

OBSERVATIONS ON TWO POEMS
OF CATULLUS

1. *Carm.* 51. 13-16:

*Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est:
otio exsultas nimiumque gestis:
otium et reges prius et beatas
perdidit urbes.*

This note does not advance definitive arguments to solve the riddle whether we should keep this stanza as a part of *carm.* 51, or detach it. My intention is a humbler one: I wish to demonstrate that the widespread notion that Catullus here seriously deplores a moral lapse and heaps blame upon himself is erroneous, and that the consequent objection to attaching the stanza to the rest of *carm.* 51, on the grounds that cold water is poured on passion, is not valid. This twinpronged objection of Catullus' lofty self-castigation and its unflattering aspersions on Lesbia, is current in highly respectable quarters. C. J. Fordyce¹), introduces the poem with these remarks: "It is hardly conceivable that to his version of so famous a poem, in which he had made Sappho's words his own, he should have appended a self-admonitory quatrain which threw cold water on his passion with the virtuous opening 'Your trouble, Catullus, is not having anything to do.'" L. P. Wilkinson finds that retaining this stanza would be inconsistent with his view of the poem as an erotic "feeler" thrown out by a shy and wary Catullus to test Lesbia's feelings for him. He says: "Now if this interpretation of the 51st. poem is true (as = erotic "feeler"), the inclusion of anything like the "Otium, Catulle" stanza would defeat its purpose, turning his declarations of love to a self-mockery unflattering to his beloved."²) A rather more sophisticated position is held by Augusto Rostagni. The swerve from passion to practical commonsense and self-reproach is paralleled, he says, by that of the Theocritean Cyclops in the eleventh *Idyll*. Furthermore, he finds that Catullus is *both* seriously upbraiding himself *and* paying a compliment to Lesbia. Through the self-reproach, he says, Ca-

1) In his *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford 1961).

2) In *Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique, Entretiens Tome II* (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1953) 48.

tullus “faceva indirettamente sentire la travolgente potenza della passione da lei ispirata”³).

Let us pause for a while to deal with Rostagni's views. There is, first of all, an important difference between our poem and Theoc. *Idyll* 11. In this *Idyll* it is the author's purpose to show his medical friend Nicias that song is an effective remedy for love, and the poet chooses the Cyclops, an ancient compatriot of his, as a paradigm. With such a didactic premise, the Cyclops *has* to turn aside from his amorous dreaming to the practical tasks at hand. No assumptions are made in the Catullan poem which demand a volte-face at the end. Secondly, although it is not un-Catullan to offer a compliment indirectly⁴), it is one thing to offer a compliment in a roundabout fashion, but quite another matter where the person to be flattered must first sidestep obviously uncomplimentary notions before arriving at the compliment. This latter method cannot be classified as shyness or subtlety; it is simply bad writing and in bad taste. What would matter to any woman is not the mere fact that she made an impact on a man, but rather *how he reacted to her as a person*. It is no compliment to Lesbia for Catullus to declare “I feel very keenly the passion you inspire in me; it must be a powerful passion, but I blame myself for succumbing to you”. This is a genuflexion to Eros, but it does not betray any high regard for its particular manifestation in Lesbia, – and it is certainly this latter aspect which is important for any personal relationship. Rostagni's opinion is a case of cleverness born of desperation; it cannot stand. We shall see that Catullus is not seriously blaming himself in this stanza, and he may even be complimenting Lesbia for her agency in occasioning in him an experience which puts him on the same level with kings and prosperous cities. To substantiate these views, we must turn to an examination of the function and the effect of the paradigm in the *otium*-stanza.

The thought at the root of lines 15–16 has been admirably

3) *Ibid.* 49.

4) In *carm.* 13 there is an oblique compliment to Lesbia on her taste in unguents, and it is flattering to her that she can receive gifts from *Veneres Cupidinesque* (12). In *carm.* 43 the catalogue of qualities which Ameana, named in *carm.* 41, does not possess, must be a list of those which Lesbia does have. See my article, *Color Romanus in Catullus* 51, *Latomus* 25 (1966) 448–60 for the view that in *carm.* 51 there is again an oblique compliment to Lesbia, – that she is a *dea*, – based on the popular Roman belief that a mortal cannot face a deity except by divine favour (*fas sit vidisse*). On *carm.* 13 and 43, see 459, n. 2.

explained by Prof. Ed. Fraenkel⁵). It is based on a theory of moralizing historiographers, particularly developed during the Hellenistic period, according to which long periods of peace and freedom from external threats produced a slackening in the physical and moral tensions of a nation and culminated in degeneration and collapse. But Fraenkel's view of the function and the effect of this paradigm is unsatisfactory. He says on p. 213: "The magnitude of the *exemplum*, which does not point to this or that particular case but to a general rule established in history, serves to intensify the heaviness of the preceding self-reproach and to invest it with greater seriousness than it would have if it were expressed merely in the conventional terms of a lover's complaint and remorse". It must evidently be admitted that a common effect of a lofty paradigm, taken from the realm of history or myth, is to impart dignity to human action and make it weightier. The ideal events and patterns of behaviour established in the glorified past serve as a backdrop against which the experiences of presentday humanity, uncertain and unstable, could find corroboration and explanation. Thus when Syriskos in Menander *Epirr.* 149ff adduces the experiences of Neleus and Pelias from myth to support his argument for the restoration of the baby's trinkets, weight accrues from the paradigm. But although the exalted past always provides an ideal and firmly established picture by which we can measure human achievement, the effect of a paradigm is not always to give weight to human experience. An equally important function of myth is *to make lighter the experiences of mankind*, and to this usage we must now turn.

