

sizing the defiant strength of Achilles. By equating Protagoras with an occasionally godless Achilles and by reminding his auditors of his sympathy for such *theomachoi*, Plato is once again maliciously hinting at the sophist's alleged impiety.¹⁹ As in the cases mentioned above, doctrinal allusion and malicious mythology merge and overlap so as to form a picture of unexpected aggressiveness, which suddenly surfaces from the placid waters of Socrates' usual *urbanitas*.²⁰ Athenaeus was right, and we can conclude by saying that among the many qualities of Plato's style one can certainly count a genuinely satirical vein.²¹

ANDREA CAPRA
University of Milan

19. Moreover, one must not forget that the protagonist of the myth delivered by Protagoras in the dialogue (320c–22d) is Prometheus, arguably the most notorious *theomachos* of Greek mythology. All of these references can hardly be coincidental.

20. Through mythological allusion and other similar devices, Plato can address his audiences over the heads of his characters. Socrates and Protagoras may well be unaware of the impending allegations against the sophist, and from their point of view there may be no double entendre in Socrates' Homeric quotations. Yet Plato, writing some decades after the death of both, shares with his audiences a full knowledge of the facts, so that the very same words are given a second, sinister meaning. For a good account of this literary technique, somewhat reminiscent of the so-called tragic irony, see D. Clay, *Platonic Questions: Dialogues with the Silent Philosopher* (University Park, Penn., 2000), 33–40.

21. Warm thanks to A. Brancacci, F. Caizzi, and J. Haubold.

AN ALLUSION TO OVID IN CLAUDIAN'S *CARMINA MINORA* 22.56

Ovid's influence on the poems of Claudian has long been recognized.¹ Recently, M. L. Ricci and F. Consolino have explored the constellation of allusions that link Claudian's *Carmina Minora* (*c.m.*) 22, the so-called *Deprecatio ad Hadrianum*, to the programmatic situation of Ovid's exile poetry.² Ricci has demonstrated how Claudian's allusion at *c.m.* 22.27–31 to *Tristia* 3.5.31–36 is part of a broader interaction of vocabulary and imagery linking *c.m.* 22 to the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.³ Consolino has further illuminated how Claudian's allusions and structuring

1. The editions of T. Birt (Berlin, 1892) and L. Jeep (Leipzig, 1876–79) remain the starting points for any discussion of allusion in Claudian. Ovid's influence on Claudian has been most extensively, although not exhaustively, addressed by A. H. Eaton, *The Influence of Ovid on Claudian* (Washington, D.C., 1943).

2. M. L. Ricci, "Il carme minore 22 di Claudiano e l'Ovidio dell'esilio," *InvLuc* 20 (1998): 221–28; F. Consolino, "Poetry and Politics in Claudian's *Carmina Minora* 22 and 50," in *Aetas Claudianea: Eine Tagung an der Freien Universität Berlin vom 28. bis 30. Juni 2002*, ed. W.-W. Ehlers, F. Felgentreu, and S. M. Wheeler (Munich, 2004), 142–74. The link between *c.m.* 22 and Ovid's exile poetry has also been noted in passing by M. Bonvicini, D. Giodrano, and R. Mazzanti, *P. Ovidio Nasone, "Tristia"* (Milan, 1991), 323, and M. L. De Gubernatis, "Claudianus," *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti* (Rome, 1932), 543–44.

3. Ricci discusses how the narrators of *c.m.* 22.27–40 and *Tr.* 3.5.31–36 call on their addressees to show *clementia* by recalling Achilles' mercy to Priam and Alexander the Great's compassion towards Darius and Porus. Both passages also mention the lion and other animals to highlight the natural order of the strong fighting the strong. Other similarities between Ovid's exile poetry and *c.m.* 22 include the use of *telum/-a* to symbolize aggressive eloquence (*c.m.* 22.8; *Tr.* 4.1.36), the narrators describing their ruin as *vulnera* (*c.m.* 22.8; *Tr.* 1.1.99, 3.11.64), and the narrators comparing themselves to Telephus (*c.m.* 22.46–49; *Tr.* 5.2.15–16, 2.19–22; *Pont.* 2.2.26). In addition to these parallels, the appearance of *exul* (*c.m.* 22.25) is also noteworthy.

of the poem give an ironic twist to the pleading tone of the *deprecatio*.⁴ Previous discussions of *c.m.* 22, however, have failed to notice that *c.m.* 22.56 contains an allusion to *Tristia* 5.6, one with significance for the tone of the poem and the relationship between its narrator and addressee.

