome as it transfers civil conflict and the destruction it threatens from the Romans to their enemies.

For Coriolanus himself, the results of his retreat from Rome are mixed. He becomes a particularly interesting exemplum in Livy's history because his loss of memory and his personally motivated attack on Rome initially cast him as an exemplum of bad behavior, while his recollection of his memories and his retreat later rehabilitate him as an exemplum of good behavior.<sup>28</sup> Still, in the end he must go back into exile, and the resolution in his story is only a partial one. Although he has renewed his connection to Rome in his mind, he remains spatially alienated from the city in his exile. He is never reintegrated into the Roman community and thus never recovers his former role in the state and the identity it provided him.

The story of Coriolanus shows us that Livy's history sees the Romans and the city of Rome as a natural unit. Veturia's speech emphasizes how unnatural the physical separation in this episode is because it can lead to sons becoming their mothers' enemies, mothers becoming their sons' captives, and people seeking to destroy the land which created them. Here, alienation from Rome—particularly in the form of a Roman attacking his own city—is as unnatural as matricide. We also see here that memory plays an important role in this connection between the Romans and their city. Feldherr has emphasized the special role of vision in creating meaning in Livy's history.<sup>29</sup> In particular, Livy connects vision with memory in the Coriolanus episode when Veturia

---

<sup>28</sup> Cornell (2003) 77-78.

<sup>29</sup> Feldherr (1998) 1-12, 47-48.

points out that the sight of Rome should activate Coriolanus' memories of his family, his home, and his debt to Rome as the place where he was raised (2.40.6-7).

One of the problems with Coriolanus' exile, though, is that it disrupts his connection with Rome by causing him to remember the wrong things about the city. Even when he sees Rome during his march against the city, he still does not remember why this space is important to him, reflecting the loss of his ability to grasp the meaning which his vision ought to communicate to him. Instead, he only remembers the injury which his fellow citizens have inflicted on him (2.39.11). When Coriolanus is alienated from the people of Rome as a result of civil conflict and then from the physical space of the city as a result of his exile, the memory of his homeland loses its power and his attachment and loyalty to Rome is broken. Because the ability to correctly connect memory and place is so essential to Roman identity in Livy, Coriolanus' loss of this ability after his exile deprives him of his true Roman character and permanently alienates him from Roman space and society.

Coriolanus' exile from Rome is also problematic because it is closely connected to division within the city. Not only does it come about as part of a series of civil disputes, but Livy continues to describe his departure in the same terms as he uses for the conflict over the grain distribution even after he leaves the city and stages an external attack on it. Throughout the Coriolanus story, his physical separation from the city recalls the political separation of the Roman state into combative factions. The case of Coriolanus shows us just how dangerous this separation can be, when it leads to a military attack on the city and threatens the safety of the whole state.

## Camillus

Perhaps the most famous exiled figure in Livy's early books is Camillus. After Camillus' defeat of Veii in the first half of Book 5, a dispute over the spoils of the war causes Camillus to be exiled to Ardea in 391 BC. While he is in exile, the Gauls sack and then besiege the city of Rome. In their hour of need, the Romans recall Camillus from exile and he arrives in Rome just in time to save the city from being ransomed. Camillus then leads the Romans to victory in a final battle against the Gauls. His final act in Book 5 is to save the city once again by preventing the Romans from moving to Veii and instead convincing them to stay and rebuild Rome.

Livy describes Camillus' exile as the result of civil conflict. Before his exile, Livy says that the tribunes of the plebs are stirring up sedition (*seditio*) and that they are especially trying to incite the plebs against Camillus (5.25.11). The tribunes speak fiercely (*ferociter*), while the people listening to them are angry (*iratus*, 5.25.12). The language of civil discord continues after Camillus is exiled as well. Like Coriolanus, Camillus sees his exile as an injustice (*iniuria*, 5.32.9) at the hands of his fellow citizens. He also sees his fellow citizens as ungrateful for his services to the state, both as he goes into exile and while he is in exile at Ardea (5.32.9, 5.44.2).

Camillus' speech at the end of Book 5 after his return to Rome further emphasizes the role of civil strife in his exile. Near the end of his speech, Camillus describes his exile as an injustice (*iniuria*) and a disaster (*calamitas*) for himself (5.54.3), implying that his exile was unfair and politically motivated. Further, at the beginning of his speech, he says, "the squabbles with the tribunes of the plebs are so harsh to me, citizens, that I had no other solace for my most unhappy exile, while I lived at Ardea, than that I was far away from these disputes, and because of these same things, I would never have returned, even if you summoned me a thousand times by the decree of the senate and the order of the people" (*adeo mihi acerbae sunt, Quirites,*

*contentiones cum tribunis plebis, ut nec tristissimi exsilii solacium aliud habuerim, quoad Ardeae uixi, quam quod procul ab his certaminibus eram, et ob eadem haec non si miliens senatus consulto populique iussu reuocaretis, rediturus unquam fuerim, 5.51.1).* Camillus here paints the civil conflict leading to his exile not as an isolated incident but as an ongoing problem that is tiresome and destructive to the city. For him, the strife in the city is so bad that even exile is preferable to being a part of it.

The outcome of Camillus' exile for the city of Rome shows clearly how damaging the departure of a leading statesman from the city can be. Livy presents Camillus' departure from Rome as one of the causes of the Gallic sack of the city later in the book. Livy says the Gallic sack occurs because the Romans not only ignored the warnings of the gods, "but also removed Marcus Furius, who was their only human aid, from the city" (*sed humanum quoque opem, quae una erat, M. Furium ab urbe amovere, 5.32.7*). Here Livy emphasizes the importance of Camillus' physical presence in the city and casts his departure from it as a threat to its safety.

For Camillus himself, his exile functions as a loss of his identity as a Roman in this episode. When the Gauls approach Ardea, Camillus speaks in an assembly there and calls the people of Ardea his new fellow citizens (*novi cives mei, 5.44.1*). Camillus now has new fellow citizens, casting him as one of the Ardeates and no longer as a Roman. After the speech, he goes on to lead the people of Ardea to victory against the Gauls. Instead of leading the Romans in battle, as he has done throughout his career before his exile, Camillus now leads the Ardeates, making him a general of Ardea instead of a general of Rome.

The subsequent recall of Camillus as a leader of the Romans, however, leads to the salvation of Rome. While the Gauls besiege the city, the Romans who have fled to Veii decide to recall Camillus from exile. They then secretly send a messenger to the senate in Rome, and the

senate elects Camillus dictator in his absence. After hearing the news from the senate, Camillus leaves Ardea and gathers the Roman troops in Veii before returning to help the Romans at Rome (5.46.5-11). He arrives in Rome just as the Romans are paying the ransom for their city to the Gauls. Camillus intervenes, saying that the ransom is not valid because the dictator has not approved it (5.49.1-2), and then leads the Romans to victory against the Gauls (5.49.4-6). Scholars have argued that Camillus' involvement here is not part of the original story of the Gallic sack, but is a later addition which Livy includes to make the story more exciting<sup>30</sup> or to make Camillus a greater focus of the story.<sup>31</sup>

Livy's focus here is not only on Camillus himself, though, but also on his physical return to the city. After the defeat of the Gauls, Livy says Camillus returned to the city in triumph (*triumphans in urbem redit*, 5.49.7). This language is typical of generals returning from war, but for Camillus it is even more meaningful because it also corresponds to his return from exile. Upon his return, the Romans call him "Romulus and the father of his homeland and a second founder of the city" (*Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis*, 5.49.7). This language casts Camillus as not only the savior of Rome but also its refounder in the tradition of its original founder, Romulus.<sup>32</sup> Just as the Gallic sack of Rome occurs as a result of Camillus leaving the city, it is only his return to the city which leads to its salvation.

The defeat of the Gauls is not the only way Camillus' return saves the city, however. After his triumph, Livy says Camillus "then undoubtedly again saved the city in peace which he had saved in war, when he prevented the migration to Veii" (*servatam deinde bello patriam iterum in pace haud dubie servavit cum prohibuit migrari Veios*, 5.49.8). Camillus' return to the city not only protects Rome from external threats, but also from internal threats to its existence

---

<sup>30</sup> Luce (1971) 291-297.

<sup>31</sup> Ogilvie (1965) 698, 727-728.

<sup>32</sup> Miles (1995) 125-130.

with the proposal of the tribunes to abandon it. The fact that Camillus keeps his post as dictator until he resolves the issue of migration to Veii (5.49.9) casts the move to Veii as a crisis equally as dangerous as the Gallic sack,<sup>33</sup> making Camillus' return to Rome and the overturning of his exile a double salvation for the city. For Livy, Camillus' departure from Rome leads to crisis, while his return and his prevention of others from leaving the city leads to its rescue.

Camillus' return and election to the dictatorship also restore the Roman identity which he loses during his exile. After his return, the Romans defeat the Gauls under the leadership and auspices of Camillus (*ducto auspicioque Camilli*, 5.49.6). This echoes what Livy says previously when the Roman soldiers in Veii remember Camillus and how they fought successfully before under his leadership and auspices (*ductu auspicioque eius*, 5.46.6).<sup>34</sup> Camillus' return thus restores him to his former importance as a Roman leader. The new titles he receives of *Romulus*, *parens patriae*, and *alter conditor urbis* further solidify this restoration with their celebration of his salvation of the city. Camillus' return from exile not only saves the city, but also saves his own former identity and role in the state.

In many ways, the story of Camillus' exile is an inversion of the story of Coriolanus. The two men are similar in that they are both exiled as a result of political conflict. Both episodes emphasize the injustice of the character's exile and the injuries he receives as a result. Their stories also highlight the divisive nature of civil strife in Rome's history. Ultimately, however, the differences between the stories of Camillus and Coriolanus cast them as foils to each other. While Coriolanus responds to exile by attacking his native city, Camillus goes into exile peacefully and only approaches the city again after his recall. Although Camillus laments his

---

<sup>33</sup> For more on the move to Veii as another potential departure from Rome, see below.

<sup>34</sup> The phrase *ductu auspicioque* occurs only seven times in all of Livy's first decade (twice in Book 5, twice in Book 7, twice in Book 8, and once in Book 10). The fact that two of them appear here, both in connection with Camillus and in such close proximity, makes the connection between these two passages even more striking.

injury at the hands of his fellow citizens, he longs for Rome during his exile and leaves the city praying that his fellow Romans will miss him (5.32.9). His return to Roman territory is also for the benefit of Rome in an attempt to save the city from the Gauls, whereas Coriolanus enters Roman territory in an attempt to harm the city by attacking it with a foreign enemy.

Unlike Coriolanus, Camillus continues to think of the wellbeing of Rome even after his exile. When the Gauls attack Rome while he is at Ardea, Camillus is more concerned with the public fortune than with his own (*maestior fortuna publica quam sua*, 5.43.7). He continues to put Rome before himself after his return as well. He keeps his dictatorship after the defeat of the Gauls not for his personal glory, but because he sees that Rome is still in danger with the proposal to move to Veii (5.49.9). He also braves another conflict with the tribunes, despite his personal distaste for political conflict, when he opposes their proposal to abandon the city (5.51.2). Coriolanus, on the other hand, only thinks of his personal injury and the injustice of his exile and is willing to exact his revenge on Rome instead of putting the safety of the state before his own personal desires.

One of the most important differences between Camillus and Coriolanus is that unlike Coriolanus, Camillus keeps his memories of Rome after his departure from the city. When Coriolanus attacks the city, his mother Veturia must remind him of his connection to the hills and the landscape of Rome which even the sight of the city does not trigger for him. She must also remind him that Roman soil nourished him as a mother. Camillus, on the other hand, remembers all of this on his own. He thinks of his memories of Roman landscape throughout his exile, even when he is away from Roman territory. He himself reminds the Romans that Roman soil is like a mother to them during his speech at the end of Book 5. In this way, Camillus is more like Veturia than Coriolanus, in that he is responsible for reminding the Romans of what

they have forgotten and for reforging the connection between the Romans and their city. Both of these stories of departure from Rome involve division in the state which escalates into crisis, but only Camillus is able to keep his personal attachment to the city intact and in this way resolve the threat to the state and create reunification.

In this episode, Livy again sees departure from Rome as disruptive to the unity of the Romans and their city. When prominent Romans leave Rome, their departure creates danger for the city and leads to crisis. In the case of Camillus, this crisis is the near obliteration of the city by foreign enemies. His return, however, represents the salvation of Rome and the removal of the threat to the city's existence. Livy particularly focuses on the role of memory in this connection between Romans and their city here. Camillus emphasizes his memories of the Roman landscape, including the hills, fields, and the Tiber, when he recalls the experience of his exile during his speech at the end of Book 5 (5.54.3). He tells the Romans that their attachment to their city comes from this landscape, not only from buildings (5.54.2). His speech emphasizes familiarity and personal connection to Roman space as well. He refers to the area of Rome as familiar (*adsueta*) and says he was born and raised (*natus educatusque*) under the Roman sky (5.54.3). He also refers to Roman soil as mother (*mater*, 5.54.2). These descriptions highlight his lifelong familiarity with Roman space and portray Rome as a place to which he has a deep personal attachment.

Camillus assumes that the rest of the Romans feel this same attachment to Roman space as well. He refers to the dearness (*caritas*) which Romans should feel for the Roman landscape twice (5.54.2, 5.54.3), implying that all Romans are connected to Roman space by this dearness. Camillus' exile and return put him in a unique position to advise the Romans about their connection to their city, in that he has experienced the negative effects of being separated from it.

He emphasizes his memories of his longing for Rome during his exile (*meminisse iuvat*, 5.54.3) in order to warn them not to willingly create this same longing (*desiderium*) for themselves in the future (5.54.3). In this way, Camillus' description of his experience with exile and return serves as an exemplum to his fellow Romans to connect them with the physical site of Rome and emphasize their familiarity with and personal attachment to their city. Chaplin has argued that Livy uses exempla to convey meaning to both the internal and external audiences of the text and that these two audiences may sometimes interpret the same exemplum in different ways.<sup>35</sup> In this case, though, the message conveyed by Camillus' experience is the same for both the internal audience of the work, i.e. the people listening to his speech, and for the external audience, i.e. Livy's readers.

