

Tetralogies, two examples in Lysias, three in Isaeus, and thirteen in the Demosthenic corpus.² Although evident in the oratorical tradition, the device may not have originated there; there is at least one example in Herodotus.³

Cicero adopts this venerable argumentative form with enthusiasm. For reasons which remain uncertain, the simple bipartite form of the device occurs much more frequently in his speeches than in any of the Attic orators.⁴ This difference of quantity becomes a difference of quality in *Pro Archia* and *Pro Milone*. These speeches afford the first examples in extant classical oratory of a single use of this common argumentative form to organize an entire *argumentatio*. This is an innovation for which Cicero deserves full credit.⁵

CHRISTOPHER P. CRAIG
University of Tennessee

2. Antiphon *Herodes* 27, 62–63, cf. *Choreutes* 48; *Tetralogies* 1. 2, 10; Lysias 4, 4–5, 14, 1–2; Isaeus 6, 44, 7, 29–36, 11, 29–30; Dem. *De cor.* 95, 19, 332, 20, 115–16, 21, 169, 21, 189, 23, 128, 31, 14, 33, 33–34, 36, 42, 39, 20, 39, 34–35, 41, 25–26, 53, 27.

3. 2. 120. I am grateful to the Editor for bringing this passage to my attention.

4. The tripartite form does not occur after the *Pro Quinctio*. I count sixty-one occurrences of the bipartite form, in the orations of every period, with no clearcut, significant pattern of use. They are: *Rosc. Am.* 53–54, 62, 73; *Div. Caec.* 5–9, 36, 37–39; *Verr.* 2. 1, 34–37, 70; 2. 2, 95 with 99, 141, 148–49; 2. 3, 83, 151, 166, 193–94, 218–20; 2. 4, 8–10, 11, 19, 114 (to the jury); 2. 5, 151 *bis*; *Font.* 3; *Caecin.* 102; *Clu.* 81, 126, 138–42; *Mur.* 15–16 with 17; *Cat.* 1, 29 (regarding Cicero himself); 2, 19–20; *C. Rab.* 18; *Sull.* 22, 45, 68; *Arch.* 15–16; *Flac.* 25; *Dom.* 34–35 with 43, 119, 122, 117–21 with 139; *Har. resp.* 16–17; *Vat.* 8; *Cael.* 39–43 with 44–47; *Balb.* 32, 33, 37, 38; *Pis.* 40; *Planc.* 31; *Rab. post.* 45; *Mil.* 46–47; *Marcell.* 29–30; *Lig.* 1 with 16; *Deiot.* 24, 28, 30; *Phil.* 2, 5, 6, 9; 5, 13, 29–30; 13, 32.

The form also occurs in Cicero's description of the arguments of L. Aurelius Cotta (*Sest.* 73) and M. Juventius Laterensis (*Planc.* 4). It seems likely that Cicero is here simply reproducing the arguments of these orators, but he may be recasting them in the form of the device.

5. This is part of work done under a University of Tennessee faculty research grant. For various helpful comments, I am grateful to J. C. Anderson, Jr., S. M. Cohen, K. Coleman, and the anonymous referees of *CP*.

CHLOE AND PHYLLIS: HORACE *CARMINA* 1. 23 AND 4. 11

In an earlier article in this journal, C. Fuqua proposed that Horace *Carmina* 1. 23–25 constitute “a carefully structured sequence of odes,” a sequence in which “1. 23 and 1. 25 form a complete cycle of the seasons.”¹ *Carmina* 4. 11–13, published some ten years later, also function as a unit² and contain a seasonal progression, one that moves from the spring setting of 4. 11, 14–16 to the winter associations of 4. 13, 12; again, as in 1. 23–25, the centerpiece of the triptych is a poem to Virgil in which death looms large, although here the death in question is not that of a friend of Virgil, as in 1. 24, but of Virgil himself, for Virgil had died in 19 B.C., six years before the publication of Book 4, and thoughts of his death find expression not only in the black fires of 4. 12, 26 but also in the

1. “Horace *Carm.* 1. 23–25,” *CP* 63 (1968): 44–46.