Claudian's *Deprecatio ad Hadrianum* presents an apology to a powerful man, whose *ira* (1) has destroyed the narrator's prosperity.⁵ In fifty-eight hexameter lines, the poet asks for mercy (1–5), admits his guilt in assailing a superior (6–12), cites examples of *clementia* from myth (13–22), confesses his abject state (23–26), contrasts the addressee's unremitting anger against a lowly poet to the natural order of the strong battling the strong (27–40), offers this poem as supplication citing the example of Achilles' curing of Telephus (41–49), and concludes with a call for Egypt to lament a fellow countryman's unjust destruction by a former companion (50–58).

In addition to the references to Ovid's exile poetry documented by Ricci and Consolino, Claudian's *c.m.* 22 contains numerous thematic and verbal similarities to *Tristia* 5.6. In both poems, the addressee is referred to as a friend (*c.m.* 22.52: *comitem . . . sodalis*; *Tr.* 5.6.3: *amici*);⁶ both open with a series of rhetorical questions that emphasize the fractured relationship between narrator and addressee; close with water imagery (the narrator's ship abandoned *in medio . . . mari* in *Tr.* 5.6.46; the Nile bemoaning the narrator's destruction *numerosis . . . ripis* in *c.m.* 22.58); employ mythological *exempla* to characterize narrator and addressee; emphasize the abject situation of the narrator; confirm the power of the addressee to remedy the situation; and describe forgiveness as a duty owed to the narrator (*c.m.* 22.55: *cognata potentia*; *Tr.* 5.6.3: *officiique pium . . . onus*). The thematic similarities between the two poems are reinforced by a tissue of verbal echoes, for example, *c.m.* 22.1: *tuae . . . irae* and *Tr.* 5.6.34: *in nostra . . . ira*; *c.m.* 22.7: *tumor* and *Tr.* 5.6.45: *tumores*; *c.m.* 22.12: *confessus crimina* and *Tr.* 5.6.18: *crimina nostra*; *c.m.* 22.9: *querellae* and *Tr.* 5.6.42: *querella*; *c.m.* 22.4: *pii* and *Tr.* 5.6.4: *pium*; *c.m.* 22.48: *medicina* and *Tr.* 5.6.12: *medicae . . . artis*; *c.m.* 22.55: *miseros* and *Tr.* 5.6.29: *miseris*; and *c.m.* 22.56 *commune solum* and *Tr.* 5.6.29 *solum commune*.

The last and most distinctive of these echoes (*commune solum*) occurs near the conclusion of Claudian's poem, where the narrator calls upon his homeland to bear witness to his destruction (*c.m.* 22.55–58):

inruat in miseros cognata potentia cives;
audiat haec commune solum longae carinis

4. Consolino ("Poetry and Politics" [n. 2 above]), under the heading "Playing the Exile Ovid: The *Deprecatio ad Hadrianum*," revisits many of the points of contact between Ovid and Claudian noted by Ricci, and discusses other allusions, in particular those to Vergil and Horace, by which Claudian manipulates the rhetorical expectations of the *deprecatio*. Ovid's exile poetry, however, remains at the core of Consolino's analysis of the poem (e.g., the relationship between the concessive subjunctives in *c.m.* 22.6–7 (*duxerit, impulerit, egerit*), as well as *Tr.* 3.11.33, where the *fulmen* provoked by the *ira Tonantis* (*c.m.* 22.39–40) recalls Ovid's description of his unexpected and devastating punishment (*Pont.* 1.7.46–47, 3.6.17, 3.6.27–28; *Tr.* 1.1.72, 1.1.81, 2.33–34, 2.179–80).

5. Nearly all studies of the poem have equated Claudian with the narrator and assumed that the addressee is the Hadrian of the title appended to *c.m.* 22 in certain manuscripts (e.g., *Flor*, Δ, and J in Hall's 1985 Teubner); a notable exception is P. G. Christiansen, "Claudian: A Greek or a Latin?," *Scholia* 6 (1997): 79–95. While precise knowledge of the unnamed addressee's identity would be informative, it is not crucial for understanding either how the poem constructs the relationship between narrator and addressee or the poem's connection to *Tr.* 5.6.

6. It is possible that the addressee should be included as one of the lost friends in *c.m.* 22.24 (*caris spoliatur amicis*).

nota Pharos, flentemque attollens gurgite vultum
nostra gemat Nilus numerosis funera ripis.

