A USE OF MYTH IN ANCIENT POETRY[1]

(Cat. 68; Hor. *Od.* 3. 27; Theoc. 7; Prop. 3. 15)

IT is perhaps unnecessary to defend the principle that mythical *exempla* in ancient poetry are not merely decorative, but serve in the expression of 'significant emotion';[2] it would still be welcome to see it more frequently and more coherently applied. This paper tries to isolate one characteristic use of myth in four poems from Hellenistic and Roman authors; the last section summarizes its conclusions and briefly sets them in a context of literary history.

I

The unity of Catullus 68 is still disputed. This is not the place to discuss the question in full; neither, however, can it be ignored. It will be assumed in what follows that the persons addressed in lines 1–40, 149–60, and praised in 41–148 are the same; this paper will touch on a number of problems arising from this assumption and is meant to contribute to the interpretation of Cat. 68 as a single whole.[3] But its main contentions are not affected, even if 41–160 form a separate piece.

The explicit connection between the myth and the main situation lies in a comparison of Lesbia with Laodamia. Setting his mistress with the beauties of legend is one of the ways the ancient love-poet most frequently praises her; but this comparison concerns more particularly the arrival of the two women at the house they were to share, the one with her lover, the other with her husband; and so our attention is arrested on the moment in which Lesbia places her foot on the threshold (70–2; cf. 131–4). In a similar way Theocritus' Simaitha (2. 103 ff.), Propertius (1. 18. 11 f.) or Tibullus (1. 5. 45 f.) dwell on their beloveds' coming in because it is the moment which culminates and concludes the anxious waiting of the lover.[4] But Catullus also enlarges on Lesbia's appearance and the manner of her entry and goes on to tell the story of Laodamia in breadth. To appreciate why, it is necessary to bring out certain implicit connections between the myth and the body of the poem.

[1] I am much indebted for comments on an earlier draft of this article to Professor Francis Cairns and Professor R. G. M. Nisbet; it is not to be assumed they agree with all of what is said here.

[2] T. S. Eliot, *Selected Essays* (London, 1951), 22.

[3] The main arguments for this view are usefully summarized by Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 229 ff.; for more detail see esp. Prescott, *T.A.P.A.* lxxi (1940), 473–500. The problems of nomenclature, however, remain difficult. Lachmann's apparently attractive proposal, to read the *praenomen* 'Manius' in lines 1–40 and the *nomen* 'Allius' in the rest, is unacceptable. The *praenomen*, the distinguishing mark of a Roman citizen, is too formal or too respectful for this context, where it could hardly sound anything but sarcastic: cf. Perrotta, *Atene e Roma* N.S. viii (1927), 135 f., referring to Paoli, *R.F.I.C.* liii (1925), 542–50. For other passages besides those dealt with by Paoli where the *praenomen* indicates a tone of solemnity, see Philodemus, *Rhet.* 1. 223. 5 Sudhaus; Lucilius 1035 Marx; Cic. *De Or.* 2. 286, *De Legg.* 1. 5, *De Rep.* 6. 15, *Ad Fam.* 12. 25. 5; Ov. *Ex Pont.* 4. 1. 35, 15. 3, 18; Petron. 30. 3 and Friedländer ad loc. Perhaps we have simply to fall back on Schöll's *mi Alli*: cf. Prescott, art. cit. 495–7; Perrotta, art. cit., 136 f.

[4] Cf. Lieberg, *Puella Divina* (Amsterdam, 1962), 204 f., 218 f.

1. The passion of Laodamia corresponds not with Lesbia's, but with Catullus'.[1] It is the poet who, like his legendary heroine, was eaten up with longing (51 ff., 107 ff.), whereas nothing is said about Lesbia's feelings, if any, towards her lover; we only know that now she is less devoted to him than she might be (135 ff.). Further, the formal correspondence of lines 57–62 and 109–16[2]—the two long, straggling similes of roughly equal length, both concerned with watercourses and both beginning with a form of the word *qualis*—suggests a link between their subjects; and the vocabulary of 159 f., closely echoing that of 106 f., suggests that Lesbia and Protesilaus correspond as the two loved ones. Catullus, then, thrusts himself and his yearning between Lesbia and Laodamia to produce a more unusual comparison, one between the male and the female. This entails that the more passive and suffering part in love, normally thought of as feminine and here embodied in Laodamia, is transferred on to Catullus. And indeed he is still at the mercy of Lesbia's whims (135 ff.), just as he was once dependent on her company and tormented by her absence (51 ff.). The point is much the same when the poet likens himself to Juno; for though he turns away from this comparison in 141 ff., an analogy between his own and her situation remains. What this analogy is, depends in part on the interpretation of the corrupt *flagrantem* †*cotidiana* in 139. Since Catullus goes on that men should not be likened to gods, and since he is also recommending a calm and liberal attitude, it might seem natural, as Baehrens suggested, to read something meaning 'got angry'.[3] In that case the transition from 136 to 137 ff. is rather abrupt, because that Catullus might be angry is only implicit in 135 f.; but even if, with most editors, we emend line 139 to mean 'restrained her wrath' (thus producing a smoother transition from 136 to 137 ff.), the point in 141 ff. must still be that Juno had some bitter feelings to hold back, and it is feelings such as hers which Catullus is rejecting. Line 142[4] draws the conclusion from the comparison; it means 'take up the unwelcome burden of an anxious old (cf. 17. 13, 61. 51) parent': i.e. 'put up with the cares Lesbia brings on you as a (wanton) daughter does on her father',[5] the lover's feelings being

[1] Cf. Rankin, *Latomus* xxvi (1967), 693 f. for this and other correspondences (some fanciful).