It is a commonplace in ancient *consolationes* that we have no right to grieve ceaselessly when greater figures than ourselves have suffered as much or more. Thus Cicero writes in *ad fam.* 6. 6. 12: *levat enim dolorem communis quasi legis et humanae condicionis recordatio*. Seneca advises Marcia in *De cons.* 12. 4: *circumfer per omnem notorum, ignotorum frequentiam oculos, occurrent tibi passi ubique maiora. Senserunt ista magni duces, senserunt principes; ne deos quidem fabulae immunes reliquerunt, puto, ut nostrorum funerum levamentum esset etiam divina concidere*. The effect here is not at all to intensify the weight of the human experience; rather it is to make it lighter and bearable, by showing that the sufferer is not isolated, not beyond the pale of common human vicissitudes, but has companions in woe among similar or greater personages. It is in

5) In his *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 212-13.

this spirit that Phaedra's nurse tells her at Eur. *Hipp.* 439: "Why are you amazed at this passion? It is an experience you share with many mortals", – ἐρᾶς. τί τοῦτο θαῦμα; σὺν πολλοῖς βροτῶν⁶). In our Catullan poem, the poet makes lighter the calamity which has befallen him. The powerful assailant *otium*, before whose onslaught even kings and rich cities fell, has also made Catullus its victim. There is dignity in such a comparison, for our poet is put on a par with great entities. But there is the suggestion as well that Catullus' calamity is very much to be expected. When *reges* and *beatae urbes* succumb to *otium*, it is to expect too much of a poor mortal that he should be able to withstand it. Let us now turn to another use of mythical paradigm where the effect of making the human experience lighter is the same as in *consolationes*, but the purpose of the paradigm is to excuse or justify behaviour which might seem to be objectionable.

It is inherent in any mythological system whose characters are also endowed with human frailties, that it would provide not only praiseworthy precedents, but also blameworthy ones. The human 'sinner' who appeals to the glorified past for *exempla* to excuse or justify his own shortcomings does not differ, as far as method goes, from the respectable person seeking by an appeal to the same court to support his decent proposals or his conduct. Also, the mere fact that an evildoer can compare himself with a figure from a charmed past showers him with glamour rather than opprobrium, and to such an extent that it tends to obliterate the culpability of his actions. This use of myth we find for instance at Ovid *Am.* 2. 8. 13–14, where the philandering poet justifies himself for having a affair with a slave girl, – Cypassis, Corinna's maidservant, – by claiming Homeric precedent! *Nec sum ego Tantalide maior, nec maior Achille; | quod decuit reges, cur mihi turpe putem?* In a similar way the excitable youth Chaerea takes his inspiration from no meaner personage than Jove himself, when he sets about ravishing Pamphila at Ter. *Eum.* 583–91. There was in the room a picture of Juppiter descending into the *gremium* (585) of Danae in the form of a shower of gold. First the

6) So too the nurse Mania in Menander's *Tithe* (fr. 396 Körte) appeals to the men in the audience and suggests that each of them had at some time or other committed a crime similar to her own, involving the substitution of a baby, and she thus excuses herself by making everyone else equally blameworthy, and provides a consolation for her plight, fettered at the mill, since a rapport is established with humanity in general. On this see the highly instructive article by Thomas Williams, *Towards the Recovery of a Prologue from Menander*, *Hermes* 91 (1963) 287–333, esp. 322.

girl, then Chaerea, look at this erotic paradigm. It is the young man's inspiration as well as his excuse. He says at 586-91: *quia consimilem luserat | iam olim ille ludum, impendio magis animu' gaudebat mihi, | deum sese in hominem convortisse atque in alienas tegulas | venisse clanculum: per inpluvium fucum factum mulieri. | At quem deum! qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit. | Ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego illud vero ita feci - ac lubens.*

There is an interesting example in Horace. It has long ago been observed, but restated with greater emphasis by Fraenkel, *op. cit.* 211, that Horace picks up Catullus' thrice-repeated *otium* and uses it in a similar anaphora but with a different significance at *Odes* 2. 16⁷). But if Horace in that ode used *otium* merely as a "motto", there is another poem of his where his use of weighty paradigms to excuse his falling victim to undesirable emotions may profitably be compared with Catullus. At *Odes* 1. 16, we have an amusingly pompous plea for forgiveness for past *irae*. Lines 17-22 form an illuminating parallel to Catullus: *irae Thyestien exitio gravi | stravere et altis urbibus ultimae | steterae causae cur perirent | funditus imprimeretque muris | hostile aratrum exercitus insolens. | compesce mentem: me quoque* etc. Horace's *altae urbes* recall Catullus' *beatae urbes*, but for the generalizing *reges* of the earlier poet, we have here Thyestes, specially chosen as an example of monstrous anger. In Horace's poem, the purpose of apology is expressly declared and the humour sustained and patent. But he seems to furnish a close enough parallel to Catullus as far as the function and effect of the paradigm are concerned. In each case the poet, with a varying degree of humour, introduces lofty paradigms which share some fault with him and he thus *diminishes his own blameworthiness*. The paradigm employed in such a way as to excuse one's own weakness is seen in Catullus *carm.* 66. 43-7, where the *coma* says: *ille quoque eversus mons est, quem maximum in oris | progenies Thiae clara supervehitur, | cum Medi peperere novum mare, cumque iuventus | per medium classi barbara navit Athon. | Quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant?* Thus, in the final stanza of *carm.* 51, we could perhaps sum up Catullus' case in such words as these: *Quid homuncio faciat noster Catullus, otio cum reges prius, cum beatae olim urbes perierint?* Not only is the element of self-reproach mitigated, but Catullus' rapprochement with such imposing entities as *reges* and *beatae urbes* is flattering to him. The

7) See H. Womble, Horace *carm.* 2. 16 in *AJP* 88 (1967) 385-409, esp. 387-90.

implications of flattery for Catullus are not, of course, thrown out with the plain boldness of an Ovidian grin; they are obvious without our being given special pointers. An instance where we find the sufferer proud of an affliction through which he takes his stand by the side of great figures occurs in Petronius, *Sat.* 139, where the victim of a wrathful Priapus begins: *non solum me numen et implacabile fatum | persequitur. Prius* etc., and rounds off his observations with *me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor | Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi*. Consolation here becomes self-eulogy! The *schema dianoiias* here is exactly parallel to Catullus'; the difference lies in our poet's omission to applaud his lofty fate. We should observe that since the glamorous comparison with *reges* and *beatae urbes* is due to Lesbia's role in Catullus' life, the implications of this stanza are flattering to her as well.