Let kindred power rush upon wretched countrymen;
let our common land hear these things and Pharos, too,
known by ships far off, and let our Nile, raising its weeping face,
lament my ruin with its many shores.

Even beyond the obvious inversion of word order, Claudian's *commune solum* is not a simple citation of *Tristia* 5.6. Rather, since Ovid's meter requires the *o* in *solum commune* to be long (yielding "the only common thing" as opposed to Claudian's "common land"), Claudian is employing a subtler—but no less certain—form of poetic adaptation in this passage. Despite the seeming ordinarieness of Claudian's phrase, *commune* and *solum* rarely appear together. *Commune solum* appears only in Cicero *In Catilinam* 4.16.4, Statius *Thebais* 1.586, and *Digest* 8.4.5.2–6; *solum commune* is unique to Ovid's poem. Both the Ciceronian and Statian passages would have been familiar to Claudian and his audience, and the notion that either passage could have resonance should not be dismissed.⁷ Given, however, the broad interaction between *c.m.* 22 and Ovid's exile poetry and the thematic and verbal similarities between Claudian's poem and *Tristia* 5.6 that condition the allusion, the resonance with *solum commune* at *Tristia* 5.6.29 is particularly powerful.

Ovid's phrase occurs in a discussion of friendship's ability to weather turmoil (*Tr.* 5.6.25b–30):

. . . quotiens Agamemnone natum
dixisse in Pyladen improba verba putas?
nec procul a vero est quin vel pulsarit amicum:
mansit in officiis non minus ille suis.
hoc est cum miseris solum commune beatis,
ambobus tribui quod solet obsequium.

. . . how many times do you think that Agamemnon's son
spoke disloyal words against Pylades?
Nor is it far from true that he also struck his friend.
Yet Pylades remained no less dutiful.
This is the only thing in common between the fortunate and the wretched,
that indulgence is routinely granted to both.

Ovid's narrator affirms that consideration or indulgence enables friendship to survive conflict and calls on his addressee to follow the example of Pylades, who, wronged by Orestes, nevertheless remained loyal to his friend. In light of the similar themes of *c.m.* 22 and *Tristia* 5.6 and the use of a rare collocation of *commune* and *solum* in the context of the duties of friendship and its ability to overcome discord, Claudian's

7. The Ciceronian parallel, which appears near the climax of his fourth *Catilinarian* (*et commune patriae solum cum sit carum tum vero dulce atque iucundum*), shares its appeal to patriotism with *c.m.* 22. In *Theb.* 1.586, *pecori commune solum* describes the ground a sleeping infant shared with a flock just before he was ripped apart by wild dogs. The infant could be identified with Claudian's narrator, who thought his national ties would insulate him from the addressee's fury. Both of the Ciceronian and Statian parallels, however, lack the thematic and verbal conditioning that prepares the reception of the allusion to Ovid. Since *commune solum* was not a common legal term—it appears only in one passage of the *Digest*—possible legal connotations need not be considered further.

use of the phrase summons to mind the associations of durable friendship and forgiveness present in Ovid's poem.

Until Alan Cameron persuasively argued that Claudian's *deprecatio* was "not to be taken seriously" because Claudian could not have been in such dire circumstances when *c.m.* 22 was likely composed, this poem was thought to bear tragic witness to an historical situation that required a sincere apology to the offended and powerful Hadrian.⁸ This view, of course, disregards the implication of *c.m.* 22.52 that the narrator and addressee are not simply fellow countrymen but friends and the notice near the beginning of *c.m.* 22 that the addressee had responded to the narrator's *dolor incautus* (6) with *paribus telis* (8), which Cameron argued could only refer to a poem by Hadrian. Whether or not the poem corresponds to an actual event in Claudian's life, the allusion to *Tristia* 5.6 further supports the idea that the addressee of the work and the narrator were close friends. After admitting the skill of Hadrian's previous lampoon through the ironic use of elements of a *deprecatio*, the closing allusion to a "common ground" of mutual respect and indulgence between friends, even those who disagree, cleverly signals that the dispute was nothing exceptional and that the narrator, perhaps Claudian, was humbly asking forgiveness from his latter-day Pylades.⁹

BRET MULLIGAN
Brown University

8. A. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford, 1970), 399–400. For a useful survey of interpretations, see Consolino, "Poetry and Politics," 144–46.

9. I would like to extend my sincere thanks for their helpful suggestions to *CP*'s referee and to Walter Eder for confirming that *commune solum* was not a technical term of regular use in Roman law.