

## CATULLUS 68

Catullus 68 has for generations been the site of hard-fought and inconclusive philological battles. This, it may be confidently predicted, will continue to be the case. The present contribution, therefore, can pretend to no more elaborate aim than the opening up of certain new fronts. It falls into two parts of unequal length: first (I) some general observations on the contents of the poem – or poems, for the *Einheitsfrage* cannot be evaded – and the underlying theme(s) thereof; second (II) a detailed examination of the source (A) and significance (B) of perhaps the most remarkable passage in an altogether remarkable piece of work, to wit the *barathrum* simile (107 ff.). The argument of I has, the reader will observe, a not inconsiderable bearing on that of IIB, though it is in no way dependent on the latter's acceptability. The argument of IIA, to the contrary, has no necessary link with those of I and IIB and may profitably (and justly) be judged by itself.<sup>1</sup>

## I

Poem 68 appears as a single unit in the MSS under the heading '*Ad Mallium*'. Unfortunately, this does not prove that 68 is one poem,<sup>2</sup> and generations of scholars have thought to find intrinsic reasons to doubt its unity. What most would stress would, I think, be: (i) 1–40 (= 68A) show Catullus refusing to provide *inter alia* poetry to a friend, whereas 41–160 (= 68B) constitute a poem to a friend; (ii) lines 92–6 (on the brother's death) repeat 20–4 almost *verbatim*, which seems odd within the context of one poem; (iii) at 19 ff. Catullus shows himself having given up the pursuits of love, whereas in 135 ff. he appears still engaged (albeit somewhat unsatisfactorily) in a love-affair. Perhaps answers to these problems can be produced (provided that one still accept that 68 is a poem with two distinct elements, to be printed, for example, with a row of asterisks between lines 40 and 41 – in the same way that poems 65 and 66 might be printed). But there is also what some might think the most 'objective' criterion, the question of the name(s) of the friend(s). The MS tradition is quite clear that the addressee of 68A is 'Mallius', that of 68B 'Allius'.<sup>3</sup> If these are two different names, then we have got two separate poems. Vice-versa, if we wish not to have two separate poems, we have got to make the names the same. Modern scholarship has tried to achieve the latter aim in two ways: (i) by reading *Mani* in 68A, so that the addressee is M.' Allius throughout; (ii) by reading *mi Alli* in 68A so that he is Allius throughout. These expedients are not as satisfactory as they look. *Mani* (if restored in lines 11 and 30) would become the only case in Catullus' poetry of his addressing

<sup>1</sup> Versions of all or parts of this paper have been read to the Liverpool Latin Seminar (in October 1977) and the Classical Society of the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth (March 1979) and I am grateful to those present on those occasions for helpful discussion. I am also deeply indebted to Ian DuQuesnay, Peter Wiseman and Francis Cairns for detailed comments at various stages and to Professor R. M. Ogilvie for his indulgence in permitting an already by no means short manuscript to grow even longer. All *culpa* remains mine.

<sup>2</sup> For the unreliability of the MS headings cf. the table in R. A. B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford, 1958), pp. xiv–xv. I quote from Mynors' text throughout this paper.

<sup>3</sup> cf. T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (Leicester, 1974), p. 88.

or naming a person by *praenomen* alone and is therefore a dangerous emendation.<sup>4</sup> *Mi Alli* is certainly better in some respects<sup>5</sup> but, as Dr Adams has recently shown,<sup>6</sup> the formula *mi*+voc. is one used only to the closest of friends (at least in Ciceronian practice) and its restoration in 68A would require the raising and settling of questions about just how close a friend that poem's addressee really is. But in that case we are committed to consideration of the proper interpretation of 68A and the apparent objectivity of the criterion of the names is shown to be illusory. It may, of course, seem simply too coincidental that such similar names as 'Mallius' and 'Allius' should turn up in consecutive separate poems and therefore that, since *Mani* is excluded, *mi Alli* will have to be accepted. But *Mallius* might itself be a corruption of *Manlius* (the same corruption appears in Poem 61),<sup>7</sup> in which case the coincidence sensibly diminishes. The truth is that one has to start from the contents of the poem(s) and only later see, if one can, whether unity or separation is the better line to adopt.