[2] Fordyce has a good discussion of whether to take lines 57–62 with what precedes or what follows. He seems to incline, as I do, to the former course; and the correspondence between those lines and 109–16 may be taken as another argument in its favour. Further, 61 f. are not perhaps as irrelevant as may be thought, for they seem to imply that tears are a relief of sorrow, and so give a kind of pleasure to the weeper (cf. *Iliad* 23. 10, 98; Aesch. fr. 739 Mette, as quoted by Σ on *Iliad* 23. 10; Soph. *El.* 285 f.; Eur. fr. 563, 573 Nauck); by mentioning this inferior form of relief Catullus leads up to and enhances the praises of Allius' help. So too the conclusion of the corresponding simile (116) produces a fresh point of contact with the narrative—like Laodamia's yearning, Hercules' labours led up to his wedding; and 103 f., the end of the digression on the Trojan war, by mentioning its cause in Paris' adultery link it to the theme of love opposed to marriage which dominates the poem.

[3] Baehrens suggested *colligit* or *concipit iram*; if a perfect is more appropriate, perhaps *flagranti excanduit ira*.

[4] If line 142 is an exclamation in parenthesis, then no lacuna need be posited and *nec* in 141 is picked up naturally by *nec tamen* in 143; cf. Friedrich ad loc., and for the use of *nec tamen* add Cic. *Ad Qu.* 3. 1. 20. This seems better than Williams' (op. cit. 712 f.) proposal to put *nec divis . . . aequum est* in parenthesis, which, though it also avoids postulating a lacuna, leaves no connection between *nec* and *nec tamen*.

[5] This interpretation has the advantage of giving to *onus* an attested meaning and to *tolle* the sense one would expect it to have when *onus* is its object (cf. Fordyce ad loc.): the idea is similar to that of line 136.

compared to a father's as elsewhere in this poem (119–24) and in 72. 4. Unlike the goddess Juno, then, Catullus the mortal cannot allow himself the luxury of anger; nor has he much right to, since Jupiter's misdemeanours were many (140 *plurima facta*)[1] whereas Lesbia's are few (136 *rara . . . furta*). By making these contrasts he holds back the anger he had begun to express through the parallel with Juno. But he is comparable to the goddess in so far as she was betrayed by her husband as he is by his mistress. By these exchanges of male and female roles, Catullus strikingly depicts his kind of love and its pains; it is also a device we meet again in poem 70. There it is the woman who dangles promises of marriage before the man, rather than the other way round, as convention in literature no less than in real life dictates;[2] and the man's lust, so far from removing his scruples, makes him only the more gullible.[3] The lover is scarcely more than his mistress' victim.

2. The loss of Protesilaus corresponds to Catullus' loss of his brother: both die and are buried away from home in Troy, both are greatly loved.[4] It might be objected that this introduces a confusion into the poem: granted that Catullus is compared to Laodamia, how can Protesilaus be the analogue of both Lesbia and his brother? This in its turn leads to a larger and familiar question: if in lines 1–40 the death of the poet's brother has caused him to renounce love and love-poetry,[5] how is it that in 41–160, where his brother's death is no less vividly recalled, he describes his relationship with Lesbia as continuing (though in a new climate of complaisancy) and that this section is itself a kind of love-poem? What must be emphasized in reply to this question is that line 41 makes a fresh start, contradicting what goes before.[6] The asyndeton in *non possum reticere* may seem surprising, but there is a close parallel in Propertius (3. 9. 47) who, likewise after a long *recusatio* and likewise moved by gratitude,

[1] *Facta* is not to be emended: see Pichon, *De sermone amatorio apud latinos elegiae scriptores* (Paris, 1902), 54 f.

[2] e.g. Cat. 64. 139 ff.; Men. *Sam.* 52, *Georg.* 74; Lucian, *Dial. Mer.* 7. 2. This point is made all the plainer by the poem's reversing the situation of Call. *Epig.* 25, its model.

[3] Contrast the implications of *cupiens* in 64. 145 and *cupido* in 70. 3. For another similar, though less powerful, reversal see Prop. 1. 11. 23 with *Iliad* 6. 429 f. In general cf. Klingner, *Römische Geisteswelt* (Munich, 1961), 226; E. Schäfer, *Hermes* Einzelschr. xviii (1966), 68–72.

[4] Cf. Kinsey, *Latomus* xxvi (1967), 49; Bardon, *Propositions sur Catulle* (Brussels, 1970), 98.

[5] *Munera . . . et Musarum . . . et Veneris* (10) both refer to poetry (cf. Jachmann, *Gnomon* i [1925], 211); and indeed, as Prescott observes (art. cit. 500), the request would be granted by the single act of sending a love-poem. For the love-poet, as such, is able to smooth out lovers' quarrels or soothe their pains (cf. Prop. 1. 10. 15–19 and Theoc. 11. 1 ff., 13. 1 ff., where the poems speak of the troubles of love and at the same time are consolation to a lover). But he is also, as always in ancient poetry, assumed to be himself a lover (cf. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* xxxiv [1962], 262). So the ambiguity of *lusi* (17), *studium* (19), *studia* and *delicias* (26) should not be resolved, because to give up love-poetry is also to give up love (cf. Anacreon ap. Himer., *Or.* 48. 4 and Propertius, who uses two farewells to love, 3. 24 and 25, as the seal of his first three books, the ones almost entirely devoted to love-poetry). The distinction between *munera Musarum* and *munera Veneris* is thus, though sharp, only a formal one; its purpose is to characterize Catullus as a poet who can unite the divergent qualities of learning and passion. For similar self-characterizations see 'Catullus 116', *C.Q.* N.S. xxiii (1973), 306, 309.