2. On the links between 4. 12 and 4. 13, see D. H. Porter, “Horace, *Carmina*, IV, 12,” *Latomus* 31 (1972): 76–77; on those between 4. 11 and 4. 12, see J. Perret, *Horace* (Paris, 1959), p. 180, and S. Commager, *The “Odes” of Horace* (New Haven, 1962), pp. 305–6.

melancholy undercurrents of the whole poem.³ The several links between these two sets of poems suggest that Horace composed the later set as a conscious reminiscence of the earlier. These very links, however, serve also to underscore the significant differences between the two groups of poems.

That the two sets are indeed parallel seems clear. Since in an earlier discussion I have shown in some detail that 4. 12–13 closely parallel 1. 24–25,⁴ here I shall concentrate on 4. 11 and 1. 23. The very presence of the extensive parallelism between 4. 12–13 and 1. 24–25 would lead us to expect similar correspondences between 4. 11 and 1. 23, and such links do indeed exist. There is, for one thing, the obvious similarity between the addressees—Chloe, Greek χλόη, “shoot,” in 1. 23, and Phyllis, Greek φύλλις, “leaf” or “branch,” in 4. 11.⁵ The leafy rustles of spring in 1. 23. 5–6 (*foliis* in 6 is, of course, cognate with *Phyllis*) are balanced by the mid-April setting of 4. 11, a setting emphasized by the greenery described in lines 2–5. And both poems deal with what their addressees avoid, or should avoid (cf. 1. 23. 1 *vitas* and 4. 11. 31 *vites*), and what they follow, or should follow (cf. 1. 23. 12 *tempestiva sequi viro* and 4. 11. 29 *te digna sequare*).

These same verbal motifs suggest also, however, the differences of mood and situation between 1. 23 and 4. 11. *Chloe* refers to a young shoot, while *Phyllis* suggests more fully developed foliage,⁶ and the distinction between the two Greek names corresponds to the characters and situations of the two women. While the shy Chloe avoids any male contact (*vitas me*) and is gently reminded by Horace that she is of an age finally to follow a man (*tempestiva sequi viro*), the more forward Phyllis already seeks after Telephus and is warned by Horace to avoid one who is *dispar* (*disparem vites*) and to follow only what is worthy of herself (*te digna sequare*). For Chloe, the season is still young, while for Phyllis life is already in full leaf: we are not told her age, but Horace addresses her as *meorum finis amorum* (4. 11. 31–32) and locates her in a poem filled throughout with reminders of the passing of time (see, e.g., the *nonum superantis annum* of line 1, the *adfluentis annos* of 19–20, the *non enim posthac alia calebo femina* of 33–34). And while for Chloe maturity has scarcely been glimpsed, a world at once frightening and full of promise, for Phyllis adult life has been fully explored, its frustrated hopes (cf. 25–26) and dark cares (cf. 35–36) already tasted.

To return to the two brief cycles with which we began, 1. 23–25 and 4. 11–13, we can see that in each the first poem sets the stage for what follows. Chloe's total innocence and isolation, her shrinking from the vast unknown, provide the perfect introduction to the absolutes of 1. 24 and 25—to implacable death and engulfing despair in 1. 24, to unheeding scorn and the absolute gulf between

3. I have suggested elsewhere that 4. 12 applies to Virgil a tension basic to Book 4, that between death and the immortality of poetry. The poem is a recreation in verse of the poets' previous friendship, a recreation that addresses Virgil as if he were still alive but that contains clear hints of Horace's grief over his friend's death: see “Horace, *Carmina*, IV, 12,” pp. 71–87, and “The Motif of Spring in Horace, *Carmina* 4. 7 and 4. 12,” *CB* 49 (1972–73): 57–61. On the underlying sadness of 4. 12, see also N. E. Collinge, *The Structure of Horace's “Odes”* (London, 1961), pp. 75–76. Even K. J. Reckford, who resists the literal identification of the Virgil of 4. 12 with the poet, suggests that the mood of the poem is colored by Virgil's recent death: see *Horace* (New York, 1969), pp. 128–29.