Interpreted in this way, the *otium*-stanza does not pour cold water on passion by any self-denunciation. Before we leave it, we may make a few general remarks on the humour of Catullus' paradigm. Scholars have been blind to this obviously humorous use of a paradigm out of all proportion to the humbler human instance. If we ask ourselves why, the answer would perhaps lie partly in the tendency to associate Ovid, rather than Catullus with intellectual subtlety in love poetry⁸). But there are some cases where, no matter how seriously a paradigm is invoked, it strikes us as being rather too "ambitious", and its weight threatens to crush the human parallel and put it in a somewhat ridiculous light. This accounts equally for the humour in Horace *Odes* 1. 16, and the Menandrian passage cited already, *Epitr.* 149ff. In the latter instance we doubt neither the seriousness nor the moral rectitude of Syriskos' appeal to the example set in the cases of Pelias and Neleus. Nonetheless, the audience could not help feeling that there was hardly any chance that the baby involved would be of such exalted rank as the figures from myth. This basic improbability provides humour, as does the fact that Syriskos uses the mythical incident not only for its persuasive power, but also as a means of magnifying himself⁹).

8) On the Ovidian stance see for instance E. J. Kenney's essay, *Nequitiae Poeta* in *Ovidiana*, ed. I. Herescu (Paris 1959); also in the same volume E. de Saint Denis, *Le malicieux Ovide*. The tendency of Ovid to parody the sentimental clichés of his elegiac predecessors is well shown in *Amores* 1. 7, on which see my article in *Latomus* 25 (1966) 880-94.

9) He is sensitive about Smikrines' disdainful remarks to mere workmen, - *διφθέρως ἔχοντες* (53-4) and he carefully draws the old man's attention

Recent scholarship has gone a far way to show that Catullus was a very conscientious artist, even in the short personal poems, where a reader would perhaps be tempted to think that he was heedless of form and *doctrina*, and swept along by unbridled emotion¹⁰). I do not propose to list instances of Catullan wit or irony or humour in the love poems, but an interesting example of humour in a poem concerning Lesbia is *carm.* 92. There he tells us that Lesbia is always being rude to him. The devil himself might find that too difficult to interpret. Not so Catullus. He has a ready answer. He is always cursing her, and he loves her. She curses him, therefore, he declares, she must love him as well! Even if the poem fits the image of a crossed lover desperately squeezing a favourable interpretation out of anything, and having recourse to a quasi-syllogistic argument in order to convince himself that his love is requited, the humour remains. Catullus, or anyone else, did not have to read Aristotle before he could see the falsehood in such reasoning. The poem was meant to entertain, – Lesbia, as well as the general reader. If *carm.* 51 was an erotic “feeler”, an idea I willingly share with L.P. Wilkinson, *op. cit.* 47, a measure of humour in the *otium*-stanza would not defeat this purpose. Catullus might well have accounted such humour a stylistically pleasing and emotionally useful device. The poem would function as a subtle declaration of love which steered clear of giving the impression that he was ‘crawling’ at Lesbia’s feet¹¹). Such humour, born of that enviable amalgam of intellectual control and emotional sensitivity, was likely to draw forth a favourable response, in the first place from Lesbia, and later, perhaps, from a circle of close friends.

to the fact that the rescuer of Neleus and Pelias wore exactly the same attire as he does, – *πρεσβύτης ἀνήρ | αἰπόλος, ἔχων οἶαν ἐγὼ νῦν διπθέραν* (151–2). T.B.L. Webster fails to recognise the humour here. He says in *Studies in Menander* (Manchester 1950) 156: “Tragedy had become a classic to be quoted as a source of wisdom, whether in all seriousness as by Syriskos in the *Epitrepontes* or for comic effect as by Demeas in the *Samia*”. Syriskos does indeed offer the paradigm “in all seriousness,” but its comic aspect must not be ignored.

10) See for instance J.P. Elder, *HSCP* 60 (1951) 101–36; W.M.A. Grimaldi, S.J., *CP* 60 (1965) 87–93; Steele Commager, *HSCP* 70 (1965) 83–110.

11) This of course does not mean that his feelings were not strong. So too in poem 8 poignant feelings are given playful expression (at least in lines 15–18). See A.L. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*, (Berkeley 1934) 299, and refs. For a detailed analysis see my article in *Latomus* 27 (1968) 555–74.

2. *Carm.* 62. 39–58:

<i>Ut flos in saeptis secretus nascitur hortis,</i>	39
<i>ignotus pecori, nullo convulsus aratro,</i>	40
<i>quem mulcent aurae, firmat sol, educat imber;</i>	41

In an earlier study of 62. 39–58¹²), I offered a general analysis of the two stanzas and I suggested that Catullus could very well have relied upon Euripides, *Hipp.* 73 ff to provide a model for the chaste flower of line 39. In the present note, which is self-contained, it is the question of Catullus' models which I treat again in greater detail. Scholars have been in general agreement that it was Sappho who provided Catullus with a point of departure for the image of the unsullied flower. They vary however in their choice of the particular fragment, some preferring the hyacinth-fragment, (105 c Lobel-Page = 117 Diehl):

*οἶαν τὰν ὑάκινθον ἐν ὄρεσι ποίμενες ἄνδρες
πόσσι καταστειβοῖσι χάμαι δέ τε πόρφυρον ἄνθος...*

while others see greater relevance to the Catullan flower in the apple that hangs high above the heads of the pickers, (105 a Lobel-Page = 116 Diehl):

*οἶον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἐρεῦθεται ἄκρω ἐπ' ὕσδωι,
ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ, λελάθοντο δὲ μαλοδρόπτης·
οὐ μὰν ἐκλελάθοντ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐδύναντ' ἐπικεσθαι.*

Wilamowitz at *Hell. Dicht.* II, 279, rightly pointed out the closer connection between the latter fragment and Catullus' walled-in flower, out of reach and therefore chaste and to be greatly valued: "Bei Sappho haben wir die Blume auf dem Felde, die achtlos zertreten wird: die paßt in keines der catullischen Gleichnisse, läßt sich auch nicht für seine Antithesen verwenden. Aber trennen läßt sich davon das andere Bild der Sappho nicht, der Apfel, der für die Pflücker zu hoch hing; was den Gegensatz ergibt, daß was für jedermann erreichbar ist, keine Beachtung oder wenigstens keine Hochachtung findet." The context forms a link with Catullus as well; the girl for all the enthusiasm her suitors evince, remains intact (cf. Himerius *or.* 1. 16¹³). But there are obvious differences between Sappho and Catullus, despite their agreement

12) H. Akbar Khan, *On the Art of Catullus carm.* 62. 39–58 etc., *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 160–76.