[6] This point is made very clearly by Vahlen, *Gesammelte philologische Schriften*, ii (Leipzig and Berlin, 1923), 660 f. = *Sitzb. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* (1902), 1031 f.; compare also the use of similar phrases ('I cannot but speak') in Aesch. *P.V.* 106 f.; Eur. *Hipp.* 990 f.; Antiphon *Tetral.* 2. β1; Auson. *Ep.* 29. 48, after the writer has expressed a preference for silence.

changes course without any adversative particle:

> te duce vel Iovis arma canam caeloque minantem
> Coeum et Phlegraeis Oromedonta iugis . . .

and *quod potui* in 149 is designed to make it quite clear that the poet has gone back on his original refusal.[1] And so it is that lines 41–148, a learned poem and a love-poem, do supply the 'gifts' Catullus was professing to withhold in 1–40,[2] just as they do implicitly offer a sort of consolation to the addressee.[3] So though this contradiction is softened by lines 41–148's pretending to be merely an encomium[4] (and therefore not exactly *munera . . et Musarum . . . et Veneris*), contradiction it remains. Its purpose is complex. In part it heightens the expression of gratitude to the addressee: despite Catullus' disinclination to write he cannot but thank his friend. In part, as was suggested above (p. 84 n. 5), the *recusatio* serves here, as it commonly does, to say something about the nature of the writer's work, and more specifically of what is to follow in the poem. But the new departure in line 41 also introduces a shift of feeling and an account of things which is more realistic and *nuancé*. The original situation in which Catullus' grief over his brother led him to reject love entirely gives way to another, in which, although he mourns his brother no less, he recalls his affair with Lesbia and tries to deal with the emotions it still arouses. If then Catullus' 'Protesilaus' is both his brother and Lesbia, that reflects the complex of sentiments which underlie the poem, for he is writing as one both bereaved and in love. What happens in the course of it is that the lover reasserts himself, though in a restrained and 'adult' fashion, after initially yielding to the mourner; and so it is proper that the poem should end with words of homage to Lesbia. Yet even at this point a tension remains; for the work concludes with a valediction, one which comprises not only the addressee and his woman, but also Lesbia, the house where Catullus used to meet her, and perhaps also the gods of love (cf. p. 86 n. 8 below). So something of the renunciation in 15 ff. remains: Catullus is now saying good-bye to his love not altogether, but as he once knew it.[5]

3. There is a contrast between Laodamia, deeply in love, and Lesbia, something less than faithful, as between Laodamia the wife and Lesbia the mistress.[6] The myth opens with the word *coniugis* (73)[7] and it is emphatically echoed in what follows (81, 84, 107). The similes of lines 119–130 further emphasize the dignity of the mythical heroine's passion. The first, where she is compared to

[1] Cf. κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἡμετέραν in Greg. Thaum. *Ad Orig.* 203, which also refers back to an initial *recusatio* (ibid. 1–18). For some useful comparisons with the form of *recusatio* which opens the *Ciris* see Salvatore, *G.I.F.* ii (1949), 36 f.

[2] Cf. Fraenkel, art. cit. 262.

[3] Cf. Williams, op. cit. 230.

[4] They correspond to the form of encomium which Menander (*Rhet. Gr.* iii. 414. 31 ff. Spengel) calls προσφωνητικὸς λόγος and which deals with specific deeds of the person concerned. Further encomiastic features are the repeated *is* in 67 f. (cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* [Leipzig and Berlin, 1923], 163–6) and the promise of long-lasting fame in 43 ff. (cf. Gow on Theoc. 16. 30 f.). The end of the poem (155 ff.), besides being an epistolary *vale*, is a hymnic conclusion (cf. Kroll on 64. 22).

[5] The poem is thus, in one of its aspects, a sort of 'farewell to love', a genre where a wavering attitude is natural and common (cf. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* [Edinburgh, 1972], 79–82).

[6] Cf. Fraenkel, art. cit. 263; Schäfer, op. cit. 82 f.

[7] Cf. Kinsey, art. cit. 49. *Coniunx* and its cognates, no less in love-poetry than elsewhere, normally refer to a married person: cf. Pichon, op. cit. 109 f.

a grand-father, recalls what Catullus says of himself in 72. 3 f. (cf. pp. 83 f. above), and in the second the dove is a commonplace example of constancy in marital love;[1] perhaps it is because its passion is truer that it seeks kisses more shamelessly than a woman of easy morals (126–8). This is set against the loose and furtive relationship of Catullus and Lesbia, which in its turn is pointedly distinguished from a marriage; for *etsi uno non est contenta Catullo* (135) is equivalent to saying that she is not his wife[2] and still more plainly, in 143 f., he reminds himself that Lesbia has never been brought to him in the solemn *deductio* of the Roman bride. This seems a far cry from the extreme seriousness with which Catullus treats his love in the epigrams where the language of *amicitia*[3] or even marriage[4] is considered appropriate. But here too certain touches in the description of Lesbia's entry seem designed to suggest the entry of a bride. Her Cupid's tunic (134) is of Hymen's colour;[5] and the use of *domus* (68; cf. 74) rather than *aedes* begins to raise suggestions of marriage, since by her marrying the bride becomes a *domina*.[6] It is true that the *domina* of lines 68 and 156 cannot be Lesbia;[7] and this further contrasts Laodamia, who, as the bride, is also the mistress of the house she comes to, with Lesbia, who merely frequents a house whose mistress is someone else.[8] But why should Catullus make so much of Laodamia's marriage if he has in mind no likeness at all to Lesbia in this respect? There is, in short, both a comparison and a contrast: in so far as Catullus can liken Lesbia to Laodamia, he thinks of her, or thought of her, as virtually a bride; but in so far as he faces reality, he plainly denies that there is any hint of a marriage between them: there is only the loose association of two polished and sophisticated people. The myth then represents a memory, and perhaps also a fond imagination, of the poet's:

[1] Besides Kroll ad loc., cf. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* iii 1021, s.v. Digamus.