4. “Horace, *Carmina*, IV, 12,” pp. 76–78; also, in abbreviated form, in *CW* 57 (1963–64): 121–22.

5. Φύλλις is very uncommon, but it seems to carry the same connotations as φύλλας: see LSJ.

6. On χλόη the evidence is unambiguous: see LSJ. Φύλλις and its cognates are regularly associated with developed, even ripe, vegetation: see, e.g., φύλλας in Aesch. *Agam.* 79 and 966, Soph. *OC* 676.

youth and age in 1. 25. The world of Phyllis in 4. 11, by contrast, is one of complexity and contradictions: bright greens set the stage for the sprinkled blood of a sacrifice (2–8); the bustle of young men and women leads unexpectedly into black smoke and flickering flame (9–12);⁷ a festive and loving birthday celebration calls to mind the passing years (13–20); and an invitation to wine and song is set against a backdrop of failed hopes (cf. 25–26) and dark cares (cf. 35–36). This mixture of moods in 4. 11 leads to similar mixtures in the two poems that follow—in 4. 12 to the counterpoint between spring and death, light banter and dark thoughts, loving recollection of past joys and sorrowful confrontation of present realities,⁸ and in 4. 13 to a poignant interplay of scorn and sympathy, happiness and sorrow, cruelty and gentleness.⁹ Chloe's youth is as yet untouched by age, while the springtime in which Phyllis is placed in 4. 11 has its autumnal colorings: in the same way, the seasonal contrast with which 1. 25 ends draws a sharp line between the garlands of the young and the sere leaves of winter, while in 4. 13 the winter with which Horace associates Lyce is one whose chill he himself feels as well; and the absolute separation of the living from the dead that we find in 1. 24 yields to a mysterious blending of life and death, of the winter of mortality and the eternal spring of poetry, in 4. 12.

Finally, the poems which immediately precede these two small groups foreshadow the distinctive qualities of each: the lilting Lalage ode, 1. 22, deals in absolutes—safety against danger, heat against cold, right against wrong—and is an appropriate introduction to the absolute separations that characterize 1. 23–25—fawn from tiger, life from death, joy from sorrow, winter from summer. In the same way, the complex mixture of moods that characterizes 4. 11–13 finds apt introduction in the complexities of the bitter-sweet Ligurinus ode, 4. 10—a minute poem that in its eight-line compass mingles laughter with tears, younger with older, the rose of spring with the leaves of fall.¹⁰

DAVID H. PORTER
Carleton College

7. On the "discordant image" in lines 11–12, and on the mixed mood of the whole poem, see K. J. Reckford, "Some Studies in Horace's Odes on Love," *CJ* 55 (1959–60): 30–31; also Commager, "Odes" of Horace, pp. 302–6.

8. For this interpretation of 4. 12, see my articles cited above, n. 3; D. E. Belmont, "The Vergilius of Horace, Ode 4. 12," *TAPA* 110 (1980): 1–20, supports a similar interpretation.

9. On 4. 13, see E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 416.

10. On 4. 10, see Fraenkel, *Horace*, pp. 414–15.

ISIS AND AGAPE

At the end of his instructive review of F. Solmsen's *Isis among the Greeks and Romans* (*CP* 78 [1983]: 81–83), M. N. Nagler remarks on the author's observation that "the only textual association of Isis with the quality of *agape* may even be a mistake." The reference is to *POxy.* 1380. 109–10, a text probably composed in the first century A.D., where the writer calls Isis, according to the reading of Grenfell and Hunt, confirmed by C. H. Roberts, ἄ[γά]πη θεῶν, "the love of the gods." Much attention has been focused on the locus because it