13) The two Sapphic fragments are artfully brought together in Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*, 3. 33–4.

in the point of view presented. D. Braga in his *Catullo e i poeti greci*, Messina 1950, stresses them, p. 67, and they provide an occasion for him to eulogise the art with which the Neoteric could camouflage his plagiarisms: "Bisogna convenire che questi neoterici sono abilissimi nel consumare i furti letterari, variando magistralmente l'impostazione ed i particolari; e la loro abilità è anche maggiore in quanto sembrano nascondere i fili che li legano al modello, mentre li fanno risaltare perchè si noti l'arte con cui hanno variato lo spunto." I shall endeavour to show that Catullus forms a much more substantial link not only with the Euripidean passage I suggested previously (*art. cit.*), but also with Sophocles. As we go along, attention will be paid to the similarities between Catullus and these tragedians, but we must also be conscious of the differences, for it is this which will reveal how admirably our poet turned possible models to his own use.

I begin with Eur. *Hipp.* 73-81:

σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἔξ ἀκήρατον
 λειμῶνος, ὦ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,
 ἔνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βοτὰ
 οὔτ' ἤλθέ πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον
 μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἤρινή διέρχεται,
 Αἰδῶς δὲ ποταμίαισι κηπεύει δρόσοις,
 ὄσοις διδακτὸν μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει
 τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἴληχεν εἰς τὰ πάντ' αἰεί,
 τούτοις δρέπεσθαι, τοῖς κακοῖσι δ' οὐ θέμις.

Here, as in the Catullan passage, there is a basic symbolic relationship between the character of the place (meadow, walled garden) and the person associated with it (Hippolytus, maiden). In his edition of the play, Oxford 1964, W.S. Barrett observes, p. 172: "The exquisite picture of the ἀκήρατος λειμῶν has brought out (in transparent symbolism) the austere yet tender beauty of Hippolytus' life of outdoor purity." In both Eur. and Catullus, the rejection of sex is linked with purity of soul, and this moral integrity is invested with holiness. In Eur., the dramatic situation makes this holiness manifest. The meadow is itself probably sacred to Artemis, and Hippolytus culls a wreath from it for her statue. In Catullus we do not have any such realistic setting. For one thing, he is using a simile; and again he does not make the virgin's chastity give her any religious claims. Nevertheless the hieratic implications are no less clear. Just as the unpolluted meadow is out of bounds to the profane, so in Catullus is the

walled garden. It is untrodden by animals, and the word ἄβατος is applied to the sacred precinct of Semele at Eur. *Bacchae*, 10. Furthermore, Catullus' chaste maiden is much admired by boys and girls (42), who form, as it were, a group of devotees whom she can call *mei* or *mea turba* (cf. *suus* at 45). It is also this same aura of holiness attaching to the virgin which suggests to the boys in the stanza which follows the clever play on *colere* (53, 55, 56)¹⁴) which can mean both "cultivate" and "worship". Against the argument of the girls, they assert that the maiden, sexually pure though she be (*intacta*), must necessarily remain *without* "worshippers", — *inculta* (56). Whereas at 39ff the chaste girl has a group of "worshippers", the chaste Hippolytus is not similarly an object of worship; he is himself the devotee of a goddess. We have observed that in Catullus the holy atmosphere that envelops the maiden adorns her sexual purity without giving her any claims of a religious nature. For Hippolytus, however, his sexual innocence actually qualifies him for his privileged communion with Artemis. The close connection between physical virginity and moral integrity is brought out eloquently in the reference to his virgin soul, — *παρθένον ψυχὴν ἔχων* (1006).

In both the Greek passage and in the Latin, it is benevolent nature, unaided by human artifice, which makes the sacred precinct flourish. In Catullus *aurae, sol*, and *imber* (41) are straightforward and literal; in Eur., by contrast, religious significance is fused with a description of nature. Thus the reference to the bee (77) recalls the fact that Artemis' priestesses were so called, and it is dews of Reverence (78) which water the meadow. We shall find, however, that in the Greek author as well as in the Roman, the allusions to cattle and iron (*Hipp.* 75–6), and cattle and plough (Cat. 62. 40), are not made because the authors wish to stress the superfluity of such implements of cultivation when nature itself is the gardener. Cattle, plough and iron instrument will evidently not be used, but it is because both Eur. and Catullus considered them as *possible sources of pollution* that they mention them. In order to establish this parallelism here, it is necessary to examine both of our passages, for it is not apparent that they are fully understood. I take the Greek passage first.

Barrett says on *σίδηρος* (76): "i. e. agricultural implements of any kind." Against this interpretation the following objections may be raised. Cattle and iron occur in the same sentence

14) See my article, *op. cit.* (note 12) 171 ff.

and are obviously closely related. Now Eur. does not say "no cattle ploughed the meadow", as he would have if he wished to underscore the fact that it depended for its nurture only upon nature and not upon man's contrivances. He pointedly uses *φέρβειν* at 75 since the mere presence of cattle, their grazing in the meadow and fouling it would result in pollution. His thought and language are precise. It would indeed be strange if in a single sentence he is so specific in *φέρβειν βοτὰ*, but leaves a vaguely stated *σίδηρος* to mean any tool. Why, if Eur. was here concerned with implements, did he not mention any *tool* by name intending it to represent the whole range of farm tools, instead of mentioning a *metal*? I submit we must take Eur.'s expression here to be as literal and precise as his *φέρβειν βοτὰ*. With *σίδηρος*, he is again referring to pollution caused by the approach and presence (*ἤλθε*) of the alien and profane, not to the fact that no farm implements were used in the cultivation of the meadow. He means simply *the metal iron*. Whatever form it assumed, its presence would have defiled the meadow: it was generally banned from Greek sanctuaries¹⁵). But the matter does not end there. It has, in addition, a symbolic significance.

