

century,⁹ and I should not be surprised if his short dialogue between Clonarion and Leaena, with its clear statement about the existence in Lesbos of homosexual women, had been instrumental in giving currency to the new meaning.¹⁰

Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples

ALBIO CESARE CASSIO

as homosexual, as Wilamowitz did (*Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin, 1913), p. 72 n. 3), the Samian γυναῖκας... ὑπὸ τρυφῆς καὶ ὕβρεως ἀκόλαστα ποιούσας of Plut. *quaest. gr.* 54. W. Kroll in his article *Lesbische Liebe* (*RE* 12 col. 2101) is more cautious ('vielleicht').

⁹ See K. Mraz, 'Die Überlieferung Lucians', *Sitzb. Ak. Wiss. Wien, Philos.-hist. Klasse* 167 n. 7 (Wien, 1911), 233 f.

¹⁰ I am very grateful to Professor H. D. Jocelyn, who improved this note both in form and in content, and to Mr N. G. Wilson, who kindly answered letters concerning Arethas.

CATULLUS' DIVORCE

Why does Catullus in his eleventh poem tell Furius and Aurelius to take an unpleasant message to his girl-friend? After all, in the eighth poem he imagines himself able to do the job alone: 'uale puella' (12). Has his courage just evaporated? Or is it that he wants to put his messengers, whom he perhaps does not like, in an awkward position (so Baehrens, and more tentatively Fordyce)? Kroll is not sure why the poet chooses intermediaries. Some think they came in the first place from the girl, who wanted reconciliation, and that this poem is Catullus' response. But the poet is usually able to make it plain, as in poems 7 and 85, that he is replying to a question (cf. Prop. 2. 1 and 31); here that standard device is missing, and should not be introduced. This note offers a new solution to the problem, and identifies the imagined situation in such a way that the eleventh poem can be seen to be in harmony with the poet's attitude to his idealised love-affair.

Marriage dominated Catullus' imagination. He has given us two marriage poems, 61 and 62, his little epos, 64, describes the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, and he translated a poem of Callimachus, 66, that was dedicated to a bride. More daring is his way of regarding his love-affair as a sort of marriage and adopting some of the language of an actual Roman marriage; this is well described by G. Williams in *JRS* 48 (1958), 25. That idealised affair, however, came to an end, and in the eleventh poem the repudiation is made plain. It has not been appreciated that here too Catullus persists in seeing the affair as a sort of marriage: to break it off he has adopted the Roman legal form of 'diuortium per nuntium'.

Whenever the *affectio maritalis* upon which Roman marriage was based broke down, divorce could be agreed by both partners. But a unilateral *repudium* had to be announced either *per litteras* or *per nuntium* (v. M. Kaser, *Das röm. Privatrecht* i [1971], p. 327; at *De Orat.* 1. 183 Cicero tells of a man who failed to send the messenger and so confused inheritance). Catullus has an eye to the proper form and appoints Furius and Aurelius to be the *nuntii* of his divorce (*nuntiate*, 15). A husband did not have to give grounds, but Catullus does so in line 17: his 'wife' has committed adultery. *Moechis* are not just lovers, as Baehrens said; the choice of word keeps to the metaphorical view of the love-affair as a sort of marriage. There was no fixed formula for divorce when the marriage was entered into *sine manu* (v. A. Watson, *The law of persons in the later Roman Republic* [1967], pp. 53 f.), so *uiuat ualeatque* would probably suffice for dismissal.

Catullus therefore was consistent in his vision of his relationship with his mistress. It was a sort of marriage, and its ending required a sort of divorce, formal, *per nuntium*.

The poet could rely upon the Roman reader's intuitive recognition of this legal form of repudiation, just as he expected the *flagitatio* of 42 to make its point (v. E. Fraenkel, *JRS* 51 [1961], 49ff. = *Kl. Btrg.* 2 [1964], 120–5).

Birkbeck College, London

ROLAND MAYER

AN ACROSTIC IN VERGIL (*AENEID* 7. 601–4)?

In any competition for monuments of wasted labour the collection of accidental acrostics in Latin poets published by I. Hilberg¹ would stand a good chance of a prize. But amongst his examples of 'neckische Spiele des Zufalls' (269) is one I am gullible enough to believe may be more significant. In *Aeneid* 7. 601–15 Vergil describes the custom of opening the gates of war in a long anacoluthic sentence, the first four lines of which run:

Mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes
Albanæ coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum
Roma colit, cum prima movent in proelia Martem,
Sive Getis inferre manu lacrimabile bellum...

This may be pure chance; but the consonance with the subject matter is remarkable, and certainly stronger than the parallels Hilberg adduces. Given the impeccable Hellenistic precedents,² is it inconceivable that Vergil should have used an acrostic in this way? I await the men in white coats.

Jesus College, Oxford

D. P. FOWLER

¹ 'Ist die Ilias Latina von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?' *WS* 21 (1899), 264–305; 22 (1900), 317–8.

² Pease on Cic. *de div.* 2. 111, E. Vogt, 'Das Akrostichon in der griechischen Literatur', *AA* 13 (1966), 80–97 and the literature cited p. 80 n. 1.

THE CIVIL STATUS OF CORYDON

There is a suspicion in the minds of a number of Virgil's modern commentators that Corydon, the lover-shepherd of the second *Eclogue*, is himself a slave, and that the *dominus* of his beloved Alexis (who may be the Iollas of line 57) is his master too.¹ It is the purpose of this note to show that the suspicion is baseless.

None of the ancient commentators appears to know of such an interpretation. This should be significant in that they probably shared the poet's assumptions about literary *decorum*. We can gather how Virgil viewed the function of slaves in poetry of an exalted genre by looking at the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics*. The essential considerations were set out by W. E. Heitland in *Agricola* (1921), pp. 218–41. Virgil

¹ These commentators, with or without diffidence, take Corydon to be a slave: Conington (ed. 5, 1898), Perret (1961), Coleman (1977), Williams (1979); Forbiger (ed. 4, 1872) asserted that he is free. The list can be lengthened in favour of servitude: H. J. Rose, *The Eclogues of Virgil* (1942), p. 34; E. W. Leach, *AJP* 87 (1966), 441; M. C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art* (1970), p. 83; G. Lee, *Greece and Rome* 28 (1981), 10 f.; W. V. Clausen in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* ii (1982), p. 307.