That 68A and 68B *could* be separate entities is clear. At least, there is no *evident* back-reference from 68B to 68A. The only possible exceptions to this are (i) the lines about the brother (but repetition need not be equivalent to reference) and (ii) the words *quod potui* (149) which have seemed to some to presuppose the reservations about Catullus' capacity to write anything at all expressed in 68A, but which may equally well just serve to suggest that Allius' benefactions outdo any possible poem of praise.

On the other hand, it is immediately obvious that there are, to say the least, thematic links between the two 'parts'. To see this, I propose to look at the three figures of Catullus, the addressee of 68A (whom for the moment I call Mallius) and the addressee of 68B ('Allius') to see how their predicaments and experiences relate to one another. I start with the situation in 68A and then move to the relationship between 68A and 68B.

What are the features of Mallius' situation? (i) He is oppressed by *fortuna* and *acerbus casus* (1). (ii) He is like a shipwrecked sailor tossed in the foaming waves and at death's door (2–3). (iii) He is deserted and sleepless in a 'bachelor' bed (6). (iv) The Muses fail to delight him with the sweet poetry of *veteres scriptores* (7).<sup>8</sup> Accordingly he asks for *munera et Musarum...et Veneris* (10). What exactly does that mean? By itself the line could mean 'you ask for gifts consisting in love poetry'.<sup>9</sup> The difficulty is *utriusque* (39) ('do not think that it is through malice that you are not presented, in response to your request, with a supply of *each of the two things* you want'), which seems to imply a separation of *munera Musarum* and *munera Veneris*. Modern scholars, wishing the request to be only for poetry, meet this by supposing that *munera Musarum* are poems in general and *munera Veneris* love poems in particular – a most dubious expedient.<sup>10</sup> Another possibility is to suppose that *utriusque* arises because

<sup>4</sup> C. W. Macleod (*CQ* n.s. 24 (1974), 82 n. 3) advances the criticism that *Mani* would have a solemnity amounting to sarcasm in the context. But that is to assume that sarcasm is not in place. Perhaps that is correct, but to use the point as an argument here is to undermine the objectivity of the names as evidence since some interpretation of 68A is presupposed. In fact (see text) this problem seems unavoidable.

<sup>5</sup> *Mi*+voc. is found in Cat. 10. 25, 13. 1, 28. 3. (The elision can be paralleled in 31.5 (*vix mi ipse credens...*), 68. 41 (...*qua me Allius in re...*), 76. 26 (*o di reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea*), 99. 13 (*ut mi ex ambroisa...*)).

<sup>6</sup> *CQ* n.s. 28 (1978), esp. pp. 162 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Wiseman op. cit. (n. 3), p. 89.

<sup>8</sup> cf. J. C. Yardley, *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 337–9.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Anacreon 96D where ἀλλὰ ὅστις Μουσέων τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης / συμμίσγων ἔρατ' ἡς μνήσκειται εὐφροσύνης clearly refers to love-poetry.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), p. 231.

in his reply Catullus has separated the single request for love poetry into two elements (love and poetry) and has indicated his lack of provision on both fronts, arguing first that grief has driven thought of love from his mind (11–32) and second that he does not have a large supply of books with him (33–6). But this is not totally compelling either. Catullus is talking about not having *supplied* each of the two things to Mallius and the form of expression naturally leads one to think that he might have supplied one and not the other. And of course, on the face of it, the separate explanations given by Catullus (see above) can, and perhaps should, correspond to separate requested items. Mallius' complaint had two strands: (i) he is deserted but still affected by Venus and therefore cannot sleep, (ii) the pain of his sleeplessness is not mitigated by the enjoyment of poetry. This could reasonably suggest two requests, (i) for help in getting back the girl he loves (*munus Veneris*) and (ii) (failing that) for something poetic to divert his attention (*munus Musarum*). Not that it is necessary to fill out the picture by supposing that in requesting *munus Veneris* Mallius has in mind *communio amicae*. T. P. Wiseman claims that it was an established Roman social custom that men might share with friends the favours of their *amicae*. But the evidence he adduces for this is not, in my view, sufficiently cogent<sup>11</sup> and I assume that Mallius' first request was simply for help in restoring the affections of his own *amica*.