[2] Cf. Cat. 111. 1 and Kroll ad loc.; Hor. *Epod.* 14. 15 f., where Horace's relationship to the courtesan is contrasted with Maecenas' to his wife.

[3] Cf. Reitzenstein, *Sitzb. d. Heidelb. Akad. d. Wiss.* iii (1912), Abh. 12.

[4] Cf. Reitzenstein, art. cit. 14: 'Das *foedus amatorium* ist das Gegenbild der Ehe'. See further Williams, op. cit. 404–7, 412–17, and esp. Prop. 2. 6. 42 where *uxor* is used of Cynthia.

[5] Cf. Lieberg, op. cit. 249 f.

[6] Cf. Cat. 61. 31 and Lieberg, op. cit. 182, 221.

[7] Cf. Kinsey, art. cit. 42 f.; Wilkinson, *C.R.* n.s. xx (1970), 290. As they point out (cf. Prescott, art. cit. 488–90) *dominam* is certainly the right reading in line 68. Therefore *nobis* there must mean 'Lesbia and me' and *communes* in 69 'shared by Lesbia and me'; the use of the word is adequately paralleled by Kroll ad loc. and Ov. *Am.* 2. 5. 31. The delay in explaining who the other person implied in *nobis* and *communes* is heightens the excitement of her appearance in line 70.

[8] A fresh proposal about the identity of the *domina* may be in order, since previous ones are far from plausible. It seems unlikely in a poem which, like Catullus' poems in general, tells us all we need to know about the people that play a part in it, and whose last lines seem to sum up the *dramatis personae*, that the word should allude to a figure whose role is obscure (cf. Kinsey, art. cit. 45). She may then be simply the goddess Venus who is likewise conceived as becoming the mistress of a house devoted to erotic activities in Hor. *Od.* 1. 30 (cf. Cairns, *A.J.P.* xcii [1971], 445 ff.) and who is emphatically mentioned in lines 17 f. and 51. A solution of the crux in 157 could be attempted along the same lines by reading *et qui principio nobis terram edere fertur*. This phrase would then allude to the god Eros who is sometimes thought of as sole creator of the earth (Pherekydes, D.–K. 7, B 3; Lucian, *Amores* 32; *P.G.M.* iv. 1750, 1759) and who has already made an appearance in line 133. For the present tense of *edere* cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 8. 45, *G.* 1. 279 and Kühner–Stegmann ii (1) § 31. 6. Vahlen suggested, less appropriately I think, that 157 f. referred to another god, Jupiter (art. cit. 1043).

Lesbia was once something like a bride, but now he must content himself with a mere affair.[1] So to this extent Laodamia is Lesbia as Catullus could have wished her to be.[2]

4. But the myth also strikes a jarring note. The couple neglected to placate the gods with sacrifices before their wedding, and this omission,we are given to understand, is at the root of their subsequent misfortune.[3] There is also perhaps the hint of a similar offence by Catullus and Lesbia; for in so far as she is likened to a bride, her treading on the threshold is an irregular and ill-omened action.[4] But it would be mistaken either to take this as a straightforward expression of guilt[5] or to dismiss it as ironical.[6] Catullus, like the choruses or characters of Attic drama,[7] goes back to a *fons malorum* in order to create the sense of a tragic doom rather than apply a moral stigma; and the words of 77 f.:

> nil mihi tam valde placeat, Ramnusia virgo,
> quod temere invitis suscipiatur eris

are reminiscent of those Catullus uses of himself in 76. 11 f.:

> quin tu animo offirmas atque istinc teque reducis
> et dis invitis desinis esse miser?[8]

In both cases there is tragic suffering, whether it springs from an oversight or from an infatuated persistence. In poem 68 this consists for Laodamia in the early loss of her husband, which is heavily emphasized (80–6, 105–7): likewise where the poet is concerned, the joys of his love are confined to the moment of Lesbia's arrival, and the subsequent suffering consists not only in the death of his brother, but also in separation from Lesbia, hinted at in 135 ff. Once again, then, the mythical marriage is like Catullus' description of his love in the epigrams; and once again it is in sharp contrast with the steady but easy-going relationship described in 135 ff. On the one hand there is a view of his love as equivalent to that of a wedded couple, though an ill-starred and unsatisfied one; on the other, as a mere amour which is happy enough within its limits, but cannot make the claims of marriage on its participants and has to leave room for the occasional escapade. In the one view there is Catullus' possessiveness and seriousness, in the other his urbanity and his resignation. Similar contrasts of the two sorts of love also find expression in Propertius. In

[1] *Verecundae* (136), as Kroll observes, is explained by *rara . . . furta*: Lesbia is 'discreet' or almost 'well-behaved' because her infidelities are few (contrast *omnivoli* and *plurima facta* of Jupiter in 140). The word is an attempt to play down those infidelities and to contain the feelings they might arouse. The objections of Büchner and others to it (see Lieberg, op. cit. 253 ff.) are therefore misconceived.

[2] Cf. Bardon, op. cit. 98 f.

[3] This detail is, on the evidence as we have it, Catullus' invention. The nearest parallel is in Eustathius (1. 507. 1–6 van der Valk), who retails two versions of the story where the anger of Aphrodite plays a part. But this anger is only the cause of what happens *after* Protesilaus' death.