In this passage Eur. is extolling what is natural, *ἐν τῇ φύσει* (79), against what is learnt, *διδασκόν* (79). Only those who have been given *τὸ σωφρονεῖν* by divine dispensation and possess it in their nature have access to the sacred meadow, whereas those who have learnt it are excluded. Now this same antithesis between Nature and Learning is a recurrent motif in "primitivistic" writers who declare that in the Golden Age, when everything was in its natural state, and no technological advances had yet been made, men were happy and enjoyed all good things in abundance; but together with such learnt arts as ploughing, ship-building and overseas ventures, and in fact any tampering with the world's natural state, there came a loss of that paradisiac bliss and an endless round of toil and unhappiness. Metallurgy, like ploughing, would fall under the rubric *τὰ διδασκτά*, and is opposed to unspoiled nature, *φύσις*¹⁶). Iron, therefore, the product of

15) See the discussion by J.G. Frazer on Ovid, *Fasti* 5. 441 (vol. 4, p. 49), who quotes Plutarch. *praecepta gerend. republ.* 819E. Cf. Frazer, p. 95; "...as a general rule gods are opposed to innovations, and the introduction of iron was one of the most momentous innovations in the history of mankind."

16) On the natural bliss of the Golden Age see Hesiod, *Erg.* 116-20 etc. Maximus Tyrius, *Diss.* 36, quoted at length by Lovejoy and Boas, *Pri-*

a learnt art, would pollute the sacred meadow in the same way as those who had learnt virtue.

We find in line 40 of the Catullan poem, *ignotus pecori, nullo convulsus aratro*; the girls are concerned with *dissociating* the traditional symbols of bull and plough from the idea of vitality and increase. The equation of man in his sexual capacity with a bull or a plough is both old and widespread. Indeed ploughing was looked upon as so closely analogous to the copulation of human beings that this latter activity was practised in the fields themselves as a magical means of boosting the efficacy of ploughing¹⁷). Since the girls here are against marriage, they astutely use a dissonant scheme of sexual symbols to suggest the pollution of the flower and its destruction by cattle and plough. Their cleverness becomes even clearer when we think of the effect that would have been produced if they had used the traditional symbol of the wife as a field. There would have been no dissonance here between field and plough. In fact we may recall that the Greek formula of betrothal incorporated this symbolism. The *κύριος* of the girl gave her to her future husband "for her to be ploughed and made to produce genuine offspring", — *παίδων ἐπὶ ἄροτῳ γηγησίων* (Men. *Dysk.* 842; cf. *Perik.* 435 f; fr. 682 Körte). Cattle and plough here then, as cattle and iron in Eur., are not concerned with cultivation; they are a source of pollution, and in Catullus we have them in addition used as sexual symbols, for it is not pollution generally, but sexual taint which is underscored by the girls.

We should notice as well that it is not only the flower, cattle or bull, and the plough which fit into a symbolic scheme. *Ignotus* is to be taken in the sense of sexual or carnal knowledge. Fordyce

mitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity (New York 1935, reprinted 1965), 146–8, says of the abundance of fruit produced by the unmolested earth, — *ἅσα γῆ φέρειν φιλεῖ μηδὲν ὑπὸ γεωργῶν ἐνοχλουμένη*, and links man's decline with his tampering with nature: *καὶ παρέχοντες τῇ γῆ πλάσματα, μεταλλεύοντες αὐτήν καὶ σκάπτοντες καὶ ὀρύττοντες* etc. For the several passages relating the degeneration from the Golden Age with technological advancement in "primitivistic" writers, see the index of Lovejoy and Boas, *op. cit.* s. v. Agriculture, Metallurgy, Technological state of nature. The authors interestingly observe on Maximus, p. 145–6: "Prometheus, incidentally, appears in a role the reverse of his usual one: instead of culture-hero he is a deputy creator whose handiwork, the human species, is spoiled by the introduction of the arts and of private property." He appears as the "first finder" of metals at Aesch. *Prom.* 500–3.

17) See for instance M.L. West, Hesiod, *Theogony* (Oxford 1966), ad 969–71.

neglects to comment on it. Baehrens, on the other hand, offered comments which revealed his bewilderment. He says in his ed., Leipzig 1885, *ad loc.*: "Subobscurum atque difficile illud 'ignotus'; quae enim notitia flori cum pecore conculcante?" Whereupon he suggested *non ictus*. But we find *nosse* used for sexual knowledge at *carm.* 72. 1: *dicebas quondam solum te nosse Catullum*. The poet here alludes to a declaration of fidelity by Lesbia couched in terms of *univiria*, a conjugal ideal of the Roman *matrona* and a quality important enough to be recorded on epitaphs. Thus at *Carm. epigr.* 1872. 5, we read *maritum quem solum norat*¹⁸). And what about *pecori*? There is no doubt that it is meant to suggest the bull/husband equation, but it is, after all, the word for a flock or a herd¹⁹), and *pecus* is used contemptuously of men²⁰). We should bear it in mind that we have to do with a symbolic flower, i. e. one that is at least half-personified, and if this flower/maiden, walled in and aloof, with her group of devotees were to declare *ignotus sum pecori*, the quality of this declaration would not differ very much from Horace's *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (*Odes* 3. 1. 1)²¹). It would appear, then, that the girls not only arrange their scheme of sexual symbolism so that the traditional bull and plough occasion pollution and destruction, but also use *pecus* (instead of, say, *iuvenus* or *taurus*) because of its derogatory overtones.