In his treatise *On Exile*, Plutarch argues that exile is not such a bad fate after all because nature does not provide people with their countries and there is no reason to be attached to any specific place (*On Exile*, 5). For Plutarch, the water, earth, and sky are the same everywhere and no place need be privileged over another (*On Exile*, 6). He even cites the story of Camillus as proof that people can still achieve greatness after being exiled (*On Exile*, 15). Livy's Camillus himself, however, could not have imagined such an outlook on exile from Rome. For Camillus, the landscape of Rome is not duplicated anywhere else and has in fact been given to Romans by nature and the gods. Camillus' greatness is eventually restored after his exile, but for Livy this greatness is only possible when he is recalled to Rome and is most fulfilled precisely when he reconnects to the city and causes other Romans to do so as well.

This episode also portrays departure from the city as connected to division within it. Camillus is exiled as a result of civil strife, emphasizing the political divisions within the city. After the Romans lose Camillus and the Gauls defeat them at Allia, some of the Romans retreat

---

<sup>35</sup> Chaplin (2000) 37-39, 48, 50-53.

to Rome, while some of them retreat to Veii. This creates a physical separation of the Roman people and makes it impossible for the whole population to act together. What begins as a civil conflict between the people and Camillus ultimately leads to a division of the whole population. The recall of Camillus not only restores the general himself to the city, but also reunites the entire community when Camillus brings the troops from Veii and rejoins them with the rest of the population in Rome. Only the return of Camillus to the city can end the cycle of division in the state which begins with his exile.

### Cincinnatus

The final individual departure from Rome is that of Cincinnatus in Book 3. In this story, Cincinnatus' son Caeso is indicted for murder in 461 BC as a result of his hostility to the plebs and avoids facing the charges by going into exile. Cincinnatus must then cover the expenses of Caeso's bail and leaves the city as though he were an exile (*velut relegatus*, 3.13.10) to work on his farm outside the city. When the Romans are later in danger of an attack by the Aequi in 459 BC, they elect Cincinnatus as dictator and recall him to the city. Upon his return, he leads the Romans to victory and abdicates his dictatorship within sixteen days of being elected.

Like the exiles of Coriolanus and Camillus, the departure of Cincinnatus from Rome in Book 3 occurs as a result of political strife in the city. Throughout Book 3, there is an ongoing conflict in Rome over a land law. Cincinnatus' son Caeso fiercely opposes the law and the plebs and tribunes who support it (3.11). Livy describes Caeso as fierce (*ferox*, 3.11.6) and harsh (*atrox*, 3.11.9) and says that he opposes the tribunes as if he were fighting a war with them (3.11.9). He even ejects the tribunes and the plebs from the forum and becomes violent to those standing in his way (3.11.8). Finally, the people see Caeso as a threat to their liberty (3.12.1) and

indict him for the murder of Marcus Volscius Fictor's brother and other crimes against the people. The conflict becomes so heated that the people almost attack and kill Caeso (3.13.3). Before the trial takes place, the senate grants Caeso release on bail. He then flees the city and violates his bail, leading to the cruel exacting of the money from his innocent father Cincinnatus (3.13.9). The story of Caeso and Cincinnatus thus presents another example of the recurring civil discord and violence in Livy's early books.

The ultimate result of the civil conflict surrounding Caeso is the virtual exile of Cincinnatus. Livy says the result of Cincinnatus' forced payment of his son's bail is that, "after selling off all of his property, he lived for a while in a certain remote hut across the Tiber as if he had been banished" (*divenditis omnibus bonis aliquamdiu trans Tiberim velut relegatus devio quodam tugurio viveret*, 3.13.10). The word *relegatus* here, normally used for Romans who were banished but allowed to keep their property, casts Cincinnatus as an exile as much as his son Caeso, although he himself is not indicted for any crime. He no longer possesses his property or lives in a proper house as he did in Rome. For Cincinnatus, departure from the city is a loss of his true identity as a Roman. The fact that he is on the other side of the Tiber emphasizes his separation from the city and shows that he is no longer in the place where he belongs. When he crosses the Tiber and leaves the city limits, Cincinnatus leaves his role as a Roman leader behind and becomes an anonymous farmer.

Like Camillus, Cincinnatus eventually returns to Rome when the city is in crisis. Three years after Cincinnatus leaves the city for his farm on the other side of the Tiber, the Aequi succeed in besieging the consul Lucius Minucius in his camp after they defeat him in a minor battle. Although Rome is not directly in danger, Livy says, "there was as much panic and as much fear as if the enemy were besieging the city and not the camp" (*tantus pavor, tanta*

*trepidatio fuit quanta si urbem, non castra hostes obsiderent*, 3.26.5). The Romans' fear and the desperation of the situation lead them to summon Cincinnatus, whom Livy describes as the only hope for the power of the Roman people (*spes unica imperii populi Romani*, 3.26.7), just as he describes Camillus as the only human aid for the city against the Gauls in Book 5. And just as Camillus returns from Ardea to save the city, Cincinnatus crosses the Tiber in a boat and reenters the city as the unanimously elected dictator.

Although Livy does not portray the crisis with the Aequi as a direct result of Cincinnatus' departure (unlike in the story of Camillus and the Gallic sack), he does portray the salvation of the city as the result of Cincinnatus' return. Cincinnatus defeats the enemy besieging the Roman camp by surrounding them and effectively making them into the besieged rather than the besiegers (3.28). The salvation of the Roman camp and the consul commanding it is only possible when Cincinnatus, one of Rome's leading statesmen, returns to Rome and his proper place in the state.

For Cincinnatus, this return to Rome and election to the dictatorship restores him to his previous status. When the legates meet him on his farm, they ask him to put on his toga and receive the orders of the senate (3.26.9). This return to the toga is the first step in Cincinnatus' return to his Roman identity. When he crosses the river into the city, Cincinnatus' sons, his family and friends, and the senate meet him, marking his reintegration into Roman society to which he previously belonged (3.26.11). Finally, whereas Cincinnatus lives in a hut (*tugurium*, 3.26.9) while he was outside the city, when he reenters the city he goes to his *domus* (3.26.12), his true home. The full restoration of Cincinnatus to his Roman identity thus only occurs when he returns to the city, rejoins Roman society, and resumes his role as a leader of the Roman people.

Cincinnatus' story features parallels with those of Coriolanus and Camillus. All three must leave the city because of political conflict and become alienated from Rome as a result of their departure. Cincinnatus' eventual return to Rome, however, makes his story different from that of Coriolanus, who is not restored to Rome and does not achieve a true resolution of his alienation from the city. Rather, Cincinnatus is more like Camillus, who also returns to Rome and saves the city from crisis, ensuring the rebirth of Rome and the continued connection between the city and its citizens.

Here, Livy presents Rome and the Romans as a unit which departure from the city disrupts. The departure of Cincinnatus is problematic for Rome because it deprives the city of one of its leading statesmen. Cincinnatus' departure also seems unfitting because he is forced to leave as a result of the exile of his son, through no wrongdoing of his own. Just as in the stories of Coriolanus and Camillus, the Cincinnatus episode reveals an escalating cycle of division in the state which begins with political conflict and leads to the forced departure of important Romans from the city of Rome. The return of Cincinnatus to the physical space of the city, however, corrects these problems. For Cincinnatus himself, the return allows him to resume his proper place in Roman society which he loses during his absence from the city. For Rome, the return of Cincinnatus leads to the defeat of foreign enemies and saves the city during a crisis. Departure from Rome in the form of quasi-exile here undermines the unity of the Romans and their city, but this separation need not be permanent. It is reversed when Cincinnatus returns to the city and reunion is accomplished.

## Part II: Secession and Group Departures

### First Secession of the Plebs

The first group departure in Livy in this section is the first secession of the plebs in Book 2. In this episode, a debt crisis in 494 BC leads to increasing civil conflict in the city, prompting the plebs to secede from Rome and go to the Sacred Mount near Alba Longa as an act of protest. In response, the senate sends Menenius Agrippa to the plebs to negotiate a reconciliation and he convinces them to return. During the secession, the people elect tribunes to represent them for the first time, and the conflict is ultimately resolved when the plebs return to the city and are reintegrated into the Roman state with their political rights expanded.

Just as in the individual departures discussed above, the cause of the departure of the plebs is civil strife. The debt crisis facing the plebs fuels tensions between them and the patricians. The sections leading up to the secession are full of the language of civil conflict. Livy uses the words *discors* and *discordia* to describe the conflict in several places (2.23.1, 2.29.8, 2.31.10), and says that this discord causes the dictator Valerius to resign in his frustration at trying to resolve it. He uses the word *ira* and says the consuls cannot control the anger of the people (2.23.14, 2.29.4, 2.29.6). He describes the tension between the plebs and the patricians as *invidia* (2.28.8). Further, he says the state is divided by internal hatred (*intestino odio*, 2.23.1), and that the consul Servilius earns the *odium* of both the plebs and senators alike when he attempts to take a middle course and compromise (2.27.3-4).

As the conflict deepens, the language Livy uses to describe it becomes increasingly connected with violence and mutiny. He describes the activity of the plebs as *seditio* (2.27.12, 2.29.1) and *secessio* (2.27.13). The link between the word *secessio* and the verb *secedo* (to depart) draws attention to the physical separation of the plebs from the rest of the state. In this

way, strife in Rome is linguistically conceived of in spatial terms even before the physical departure of the plebs from the city. During the consulship of Appius and Servilius, the conflict becomes violent as creditors are roughed up in front of the consuls (2.27.9). Later, when the consuls Verginius and Vetusius attempt to control the problem, Livy says they realize that a fierce conflict with the plebs (*atrox cum plebe certamen*, 2.28.8) is on the horizon. In sections 28 and 32, the people engage in secret meetings and conspiracies (*coetus occulti coniurationesque*), suggesting that they are plotting against the state. At the height of the sedition, just before the secession to the Sacred Mount, there is even discussion among the plebs of murdering the consuls (2.32.2).

The language describing the discord in the sections before the secession is also similar to that used of foreign wars. Early on, the plebs complain that they have been seized and oppressed by their fellow citizens (*a civibus captos et oppressos esse*, 2.23.2). The word *captos* here aligns them with captives seized in a war with foreign enemies. They also say they have more freedom among enemies than among their citizens, again making a close comparison between their fellow citizens and their foreign foes. When the Volsci attack in section 24, the senate is seized by a twofold fear both from the citizenry and the enemy (*ancipiti metu et ab cive et ab hoste*, 2.24.3), linking the plebs and the foreign enemies as threats to the state. Livy describes the movement of the crowd toward the senators in a scuffle in the forum during the consulship of Verginius and Vetusius as an *impetus*, a word often used for attacks in military contexts (2.29.4). Before Valerius resigns from the dictatorship, he says that peace has been achieved abroad, but is hindered at home (*pax foris parta est, domi impeditur*, 2.31.10), again assimilating the Romans' external and internal conflicts and suggesting that the internal ones are even more destructive to the state than the external ones.

The language of foreign wars continues during the actual secession as well. Although the plebs do not exhibit any violent behavior after they go to the Sacred Mount, they do possess a palisade (*vallum*), ditch (*fossa*), and military camp (*castra*) (2.32.4), casting them as a military force preparing for a battle. Moreover, this whole conflict between the plebs and the patricians over the debt crisis occurs amid repeated threats of external wars. During these threats, the people refuse to enlist in the army as a way to give themselves leverage in the internal conflict in the city. This refusal to fight on Rome's behalf, which reaches its culmination with the secession and the subsequent creation of a plebeian army outside the city, is like an act of treason and serves to help Rome's enemies more than Rome itself. All of these parallels with external wars in this episode serve to align this relatively nonviolent civil conflict with actual civil war by casting the Romans not as a united front but as a group of factions fighting against each other and not protecting the state from external harm.

The secession of the plebs from Rome to the Sacred Mount poses serious problems for the safety of the city. After the departure of the plebs, a great panic (*pavor ingens*, 2.32.5) arises in the city. Livy says, "the plebs left behind by their fellows feared violence from the patricians; the patricians feared the plebs remaining in the city, not knowing whether they preferred for them to stay or to go" (*timere relictā ab suis plebes violentiam patrum; timere patres residem in urbe plebem, incerti manere eam an abire mallent*, 2.32.5), showing that the secession of the plebs creates a danger of violence within the city. There is also a fear of attack from outside the city. The patricians fear that the plebs who have seceded will tire of their peaceful demonstration and eventually make a military attack on Rome (2.32.6). They also worry about the potential danger of a foreign enemy attacking the city while it is so helpless (2.32.7). Although the people

have only left the city and no actual violence is taking place, Livy presents their departure as creating a serious threat to the city's safety, both within the city and from outside it.

This episode also creates problems for Rome because it represents an inversion of the natural course of Roman history as Livy presents it in his early books. In Livy's early books, he characterizes the history of Rome by its growth as a result of absorbing new populations and making a single state out of many.<sup>36</sup> For example, after the battle over the Sabine women in Book 1, the Romans and Sabines make one state out of two (*civitatem unam ex duabus faciunt*, 1.13.4), with Romulus and the Sabine king sharing its rule between them. The Roman state also absorbs the people of Alba Longa in Book 1 when the Romans destroy their city and their entire population migrates to Rome. Livy depicts the Roman incorporation of Alba Longa in particular as the creation of one state out of two. He suggests that these two states share a natural unity because of their common Trojan descent and that the migration of the Albans to Rome is a physical restoration of this unity.

The secession of the plebs thus represents a reversal of this trajectory in Roman history as it divides the state, rather than unifying it. Early on in the conflict, Livy says that discord had made two states out of one (*duas ex una civitate discordia fecerat*, 2.24.1). The strife in the city here has the exact opposite effect from the union of the Sabines and Romans in Book 1. Seeing the Romans transform from one united state within Rome to a patrician state in Rome and a plebeian state in a camp outside the city is like watching Livy's earlier narratives (in which foreign enemies fight Rome and then are conquered and incorporated into the Roman state) in reverse. Thus the discord within Rome and its power to divide the state is not only dangerous because it threatens the safety of the city, but also because it threatens to undo the very history of Rome and its growth as a city.

---

<sup>36</sup> Konstan (1986) 204-206, 209-210; Gowing (2008) 460-461.