[4] Cf. Lieberg, op. cit. 208 f.

[5] So Pepe, *G.I.F.* vi (1953), 107–13 and with more restraint Lieberg, op. cit. 239–42. The objections of Pennisi (*Emerita* xxvii [1959], 215–20) do not, however, do justice to the complex attitudes expressed by Catullus' poem.

[6] So Kinsey, art. cit. 51 n. 3.

[7] e.g. Soph. *El.* 505 ff.; Eur. *Med.* 1 ff., *Hipp.* 752 ff., *Hel.* 1353 ff.

[8] On religious language in Cat. 76 see the helpful remarks of Williams, op. cit. 411 f.

2. 32 the poet passes from the one attitude to the other; in 3. 21–2 he sets himself, the lover going abroad to escape from his love, against Tullus returning to enjoy the benefits of his home-country and of marriage; and in 4. 7 and 11, in the figures of Cynthia and Cornelia, he makes his greatest confrontation of the two relationships.[1]

The myth, then, of Catullus 68 is neither a decorative and learned irrelevance, nor does it simply mirror the situation in which it is set; for the analogies between the two are qualified by no less significant contrasts. But the result of such a complexity is not mere confusion; the myth, by indicating an area of feeling beyond the direct statements of the poem, helps to express a significant conflict of attitudes. It thus makes a distinct and comprehensible contribution to the whole.

II

Recent commentators have in general been unwilling to grant any large-scale relevance to the myth of Europa in Horace, *Odes* 3. 27.[2] A welcome exception, however, is W.-H. Friedrich in *Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1959, 81–100; another is Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), 190–2, who draws important conclusions from the fact that this poem is a lover's *propemptikon*, a send-off to a departing beloved. The remarks which follow here will cover much of the same ground as these valuable discussions; but since some differences remain and a few points may be added, I venture to offer a little more than a summary account.

The myth begins at line 25. In the previous two stanzas Horace dwells on the bad weather he sees in store; so the immediate point of contrast lies in the danger of the journey and in the rashness, together with the fears, of the traveller.[3] And in 25 ff. there are links with the *propemptikon* which also form a bridge to the earlier part of the poem; for the account of Europa's sufferings *en voyage* and her outburst on arrival reflects, as Cairns shows (op. cit. 191), the commonplaces of the σχετλιασμός, that part of a *propemptikon* which is designed to discourage the traveller from leaving. What is more, Horace has displaced the σχετλιασμός. In a normal *propemptikon*[4] the speaker first bewails the departure

[1] In both poems a dead woman addresses a living man, lover or husband; and in both she defends her conduct in a quasi-forensic way. Within this embracing analogy some significant contrasts are unfolded. The speaker of 4. 7 is a now betrayed mistress: that of 4. 11 is an honoured wife and mother. The lover in 4. 7 has neglected the rites due to the dying and dead woman (23 ff.): the husband in 4. 11 will not leave off weeping at his wife's tomb (1 ff.) and is even devoted to her image (81 ff.). Cynthia looks forward to the time when she will rub her bones against her lover's (93 f.): Cornelia renounces any claim on Paullus and envisages his remarrying (81 ff.). The ghost in 4. 7 has returned—a sign that something is amiss: in 4. 11 she is preparing for an honourable and irrevocable stay in the other world (contrast esp. 4. 7. 1 ff. and 4. 11. 1 ff.). Cynthia's accusations do not entirely correspond to Propertius' narrative (5 f.), but this only enhances the sense of her jealousy and the troubled relationship.

[2] e.g. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 193; Commager, *The Odes of Horace* (New Haven and London, 1962), 172; Williams, *The Third Book of Horace's Odes* (Oxford, 1969), 138. Heinze (p. 374) seems to be an exception, but his remarks are too brief. I have not been able to see Buscaroli, *Perfidum ridens Venus* (Bologna, 1937), a work I know only from Büchner's review in *Gnomon* xiv (1938), 636–9.

[3] With *palluit audax* (28) Lambinus aptly compares Ar. *E.N.* 1115^{b} 32 f.: Europa is θρασύδειλος. She acts boldly, but soon loses her nerve.

[4] Cf. Menander, *Rhet. Gr.* 3. 395 ff. Spengel; Prop. 1. 8. 1–26; Ov. *Am.* 2. 11.

and remonstrates with the traveller; and then, as he resigns himself to the facts, offers farewells, prayers, and good wishes. What Horace has done, broadly speaking, is to reverse the order of the two sections.[1] Lines 1–12 correspond to a prayer, with the difference that the poet has already consulted the omens rather than now supplicating the gods;[2] 13–16 are a farewell. Lines 17–20 echo a feature of the σχετλιασμός, fears of a turbulent or difficult voyage,[3] but these merge into another prayer, in the form of an ἀποπομπή, in 21–4.[4] In other words, like Catullus in poem 68, Horace, in order to maintain an attitude of civilized restraint, limits regrets and reproaches almost exclusively to the myth. We may now return to examine the whole more closely.