I now leave this artfully contrived sexual symbolism of Catullus, and turn to the second passage I wish to discuss, Sophocles, *Trach.* 144-52²²):

τὸ γὰρ νεάζων ἐν τοιοῖσδε βόσκειται
 χώροισιν αὐτοῦ, καί νιν οὐ θάλαπος θεοῦ,
 οὐδ' ὄμβρος, οὐδὲ πνευμάτων οὐδὲν κλονεῖ,
 ἀλλ' ἡδοναῖς ἄμοχθον ἐξαιρεῖ βίον

18) Cf. Catullus *carm.* 111. 1-2: *Aufillena, viro contentam vivere solo, | nuptiarum laus ex laudibus eximiis*. For the significance of *solum* ... *nosse* at *carm.* 72, see my article in *CP* 62 (1967) 34-7.

19) If Fick's derivation from the root *pag-* (cf. *pango*) is correct (see Lewis-Short, *s.v.*), then the basic idea in *pecus* is one of collectiveness.

20) See Lewis-Short *s.v.* IIB for examples.

21) With the girls and boys who admire the chaste flower/maiden we may compare the *Musarum sacerdos* Horace, *virginibus puerisque canto* at *Odes* 3. 1. 4. The impression Catullus creates with the chaste, holy and aloof flower/maiden in poem 62 is the extreme antithesis of the picture Lesbia cuts at poem 11. 17-20.

22) On the passage as a whole, see J.C. Kamerbeek, *The Trachiniae* (Leiden 1959) 37.

ἔς τοῦθ', ἕως τις ἀντὶ παρθένον γυνή
 κληθῆ, λάβῃ τ' ἐν νυκτὶ φροντίδων μέρους,
 ἦτοι πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἢ τέκνων φοβουμένη
 τότ' ἂν τις εἰσίδουτο, τὴν αὐτοῦ σκοπῶν
 πρᾶξι, κακοῖσιν οἷς ἐγὼ βαρύνομαι.

The broad affinity between this passage and Catullus 62. 39–58 may be stated thus: In both authors the virgin is assimilated to a protected plant; the three elements of nature, wind, sun, and rain are related to the welfare of the girl/plant; there is a contrast between virgin and wife; an upward movement of the girl/plant is associated with strength and happiness, a downward movement with distress. Corresponding to *in saeptis secretus ... hortis*, we have *χώροισιν αὐτοῦ*, in “regions of its own” (Jebb). Both passages bring to mind the *clausa puella* or *παρθένος κατάκλειστος*. But the significance of the girl’s seclusion is different in the two cases, and with this is linked the different function performed by nature. In Catullus, the flower benefits from benevolent nature, whose elements are to be understood quite literally. Here there is no attempt to go beyond the literal meaning of the elements and give them any figurative force so that they may apply also to the girl. In the Sophoclean passage, however, this is what happens. At *Trach.* 145–6, on the literal level, climatic excesses harm the young plant, and on the metaphorical, these elements refer to the woes and troubles with which the girl is beset once she emerges from the security of her father’s halls (cf. *πατρός ἐν δόμοισιν* at line 6), and acquires a husband and children²³). In Catullus, it is merely the physical state of virginity which is stressed, whereas in Sophocles it is not the state of virginity as such, but rather the kind of life the unmarried girl leads, which is important, – she towers up in radiant confidence and joy: *ἡδοναῖς ἄμοχθον ἐξαίρει βίον*²⁴). In Sophocles the emphasis falls on the state of mind of married woman and virgin, but this aspect is

23) Deianira’s plight infuses the stock motif of the *clausa puella* with a poignancy which would have been inappropriate in the light-hearted amoebean contest in Catullus, especially since it must end in favour of marriage. Another instance where pathos is added to a common topos is found at *Trach.* 31 ff. Heracles is there portrayed as a husbandman who visits his plot of land only at seed-time and at the harvest, i. e. on the rare occasions when he can share the couch of Deian. and when his children are fully grown. See Kamerbeek *ad loc.*

24) A rich expression. Kamerbeek *ad loc.* quotes G. Hermann: “*vita erigi cum dicitur idem est quod alacri et erecto spe ac fiducia animo vivere.*”

unimportant in Catullus where what matters is the great esteem the virgin enjoys in the eyes of the world (cf. in the stanza of the girls, 42, 44, 54; in that of the boys, 53, 55, 58).

In their praise of marriage, (49–58), the boys portray the vine/virgin lying prostrated in weakness and shame²⁵). It is at least implied that she is lifted up by marriage to the elm/husband. That such a symbolic movement is used here springs from the apt choice of vine and elm by the boys and from their argument in support of marriage. In Sophocles, where the arguments of Deianira are against marriage, the virgin moves upward, while she herself, the wife, is weighed down and depressed with misfortune: *κακοῖσιν οἷς ἐγὼ βαρύνομαι*. The symbolism of movement is the same, – upward for happiness, downward for grief, – but the point of view has changed. Ellis in his ed., Oxford 1889, says on Cat. 62. 39–58 that it is one of the most frequently imitated passages: it was paraphrased by Ariosto (1. 42), closely translated by Ben Jonson (*The Barriers*), and Browning transfused it, *The Ring and the Book*, 3. 233–40. Be that as it may, I am sure that one of the most attractive passages where we find the counterparts of the lowly, distressed vine, and the hope and invigorating life offered by the elm, is a part of a political poem of the late seventeenth century (but published in 1713), “*The Petition for an Absolute Retreat*”, in which Anne Finch, later the Countess of Winchelsea, describes her mental prostration when the Stuarts were expelled. Herself she calls *Ardelia*, and her friend the Countess of Thanet, *Arminda*²⁶).

When a helpless vine is found
 Unsupported on the ground,
 Careless all the branches spread,
 Subject to each haughty tread,
 Bearing neither leaves nor fruit,
 Living only in the root,
 Back reflecting let me say:
 So the sad *Ardelia* lay,
 Blasted by a storm of fate

25) For *demittere caput* of shame, see e. g. Cic. *Cluent.* 58; *Dom.* 73; for the opposite, *caput attollere*, Livy, 4. 18. 4. The head drooping in weakness is found elsewhere and at Eur. *Hipp.* 198; *Alc.* 388, Plautus, *Truc.* 525–7, on which see my note in *Latomus* 26, 1967, 1035–6.