After the senate realizes these dangers posed by the secession, they send Menenius Agrippa to reconcile the plebs with the state. His parable of the body whose parts revolt against the stomach and ultimately lead to the near destruction of the body as a whole finally convinces the people to return to the city peacefully. The outcome of the return of the plebs is the resolution of the previous political conflict. It leads to discussion of concord in the city and an end of civil strife (2.33.1). It also leads to the creation of the tribunes of the people, an important expansion of the rights of the plebs because it grants them greater political representation and a safeguard against abuses of the consuls (2.33.1). In this way, the discord leading up to the secession ends, the threat of military attack on the city subsides, and the concord between the two halves of the state returns.

The secession of the plebs in this episode creates a rift in the natural connection between Rome and the Roman people. The physical separation of Romans from their city creates a situation contrary to the trajectory of Roman history and divides the Roman community into factions fighting against each other like foreign enemies. When part of the Roman population leaves Rome, the city is not safe and the unity of the state is at risk. After Agrippa's death, Livy defines him by referring to his role as the arbiter and negotiator of concord among the citizens (*interpreti arbitroque concordiae civium*) and the leader of the Roman people back into the city (*reductori plebis Romanae in urbem*, 2.33.11). Here Livy makes an explicit link between the plebs' physical return to the city and the restoration of concord. The message in this episode is that the Romans belong together in the city of Rome, and the spatial unity of the state is not only as important as, but also intimately linked to, the political harmony of the state.

Agrippa's parable of the body and its comparison to the state reinforces this picture of the state as a natural unit. The language describing the rebellion of the body's parts is similar to the

language describing discord in the state elsewhere in the narrative of the secession of the plebs. The mention of the different body parts not acting in concert and each having its own plan (2.32.9) recalls the division of the state into a thousand assemblies throughout the city during the conflict leading up to the secession (2.28.4). Agrippa says that the members of the body conspired (*conspirasse*, 2.32.10) against the belly because of their anger, just as the plebs begin conspiring in secret meetings in sections 28 and 32 because of their anger toward the patricians. By assimilating the story of the body and the story of the secession of the plebs, Agrippa's parable suggests that discord in the state is as unnatural as a loss of harmony in the human body. The fact that the whole body nearly starves to death as a result of the rebellion of its parts also suggests that political conflict in Rome has the potential to bring about the ruin of the whole state.

The metaphor of the state as a body also features an element of spatial unity. Agrippa makes the obvious suggestion that the members of the state must work together and help each other in order to survive, just as the parts of the body must work together. But the more subtle implication in using the body as a model for the state is that the parts of the state also require a physical connection. When compared to the workings of a body, the departure of the plebs from Rome corresponds not only to a lack of cooperation among the body's parts, but even to the amputation of those parts. Just as the body is not whole and cannot function without all of its parts, the state is not whole or safe without the physical unity of its population in the same city.

The episode of the secession of the plebs represents an escalating cycle of division in the Roman state. The civil strife in Book 2 creates a political division of the state into factions. Livy says that the state was scattered and divided into a thousand assemblies and meetings (*in mille curias contionesque dispersam et dissipatam esse rem publicam*, 2.28.3). Instead of being united

as one state acting in concert, Rome is divided into many states, each acting independently. The reference to numerous councils occurring throughout the city also emphasizes the spatial separation of the factions as the organization of the state is scattered all over the city.<sup>37</sup>

The secession to the Sacred Mount, then, is the physical embodiment of the political division already taking place in the state. What begins as political tension in Rome escalates into a political division and decentralization of the government of the city, and finally into a secession which actually does create two independent states in two different locations, one inside and one outside the city of Rome. The physical departure of the plebs from the city is the final stage in the political dissolution of the Roman state. In her discussion of the battle between the Romans and Sabines in Book 1, Jaeger says, “By manipulating Rome’s topographical features, Livy has created an image that shows two armies at war becoming two warring factions in one city, one that shows the blurring of the boundary between foreign war and civil war.”<sup>38</sup> The use of topography and military language in the secession of the plebs reveals the reverse of what Jaeger observes during the battle with the Sabines, as here two warring factions in the city now become two armies. Despite this inversion, though, the blurring of foreign and civil war which Jaeger observes in Book 1 is the same in both episodes. The return of the plebs to the city of Rome, however, restores the unity of the Roman state by peacefully joining the Roman people into one location again. Just as the physical departure of the plebs from Rome represents the final culmination of the political division in the state, the return of the plebs to the city represents the physical counterpart to political reunion and harmony.

---

<sup>37</sup> It is worth noting here that there is a textual variant of 2.28.3 which adds *cum alia in Esquilis, alia in Aventino fiant concilia* (“when some councils were happening on the Esquiline, and others on the Aventine”) after *contionesque*. This topographical reference to councils in different areas of the city would add to the emphasis on spatial separation within the government, although Ogilvie does not accept the reading.

<sup>38</sup> Jaeger (1997) 45.

### Second Secession of the Plebs

The second secession of the plebs occurs in Book 3. In this episode, the abuses of the decemviri, and in particular the decemvir Appius Claudius' attempted rape of Verginia in 450 BC, lead to a mutiny of the soldiers and a secession of the plebs. The people at first go to the Aventine, which at that time was outside the city limits, but then move to the Sacred Mount near Alba Longa instead. The mutinying soldiers join them after electing tribunes of the soldiers for the first time. Eventually, Horatius and Valerius negotiate for the abdication of the decemviri and the plebs return to the city with their rights, their tribunes, and their liberty restored.

The second secession, like the first secession of the plebs, occurs as a result of civil strife in the city of Rome, this time because of the crimes of the decemviri. The sections of the episode leading up to the secession are full of words associated with civil conflict. Livy uses the word *sedition* to describe both the mutiny of the soldiers and the movement of the plebs to the Aventine (3.50.1, 3.50.15). He describes the attempted rape of Verginia by Appius Claudius as an injustice (*iniuria*, 3.50.8) which other people fear may also happen to them. The tribune Marcus Duilius refers to the situation as constant wrangling (*contentionibus adsiduus*, 3.52.1) and thus urges the plebs to move their secession to the Sacred Mount. The word *invidia* appears a number of times during the episode, referring to the feelings of the patricians toward the people (3.50.16, 3.51.4), the feelings of the people toward the decemviri (3.52.11, 3.54.4), and the feelings of Appius Claudius toward the people (3.54.3). The word *odium* also appears for the feelings of the people toward the behavior of the decemviri (3.53.7) and for the mutual feeling between Appius Claudius and the people (3.54.3). Livy also uses the word *ira* to describe the feelings of the people in the episode (3.53.1, 3.53.7). All of this language emphasizes the political strife in the episode leading up to the secession.

There is also great emphasis on the loss of liberty for the plebs in the episode as a result of the actions of the decemviri. While the word *libertas* appears three times in the narrative of the first secession of the plebs in Book 2 (2.23.1, 2.23.2, 2.28.7), it appears eleven times in that of the second secession from section 49 just after the death of Verginia to section 55 when the plebs return and their rights are restored (3.49.1, 3.50.10, 3.50.13, 3.52.4, 3.53.4, 3.53.6, 3.53.10, 3.54.7, 3.54.9, 3.55.2, 3.55.4). In all of these references, Livy presents *libertas* as freedom which the people are striving to reinstate after losing it during the rule of the decemviri. The issue of freedom features in the death of Verginia, the catalyst for the secession, when Verginius says he killed his daughter because it was not possible for her to be free and chaste (*liberae ac pudicae*, 3.50.6) under the decemviri. Later, Horatius and Valerius are hailed as liberators (*liberatores*, 3.53.2) for their role in helping the people and restoring them to the state. This emphasis on liberty is more prevalent in the second secession of the plebs than in the first secession, and highlights the seriousness of the internal strife in the city leading up to the secession.

The second secession of the plebs features more violence than the first secession as well. The catalyst for the second secession is the murder of Verginia at the hands of her father (3.48), which lacks a parallel in the first secession. This event triggers a harsh brawl (*atrox rixa*, 3.49.3) in the forum. During this brawl, the *fasces* of Appius Claudius' lictor are broken (3.49.4) and the decemvir Spurius Oppius, upon seeing what is happening, concludes that power has been conquered by force (*imperium vi victum*, 3.49.6). In this instance, violence overtakes the rule of law in the city. During the first secession of the plebs, on the other hand, although a few creditors are roughed up at times, the conflict never escalates into a full-fledged fight in the forum. Even at the height of that conflict, before the senate appoints a dictator to deal with the situation, Livy tells us that the confrontation in the forum only consists of shouting and anger, but no actual

violence occurs (2.29.4). The violence and loss of liberty for the people leading up to the second secession of the plebs presents this episode as even more divisive and destructive to the state than the first secession.

The description of the second secession also features language which reminds the reader of foreign wars. The members of the secession appear as armed (*armati*) twice, at the beginning and the end of the physical secession (3.50.15, 3.54.10). They have a military camp (*castra*) on the Sacred Mount after they secede (3.52.3, 3.53.2, 3.54.7). They also have standards (*signa*, 3.54.10), casting them more as an opposing army than a group of protesters. The reference to everything in Rome as empty (*vasta*, 3.52.4) after the secession refers to the emptiness in the city after the departure of the plebs, but it can also have connotations of military devastation since this word is often used for territory which enemies have ravaged. At the beginning of the secession, after the soldiers secede to the Aventine, the senate sees them as people, “who had besieged the Aventine as armed men and turned away from war with the enemy to occupy their own homeland” (*qui armati Aventinum obsedissent belloque averso ab hostibus patriam suam cepissent*, 3.50.15). The language of besieging and capturing here aligns the mutinous soldiers with foreign enemies who would destroy the city, even though they have only left the city and peacefully settled on the Aventine. As in the first secession, the language comparing the members of the secession to foreign foes makes this conflict like an unnatural civil war and suggests that the city is in danger of a violent attack.

Just as in the first secession of the plebs, the departure of the people from Rome during the second secession creates a threat to the safety of the city. After the plebs go to the Sacred Mount, Horatius and Valerius complain to the senate that the continued rule of the decemviri will result in the city’s ruin and destruction (3.52.6, 3.52.8). They also ask the senate what they will

do if there is an enemy attack from outside the city, or if the plebs themselves attack the city when they are no longer satisfied with merely seceding (3.52.7), highlighting the serious threat posed to Rome when the people leave the city.

Another result of the secession of the plebs is that it leaves the city deserted of people. After the secession, Livy says, “an unaccustomed solitude made everything in Rome empty” (*vasta Romae omnia insueta solitudo fecisset*, 3.52.4). Rome has become a wasteland, an unusual deviation from the way things should be in the city. Horatius and Valerius point out to the senate that there are more lictors in the forum than citizens (3.52.7) and that the city will lose the plebs entirely if they do not restore the tribunes (3.52.8). Further, Horatius and Valerius ask the senate if they intend to issue laws to buildings and walls if there are no people in the city (3.52.7). The implication in all of these statements is that the city needs people, not just physical structures, and that the plebs are an important part of this necessary human population for the city. A loss of Rome’s citizens, including the plebs, means a loss of what makes Rome a living, thriving city. A city empty of people is really no city at all.<sup>39</sup>

After talking to the senate, Horatius and Valerius then go to the Sacred Mount to negotiate with the plebs about returning to Rome. After they reach an agreement amenable to everyone, the plebs return to the city and the problems leading up to the secession are solved. First, Livy says that freedom and harmony were restored to the state (*libertatem concordiamque civitati restitutam*, 3.54.7). In an effort to achieve this harmony in the state, people on both sides of the conflict make concessions. The decemviri abdicate and give up their power (3.54.5). The tribunes and the plebs end their feud with the decemviri by putting aside their anger and pardoning them (3.54.2), while the participants in the secession receive immunity from punishment for their involvement (3.54.14). Concord is thus only restored when the plebs return

---

<sup>39</sup> This argument appears again in Camillus’ speech against moving to Veii at the end of Book 5.

to the city and the different factions agree to work together for peace. The freedom of the people is further restored after their return to the city when they once again choose tribunes of the plebs (3.54.11-12) and vote to reinstate and even expand the right of appeal (3.55.4-5). The secession also results in the creation of the new office of tribune of the soldiers (3.51.2, 3.51.8-9), further expanding the rights and protections of the people.

In addition to restoring the rights of the people, the return of the plebs from their secession also restores their ties to the community. When the legates of the senate go to the plebs on the Sacred Mount to announce the abdication of the decemviri, the crowd of people remaining in Rome accompanies them to meet the rest of the people on their return to the city (3.54.7). Upon reaching the Sacred Mount, the legates tell them to return to their homeland, household gods, wives, and children (*redite in patriam ad penates coniuges liberosque vestros*, 3.54.8). Although the legates use the general word *patriam* here instead of *urbem*, their intentions for the plebs to return to the city are clear. Their later instruction to the plebs to bring modesty into the city when they return (*modestiam ferte in urbem*, 3.54.8) more explicitly identifies the city as the plebs' final destination. Like Cincinnatus earlier in Book 3, the people must return to the city to take back their rightful place in Roman society. Their return to Rome represents not only a return to their previous freedom, but also a return to their personal, religious, and familial ties to the city and a reintegration into the community as a whole.

The return of the people to Rome at the end of the secession thus corrects the problems posed by their departure. The civil conflict which initially causes the division in the city and leads to the secession is resolved. The restoration of the people's rights puts their concerns regarding their liberty to rest. The degeneration of the Republic to the rule of ten tyrants ends as the previous institutions of the Republic are restored. The emptiness of the city and the potential

danger of a military attack, by foreigners or the disgruntled Roman citizens themselves, subside when the people and the Roman soldiers who defend the state from harm return peacefully to the city. The return to harmony in the state is thus predicated upon the successful reunion of all the Roman people in the same physical space of the city. Just as the physical city was at the heart of conflict earlier in the episode, it is now at the heart of harmony and reconciliation. It is also important to note that the return from the second secession of the plebs not only creates new rights for the people, as the first secession did, but also serves as an important restoration of old rights. In this way, it represents a refoundation by returning the Republic to the way it was before the rule of the decemviri.