The first twelve lines are involved in content and expression; but they are not designed to mystify nor simply to amuse. In fact, the anxious consultation of auguries is characteristic of the lover when his beloved is about to depart on a journey.[5] Peculiar to Horace, however, is that the poet is himself the *auspex*. The point of this is partly to maintain his dignity and lend his words authority,[6] partly to emphasize his *pietas* by contrast with the *impii* of lines 1 ff.; *pietas* is also used of the loyalty of lovers to each other.[7] Here it is pointedly not applied to Galatea;[8] her fate depends not on her own *pietas*, a quality she does not possess, but on that of her lover. And so it is appropriate that despite the hocus-pocus described in lines 7–12 storms are looming up in 17–20; for Horace cannot guarantee calm weather for an *impia*.[9]

Lines 13 f. echo a normal ancient goodbye, 'Farewell and remember me'.[10] But this is expressed here in an unusual form; 'You *may* fare well and remember me'. Horace does not wish to make the actual goodbye too categorical; he is saying in effect 'By all means go—if you want to'. So too, if there are no bad omens, that means only that she need not be held back (15 f.), not that she should in fact go. The regrets and misgivings implied hitherto come closer to finding expression in 17–20; but even here Horace does not go so far as to express a wish for bad weather to stop his beloved's leaving, as Propertius does (1. 8. 9–12; cf. 1. 6. 17): he confines himself to saying that the weather is unfavourable. Line 21, however, leaves us before the myth with an idea of what Horace's love is like; for *hostium uxores puerique* suggests that it is as for a wife or a child that he cares for Galatea.[11]

The analogies between Galatea's and Europa's situations should now be more easily discernible. Horace's Europa was all too willing to leave with the

[1] Statius (*Silv.* 3. 2) also begins with prayers; the σχετλιασμός follows at line 51, but is succeeded by further prayers in 101 ff. Theoc. 7. 52–89 (on which see below pp. 91 f.) is roughly analogous in structure to Hor. *Od.* 3. 27.

[2] The opening *impiis* might suggest a prayer to divert bad fortune was on the way; cf. esp. Verg. *G.* 3. 513: *di meliora piis, erroremque hostibus illum!*

[3] Cf. Prop. 1. 8. 5 f.; Ov. *Am.* 2. 11. 27 f.

[4] For this analysis, cf. Cairns, op. cit. 190 ff.

[5] Cf. Tib. 1. 3. 9 f. Lovers are frequently described as superstitious (e.g. Tib. 1. 5. 9 ff.; Prop. 1. 3. 27 ff.). *Cui timebo* (7) further emphasizes Horace's involvement.

[6] Cf. Cairns, op. cit. 190 f.

[7] See Pichon, op. cit. 233. Cf. particularly Cat. 76. 2, 26, where the lover's *pietas*, as here, takes on religious overtones.

[8] Cf. Friedrich, art. cit. 93.

[9] Contrast Theoc. 7. 53 f., where the lover promises the weather will be good even when Orion is near setting (i.e. the time of autumn gales), so long as the beloved accepts his suit. That is both more optimistic and more demanding.

[10] Cf. Cairns, op. cit., ch. 1 n. 29 and add Hom. *Od.* 8. 461; Ar. *Pax* 719. *Vivas* should also depend on *licet*, since 'farewell' and 'remember me' are a fixed pair.

[11] So Friedrich, art. cit. 93; cf. pp. 83 f., p. 86 n. 4 above.

bull, because she was swayed by love; and the bull is an *adulter*.[1] So too then, Galatea, like Cynthia in Prop. 1. 8, is leaving Horace for love of another. Europa has betrayed her *pietas* to her father; so too Galatea is unfit to be called *pia* towards the man whose affection for her is like a father's or a husband's. All this is very far from Moschus. Horace's lines 34–6 echo his Hellenistic predecessor (146–8), but there there is no sense of guilt—Europa calls herself simply 'unhappy'—and indeed all she does is to mount the bull in a spirit of girlish playfulness. Horace's treatment of the story is also distinguished from Moschus' by its gloom. Europa's travelling is simply a source of terror to her; and unlike Moschus' Zeus, Jupiter says nothing to relieve her anxieties, and evidently disappears as soon as they arrive in Crete. Thus Europa is able to burst into a flood of self-accusation, culminating in the resolve to commit suicide. This accords with the structure of the poem as previously described: Europa feels and gives voice to sentiments which reflect the poet's chagrin and express a veiled admonition to Galatea. So at the end what Europa has to face is not the joys of love,[2] but the heavy responsibility of being Zeus' 'wife';[3] the final phrase, as has often been observed, is somewhat cold comfort.[4] Rather than say firmly, as Moschus does at the end of his poem, that Europa slept with the god and bore him children, Horace suggests that she has gained simply a less than attentive lover. Lines 71 f. do not imply Jupiter will come back often; and indeed it is the gods' habit to sleep only once with mortal women.[5] The poem ends, then, on a note of unease.

None of this is to deny the delicate irony of Horace's poem; but it is an irony which plays over human sentiments, not a void. It should also be distinguished, for example, from that of *Odes* 3. 11 where again a mythical analogy is used to convey a kind of warning. Horace there, as a seducer, seeks to win over his elusive girl by likening himself to a husband saved from a horrible death by his wife; if Lyde refuses his suit, it is implied, she will be as guilty as the murderous Danaids and punished like them, while the poet's plight will be as bad as their husbands': if she accepts, she will be on a level with a paragon of courage and fidelity, Hypermnestra, and her evasion of parental control as noble as the mythical heroine's. The analogy is designedly outrageous: whereas Hypermnestra saves her husband's life by sending him away from her bed, Lyde is to gratify Horace's desires by taking him into hers. But it neatly characterizes a wily Don Juan who is seeking to win over a naïve girl and so is suitably entrusted to Mercury, the god of trickery. In 3. 27 the humour is less broad because the poet is cast in a more serious role, that of the deserted lover; it is rather a natural outgrowth from the 'mature' attitude of lines

[1] Cf. Friedrich, art. cit. 89–95. Europa's whole speech is an admission of responsibility and *furore* (36) points, as Kiessling–Heinze observe, to 'Liebeswahn'. Note also that *impudens* (49 f.) would be a possible word for one who breaks faith with a lover (cf. Pichon, op. cit. 243 on *pudor* etc. applied 'ad fidem uxoriam, id est inter amantes perpetuo servatam').