So far Mallius. What of Catullus' situation as he describes it? (i) He is immersed in the waves of *fortuna* (13); that corresponds both to the *fortuna* by which Mallius is oppressed and to the shipwreck image used of that oppression. The latter image is perhaps continued by *tu mea moriens fregisti commoda, frater* (21), *frangere* being not infrequently used of shipwreck.<sup>12</sup> (ii) His situation is ringed round with death. First, it is caused by *fraterna mors* (19). Secondly, it is described in terms of death. The whole *domus* (i.e. Catullus included) is buried (22); the delights which his brother *in life* nourished have perished (23); Catullus has left Rome, which is where his *domus* is (34–5: *illa domus/illa mihi sedes*), where he lived (*vivimus*, which can mean 'pass one's life' but also has the ambiguous overtone of 'to be alive'),<sup>13</sup> and where *mea carpitur aetas* (35), an image recalling his description of life before the brother's death, *iucundum cum aetas florida ver ageret* (16). In short, the 'life-force' has gone out of Catullus' existence. This corresponds to (but intensifies) Mallius' being at death's door. (iii) The terms in which the brother's loss is stated are ones that could with perfect propriety be used of the loss of a lover – or even with more propriety, for there is, at first sight, some oddity in the idea that the brother's love nurtured Catullus' *gaudia*, where those *gaudia* are, in context, the pleasures of erotic love. The loss of the brother is thus deliberately made to seem of the same sort as the loss that Mallius has sustained. (iv) On one type of reading of the vexed lines 27 f.,<sup>14</sup> Mallius has remarked that Catullus was in a place where people of good class (i.e. like Catullus) had to try and warm their cold limbs in deserted beds – i.e. were in the position that Mallius claimed to be in.

In short, Catullus is showing Mallius that his own situation was exactly like Mallius' – only very much worse. It is a theme found elsewhere in ancient poetry that the love-poet can, by virtue of his experience, act as *magister amoris* to his friends when

<sup>11</sup> Wiseman, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 95. Plut. *Pomp.* 2, Domit. Mars. fr. 1 (Morel), *Anth. Pal.* 12. 104, Plaut. *Stich.* 727 f. (which anyway does not concern people *de meliore nota*), Prop. 1. 5 (esp. 29–30) do not, I think, *require* interpretation in terms of the supposed custom. Only Ascon. ap. Donat. *Vit. Verg.* 24 explicitly records a proposal by someone (Varius) that his friend (Vergil) should share his *amica* (Plotia Hiera).

<sup>12</sup> e.g. Cic. *Ad Herenn.* 4. 57, Caes. *BG* 4. 29. 3, Hor. *AP* 20, Ter. *Andr.* 1. 3. 17.

<sup>13</sup> *vivere* = 'pass one's life, reside, dwell', Lewis Short s.v. *vivere* = 'be alive', *ibid.* 1A, B, C.

<sup>14</sup> On this passage see Wiseman, op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 96 ff.

they are smitten by love; this is, to some extent, what Mallius had asked Catullus to do, and Catullus responds, paradoxically in terms of the motif, that his very experience of *amor* (fraternal love, treated as though it were erotic love) makes it impossible for him to help, a response which serves to stress how exceptionally terrible was the experience of *amor* that Catullus had suffered. It was also a theme of ancient poetry for poets to refuse to write certain sorts of poetry. Such a *recusatio* normally served as a means of expressing a poetic ideology. Here Catullus uses it as a way of expressing a personal one. In the days of erotic love (which were certainly painful: Venus mixed sweet bitterness with care (18)) Catullus played (*lusi* (17), i.e. made love and, we may take it, poetry); but in the days of pain deriving from fraternal love he is rendered impotent and poetically incapable. And just as the duty to oneself (so to say) to enjoy oneself erotically and poetically is overwhelmed, so is the duty to fulfil the obligations of friendship. The use of the word *studium* (19, 26) is relevant here. Friendship was regularly said to be based on shared *studia* (i.e. similar interests in life).<sup>15</sup> Mallius clearly retains his interest in the *studia* of erotic experience; Catullus says that *he* has lost those *studia*. The conclusion follows that (in a sense) the *amicitia* to which Mallius appeals is no longer 'valid' or enforceable. Had things been otherwise, of course, Catullus would have met the obligations of friendship of his own accord (40).

Therefore, 68A makes a satisfactory poetic unity in itself, its theme definable as something like the pre-eminent importance and power of the special sort of *amor/amicitia* that exists between brothers as compared with that between *amici* or lovers.