The similarities between the first and second secessions of the plebs in Books 2 and 3 invite a comparison of the two episodes. Both secessions occur as a result of civil conflict due to grievances of the plebs against the ruling class. In both cases, the return of the people to Rome leads to concord, expanded rights for the people, and the restoration of the unity of the state. Both episodes also present the causes and effects of secession and return as a cycle of political and physical division and reunion in the state. There are important differences between the two episodes, however. Although the concern for the freedom of the people does come into play in the issue of debt bondage in the first secession, the concerns over freedom are much more explicit and pervasive in the second secession. This is fitting given the context of the second secession, which occurs as a result of the abuses of the decemviri. The problem with the decemviri is not only their cruel treatment of the people, but also their abuse of power and their refusal to give up that power. The rule of only ten men over the city without the right of appeal not only represents a threat to the wellbeing of the plebs, but also undermines the foundation of the Roman Republic on freedom and citizen participation in government.

This may also explain the increased level of violence in the second secession as opposed to the first. The second secession of the plebs, unlike the first, has much in common with the overthrow of the monarchy and the initial establishment of the Republic at the end of Book 1. Just as violence and the death of Lucretia accompany the end of the monarchy in Book 1, violence and the death of Verginia accompany the overthrow of the decemviri and the restoration of the Republic in Book 3. The first secession of the plebs and its outcome represent mainly a foundation of new freedom and institutions for the people, most notably the establishment of the tribunes of the plebs. The second secession is more nuanced and far-reaching than the first in that it not only creates a restoration of the specific institutions introduced at the end of the first secession, including the tribunes of the plebs, but also represents a refoundation and restoration of the entire Republic as it brings about a return to consular government and citizen participation in the state. Miles has argued that the notion of Roman history as a continuous cycle of foundation, decline, and refoundation is both pervasive in and unique to Livy's history.<sup>40</sup> Livy's narration of the second secession of the plebs particularly draws on this cyclical nature of history as the repeated foundation and renewal of Rome over time.

The memory of the first secession plays an important role in the second secession of the plebs because it gives those involved in the second secession a model to follow. First, it influences the behavior of the people seceding. As the plebs leave Rome for the Sacred Mount during the second secession, Livy says they imitate the moderation of their forefathers by destroying nothing (*modestiam patrum suorum nihil violando imitati*, 3.52.3). By imitating the behavior of those who come before them, they have a better chance of ensuring a similar peaceful outcome for themselves and the state. Chaplin has identified the creation of precedents

---

<sup>40</sup> Miles (1995) 89-109, 119-134.

for future action as one of the most basic functions of exempla in Livy's history.<sup>41</sup> She has also argued that characters in Livy's narrative influence events by employing both positive exempla to emulate and negative ones to avoid.<sup>42</sup> The first secession of the plebs serves as an exemplum for the second secession in exactly this way. The behavior of the people during the first secession positively influences that of the people in the second secession and sets a precedent for the secession's positive outcome.

The memory of the first secession also influences the place where the second secession occurs. The second secession originally begins on the Aventine but later moves to the Sacred Mount to make a greater stand. The former tribune Marcus Duilius suggests the move to the Sacred Mount not only because it will send a stronger message through the desertion of the city, but also because the place itself will be a reminder to the patricians of the perseverance of the plebs (3.52.2). The choice to secede to the Sacred Mount is the spatial equivalent of the people imitating the behavior of their forefathers during the first secession. The choice of the Sacred Mount in this episode thus reveals the importance of memory attached to places in Livy's history. This notion of the power of places and the meanings attached to them to exert influence over human action is not unique to Livy. As Vasaly argues, the manipulation of space and meaning to influence people is already present in Cicero's speeches from the republic.<sup>43</sup> Because places become repositories for memory, they also become sites for exempla and have the power to teach Romans how to behave in the future. In this way, specific places can become a stage for repeated action in history. This is why the return to the location of the first secession in Livy also means a repeat of its outcome, because the memory of that outcome influences the choices of those involved on both sides of the conflict.

---

<sup>41</sup> Chaplin (2000) 155.

<sup>42</sup> Chaplin (2000) 39-41, 44-48.

<sup>43</sup> Vasaly (1993) 25-37.

Other scholars have already noted Livy's tendency to assimilate the behavior and characteristics of different people from the same families.<sup>44</sup> For example, the Appii Claudii in Livy's history are notorious for their opposition to the plebs, while the Quinctii tend to be more fair-minded statesmen.<sup>45</sup> When taken together, the two secessions of the plebs show that Livy also employs this doubling effect with places in his history. For Livy, the same events often occur in the same places. Just as the Appii Claudii are always hostile to the common people, the Sacred Mount is always a place associated with the power of the plebs and the restoration of harmony in the state. This is why the second secession of the plebs must move from the Aventine to the Sacred Mount in order to restore the rights of the people and end the civil conflict in the city. As Ogilvie notes, Livy has a choice in the sources here for the location of the secession, with some sources placing it only on the Aventine and eliminating the Sacred Mount.<sup>46</sup> Livy may adopt the version in which the plebs move to the Sacred Mount instead of staying on the Aventine because it is the older version, but it is also possible that he chooses this version because it creates a closer link between this secession and the first secession of the plebs to the Sacred Mount in Book 2.

As in the first secession of the plebs, Livy here presents the Romans and their city as a natural unit. The Romans belong in the city of Rome, and their departure from the city disrupts this unity. The restoration of the people to their personal connection to the city upon return shows that the Roman people must be in the city of Rome to fill their proper roles in Roman society. The emphasis on Rome being a wasteland when the people leave in this episode, meanwhile, highlights the fact that the city of Rome in turn needs its people to be present in

---

<sup>44</sup> See Walsh (1961) 88-90.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Vasaly (1999) 513.

<sup>46</sup> Ogilvie (1965) 489.

order to be a real functioning city. Just as the Romans cannot reach their full potential by abandoning their city, the city needs its people to make it more than just buildings and walls.

Livy also portrays the second secession as part of a cycle of civil conflict and violence in the city of Rome. The abuses of the decemviri cause civil strife and the loss of liberty for the plebs. This political division escalates into violence in Rome and finally causes a physical departure of the people from the city. This departure of the plebs and the soldiers from Rome is the final physical representation of the political division within the city and completely divides the state both politically, militarily, and physically. This division is reversed, however, when the return of the people to Rome brings the correction of the physical separation and a resolution of the political division as well.

### Capua

Another secession from Livy's first decade is the secession and mutiny of the Roman soldiers in Capua at the end of Book 7. In this episode, the soldiers stationed at the garrison in Capua decide to secede and live there in 342 BC. When the consuls discover and thwart their plot, they band together, force the former Roman soldier Titus Quinctius to become their leader, and stage a military attack on Rome. The senate then chooses the former Roman consul Corvus as dictator to lead the Roman army against them. When the two armies meet, Corvus and Quinctius speak to the rebel army and urge them to give up their attack on Rome. Moved by these speeches, the rebels agree to return to Rome and are then peacefully reintegrated into the Roman state after the passage of new laws benefiting soldiers.

One cause of the soldiers' secession to Capua is civil discord in the city of Rome. Book 7 features a number of political conflicts in Rome, most notably problems with debt and a patrician

monopoly on offices in the government.<sup>47</sup> The episode of the Capua secession features language typical of civil conflict in Livy. There are references to the suffering of the soldiers as a result of debt (7.38.7) and to their feeling of *iniuria* from their current political situation (7.39.10). Livy describes the activities of the soldiers at Capua as *seditio* twice (7.38.10, 7.39.4). He also describes the soldiers as involved in secret conspiracies and meetings (7.38.8, 7.39.6). Oakley has identified usury and the struggle of the orders as dominant themes in the whole of Book 7.<sup>48</sup> The secession at Capua thus reflects these themes and represents the final stage of a political conflict that has been occurring throughout the book.

Another cause of the mutiny is the soldiers' loss of attachment to Rome and their attempt to replace Rome with Capua as their home. After the soldiers go to the garrison there, Livy says Capua "turned the minds of the soldiers away from the memory of their homeland" (*militum animos avertit a memoria patriae*, 7.38.5). The soldiers forget about Rome and their personal attachment to the city. They begin to find Capua more appealing than Rome. They are lured by the pleasures of Capua, which Livy says is a place hardly healthy for military discipline (*minime salubris militari disciplinae*, 7.38.5). They also consider the territory around Capua superior to that of Rome. They consider Campanian land to be the most fertile in Italy (7.38.6) and wish to expel the inhabitants of Capua so they can enjoy the fertility and pleasantness (*fertilitate atque amoenitate*, 7.38.6-7) of the place themselves. At the same time, the soldiers argue that they should not be forced to toil in the diseased and dry soil around Rome (*in pestilenti atque arido circa urbem solo*, 7.38.7). The Roman soldiers at Capua no longer feel attached to Roman landscape, creating a disconnect between them and their homeland and removing their natural aversion from attacking their own city.

---

<sup>47</sup> For more detailed discussion of the historical context of these problems in Book 7, see Oakley (1997) 18-27.

<sup>48</sup> Oakley (1997) 364-365.

Although Titus Quinctius does not join this mutiny willingly, in some ways he is a fitting leader for it because he exhibits some of the same feelings toward Rome as the rebels. Livy says that Quinctius is forgetful of the city and offices (*urbis honorumque immemorem*, 7.39.11). Like the soldiers at Capua, he has forgotten his attachment to his homeland. Livy also tells us that although Quinctius is a patrician who previously earned great glory in war, he has now decided to live in the country far from politics and the forum (*ruri agere vitam procul ambitione ac foro constituit*, 7.39.12). Like the soldiers in Capua, Quinctius too has been driven to leave Rome because of the nature of Roman politics, although he seems to find them more tiresome than injurious as the rebels do. Quinctius' alienation from Rome has not gone so far as to make him want to attack the city, as it has for the soldiers, but it still gives him something in common with them and gives them reason to believe that he will be a fitting leader for their mutiny.

There are some interesting parallels between Titus Quinctius and Cincinnatus. Like Cincinnatus in Book 3, Quinctius leaves Rome to work on his farm and live in the country (7.39.11-12). Livy refers to his house in the country as a *villa* instead of a *domus* (7.39.14), just as Cincinnatus lives in a *tugurium* instead of a *domus* while he was away from Rome in Book 3. In other ways, however, Quinctius is an inversion of Cincinnatus. He does leave Rome and later rejoin a Roman army to return to the city, but unlike Cincinnatus, who joins a Roman army to fight the Aequi, Quinctius joins a Roman army which is engaging in a civil war with other Romans. Instead of the legates of the senate leading him toward the city, as in the story of Cincinnatus, Quinctius leads a group of rebels toward the city in a hostile way. Unlike the return of Cincinnatus, which saves Rome from crisis, Quinctius' return to Rome from the country helps create a crisis for the city.

In this episode, the departure of the soldiers from Rome leads to a threat to the city in the form of a civil war between two Roman armies. Livy describes the rebels in Capua in military terms. As they begin to regroup after initially being thwarted by the consuls Rutulus and Servilius, Livy says they have everything they need to be a real army except for a leader (7.39.8). They then go on to ravage the countryside and set up a camp in the territory of Alba Longa (7.39.8, 7.39.11). These activities cast the rebels in the role of a foreign army destroying the countryside and planning an attack against Rome, rather than as a Roman army defending the city. The election of Corvus as dictator to fight against them furthers this role reversal, since the dictator's role should be to fight foreign enemies rather than Roman citizens. These parallels between the rebels and Rome's enemies cast the conflict as a civil war even before the two armies meet for battle.

The meeting of the two armies and the speech of Corvus also cast the conflict as an unnatural civil war. Livy says the two armies have previously only fought external wars and are not prepared for civil bloodshed, and that they consider this revolt to be madness (7.40.2). Quinctius in particular, who has had his fill of war altogether, is loath to fight a war against his homeland (*adversus patriam*, 7.40.3). The speech of Corvus refers to this war as unholy (*impius*, 7.40.14) and reminds the soldiers that they are fighting on their own soil against an army made up of their own citizens and led by the consul under whom they themselves previously fought (7.40.6). Quinctius' speech too urges his soldiers not to fight against their own former consul and general and force him to fight against them instead of on their behalf (7.40.16). The language of these sections casts the looming civil war in this episode as an unnatural crisis for the city because it undermines the close ties the Romans have previously forged with their city, their leaders, and their fellow citizens.

Livy also presents the departure of the soldiers from Rome as a loss of their Roman identity. The mutinous soldiers lose their military discipline, a defining Roman value, when they spend too much time in Capua (7.38.5). Their attachment to the land from which they come, another defining characteristic of Romans in Livy's narrative, disappears. They lose their place in Roman society and their connection to other Romans, including their own former commander, when they attempt to create a new state of their own. Further, the fact that Corvus and Quinctius both feel the need to remind them that they are not fighting against the Volsci or the Samnites but against other Romans (7.40.6, 7.40.16) shows that civil war in Livy amounts to a confusion over the identity of Romans and foreign enemies as the rebel army forgets whom they are fighting and who they themselves are.

The speeches of Corvus and Quinctius, however, are able to end the conflict without an actual battle between the two armies. Both leaders focus on the importance of concord. Corvus says he would rather win glory from creating harmony than from defeating the mutinous army (7.40.4), and emphasizes that they must seek peace (7.40.5). Quinctius too says he would rather be a leader of peace than of war (7.40.15) and urges his army to let go of their anger and embrace *fides* ("trust," 7.40.19) instead. After the rebels submit to the authority of Corvus and give up their attack on the city, Quinctius urges Corvus to truly bring about concord by pardoning the rebels for their secession (7.41.2).

The speech of Corvus to the soldiers also focuses on the role of memory in ending the conflict and restoring the rebels to the Roman state. He urges the rebel soldiers to remember (*meminisse*) that they are on Roman soil attempting to fight against their own citizens and former commander (7.40.6). He reminds them of their previous success in other wars with him as their leader, as well as his previous kindness and fairness toward them during his consulship (7.40.6-

9). He also reminds them of the peaceful secessions of the plebs and Coriolanus' peaceful departure from the city after his initial attempt to attack it as a way of providing them with positive exempla to influence their behavior (7.40.11-12). By emphasizing memory in his speech, Corvus makes his former kindness and the moderation of previous secessions into precedents which will positively influence the outcome of the current situation.