[2] Venus is *perfidum ridens* because she has beguiled Europa into a passion for the bull: Cupid is *remisso arcu* because now the deception, and with it the infatuation, is over.

[3] *Esse nescis* (73) should be translated, 'you do not know how to be', its proper meaning in Latin; and it is hard to see how a Roman reader could recognize that any other sense was intended, especially since Greek words of knowing take a participle, not a infinitive. It is then picked up and reinforced by *disce* (74). Cf. Büchner, art. cit. 638.

[4] Cf. *Od.* 4. 2. 3 f.: *vitreo daturus nomina ponto*. There too it is implied that the reward is less than the risk and its consequences.

[5] Cf. Maas, *Sitz.-Ber. Philol. Verein Berlin* 1919, 6 f. = *Kleine Schriften* (Munich, 1973) 66 f.

1–24.[1] Horace is not protesting too much, and even as he allows stronger feelings to emerge, he maintains the saving gracefulness of an ironical restraint.

III

To enlarge a little the idea of the function of myth sketched here, we may briefly consider two other poems, the song of Lycidas in Theoc. 7 and Prop. 3. 15.

Lycidas' piece is another lover's *propemptikon*, though of an unusual kind. He begins with a prayer for a safe voyage, but one conditional on the traveller's granting his suit (52–60). Then, after repeating his prayer in an unqualified form (62 f.), he imagines a rural banquet—a banquet not to celebrate with Ageanax his return to Cos, but his arrival in Mytilene.[2] Now if Lycidas repeats his prayer without conditions, that means one of two things: either he is tacitly giving up hope of imposing them or he is assuming his love to have been accepted.[3] But equally, at this point of time, when things are still in suspense, that assumption can be no more than wishful thinking; and what is more, the consequence of the boy's responding to Lycidas' wishes is that he will successfully go off to Mytilene. So there are sorrows to drown at the feast.[4] On this bitter-sweet occasion one Tityrus will produce songs based on two stories. The first is straightforward enough: Daphnis is wasting away for unrequited love;[5] and it has already emerged how Lycidas up till now has avoided reacting to any indifference of his beloved's. This he does here, obliquely, in the myth. The second is rather more involved. It concerns a 'goatherd' (78), whose name is later revealed to be Comatas (83). He endured the cruelty of a 'king' or 'master' (79 ἄνακτος), who shut him up in a 'chest' or 'coffin' (78 λάρναξ). The victim, however, survived, being miraculously fed by bees. Now calling the protagonist first simply 'the goatherd' is presumably designed to suggest a parallel with Lycidas himself, whose character as such is heavily stressed (13–19); so also ἄνακτος echoes the name Ageanax and indicates the lover's dependence on him.[6] Now, being 'buried alive' is sometimes a metaphorical expression of despair, particularly at the loss of someone or something dearly loved.[7] Thus in Antiphon's *Tetralogies* (2. β 10, γ 12) two fathers speaking of bereavement:

> . . . ἐπί τε τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀπαιδίᾳ ζῶν ἔτι κατορυχθήσομαι.
> . . . τοῖς γονεῦσιν, οἳ ζῶντες κατορωρύγμεθα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ . . .

or an epigram on his exile ascribed to Seneca (*Anth. Lat.* 1. 236. 7 Riese):

> Parce (sc. Corsica) relegatis, hoc est, iam parce sepultis:[8]
> vivorum cineri sit tua terra levis.

[1] On the ἦθος of the poem see the fine remarks of Friedrich, art. cit. 96 f., 99 f.

[2] On these modifications of the *propemptikon* and what they express cf. Cairns, op. cit. 27 f., 163 f.

[3] See also Gow on line 64.

[4] As also in Prop. 3. 17; Tib. 1. 2. 1–4; Tib. 3. 6. Ott, *Die Kunst des Gegensatzes in Theokrits Hirtengedichten* (Hildesheim, 1969), 150, aptly remarks: 'Beides, die Freude der Erinnerung und die Trauer über die Trennung, werden beim Fest des Hirten gegenwärtig sein'.

[5] Cf. Gow's commentary, 2.

[6] Cf. Lawall, *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals* (Washington, 1967), 93.

[7] Cf. further Ov. *Ibis* 16 and La Penna ad loc.; Mozart–Da Ponte, *Così fan tutte*, Act I scene iii: 'Ah, Ferrando perdendo mi par che viva a seppellirmi andrei'.

[8] This reading (*V*) is plainly superior to *solutis* (*AB*).

Further, being fed by bees is a familiar symbolic cause of poetic inspiration.[1] This point is made in effect by Theocritus himself who, having said that the bees nourished Comatas, goes on: 'because the Muse had poured sweet nectar over his mouth' (82). If, then, we applied the myth immediately to Lycidas, it would amount to saying that despite, or indeed thanks to the cruelty of his beloved, his inspiration will be renewed. The same sentiment is expressed by Anacreon (*P.M.G.* 378 Page):

> ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον πτερύγεσσι κούφαις
> διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ⟨παῖς ἐ⟩θέλει συνηβᾶν.[2]

But Lycidas now retires behind the figure of the other goatherd; he concludes more modestly, wishing he could have enjoyed Comatas' company and song and imagining what pleasures that would have brought him. This is a version of ἀσυχία, freedom from the cares of love, the notion with which Simichidas ends his song (126) and which governs the whole poem.[3] Here too nature, so far from being affected by the lover's grief, as with Daphnis, supplies a peaceful and agreeable background; the contrast is stressed by having ὤρεα and δρυσίν in 87 f. echo ὄρος and δρύες in 74. The myths, then, represent two fantasies of the singer; on the one hand love so unhappy that it ends in death, on the other an ordeal or a rejection which leads, however, to the enjoyment of poetic inspiration and carefree leisure. So Lycidas' suffering and ambitions are both at last resolved in the figure of Comatas[4] whose experience is considered simply a delight (83). By means of the myth, in other words, the singer is enabled to explore with delicacy his wilder feelings in the situation and escape beyond them into a world of bucolic freedom and creativity.