26) Quoted by E. M. W. Tillyard, *Some Mythical Elements in English Literature* (London 1961) 87–8.

Felt through all the British state;
 Fall'n, neglected, lost, forgot,
 Dark oblivion all her lot;
 Faded till Arminda's love,
 Guided by the powers above,
 Warmed anew her drooping heart
 And life diffused through every part.

Before we leave the subject of shut-in maidens, it will perhaps not be amiss to discuss briefly one of the two examples of the *clausa puella* adduced by Kroll in his ed., Leipzig 1929, *ad* Cat. 62. 41, with these remarks: "Mit der Förderung der Pflege durch die Elemente vergleicht man stillschweigend die Pflege, die das in der Abgeschlossenheit des Hauses aufwachsende Mädchen bei seinen Eltern genießt." Kroll quotes, aptly, Cat. 64. 87, but also the following Callimachean fragment, 401 in Pfeiffer, where the emphasis seems to lie elsewhere, —

Ἡ παῖς ἢ κατάκλειστος,
 τὴν οἷ φασι τεκόντες
 εὐναίους δαρισμούς
 ἔχθειν ἴσον δλέθρῳ.

Far from putting into relief the affection which existed between daughter and parents, this passage seems to be based on the conflict that arose between this affection and the understandable desire of the parents to arrange a marriage for their daughter without undue delay. The close tie of affection between daughter and mother is admirably expressed at Catullus 62. 21–2: *qui natam possis complexu avellere matris, | complexu matris retinentem avellere natam*. But there is no doubt that when the girl became *tempestiva viro*, she was a burden to her parents. When the chorus of boys declare at 62. 58 that the girl when wed *cara viro magis et minus est invisā parenti*, their argument is convincing because of its truth to life. This anxiety of the parents to get a nubile daughter off their hands is wittily glanced at in Cat. 66. 15–16: *estne novis nuptis odio Venus? Anne parentum | frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis*, etc. The poet humorously suggests that the girl is conscious of her parents' (excessive?) joy at having found her a husband, and she naughtily tries to give them a bad conscience! Furthermore, the parents would run the risk of appearing suspect in the eyes of a suitor if they evinced an excessive enthusiasm for prospective husbands. Thus at Ter. *And.* 249–51, Pamphilus comes not unnaturally to the conclusion that Chremes must be rearing a mon-

strous daughter at home since he seems bent on finding her a husband at all costs: *repudiatu' repetor. Quam ob rem? Nisi si id est quod suspicor: | aliquid monstri alunt: ea quoniam nemini obtrudi potest, | itur ad me.* Similarly, the parents in the Callimachean fragment are overly enthusiastic in their praise of their daughter's chaste ways, and their misguided zeal will be likely to put off suitors. They know that advertising her *pudicitia* will be a primary task in their campaign for a husband for her, but they allow their eagerness to run away with them, and with comic exaggeration they declare that she is so chaste she hates the intimacy of marriage *εὐναίους δαρισμούς*, like death itself, *ἴσον ὀλέθρῳ*. Their lack of discretion threatens to wreck their plan; for a girl such as they describe will more probably repel suitors than attract them²⁷!

Before concluding, a few remarks on a discussion of poem 62 by Fraenkel²⁸). While taking full cognizance of the differences between the two passages, he chooses Sappho's hyacinth-fragment (above) as Catullus' model for the chaste flower/maiden. In matters which do not admit of proof, likelihood must be our guide; so we cannot deny that Sappho may well have been one of the ingredients of Catullus' inspiration. But Fraenkel takes the matter further. He says (*op. cit.* p. 5): "Personally, I am confident that Catullus adapted the model a second time, in a context which makes its Sapphic origin almost certain." This context is the final stanza of poem 11. Catullus began his affair with an adaptation from Sappho, poem 51, and closed it with another poem in the Sapphic metre, the eleventh. It is not unattractive to think that Catullus used a Sapphic image in the latter poem. But Fraenkel seems to corroborate this hypothesis by an attractive idea which does not really depend for its existence upon the validity of the hypothesis. He believes that when Lesbia read the final stanza of poem 11, she "could be relied upon to recognize the allusion to Sappho and recall the time when she with Catullus enjoyed reading her poems (p. 6)." It is certainly an appealing notion that Catullus with poem 11 intended that Lesbia's thoughts should revert to the early period of sunny bliss (poem 51) which she had done much to darken. But Catullus had ensured that

27) The irony of Callimachus in this fragment is expressed in a subtle and dramatic manner and depends upon the prominence of *κατάκλειστος*, separated from its noun, the fact that it is the parents who so describe the girl, and the pointed contrast between *εὐναίους δαρισμούς* and *ἴσον ὀλέθρῳ*. For a different treatment of the unreasonableness of shutting in a girl see Ovid, *Am.* 3. 4.

28) *JRS* 45 (1955) 1-8.

Lesbia would reflect in this manner without having to rely upon any specific allusion to a Sapphic image. The use of the same metre in poem 11 and the repetition of the striking word *identidem* (51. 3; 11. 19) in the same place in the line were two conscious features which would compel comparison with the earlier poem. The image at the end of poem 11, rather than enforcing further a connexion with poem 51, seems simply to function as the poet's comment on his affair in these days of alienation and final rupture. In this bitter poem he is more concerned with expressing his own view of the present, than with evoking the happiness of the past (cf. poem 8). The effectiveness of 11. 21-4 depends, not on a possible link with Sappho, but on its relationship to the preceding stanza and the imagistic pattern. After a repulsive and realistic portrayal of Lesbia's unbounded lust in the fifth stanza, Catullus moves, in the sixth, into the realm of sexual symbolism and with an eloquent reversal of the stock sexual symbols for man and woman, reveals his own delicacy and Lesbia's crude destructiveness.