Corvus emphasizes Roman landscape in his speech as well. He urges the rebel army to remember their connection to Roman soil, reminding them that the hills they see are part of their homeland (*illos colles quos cernitis patriae vestrae esse*, 7.40.6). In this way, he is like Veturia in the Coriolanus episode in Book 2 or Camillus recalling his exile at the end of Book 5. The emphasis on concord, memory, and landscape in the speeches of Corvus and Quinctius remind the rebel army of what connects them to Rome and their fellow Romans, and it is this renewed connection which is able to achieve their return to the city and reintegration into the Roman state.

The rebel soldiers' return to Rome corrects the problems created by their departure from and betrayal of the city. First, the reconciliation with the rebels leads to increased concord in Rome. After the secession is over, the Romans pass laws giving greater rights to soldiers (7.41.4).<sup>49</sup> Livy mentions that some sources also report the passage of laws which banned lending at interest and broke up existing monopolies on elected offices, although he does not express certainty over the veracity of this claim (7.42.1-2). These laws address the issues creating political conflict throughout Book 7. When Corvus returns to Rome, he also ensures that there will be no punishment for the mutinous soldiers and that no one will criticize them for their secession (7.41.3). When the rebels propose a law targeted against Publius Salinius for his repeated holding of the tribunate of the soldiers, Salinius does not oppose the law, despite

---

<sup>49</sup> For more detailed discussion of these laws, see Oakley (1997) 383-384.

having the support of the senate, because he too wants to show his personal commitment to harmony in the state (7.41.7). With these actions, the secession of the soldiers leads to greater concord than previously existed in the state and makes way for continued harmony in the future. It also ensures the continued safety of the city as the soldiers abandon civil war and instead choose to peacefully rejoin the Roman state.

Their former attachment to Rome also returns to the rebel soldiers. When they see that the army they mean to fight is made up of their fellow Romans carrying Roman standards, Livy says, “suddenly the memory of their homeland calmed everyone’s anger” (*exemplo omnibus memoria patriae iras permulsit*, 7.40.1). Just as their departure from Rome causes them to lose their memory of their home, the return to Roman territory and the sight of their fellow citizens, along with the sentiment of Corvus’ speech, restores their memories and their former attachment to their home and their community. Their abandonment of Capua as their new home also restores them to their former Roman identity as they resume their proper role as Roman soldiers instead of that of foreign enemies attacking the city. In this way, the reconciliation of this conflict serves as a foil to the civil wars of the first century BC, in which armies marching on Rome do not give up their attacks on the city.<sup>50</sup>

As Corvus points out in his speech, the episode of the secession at Capua shares similarities with Coriolanus’ betrayal of Rome in Book 2. Both episodes feature discord ultimately escalating to civil war. In both cases, speeches emphasizing memory and personal ties to Roman landscape (from Veturia in the Coriolanus episode and Corvus in the Capua episode) lead to the withdrawal of the attack on Rome by her own citizens. Unlike Coriolanus, however, the rebel soldiers in Book 7 do not permanently depart from Roman territory in disgrace after ending their attack. Instead, they achieve reintegration into the state and a full restoration of their

---

<sup>50</sup> Oakley (1997) 365.

unity with Rome. One reason for this is that Coriolanus is already an exile before his attack, and because the Romans have not recalled him, his connection to Rome cannot be fully repaired. Another difference between the two scenarios is that while Coriolanus fights alongside a foreign army to avenge his own personal injuries and restore his own glory, the soldiers from the garrison at Capua fight together as a group for the injuries of a whole segment of the population. In this way their story is more like that of the secessions of the plebs, giving them a greater chance of being reintegrated into the community as the plebs once were.

There are further parallels between the mutiny at Capua and the secessions of the plebs in Books 2 and 3. Both represent group departures from the city (as opposed to the individual departure of Coriolanus) and both have the same outcome of reconciliation and expansion of rights for a group of people in the community. There are differences from the secessions of the plebs, however. The mutiny of the soldiers is more destructive than the secessions of the plebs in Books 2 and 3. Unlike the plebs, who spare the Roman countryside during their march to the Sacred Mount, the soldiers in Book 7 ravage Roman landscape on their way to the city. They also actually take up arms against the city, whereas the plebs merely depart from it. In this way, the secession of the soldiers achieves what is only feared in the secessions of the plebs: a military attack on Rome by an army of its own citizens.

There is more than one possible explanation for these differences. One is that unlike the plebs, who plan to depart from Rome as a protest but never show any intention of actually migrating somewhere else, the soldiers at Capua plan to abandon Rome and live in Capua instead. Their plan to forsake Rome entirely leads to a greater loss of ties to their community and makes Rome into a foreign city for them. This makes it ideologically easier for them to attack the city, which the seceding plebs are not prepared to do. The argument made by both Miles and

Chaplin that Romans sometimes make poor decisions in Livy as a result of forgetting the lessons of the past or remembering them incorrectly<sup>51</sup> offers another possible explanation. The soldiers in Book 7 forget what an effective secession in Rome is supposed to look like and follow the inappropriate model of Coriolanus' attack on the city rather than the correct model of the peaceful secessions of the plebs. The soldiers in Capua have forgotten not only their city, but also the exempla of good behavior provided to them by Romans from the past. The loss of these memories creates a serious threat to the Roman state which only subsides when the soldiers give up their attack on Rome and remember their ties to their city and their fellow Romans.

In this episode, Livy represents the mutiny of the soldiers as a disruption of the connection between the Romans and the city of Rome. When the Roman soldiers are away from Rome, they begin to lose their attachment to the city and see Capua as a better home than Rome. This loss of attachment to the city is unnatural for Roman citizens and leads to crisis for the city when the Roman soldiers at Capua go so far as to begin a civil war against Rome. As Corvus' speech emphasizes, memory plays an important role in this natural connection between the Romans and their city because it creates attachment to Roman space in the minds of the people who inhabit it. The memory of the secessions of the plebs and Coriolanus' retreat from attacking the city also play an important role in maintaining this attachment because they give the mutinous soldiers a model of unity within the state to follow.

Like many of the other episodes discussed already, the mutiny at Capua reflects a cycle of escalating division in the Roman state. What begins as a political conflict in Rome leads to the physical separation of one group from the city and the eventual division of the formerly united state into two opposing armies. As the departure from Rome is a physical manifestation of the

---

<sup>51</sup> Miles (1995) 71, Chaplin (2000) 77-85.

political division in the state, the peaceful return of the soldiers is a physical manifestation of its restored political unity.

Finally, Livy's discussion of the disagreement among the sources for this episode can also tell us something about his version and its implications for the work as a whole. Livy mentions that another version of the story says the conspirators are discovered within the city of Rome, not on their way to attack Rome (7.42.3). By comparison, Livy's version places more emphasis on the conspirators' physical separation from Rome as a representation of their ideological disconnect with the city. Livy also says that some versions give Gaius Manlius as the leader of the seceding soldiers, rather than Quinctius (7.42.4). Livy's choice of Quinctius contributes a parallel with Cincinnatus which would not have been possible if he had followed this source and included Manlius as the leader instead.

Another variant Livy notes in the other sources is that the leaders of the two opposing armies are not the agents of their reconciliation, but rather the soldiers themselves spontaneously embrace each other and compel the consuls and the senate to negotiate peace (7.42.5-6). Livy's version, though, attributes the reconciliation to the speeches of the leaders, especially that of Corvus. In this way, Livy is able to align Corvus with Veturia and Agrippa in Book 2, Horatius and Valerius in Book 3, and Camillus in Book 5 through their similar speeches emphasizing the importance of harmony, memory, and spatial unity for the Roman state. Livy thus chooses a version of the Capua mutiny which creates continuity between several episodes in the first decade and sends the same repeating message about the close relationship between concord and the physical attachment of the Romans to their city. Livy here chooses thematically between different versions of events and focuses on ideological relevance and consistency in his narration of details.

## Veii

The final episode I consider is the proposal to migrate to Veii after the Gallic sack at the end of Book 5. This episode is different from the ones above because it involves not an actual departure from Rome, but a proposed departure that never occurs. Still, there are many parallels between this story and the others, and its message is ultimately the same as that of the others. In this episode, the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 BC has destroyed the city and the Romans are considering whether to abandon Rome and move to Veii, which they conquered in 396 BC. During the debate, Camillus makes a speech urging the Romans to stay in Rome. The combination of Camillus' speech and an omen at the end of the speech ultimately convinces the Romans to stay and rebuild the city.

As in the other departures from the city considered in this chapter, the proposed departure from Rome to Veii comes as the result of conflict. In this case, that conflict is the Gallic sack of Rome. The repeated references to the city as ruined highlights its physical destruction. When the tribunes begin talking about moving to Veii, Livy describes the city as burned up (*incensam*, 5.49.8). Just before the speech of Camillus begins, the tribunes again urge the people to abandon the city, leave the ruins behind (*relictis ruinis*, 5.50.8), and move to Veii. While the departures in other episodes stem from civil strife and political conflict within the city, the proposal to move to Veii stems from an external conflict, namely the destruction of Rome by a foreign enemy.

Just as other departures of Romans from the city of Rome often lead to an actual or potential threat to the safety of the city, Camillus' speech argues that the move to Veii will lead to the complete ruin of the Roman state. For Camillus, the true ruin of Rome will come from abandonment, not from the fire brought by the Gauls. He accuses the Romans of attempting to desert the Capitol (5.51.3) and the religious sites of the city (5.52.7) and says the city will be

abandoned (*desertam*, 5.52.17) if the Romans leave. He also sees the abandonment of Rome as consigning the rites performed within the city to oblivion (*oblivioni*) and neglect (*neglegentiae*) (5.52.15). Although the Gauls have destroyed the buildings of the city, the customs of the Romans still remain and they must preserve these customs. He also argues that although most of the city is in ruins, the most important parts of it, namely the Capitol and the temples, remain unharmed and this alone is enough to make the rest of the city worth saving and rebuilding (5.53.9). Because the Capitol is a symbol of the invincibility of Rome and its fate is linked to the fate of the city,<sup>52</sup> its abandonment in particular spells the end of the entire Roman state.

For Camillus, the destruction of the meaning of Roman space, which he sees as an inevitable consequence of the abandonment of the city, is even worse than its physical destruction. He argues that the Romans cannot perform the religious rites of the city in other places without violating their sacredness (5.52.5), and that the activities performed in the *comitia curiata* and the *comitia centuriata* can only occur in their customary places (5.52.15-16). His point here is that these rites and customs cannot be moved because the meanings associated with the places where they occur cannot be duplicated, not because the buildings where they take place cannot physically be moved or rebuilt in another city. It is not the physical places themselves that are important and immovable, but the meanings and significance which they have come to hold through their repeated use over the course of Roman history. As Edwards has shown, this notion of is also reflected in the Roman practice of rebuilding physical structures to maintain their meaning and the privileging of the meaning of places even over their historical authenticity (such as in the repeated rebuilding of the hut of Romulus).<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> See Edwards (1996) 86-88.

<sup>53</sup> Edwards (1996) 40-43.

Furthermore, Camillus' speech presents the site of Rome as a source of identity for the Romans, while the abandonment of Rome amounts to a loss of this identity. Camillus makes the point that the site of Rome will become associated with the Romans' disgrace in defeat, rather than their ultimate victory, if they leave the city and move somewhere else (5.53.4-5). He also suggests that if the Romans abandon Rome and move to Veii, their former enemies, the Gauls, Volsci, or Aequi, might move to Rome instead (5.53.6-7). He asks the Romans if they are willing to be called men of Veii (*Veientes*) while their enemies are called Romans. Camillus' message here is that the role of conquerors and the conquered will switch if the Romans leave Rome, and that this will change the Romans not only in name, but also in reputation.<sup>54</sup> The Romans will lose their status as victors and assume the identity of the people they formerly defeated. If this happens, the Romans will no longer be Romans at all, but will then be someone else.

Camillus depicts the move to Veii as equivalent to the exile of the entire Roman population. He refers to the migration to Veii as exile and flight (*exsilium ac fugam*) and says that the Romans will appear to be fleeing from their defeat by the Gauls, not migrating to a city they conquered as victors (5.53.5). He also characterizes the move to Veii as an exile shared by the whole population, not just individuals (5.53.8). We have seen that exile for individuals often results in a loss of identity, as in the cases of Coriolanus, Camillus himself before his return to Rome, and Cincinnatus in his quasi-exile across the Tiber. Exile for the entire Roman population would thus amount to the permanent loss of the whole concept of Roman identity and the complete obliteration of the Romans as a people.

The loss of Roman space also coincides with a loss of identity for the Romans because it eliminates important exempla which they so frequently associate with specific places in the city. The loss of these exempla means a loss of the Romans' connection to their past and the models

---

<sup>54</sup> Feldherr (1998) 44.

for proper behavior it provides. The loss of models from the past means a loss of Roman values because there is no way of perpetuating good and bad behavior and no way to continuously link the past with current and future events. Camillus tells the Romans that although they can transfer their *virtus* to another place, they cannot transfer their fortune (5.54.6). Given the emphasis in Livy on the use of exempla tied to specific places as a source of guidance for the future, however, it seems that even the transfer of *virtus* to another place will only be temporary. If the spatial connection to the past is gone, the previous link between memory and place will not exist to reinforce and perpetuate *virtus* and other Roman values, and these values will eventually disappear for future generations. Because the past is such an important source of identity in Livy's history and in Roman culture, the loss of the spatial connection to that past will lead to the irreparable loss of Roman values and the identity they provide.

In the end, Camillus moves the Romans with his speech and they reject the proposed departure from Rome. This rejection of the proposal to move to Veii results in the rebuilding of the city. As soon as the people decide to stay in Rome, Livy says that the city began to be built (*urbs aedificari coepta*, 5.55.2). This rebuilding reverses the physical destruction of the city by the Gauls and restores the reputation of the Romans as victors who are resilient even in the face of defeat. Kraus has shown that there are parallels in Book 5 between the sacks of Veii, Rome, and Troy.<sup>55</sup> The crucial difference between Rome and the other two conquered cities here, though, is that Rome is rebuilt after its destruction, while Veii and Troy remain abandoned. The role of Veii specifically as the Romans' proposed new home underscores this difference. Veii temporarily has a chance to become populated again when the Romans consider moving there, but in the end, it is Rome—not Veii—that is saved and restored. The rebuilding of Rome also prevents the destruction of the meaning and importance of Roman space as the Romans renew

---

<sup>55</sup> Kraus (1994) 271-278.

their commitment to their city and the memory it holds for them. Furthermore, the use of the verb *coepi* and a verb for building (*aedificari*) rather than rebuilding here suggests that this is a new beginning for the city, not merely a continuation of what it was before.