We come next to the thematic links between this poetic entity and 68B, which is a *munus Musarum* (149: *hoc...confectum carmine munus*). It is the performance of a debt of gratitude owing to Allius for his services; and (154) Catullus prays that the Gods too will give Allius the *munera* properly owing to pious men, a description of Allius showing that he too is conceived as operating within a nexus of obligations, which need not be only towards the Gods. Indeed his actions for Catullus are *officia*, which may suggest that he is already under obligations to Catullus. Catullus also stresses that he had no option but to accord this *munus* (41–2) and he makes it a *munus Musarum* in a very full sense, calling on the Muses to hear what he says and then broadcast it to future generations, an unusual alteration of the normal theme by which the poet asks the Muses to tell him certain things so that *he* can broadcast them. This alteration of course stresses the longevity of the resulting praise of Allius, since the Muses last for ever. For what Catullus does is, in a sense, save Allius from death. Allius will become better and better known, even after his death (47) and the blind night (presumably of death) will not swallow him up (44). Mallius had wanted rescue from death (4, *mortis limen*) but does not get it. Allius is offered it, and cannot be denied it. Presumably, also, he will take delight in the *carta...anus* (47) containing his praises;<sup>16</sup> contrast, perhaps, Mallius' failure to be diverted by *veteres scriptores* (7). Similarly, it may be that the expression of Allius' immortality in terms of *fugiens...aetas* (43) is a verbal recall of *iucundum cum aetas florida ver ageret* and *illic mea carpiuntur aetas* (17, 35), which we have already seen to be part of the theme of Catullus' 'death' in 68A. Notice further that there is no suggestion in 68B (quite the reverse) that Allius had asked Catullus to perform the task of praising him. Rather, Catullus acts as in different circumstances he would have done in Mallius' case, viz.: *ultro* (cf. 40). In short, there is a very strong contrast between Catullus' treatment of Allius and his treatment of Mallius – or, as conventional separatists would put it, the strongest inconsistency.

<sup>15</sup> e.g. Cic. *de amicis*. 74; *ad fam.* 2. 13. 2; 3. 10. 9; 5. 13. 5, 15. 2.

<sup>16</sup> In this context it is a great pity that line 48 has gone missing.

What had Allius done? He had performed *officia* (which is what Mallius had asked Catullus to do for him (12)). He has put an end to Catullus' tearful state and afforded him the help that storm-tossed sailors get from prayers to Castor and Pollux (51–66); both these descriptions recall the state of Mallius in 68A. He has afforded Catullus the opportunity of getting together with Lesbia, a task comparable with the *munus Veneris* requested by Mallius. In fact, Allius has done for Catullus what Catullus could not do for Mallius; and (in 68B) Catullus and Allius have between them provided *munera et Musarum...et Veneris*.

In terms of the fulfilment of mutual obligations, therefore, 68B is, compared with 68A, all sweetness and light. Or so it seems so far. But as 68B develops, it becomes clear that Allius' benefaction is not quite so straightforward. This is made clear by 70–148 which (a) compare Catullus/Lesbia with Protesilaus/Laodamia, (b) reveal that the brother's death is still in Catullus' mind, (c) admit that the relationship with Lesbia is not all that it might have been; (a), (b) and (c) turn out to be very closely interconnected.

The comparison with Protesilaus/Laodamia contains some disturbing features. The relationship between Protesilaus and Laodamia was supposed to be marriage (*coniunx/coniugium* in 73, 81, 84, 107) and, similarly, Lesbia is at first represented as coming to the house of Allius like a bride coming to the bridegroom's house (70 f.), with Cupid in attendance dressed in the crocus-coloured tunic characteristic of the marriage ceremony (133–4).<sup>17</sup> But: (i) Lesbia stepped on the threshold, an ill omen in a matrimonial context<sup>18</sup> (so that even if Catullus and Lesbia are 'man and wife' there is a shadow cast over the relationship), and eventually Catullus admits that she was not brought to a perfumed *domus* by her father's hand (i.e. in formal wedlock) but only came furtively from the bosom of her real husband (143 f.); (ii) the union of Protesilaus and Laodamia was also ill omened (Protesilaus was to die in Troy and the Fates knew this all along, 85 f.) and in Catullus' presentation this is surely tied up with the ritual error that accompanied the start of that union. There had been a failure to pacify the *caelestes eri* with sacrifice (75 f.) so that the marriage had been begun *temere* and against the will of those masters. In short, the *domus* of Protesilaus and Laodamia, the mythological parallel to the *domus* of Catullus/Lesbia, was *incepta frustra*. In both cases, then, there is a pretence to propriety (symbolized by the *domus*) which is then exposed as fraudulent. In the case of Protesilaus/Laodamia the 'realization' of this consists in the death of Protesilaus at Troy. This, of course, has a parallel in Catullus' situation, as Catullus makes clear by the repetition of the passage about his brother's death from 68A at a point which is effectively the centre of 68B (leaving aside the final twelve lines as an *envoi*).<sup>19</sup> Catullus' joys and his *domus* have been killed by the brother's death at Troy, and Catullus here adds to what was said in 68A the point that his brother had died far from home, so that he could not even be buried near the rest of the family; that is, the proper bonds between the brother and the family (Catullus included) have been broken peculiarly totally. Some modern scholars have wished to remove these lines from 68B or to claim that they did not