It is evident that there is an imagistic connexion between Cat. 62. 39ff and 11. 21ff. But it must be emphasized that the significance of this link does not at all depend upon their having both emanated from a single source. Nor, even if the image at the end of poem 11 does go back to Sappho, do I spoil its relation to poem 51 by my suggestion that Catullus may have used Euripides and Sophocles as models for 62. 39ff. It will perhaps help us if we formulate, in fairly broad terms, some principles to guide us in appreciating Catullus' poetry when more or less discernible models lie at its root. When once we have hit upon what seems to be a Catullan model, a critical comparison of the two (or more) passages or poems concerned is rewarding for at least two reasons. Firstly, it provides an insight into Catullus' craftsmanship in adaptation, an insight which is proportionately more instructive as our certainty of the model is the greater. Secondly, even when we cannot point with certainty to this or that particular passage as a model, thematic affinity invites comparison; and such exercises in comparison point up stylistic features which may remain unnoticed when passages or poems are studied in isolation. This is one kind of poetic relationship: between original and adaptation. But another kind of relationship arises between the poems of Catullus which are interconnected by a common theme, metre, diction or imagery. Here it is the Latin artefact which should first and foremost occupy our atten-

tion. For whatever verbal or imagistic interplay occurs in Catullus' poems, our appreciation of it must depend upon the patent links which exist in the Latin poetry itself, rather than upon the possibility of connexions between his models. A simple yet instructive example is provided by the word *identidem* connecting poems 51 and 11. This word does not correspond to anything in the Sapphic model for Catullus 51 (fr. 31 Lobel-Page). Catullus himself forges the link; so although in a study of Catullus' art of adaptation we must examine Sappho and Catullus side by side, when we turn to consider the relation between poems 51 and 11, it is the Latin, not the Greek, upon which our observations must pivot.

Although Fraenkel sees the connexion between poems 62. 39ff and 11. 21ff, he is more interested in the possibility of a common source and the importance of this for the link between poems 51 and 11 than in suggesting a meaningful use of basically similar imagery in poems 62 and 11. Whether it was possible for Lesbia to read poem 62 and use the imagery there as a means of deepening her appreciation of the final stanza of poem 11 must remain an open question. It is unreasonable to think that Catullus intended her or any reader to use the epithalamium as a key to unlatch any mystery in the imagery of the shorter poem; but even if we dismiss this possibility as an idle, though attractive, speculation concerning Lesbia's reaction, we are on much safer ground if we take a comparison of poems 62 and 11 as a clue to the way in which Catullus' mind worked. One or two observations may, I believe, profitably be made. It is perhaps not without significance that it is with a marriage-song that the last poem in the Lesbia-cycle forms an imagistic link. It was from this exalted sphere of marriage that Catullus had, in the early days, borrowed terms and concepts to describe his passion. But the end of poem 11 is linked with a stanza of poem 62 which *condemns* marriage. At the end of his affair, Catullus saw how incongruous it was to use the language of marriage for his liaison with Lesbia. Her rampant promiscuity made her more like the plough, and her touch was not the restorative life-giving one the boys praise at 62. 49ff, — it polluted and destroyed. The flower of poem 11 has lost its protective wall, its admirers and its position of importance: Catullus has been reduced to utter insignificance among *trecenti moechi*, and like the flower at the edge of the meadow, he is now on the fringe of Lesbia's circle. Catullus closes his affair; Lesbia *passes on heedless* (*praetereunte* at 11. 22) of her cruelty.

In conclusion we may say that in an enquiry such as this it would evidently be foolhardy to claim for our suggestions the status of irrefutable *ἀποδείξεις*. We can practise only such accuracy as our subject admits: *ἐφ' ὅσον ἢ τοῦ πράγματος φύσις ἐπιδέχεται*. Thus, whereas it is not impossible that Catullus took his inspiration from Sappho alone and from this single source developed his ideas so that they took the form they exhibit in poem 62, it is, by virtue of the evidence adduced from Euripides and Sophocles, almost impossible to think that the Roman poet is free from debt to these Greek tragedians²⁹).

University of Nottingham

H. Akbar Khan

ZUFALL ODER FORMALER GESTALTUNGSWILLE BEI TIBULL?

J. Marouzeau hat dargelegt¹⁾, im ersten Elegienbuch Tibulls umfaßten die Gedichte 1 und 9, 2 und 7, 3 und 10, 4 und 8, 5 und 6 jeweils zusammen 162 Verse, im zweiten Buch ergäben die Gedichte 1 und 6, 2 und 5, 3 und 4 jeweils zusammen 144 Verse, und beide Summen seien symbolische Zahlen. Lege schon der Umstand, daß man Tibull die absichtliche Anwendung einer Zahlensymbolik nicht zutrauen könne, den Gedanken an ein Spiel des Zufalls nahe, so werde daraus volle Gewißheit, wenn man in Betracht ziehe, daß Tibull lückenhaft überliefert sei und also die Zahl der noch vorhandenen Verse gar nicht anders als durch das Wirken des Zufalls erklärt werden könne.

Hinsichtlich der Symbolik wird man Marouzeau ohne weiteres recht geben²⁾. Das wiederholte Auftreten besonderer Zah-

29) I wish to record my gratitude to my colleague Mr. Walter R. Chalmers, and to Professor W. Geoffrey Arnott of Leeds University who read this article and commented on it.

1) *Revue des Études Latines* (REL) 24, 1947, 77f.

2) REL 40, 1962, 107 (vgl. 284f.) schreibt J. Marouzeau über das Buch von G. E. Duckworth, *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid. A Study in Mathematical Composition*, Ann Arbor (The University of Michigan Press) 1962: „L'auteur se fait fort de découvrir non seulement chez Virgile, mais chez maints autres poètes latins, des rapports numériques du genre de ceux qu'a interprétés chez nous M. P. Maury dans un article des *Lettres d'humanité* assez retentissant (t. III, 1944, p. 71-147) sur les dispositions symétriques et la valeur mystique de certains nombres.“ Da-