The basic likeness between the myth and the rest in Prop. 3. 15 is clearly stated by Rothstein in his introduction to the poem. As Dirce out of jealousy maltreated her servant Antiope, so Cynthia her servant Lycinna. Further, the conclusion of the story makes it clear that it is designed as a warning; otherwise there could be no point in describing Dirce's unhappy end. But the poem can hardly fulfil its nature as such unless the parallel goes a little further; the punishment of Dirce must correspond to some punishment imagined for Cynthia. The obvious one to inflict it is Propertius himself; and he has his double in the myth in the shape of Jupiter, once Antiope's lover as Propertius was Lycinna's. Just as the poet for over two years has hardly exchanged a word with his former mistress (7 f.), so Jupiter does not at all come swiftly to the aid of Antiope, his *puella* (19–22); but in the course of time she is avenged and the god vindicated (39 f.), as it is hinted Lycinna and Propertius will be. But the myth also gives some attention to Antiope's sons, Amphion and Zethus, who carry out the punishment. Even if it comes late, they make a display of *pietas*

[1] Cf. *R.E.* iii. 447 f. s.v. Biene.

[2] That the flight and the wings are those of poesy is clear from Aristophanes' parody (*Av.* 1372). Anacreon is reversing the commonplace that the poet is inspired by the beloved's favour (e.g. Anacr. ap. Himer. *Or.* 48. 4): cf. Prop. 2. 24. 5–8.

[3] Cf. Pohlenz, *Kleine Schriften* ii (Hildesheim, 1965), 27 f. = *Charites, Friedrich Leo . . . dargebracht* (Berlin, 1911), 102 f. For the use of the word ἡσυχία (or in Latin *otium*) cf. e.g. *A.P.* 5. 133 (Maccius); Ov. *Am.* 1. 9. 41. For the country as an escape from love cf. Hor. *Od.* 1. 17. 21–8; *Epod.* 2. 37 f.; Ov. *Rem. Am.* 169 ff.; and for poetry in the same function cf. Theoc. 11. 1–3 adduced by Ott, op. cit. 151 n. 426.

[4] Cf. Ott, op. cit. 151: Comatas becomes 'in der gegenwärtigen Situation der Liebesnot . . . zum Rettungsanker'.

when they rediscover their mother (35). So also Propertius, long as he has all but ignored Lycinna, implicitly threatens to recognize his bond with her and reinstate her in his affections.[1] That the parallel is here with an example of filial *pietas* is the more appropriate since it was Lycinna who instructed in love the adolescent poet (5 f.);[2] and that his narrative should be infused with sympathy for Antiope (esp. 13–16, 19–22) is only fitting when he remembers the generosity of Lycinna as a mistress with such nostalgia (6). But here again the myth is in danger of carrying the writer too far. Already as it begins Propertius is trying to veil the threat it will convey; for he is content to leave implicit just what the analogy between Cynthia and Dirce is meant to be. This is why *testis erit* in line 11 is not overtly linked to anything in lines 1–10, thus creating a highly elliptical transition; and for the same reason no lacuna should be posited between lines 10 and 11. Likewise at the end (45 f.) Propertius asserts again that his only love is Cynthia; there can be no question of his leaving her for another, still less of his meting out to her the sort of treatment Dirce had to endure. The warning which the poem was originally designed to embody dissolves into protestations of faithfulness; but the myth has served the poet to express at least a fantasy of abandoning or punishing his beloved and finding another.

IV

It would naturally be possible to go back beyond Theocritus in illustrating this use of myth. So in a famous passage from Sophocles' *Antigone* (944–87) the chorus, though initially offering consolation, insinuate through the stories of Lycurgus and Cleopatra an attitude of condemnation towards the heroine and a memory of the horrors which have befallen the Labdacids; again the legends serve for the expression of feelings which the speaker has reason to intimate only in a veiled form. The chorus cannot simply comfort Antigone; but their harsher observations are conveyed with tact. But what is perhaps most appropriate to note at this point is that the Hellenistic and Roman poets are simply keeping alive one of the oldest functions of myth. From the earliest documents of Greek literature (Hom. *Il.* 9. 524–605, *Od.* 14. 459–509; Hes. *Op.* 202–12) we are familiar with the αἶνος, the story told to convey a warning or a request in a diplomatic way. And it is this purpose which Karl Meuli in a brilliant and delightful monograph[3] has singled out as the very essence of the fable. The poems of Horace and Propertius discussed here were seen to have the character of an admonition; the other two do not, but they still use myths in a similar way for the oblique or restrained expression of feeling. In all these cases the employment of myth has the qualities the ancient rhetoricians called πάθος and ἦθος; πάθος in that it conveys feelings, ἦθος in that it conveys them through a civilized attitude. Thus it enables the poet to marshal the 'undisciplined squads of emotion' and to let human sentiments speak in a realistic and significant manner.

Christ Church, Oxford C. W. MACLEOD

[1] For the threat of getting another and better woman cf. Cairns, op. cit. 81.

[2] On lovers' *pietas* see above, p. 89 n. 7.

[3] *Wesen und Herkunft der Fabel* (Basle, 1954). The distinction between myth and fable is not relevant here, since it is simply their character as stories and examples which is in question.