The opening of Book 6 portrays the physical rebuilding of the city as a new beginning in Rome's history as well. In his preface to Book 6, Livy says he will now discuss the deeds of the Roman people, "from the second beginning of the city, reborn more happily and fruitfully as if from its roots" (*ab secunda origine velut ab stirpibus laetius feraciusque renatae urbis*, 6.1.3). Just as the return of Romans after departure from the city in other episodes often saves the city from internal and external threats, the rejection of the proposal to move to Veii and the decision to stay in Rome saves the city from the ultimate physical and ideological destruction and even provides it with an opportunity to begin again and become better than ever.

As Miles notes, the rebirth of Rome was a notion particular to the late Republic and not derived from the time of Camillus.<sup>56</sup> The rebuilding of Rome at the beginning of Book 6 thus draws particularly on the contemporary rebuilding and refounding of Rome by Augustus in Livy's own time. Scholars have noticed many parallels between Augustus and Livy's Camillus.<sup>57</sup> Among these similarities are the references to Camillus as "Romulus and the father of his homeland and a second founder of the city" (*Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis*, 5.49.7), mirroring contemporary references to Augustus as a new Romulus, the *pater patriae*, and the new founder of Rome. Ogilvie's argument that the speech of Camillus is Livy's own creation and not merely a repetition of his sources<sup>58</sup> further suggests that Livy's characterization of Camillus here draws more from contemporary thought than from the historical tradition. Given the emphasis on new beginnings and new foundation for Rome in the Augustan period, it

---

<sup>56</sup> Miles (1995) 99-108.

<sup>57</sup> See Miles (1995) 89-95, 132-133; Feldherr (1998) 48-51; and Gaertner (2008) 28-29, 51-52.

<sup>58</sup> Ogilvie (1965) 742-743.

is unsurprising that Livy's Camillus conceives of the city and the Romans' commitment to it in the ways he does. The city of Rome in Livy is crucial for the continuity of Roman history and must be rebuilt and born anew after the crisis of the Gallic sack in 390 BC, just as it is born anew after the crisis of the civil wars of the first century BC.

Through the speech of Camillus, Livy presents Rome as the close connection between Roman people and the physical space of their city. The city of Rome in this episode needs people in order to continue to exist. Roman space is not only filled with buildings, but with people who make it a thriving place. Without these people, it is no longer a city but a wasteland (*solitudinem*, 5.53.7). Camillus portrays the move to Veii as an abandonment and betrayal of Rome, suggesting that the city is a living entity dependent on its population to ensure its survival. Moreover, the loss of people in the city means a loss of the meaning of Roman space and monuments. As Jaeger points out, Roman monuments occupy public spaces and require an audience to understand them.<sup>59</sup> If the Romans leave Rome, the monuments of the city and the connection they create with the past will lose this audience and subsequently their meaning.

Camillus' speech also reveals the deep personal attachment Romans feel for Roman landscape in Livy's history. Camillus talks about how much he missed the Roman landscape when he was in exile and how he often thought of the Roman hills and soil, the Tiber, and the sky under which he was born and raised (5.54.3). He also refers to the Roman landscape as a mother (5.54.2). For Camillus, Roman space creates attachment for its inhabitants because it is familiar to them and has nurtured them throughout their lives. He cites the uniqueness of Rome's geographical features as another reason the Romans should feel attached to the city. He says Rome is located in a fertile area, enjoys a perfect proximity to the sea and a strategic position within Italy, and has a beneficial river and hills (5.54.4). He does not see these advantages as

---

<sup>59</sup> Jaeger (1997) 16-26.

shared by any other place, making the site of Rome irreplaceable. The Romans may be able to rebuild their buildings somewhere else, but they cannot move the natural landscape which has contributed to the city's success. As Gowing has noted, there is more to Rome's connection to physical space than buildings alone.<sup>60</sup>

Camillus argues that the Romans have a special attachment to Roman space because of the activities they engage in there as well. He says that the religious rites which the Romans perform in the city cannot be performed anywhere else (5.52.13-14). Nor may the activities of the military and the elections and other political activities which take place in the *comitia curiata* and *comitia centuriata* be moved (5.52.15-16). The Capitol cannot be moved, and the discovery of the human head on the Capitol and the immovability of the shrine of Terminus ensure the existence of Roman *imperium* only as long as the Romans remain in Rome (5.54.7). The city of Rome is special to the Romans because it is filled with the places necessary for the performance of specific activities which ensure the health and longevity of the state and the continued connection between the Romans and their gods.

The connection between physical space and memory is also important in this episode. The physical space of the city is important to the Romans because, in many cases, memory and exempla, which perpetuate Roman values and power, are associated with specific places in the city. Romans in Livy's history must therefore remember the past through the topography of the city. While it is always possible to create new memories in a new place, it is impossible to move preexisting memories of places associated with the past to a new place. Veii may have memories of the glory of Camillus as its conqueror, but it does not have any memories within it of the values of the Roman state, its past, or its original foundation. Moving to Veii is not an option because it is an abandonment not only of the city itself, but also of all of its meaning and its

---

<sup>60</sup> Gowing (2008) 464-465.

ability to perpetuate Roman values and power. The rejection of the proposal to move to Veii thus puts an end to the cycle of destruction of Rome in the second half of Book 5. Although the Gallic sack physically destroys the city, the Romans ultimately reassert their connection to the space of the city and the meaning its memories hold for them, thereby preventing the complete political and ideological destruction of their state and their identity as Romans.

### Conclusion

The emphasis on political discord is pervasive in the narratives of departure from Rome in Livy's first decade. This focus on civil strife as a cause of alienation from the city recalls the Roman civil wars of the first century BC and fills Livy's history of early Rome with echoes of the history of his own recent past. In this way, contemporary events color Livy's presentation of Rome's early history. Livy presents civil conflict as a recurring theme in early Roman history, suggesting that these problems are inherent in the nature of Rome even from its very founding. The difference between all of the episodes of civil discord discussed above and the events of Livy's time, though, is that the episodes from Livy's first decade all end peacefully and do not ever feature two Roman armies in a real battle. The events of Rome's early history in Livy often appear to be leading up to civil war, but they never go so far as to actually achieve it. By emphasizing peaceful reconciliation as a resolution to potential civil war in his first decade, Livy perhaps envisions (or at least hopes for) a similar outcome for the events of his own time, with civil war ultimately giving way to greater peace.

One explanation for this unique influence of the events of the first century BC on Livy's work is the fact that he is a historian, not a poet. This makes him more overtly concerned about the past, including both the distant and recent past, and its effects on the present and the future.

Livy's choice to write history also shows a greater concern for the systematic preservation of the past than we see in the poets. The connections he draws between departure from the city and the loss of collective Roman memory are unique to Livy and reflect the concern in his work for the preservation of the Roman state and its connection to its past.

Furthermore, no other Augustan author considers the implications of departure from Rome in national terms as Livy does. While Horace and the elegists write about personal feelings about departing from Rome, Livy considers what departure from Rome means for the Roman state as a whole. This comes as no surprise, given the unique nature of Livy's work as a complete history of Rome from its founding and the increased concerns with the past and Roman nationalism which automatically accompany such a work. Unlike any other Augustan author, Livy's aim in writing is not to preserve his own personal experiences, but rather the collective experiences of the Roman people throughout their history.

In some ways, however, Livy's work is consistent with the bigger picture of the city of Rome in Augustan literature. Like other Augustan authors, Livy presents Rome as a place of intimate familiarity for Roman people and emphasizes the connection Romans feel to the physical site of Rome and the landscape surrounding it. Rome in Livy is the place in which the Romans are born and raised and as such is the place they know best. Chaplin has argued that, in Livy, only the Romans know how to accurately read the past and interpret the exempla it provides.<sup>61</sup> By extension, the tendency in Livy's narrative to associate important memories of the past with physical places in the city also creates a tapestry of meaning in Rome which only the Roman people know how to appreciate and understand. This emphasis on personal knowledge and familiarity with the city is not unique to Livy, but is widespread in Augustan literature. In

---

<sup>61</sup> Chaplin (2000) 37-38, 73-77.

Livy's history in particular, it becomes a source of attachment to the city and an impetus for Romans to stay in Rome or to return at a later date if they must depart.

Livy's narratives of departure from Rome feature varying levels of agency on the part of those leaving. His exiled characters do not have a choice and are forced to leave the city, just as Ovid is. They also have no choice in their return to Rome, but must be recalled by others. The characters in his group departures and secessions make the choice to leave rather than being forced out, but they often do so because they feel they have run out of other options, revealing that their choice in the matter is actually somewhat limited. For example, the plebs must resort to secession as a political statement because they are being treated badly, and the proposal to move to Veii is precipitated by the destruction of the city and the overwhelming prospect of rebuilding it.

Although the return (or decision not to leave) of these characters is always facilitated by a representative from the city who convinces them to change their minds, the final decision is in the hands of those who have departed, indicating that they maintain or even bolster their power and agency in their return. No matter whose choice it is when Romans leave the city, though, departure in Livy's narratives is always detrimental to the city and to those departing, while return is restorative. Some of Livy's characters may have power in deciding whether to leave the city, but none of them are able to override the connection between the Roman people and their city. In the end, the attachment to Roman space is determined by nature, not by the direct agency of those departing and returning.

### Epilogue: Future Departures

This study has examined perspectives on leaving Rome in a number of authors from the Augustan period. As a way of concluding, this section considers the view of leaving Rome found in Juvenal's third satire, an imperial text written nearly a century after those of the Augustan age. Juvenal's poem features a number of striking differences from the Augustan texts in its outlook on leaving Rome and thereby its outlook on attachment to and alienation from the city. These differences serve to further illuminate the unique relationship between the Romans and their city in the Augustan age and how it is displayed in the narratives of departure from Rome in Augustan literature.

The attitude toward leaving Rome in many of the authors I have considered reveals their perception of Rome as the best place in the world. For Propertius, Rome is the only place where love and elegiac poetry can take place. When Propertius' beloved Cynthia leaves Rome for Baiae or other places, their love affair is jeopardized and their relationship falls apart. When Propertius himself leaves Rome, he views it as an abandonment of love and his relationship with Cynthia as well as a rejection of elegiac poetry and his role as an elegiac poet-lover. Propertius may fantasize about him and Cynthia leaving Rome together happily, but this fantasy never comes to fruition and the couple must remain together in Rome in order to maintain their relationship.

Ovid too views Rome as the best possible place to be. In his exile poetry, he praises the sites of Rome and longs for the beauty and splendor of the city. He also identifies Rome as the best place because it is where his friends and family live and where his home is. His characterization of Tomis as a barbaric frozen wasteland at the edge of the world is furthered by its implicit comparison with Rome, the beautiful and refined city at the center of the Roman

empire. Ovid's exile is miserable not only because he is in an inhospitable place, but also because he is away from the city he loves.

Livy sees Rome as the optimal place for Romans as well. Camillus' speech at the end of Book 5 catalogues the many advantages of living in Rome, including its superior location, its favor from the gods, and most importantly its role as a repository of Roman memory. It is inconceivable to Livy that the Romans move somewhere else because there is no place that could be better than the existing site of Rome and because the Romans will never be able to duplicate the success they enjoy at Rome if they go elsewhere.

Juvenal's description of Rome in his third satire, however, offers a different opinion of the city. Rather than focusing on the advantages of Rome as Propertius, Ovid, and Livy do, Juvenal's character Umbricius focuses on its negative aspects. He says it is difficult to sleep in Rome due to the constant noise and traffic (*Sat.* 3.235-238) and complains that the city is too crowded to walk in without being jostled or trampled (*Sat.* 3.247-248). Unlike Ovid, who praises the beauty of Rome, Umbricius sees Rome's beauty as artificial rather than natural and native (*Sat.* 3.18-20). He complains about the many dangers of the city, including the constant collapse of buildings (*Sat.* 3.7-9), the destruction of buildings by fire and the burden it places on the poor (*Sat.* 3.197-202), and encounters with violent thugs in the streets after dark (*Sat.* 3.278-301). This portrayal of the city as full of dangers particularly contrasts with Ovid's view of Rome as a safe place compared to his dangerous life in exile. Unlike Livy who sees the city of Rome as the locus of Roman morality and values, Umbricius sees Rome as representative of the decline in Roman morals as iron is used for chains rather than the plows of the Roman past (*Sat.* 3.310-311) and the city requires more prisons (*Sat.* 3.312-314). The Rome that Umbricius describes is

not the same as that of Propertius, Ovid, or Livy. It is not beautiful or safe, but dirty, dangerous, noisy, and full of the corruption of traditional Roman values.

The authors who view Rome as the best place to be also identify the city as an important source of Roman identity. Propertius connects his identity as an elegiac poet-lover to his presence in the city with Cynthia. When Cynthia leaves Rome, Propertius can no longer maintain his relationship with her and as a result loses his role as an elegiac lover. The same is true when Propertius himself leaves Rome without Cynthia or threatens to do so. More importantly, Propertius views his farewell to Rome during his trip to Athens in 3.21 also as a farewell to the pursuit of elegy as he becomes occupied with Greek philosophy and other non-elegiac genres. If Propertius stops writing elegy and immerses himself in these other genres, he loses his identity as a Roman elegiac poet. The urban Roman backdrop is necessary not only for Propertius' erotic material, but also for his status as an elegiac poet-lover.

Ovid too loses his former identity when he leaves Rome to go into exile. Like Propertius, he no longer engages in his former amatory endeavors while he is away from Rome, distancing him from his former life as an elegiac lover. His time in exile even forces him to become a soldier, a role antithetical to the pursuit of elegiac love and its rejection of public concerns in favor of private ones. Ovid also claims that he is no longer who he used to be while he is in exile (*Tristia* 4.1), revealing the intimate connection between the city of Rome and his sense of self. He even claims that his poetry has changed and declined in his exile, further highlighting the break away from his former identity as a talented and celebrated poet. His repeated claims that he is forgetting how to speak and write Latin and that he is instead starting to learn foreign languages also indicate the loss of his former identity as he becomes less Roman and more like

the barbarians around him. When Ovid is away from his beloved city of Rome, he is no longer an elegiac poet-lover or a Roman in the way that he was before.

