

Recent scholarship has revealed the various ways in which domestic life during the Augustan period became a highly politicized arena of public discourse (Milnor; Severy). Propertius 2.6 and 2.7 share in that discourse by considering the rightful constitution of the Roman *domus*: the first poem implicitly casts Cynthia as a wayward *ingenua nupta* (26) and assails the erotic paintings that hang on her hardly chaste *domus* (28); the second voices the *amator*'s rejection of Augustus' proposal of laws that would encourage marital fidelity as a bedrock for stabilizing family lineage. This paper examines the language of kinship articulated in the two poems and argues that the *amator*'s disavowal of the Roman *domus* as defined in poem 2.7 through marriage and reproduction must be interpreted in light of Cynthia's *domus* as represented in poem 2.6. However disparate the two *domus* may appear, both are configured as replacements for those elite Roman households disrupted during the civil discord of the late 40's and 30's B.C.E., and both offer a means of re-establishing the identity of the elite male, who formerly relied on birthplace and familial lineage as a primary means of self-representation (cf. Prop. 1.21-22).

Interpretations of Propertius 2.7 have often focused on the relationship between the poem's speaker and the mysterious *lex sublata* ("repealed law," 2.7.1) that prompts Cynthia's rejoicing (cf. Fedeli 2005). Scholarly consensus avers that the law indicates the speaker's resistance or adherence to a climate of moral reform (Besnier; Della Corte; Wallace-Hadrill; Galinsky; Cairns; contra Badian), whether or not it specifically refers to a prototype for the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (18 B.C.E.). This paper identifies 2.7's rejection of familial roles mandated by Augustus (*nupta*, 8; *maritus*, 9; *nati*, 13; *pater*, 20) in allegiance to Cynthia's threshold (*tua limina*, 9) as an attempt to construct an erotic *domus* as a substitute for the late Republican household as well as an alternative to those households regulated under the new regime: *tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus:/ hic erit et patrio nomine pluris amor* (cf. *tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes*, 1.11.23). And yet, Cynthia's *domus* in 2.6, with its population of suspicious relatives (*falsos propinquos*, 7; *mater*, 11; *soror*, 12), offers the *amator* few opportunities to distinguish himself among a throng of rival *vir*i (14, 24). Heyworth's recent decision (2007a; following Sandbach) to transpose the final couplet of poem 2.6 (41-42) to poem 2.7 points to the centrality of familial roles as a matrix for self-identification in both poems: *nos uxor numquam, numquam deducet amica:/ semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris*. The fact that Cynthia's relatives prove ersatz in poem 2.6 and that the poet in 2.7 disowns the most authoritative familial *nomen* (*nomine patrio*, 20; Postgate 1894) to which the elite male is entitled reflects a widespread failure of kinship terminology.

From a broader perspective, this paper attempts to reconcile Augustan elegy's recent interpretations as a genre born from a crisis in the elite male's self-identification, resulting in part from post-civil war displacement (Miller; Janan), with an emerging body of literature on an ideology of domesticity harnessed by the Princeps as a way of securing his authority and lineage. Manipulations of the *domus* in Propertius are best understood as attempts to reconstruct identity and respond to a widespread, though not uncontested, transformation in the representation of familial life in Augustan discourse.