Livy's narratives of departure from Rome reveal a similar connection between presence in Rome and Roman identity. Individuals who leave Rome, such as Camillus in his exile and Cincinnatus when he leaves the city limits and moves to the Janiculum, lose their personal status within Roman society. Some Romans who leave Rome even join forces with foreigners, as Coriolanus does with the Volsci, stripping him of his identity as a Roman and his personal connection to the city. For Livy, the only way to restore Roman identity when it has been lost as a result of leaving the city is by returning to it, as Camillus and Cincinnatus do. For these men, their return to Rome restores their former home and role in Roman society and reestablishes their identity as Romans. Livy presents the proposed move to Veii in Book 5 as equivalent to the total destruction of Roman identity because it will leave no more Romans within Rome to maintain the crucial connection between themselves and the physical space of their city. When Camillus says the Romans will become Veientes if they move to Veii, he is not merely referring to a change in their name. He argues that this move will coincide with a loss of their values, their history, and the success they have enjoyed in all of their previous endeavors. Because the city of Rome is so important for connecting the Romans to their past, the abandonment of Rome by the entire Roman population will erase Roman history and Roman identity along with it.

In Juvenal's third satire, though, the city of Rome is no longer a source of true Roman identity. Umbricius says he cannot bear a Greek city (*non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam Urbem, Sat. 3.60-61*) and that the Syrian Orontes river has flowed into the Tiber and brought its language and customs with it (*iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes / et linguam et mores... / secum / uexit, Sat. 3.62-65*), implying that Rome is now a Greek city and that

traditional Roman society and values are being contaminated and replaced by foreign ones. Just as the loss of the Latin language indicated a loss of Roman identity for Ovid in his exile, here the presence of foreign languages in the city of Rome and the implied loss of the Latin language there is also connected to the loss of Roman identity within the city. Livy's Camillus worried that Roman values would be lost if the Romans moved to Veii, but Umbricius now asserts that those values have indeed been lost, not due to the Romans leaving the city, but to corrupting foreign influences entering the city. In Umbricius' Rome, Romans no longer value strong morals or character, but rather wealth, luxury, and artifice. As Umbricius says, there is no place for any Roman in a city where Greeks rule (*non est Romano cuiquam locus hic, ubi regnat / Protogenes aliquis uel Diphilus aut Hermarchus, Sat. 3.119-120*). He thus sees his departure from Rome not as a loss of Roman identity but as a restoration of it as he breaks away from the foreign influence that has overtaken the city. Because Rome is no longer a source of Roman identity and instead is full of its perversion, the real way to maintain traditional Roman values and identity is to leave Rome and go elsewhere.

Some of the narratives of leaving Rome in this study display a rejection of the city and a longing for other places. In his satires and epistles, Horace praises the simplicity of the rustic life and wants to escape the obligations and bustle of the city with a peaceful retreat to his Sabine farm in the countryside. At the same time though, he praises Rome as the best city and finds himself easily caught up in his connections there and the prestige he gets from them. His trip to Brundisium through a number of small towns in Italy further displays his fondness for Rome as all of the towns through which he travels lack the sophistication and amenities of Rome. Horace admits that his feelings about the city and the country are fickle and that he is in fact attached to

both places and wants to spend time in both of them. He may long to leave Rome and visit the country at times, but he does not plan to leave permanently. The country thus provides him with a temporary escape from Rome that is meant to complement his time in the city rather than replace it. Despite all of his complaints, Horace would not dream of abandoning Rome permanently, reflecting his underlying sense of attachment to the city.

Tibullus' love poetry features a similar rejection of the urban environment in favor of the countryside. He fantasizes about leaving Rome and enjoying love in the country as a way of avoiding all of the obstacles to love that the city presents. He sees the country as a place free from the rivals and romantic conflict that he cannot escape in the city. In the end though, Tibullus must always admit that his hope of pastoral love is merely a dream and not reality. As an elegiac poet, he knows that the city of Rome is the necessary backdrop for his poetry. His imaginary rejection of Rome always ultimately returns to the necessity of his presence in Rome, reinforcing the inherent connection between the physical space of Rome and the writing of elegiac poetry.

Umbricius in Juvenal's third satire also rejects the urban space of Rome in favor of another location, but his rejection of Rome is more wholesale and serious than that of Horace and Tibullus. Unlike Horace, who sees the country as a second home in addition to Rome, Umbricius sets out to forsake Rome entirely and set up a new home (*sedem*) at Cumae (*sedem figere Cumis / destinet, Sat. 3.2-3*). He views the time he will spend at Cumae not as a complement to his eventual return to Rome, but as a replacement of his life in Rome. His departure is not temporary like Horace's, but permanent, signaling his lack of the underlying attachment to the city seen in Horace. Umbricius' rejection of Rome also differs from Tibullus' in that while Tibullus only fantasizes about leaving Rome but eventually recognizes that he

cannot leave, Umbricius is leaving Rome in reality. When the poet meets him, he has already packed up all of his possessions and is at the *Porta Capena* on his way out of the city (*Sat.* 3.10-11). Juvenal's satire ends with a Roman citizen willfully and permanently leaving the city of Rome, a scenario that does come to fruition in the texts of the Augustan period.

The attachment to the city of Rome seen in authors of the Augustan period originates from a number of sources. For Horace, his friends and connections in Rome and his involvement in city life there create his sense of belonging in the city. For Propertius and Tibullus, love and the writing of elegy bind them to Rome. Love and elegy also link Ovid to the city of Rome, but his exile poetry additionally cites his connections to friends and family in the city, the location of his home there, and the beauty of the city itself as other sources of his attachment to Rome. For Livy, Roman history and memory, the time Romans have spent in Rome, and the successes they have enjoyed there connect them to the space of the city.

At the same time though, most of the narratives of leaving Rome in these authors also feature a sense of alienation from the city. The causes of this alienation from Rome, like the sources of attachment to it, vary from one author to another. Horace feels alienated from the city because he desires peace and quiet that the city life cannot offer him. His obligations in the city connect him to other people there, but they distance him from the city itself because he sees it as a place of duty and responsibility rather than as a place of relaxation and rest. Tibullus' alienation from Rome arises from his suffering in love. When his erotic affairs do not succeed, he connects his failures to his presence in the city and wants to solve the problem by removing the city as the backdrop of his poetry. He therefore longs for the countryside because he thinks it will bring about a better outcome than he has experienced in Rome. Both Horace and Tibullus

reject the city based on their knowledge and experience there because they hope for a different experience elsewhere.

The source of Ovid's alienation from the city is quite different. Unlike Horace and Tibullus, he does not wish to leave Rome but is forcibly removed from the city when he is exiled. His separation and alienation from the city originates not internally within himself but externally from the decision of the emperor. He wants to maintain his connection to Rome, but is not able to do so fully because of the permanent physical distance between him and the city.

The alienation from the city in Livy's narratives is similar to that of each of the authors above. Like Ovid, some of Livy's characters, such as Camillus and Coriolanus, become alienated from Rome by force when they are exiled. For Coriolanus, this physical alienation from the city even turns to personal alienation when he betrays the Romans and joins the Volsci. As in Horace and Tibullus, the alienation from the city that leads to the group departures in Livy often stems from negative experiences in the city. In the secessions of the plebs, the people feel they are not appreciated and are being denied their rights, so they withdraw from the space of the city as an act of protest. Livy particularly focuses on civil discord as a recurring cause of alienation between Romans and their city that often leads them to leave Rome either forcibly or willingly.

In these authors, alienation from the city is always dependent on the personal status or outlook of those departing. Horace and Tibullus want to leave Rome because of their own negative feelings about the city and their experiences there. Ovid is alienated from the city because of a change in his personal status and the loss of his privilege of living there. Livy's characters become alienated from the city when their status similarly changes and they are exiled or when their personal rights are violated by other Romans. In all of these scenarios, Romans who may have felt attached to Rome at other times become alienated from the city because of

changes in their own lives and experiences. The city itself remains the same while the circumstances of the individual's relationship to it change.

The alienation from Rome expressed by Juvenal's Umbricius, however, stems from a fundamental change in the city itself. For Umbricius, Rome is no longer the same place as it used to be, but has instead become a Greek city. Because traditional Roman values are no longer respected in Rome, the Romans themselves no longer belong there and therefore must either change who they are or leave the city. Umbricius thus sees the departure from Rome to Cumae not as an abandonment but as a restoration of Rome and what it means to be a Roman. In the authors of the Augustan period, leaving Rome erases the identity of those leaving, but in Juvenal it is not the identity of the people leaving Rome that changes, but rather the identity of the city itself. Departure from Rome is now a way of preserving and maintaining Roman identity as it dissolves within the city.

Despite their varying levels of attachment to the city and appreciation for it, all of the Augustan authors in this study consider Rome a familiar place and see themselves as insiders there. Horace discusses frustrations with the city and his obligations there, but he often emphasizes his ties with Maecenas, and by extension Augustus, casting him as an insider within the city. He may not always enjoy his time in the city and sometimes prefers the peace and quiet of the country instead, but Rome is where he is an important person and belongs to a prestigious circle of poets and influential people. The obligations about which Horace complains further the portrayal of himself as belonging in Rome as well. Since the city is the place where he is most needed, it is also the place where he can serve the greatest purpose and feel most important.

The Augustan elegiac poets display particularly intimate knowledge of and familiarity with the city of Rome. Propertius feels that he belongs in Rome more than anywhere else and celebrates Roman sites and monuments in his poetry. His fourth book especially highlights his knowledge of the Roman city and its places. Tibullus reveals his familiarity with the city of Rome, too. His first book of elegies explores the experience of urban love in Rome and although he eventually wishes to abandon Rome and transfer his erotic activity to the country, we know that this is impossible and that this desire itself stems from his extensive familiarity with love in Rome and all that it entails. Ovid also presents himself as an insider of the city of Rome in his poetry. His complaints about not belonging in Tomis and pining for Rome emphasize his former sense of belonging in Rome that exile has taken away from him. His imaginary narratives of triumphs and celebrations in Rome during his exile reveal his knowledge of Roman monuments and physical space as well as Roman customs. He is able to imagine himself as a spectator at these events because he knows the city so thoroughly. Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid shape elegy into a distinctly urban genre that explores the sites and streets of Rome as the physical backdrop for love and poetry.

Familiarity with the city and a sense of belonging there is prevalent in Livy as well. For Livy, Romans belong in Rome and are connected to the city because they were raised there and have both personal and collective memories there. Livy attributes the Romans' success in large part to their unique ability to connect Roman space with memory in meaningful and instructive ways. For Camillus, moving to Veii amounts to the destruction of the Roman state because it ruins this connection and the sense of belonging that Romans should feel for their city. Similarly, when Coriolanus leaves Rome and joins the army of the Volsci, he not only loses his Roman identity but also his sense of attachment to the city where he was raised. The most disturbing

development in Coriolanus' exile, as his mother points out to him, is that he has become so disconnected from Rome that even the sight of the city does not activate his old feelings of familiarity and loyalty to it.

In contrast, Umbricius in Juvenal's third satire does not view Rome as a place to which he belongs. At different times in the poem, he asks what there is for him to do in Rome (*quid Romae faciam?*, *Sat.* 3.40) and says that there is no longer a place in Rome for any Roman, suggesting that he is an outsider in his own city and has no clearly defined role or place there. Umbricius does not enjoy connections to important people or high status in Rome, unlike Livy's characters, who are prominent figures in Roman politics and society, and unlike Horace, who is connected to the emperor's inner circle and has a number of important responsibilities in Rome. Instead, Umbricius repeatedly refers to privileges in the city from which he and other humble Romans are excluded. He says the slaves of rich men are given the right of way in the street over free men (*Sat.* 3.131-132) and that poor citizens must give up their seats at public events to the children of pimps (*Sat.* 3.154-156). Likewise, as Greeks gain more influence in the city, he is pushed away from the threshold and his long years of service are overlooked (*limine summoueor, perierunt tempora longi / seruitii*, *Sat.* 3.124-125). For Horace, the elegists, and Livy, spending time in the city of Rome leads to intimate knowledge of the city and a sense of belonging there. Umbricius, however, lives in and explores the city but ultimately does not belong there and lives as an outsider.

The narratives of leaving Rome in authors of the Augustan period reveal rich and diverse perspectives on the relationship between the Romans and their city in this period. The authors I have discussed display a complex mix of both attachment to the city and alienation from it. Some

authors and characters celebrate being in Rome but are forced to leave for various reasons, while others reject the urban space of Rome in favor of other locations. Despite the wide variation in outlooks on the city displayed in these authors, however, some common themes emerge about the Romans of the Augustan period and the way they relate to their city.

One of the most prominent messages in these narratives is that leaving Rome leads to a change in the personal identity of those leaving. When Romans leave Rome and become alienated from the city, they often become disconnected from what it means to be Roman as well. The implication of these changes in identity as a result of departure from Rome is that the city of Rome creates Romans' identities. Rome and the presence of Romans within it make them who they are as individuals and as Romans. One of the most striking differences between these Augustan texts and that of Juvenal is precisely this difference in the relationship between Roman identity and presence in Rome. In Juvenal's text, unlike in the Augustan texts, the city of Rome has been stripped of its power to create and maintain Roman identity because it is no longer Roman itself.

Another common theme in the Augustan authors is that they view Rome as a familiar, known place to which they belong on some level. Although they vary in their evaluation of Rome as a place—some think it is the best place to be, while others want to go somewhere else—none of them present themselves as outsiders in the city as Juvenal's Umbricius does. Ovid and some of the characters from Livy's history become outsiders when they are exiled from Rome, but they are not presented as such while they are in Rome. Horace and Tibullus may fantasize about leaving Rome for the countryside, but they still see the city from an insider's perspective while they are there. In the Augustan works, presence in Rome is equated with belonging, but Umbricius never belongs in Rome, whether he is present in the city or not. The

comparison of the Augustan texts with Juvenal's underscores these common themes by demonstrating that they are not universal in Latin literature, but particular to the Augustan period.

There are a number of reasons that such a strong connection exists between the Romans and their city in the Augustan age. Augustus' reorganization of the city makes it more cohesive, while his building projects and monuments provide a more consistent visual and political message throughout different areas of the city, as opposed to the hodgepodge of personal and familial monuments around the city in the republican period. This new cohesion is conducive to the Romans' identification of themselves with the city in a broader, further reaching way. Augustus' division of the city into regions makes the city more quantifiable and more knowable, leading to a deeper sense of familiarity with the city among its inhabitants. It is thus not surprising that the Augustan authors of this study see the city as a place that they know well and in which they belong. The expansion of the Roman empire at this time may also contribute to the Romans' feeling of belonging within the city, given that they live at the geographical and political center of the Roman world. Even people who are not connected to Maecenas and Augustus, as Horace is, may feel that they are insiders because of their location at the nucleus of an everlasting empire. All of these changes in the physical and political environment of Rome during the Augustan period contribute to a widespread preoccupation among Augustan authors with the city and the Romans' relationship to it that is unparalleled in Latin literature of the republic or the principate.

## Bibliography

- Ball, R.J. (1983) *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey*. Göttingen.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001) *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. London.
- Bowditch, P.L. (2012) "Roman Love Elegy and the Eros of Empire" in Gold (2012). 119-133.
- Boyle, A.J. (2003) *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*. Bendigo.
- Braund, S. (1989) *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter.  
ed. (1996) *Juvenal: Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- Burck, E. (1964) *Die Erzählungskunst des Titus Livius*. Berlin.
- Butler, H.E., ed. (1905) *Sexti Properti Opera Omnia: With a Commentary*. London.  
and E.A. Barber, eds. (1933) *The Elegies of Propertius*. Oxford.
- Cairns, F. (1979) *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.  
(2006) *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*. Cambridge.
- Chaplin, J. (2000) *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford.  
(2003) "Livy's Narrative Habit" in G.B. Bakewell and J.P. Sickinger eds. *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold*. 195-213. Oxford.
- Claassen, J.-M. (1999) *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. Madison.  
(2008) *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile*. London.  
(2009) "Tristia" in Knox (2009). 170-183.

- Coarelli, F. (2007) *Rome and Environs: An Archaeological Guide*, tr. J.J. Clauss and D.P. Harmon. Berkeley.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1956) *The Idea of History*. Oxford.
- Connors, C. (2000) "Imperial Space and Time: The Literature of Leisure" in O. Taplin ed. *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*. 492-518. Oxford.
- Cornell, T. (2003) "Coriolanus: Myth, History, and Performance" in D. Braund and C. Gill eds. *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome*. 73-97. Exeter.
- Cosgrove, D.E. and Daniels, S. eds. (1988) *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*. Cambridge.
- Cosgrove, D.E. (2008) *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World*. London.
- DeBrohun, J.B. (2003) *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor.
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley.
- Dickinson, R.J. (1973) "The *Tristia*: Poetry in Exile" in J.W. Binns ed. *Ovid*. 154-190. London.
- Dyson, S.L. and R.E. Prior (1995) "Horace, Martial, and Rome: Two Poetic Outsiders Read the Ancient City". *Arethusa* 28, 245-263.
- Dyson, S.L. (2010) *Rome: A Living Portrait of an Ancient City*. Baltimore.
- Edwards, C. (1996) *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Elder, J.P. (1962) "Tibullus: *Tersus atque Elegans*" in J.P. Sullivan ed. *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*. 65-106. Cambridge, Mass.
- Evans, H.B. (1983) *Publica Carmina: Ovid's Books from Exile*. Lincoln.
- Fantham, E. (1997) "Images of the City: Propertius' New-Old Rome" in Habinek and Schiesaro (1997). 122-135.

- Favro, D.G. (1996) *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge.
- (2005) "Making Rome a World City" in Galinsky (2005). 234-263.
- Fedeli, P., ed. (1994) *Sexti Properti Elegiarum Libri IV*. Stuttgart.
- Feldherr, A. (1997) "Livy's Revolution: Civic Identity and the Creation of the *Res Publica*" in Habinek and Schiesaro (1997). 136-157. Reprinted in J. Chaplin and C. Kraus eds. (2009) *Livy*. 409-435. Oxford.
- (1998) *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley.
- Forsythe, G. (1999) *Livy and Early Rome: A Study in Historical Method and Judgment*. Stuttgart.
- Freudenburg, K. (2001) *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- Gaertner, J.F., ed. (2005) *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*. Oxford.
- ed. (2007) *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden.
- (2007a) "The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity" in Gaertner (2007). 1-21.
- (2007b) "Ovid and the 'Poetics of Exile': How Exilic is Ovid's Exile Poetry" in Gaertner (2007). 155-172.
- (2008) "Livy's Camillus and the Political Discourse of the Late Republic". *Journal of Roman Studies* 98, 27-52.
- Galasso, L., ed. (1995) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber II*. Firenze.
- (2009) "Epistulae ex Ponto" in Knox (2009). 194-206.
- Galinsky, K. (1996) *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton.
- ed. (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge.

- Gold, B.K., ed. (2012) *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. Malden.
- Gowers, E. (1993) "Horace, *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39, 48-66.
- (2005) "The Restless Companion: Horace, *Satires* 1 and 2" in K. Freudenburg ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. 48-61. Cambridge.
- ed. (2012) *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- Gowing, A. (2008) "Rome and the Ruin of Memory". *Mouseion: Journal of the Classical Association of Canada* 8 (3), 451-467.
- Gunther, H.C., ed. (2006) *Brill's Companion to Propertius*. Leiden.
- (2006) "The Fourth Book" in Gunther (2006). 353-395.
- Habinek, T.N. and Schiesaro, A. eds. (1997) *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Habinek, T. N. (1998) *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Hallett, J.P. (2012) "Authorial Identity in Latin Love Elegy: Literary Fictions and Erotic Failings" in Gold (2012). 269-284.
- Hardie, P.R. (2002) *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.
- Harley, J.B. (1988) "Maps, Knowledge, and Power" in Cosgrove and Daniels (1988). 277-312.
- Harrison, S.J. (2007) "Town and Country" in S.J. Harrison ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. 235-247. Cambridge.
- Helzlsouer, M., ed. (1989) *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber IV: A Commentary on Poems 1 to 7 and 16*. Hildesheim.
- ed. (2003) *Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto: Book I-II: Kommentar*. Heidelberg.

- Heyworth, S.J., ed. (2007) *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford.
- and J. Morwood., eds. (2011) *A Commentary on Propertius, Book 3*. Oxford.
- Hinds, S. (1985) "Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 31, 13-32. Reprinted in P.E. Knox ed. (2006) *Oxford Readings in Ovid*. 415-440. Oxford.
- (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- (2011) "Black-Sea Latin, Du Bellay, and the Barbarian Turn: *Tristia*, Regrets, Translations" in J. Ingleheart ed. *Two Thousand Years of Solitude: Exile After Ovid*. Oxford.
- Holzberg, N. (2002) *Ovid: The Poet and His Work*. Ithaca.
- Hubbard, M. (1975) *Propertius*. New York.
- Huskey, S. (2002) "Ovid and the Fall of Troy in *Tristia* 1.3". *Vergilius* 48, 88-104.
- Jaeger, M. (1997) *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor.
- Janan, M.W. (2001) *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*. Berkeley.
- Keith, A. (2008) *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*. London.
- Kennedy, D.F. (1993) *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge.
- Klingner, F. (1927) "Rom als Idee". *Die Antike* 3, 17-34.
- Knox, P.E., ed. (2009) *A Companion to Ovid*. Chichester.
- Konstan, D. (1986) "Narrative and Ideology in Livy: Book I". *Classical Antiquity* 5, 198-215.
- Kraus, C. (1994) "'No Second Troy': Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V". *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124, 267-289.

- Larmour, D.H.J. and Spencer, D. (2007) *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*. Oxford.
- Leach, E.W. (1988) *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton.
- (1997) "Horace and the Material Culture of Augustan Rome: A Revisionary Reading" in Habinek and Schiesaro (1997). 105-121.
- (2012) "Rome's Elegiac Cartography: The View from the *Via Sacra*" in Gold (2012). 134-152.
- Lee, B.T. (2008) "The Potentials of Narrative: The Rhetoric of the Subjective in Tibullus" in Liveley and Salzman-Mitchell (2008). 196-220.
- Lee-Stecum, P. (1998) *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies Book One*. Cambridge.
- Liveley, G. and P. Salzman-Mitchell, eds. (2008) *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*. Columbus.
- Luce, T.J. (1971) "Design and Structure in Livy: 5.32-55". *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 102, 265-302.
- (1977) *Livy: The Composition of His History*. Princeton.
- Luck, G. (1969) *The Latin Love Elegy*. London.
- ed. (1977) *P. Ovidius Naso: Tristia*. Heidelberg.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1980) *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace*. Oxford.
- MacLeod, C.W. (1979) "Horace and the Sibyl (Epode 16.2)". *Classical Quarterly* 29, 220-221.
- Maltby, R., ed. (2002) *Tibullus: Elegies: Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- (2006) "Major Themes and Motifs in Propertius' Love Poetry" in Gunther (2006). 147-182.
- Mankin, D., ed. (1995) *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge.

- Manuwald, G. (2006) "The First Book" in Gunther (2006). 219-244.
- Mazzolani, A.L. (1970) *The Idea of the City in Roman Thought*. London.
- McGowan, M.M. (2009) *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*. Leiden.
- Miles, G. (1995) *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca.
- Miller, P.A. (2012) "Tibullus" in Gold (2012). 53-69.
- Montiglio, S. (2008) "Perfer et Obdura: Multo Graviora Tulisti (Tr. 5.11.7): Ovid's rejection of Ulysses' endurance". *Classical Quarterly* 58, 196-205.
- Murgatroyd, P., ed. (1980) *Tibullus I: A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*. Pietermaritzburg.
- ed. (1994) *Elegies II*. Oxford.
- Newman, K. (2006) "The Third Book: Defining a Poetic Self" in Gunther (2006). 319-352.
- Nicolet, C. (1991) *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor.
- Oakley, S.P., ed. (1997) *A Commentary on Livy Books VI-X, Vol. 2, Books VII-VIII*. Oxford.
- Ogilvie, R.M., ed. (1965) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*. Oxford.
- ed. (1974) *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita, Libri I-V*. Oxford.
- Oliensis, E. (1998) *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.
- O'Sullivan, T. (2011) *Walking in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.
- Owen, S.G., ed. (1915) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia Libri Quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor, Haleutica, Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- Postgate, J.P., ed. (1915) *Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres*. Oxford.
- Putnam, M.C.J., ed. (1973) *Tibullus: A Commentary*. Norman.
- (1982) *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy, and Epic*. Princeton.

- Reckford, K.J. (1999) "Only a Wet Dream? Hope and Skepticism in Horace, *Satire 1.5*".  
*American Journal of Philology* 120 (4), 525-554.
- Richardson, L., ed. (1977) *Propertius Elegies I-IV*. Norman.
- Rosati, G. (1999) "L'Addio dell' Esule Morituro (*Trist.* 1.3): Ovidio come Protesilao" in W. Schubert ed. *Ovid: Werk und Wirkung: Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht, Teil II*. 787-96. Frankfurt.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. (1997) "Ovid's *Heroides* and *Tristia*: Voices From Exile". *Ramus* 26, 1, 29-56.
- Ross, D.O. (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*. Cambridge.
- Rothwell, J.K.S. (1996) "Propertius on the Site of Rome". *Latomus* 55, 4, 829-854.
- Schama, S. (1995) *Landscape and Memory*. New York.
- Sharrock, A.R. (2012) "Ovid" in Gold (2012). 70-85.
- Smith, R.A. (1997) *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil*. Ann Arbor.
- Spencer, D. (2010) *Roman Landscape: Culture and Identity*. Cambridge.
- Stahl, H.-P. (1985) *Propertius: "Love" and "War": Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley.
- Sullivan, J.P. (1976) *Propertius: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Syme, R. (1959) "Livy and Augustus". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64, 27-87.
- Syndikus, H.P. (2006) "The Second Book" in Gunther (2006). 245-318.
- Tola, E. (2008) "Chronological Segmentation in Ovid's *Tristia*: The Implicit Narrative of Elegy" in Liveley and Salzman-Mitchell (2008). 51-67.
- Tuan, Y.-F. (1977) *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis.

- Vasaly, A. (1993) *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley.
- (1999) "The Quinctii in Livy's First Pentad: The Rhetoric of Anti-Rhetoric". *The Classical World* 92 (6), 513-530.
- Veyne, P. (1988) *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*. Chicago.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1993) *Augustan Rome*. London.
- (2008) *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Walsh, P.G. (1961) *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge.
- Walters, C.F. and R.S. Conway, eds. (1919) *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita, Libri VI-X*. Oxford.
- Watson, L., ed. (2003) *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford.
- Welch, T.S. (2005) *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments*. Columbus.
- (2012) "Elegy and the Monuments" in Gold (2012). 103-118.
- West, D. (1974) "Of Mice and Men: Horace, *Satires* 2.6.77-117" in T. Woodman and D. West eds. *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. 67-80. Cambridge.
- White, P. (2005) "Poets in the New Milieu: Realigning" in Galinsky (2005). 321-339.
- Wickham, E.C. ed. (1901) *Quinti Horati Flacci Opera Omnia*. Oxford.
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1955) *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge.
- Williams, G.D. (1994) *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge.
- (2002a) "Ovid's Exilic Poetry: Worlds Apart" in B.W. Boyd ed. *Brill's companion to Ovid*. 337-381. Leiden.
- (2002b) "Ovid's Exile Poetry: *Tristia*, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, and *Ibis*" in P.R. Hardie ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. 233-245. Cambridge.
- Williams, R. (1973) *The Country and the City*. New York.

Wilson, M. (2009) "The Politics of Elegy: Propertius and Tibullus" in W.J. Dominik, J.

Garthwaite, and P.A. Roche eds. *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. 173-202. Leiden.

Wyke, M. (1987) "The Elegiac Woman at Rome". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological*

*Society* 33, 153-178.

Zanker, P. (1988) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, tr. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.