<sup>17</sup> e.g. Cat. 61. 9–10; Ovid, *Met.* 10. 1–2, 21. 164, 170.

<sup>18</sup> e.g. Cat. 61. 159 f.; Tib. 1. 3. 19; Ov. *Amor.* 1. 12. 3; *Met.* 10. 452; Varro ap. Serv. *Eclog.* 8. 29; Plut. *Quaest. Roman.* 29; Lucret. 2. 359.

<sup>19</sup> On this basis lines 41–148 can be divided into a symmetrical structure thus: 41–50 (10 lines); 51–6 (6 lines); 57–72 (16 lines); 73–86 (14 lines); 87–90 (4 lines); 91–100 (10 lines); 101–4 (4 lines); 105–18 (14 lines); 119–34 (16 lines); 135–40 (6 lines); 141–8 (10 lines, assuming lacuna); but this is a purely *formal* fact (the sections of equivalent length in the two halves of the ring do not have any special substantial reference to one another). One may make of it what one will; all that matters here is that 91–100 comes in the centre of the main body of the poem.

originally belong there but were inserted by Catullus at a later stage.<sup>20</sup> This will not do, not only because the arguments used often depend on arbitrary schemes of the symmetry of 68B, but because even if 91–100 are excised one is left with a puzzling emphasis on Troy as a symbol in 89–90, which is hard to explain except in terms of Catullus' brother's death there. The fact is that Catullus wished to let his readers see that he had suffered a loss like Laodamia, and even though this means that Laodamia is explicitly or implicitly compared both with Lesbia and with Catullus, we must live with it. Indeed, we must perhaps grasp the nettle and admit that Catullus wants us to think that just as Laodamia had to learn about life without *coniugium* because of a death at Troy so Catullus must, in similar circumstances, learn a similar lesson. In any event, that seems to be the sort of lesson that he is embracing in 135 ff. He starts by confessing that Lesbia is not satisfied with just him, though claiming that her *furta* are *rara* – which may, however, only be by comparison with Jupiter's (138–9). Then he disavows comparison of god and men – yet earlier he had called Lesbia *diva* and described her coming to Allius' house first in a manner recalling divine epiphany (70 f.) and then (131 f.) with hints that she is really Venus. Finally in the passage already mentioned (p. 117) Catullus points out that, in effect, he has no rights over Lesbia's constancy, since their relationship is an illegitimate one; he also fairly firmly puts the era of Allius' *domus* in the past (*dedit; in qua lusimus* (156)). All he can reasonably hope now is that Lesbia will regard him as more interesting than her other lovers. As long as she remains alive, life will be sweet for him – no mention of the bestowing of any favours. Despite all this, however, it is evident that Catullus' reaction is not what it had once been, burning and weeping with frustration (51 f.). The psychological basis of this change is, I suggest, the feeling that Lesbia – as, after all, simply the object of an illegitimate relationship – cannot be allowed to command the extremes of emotional reaction, a feeling brought home to Catullus by the experience of the loss of his brother. The claims of fraternal *amor* outweigh those of erotic love and should be taken much more seriously; on the loss of the object of that *amor* Catullus realizes that it is not appropriate to go on regarding Lesbia in the light in which he had previously seen her.

This, of course, closely resembles the conclusion reached above about 68A (p. 116). Obviously, though, Catullus' view in 68B is more balanced than it had been in 68A. In 68B he retains some interest in erotic relationships (contrast *tota de mente fugavi/haec studia atque omnes delicias animi* (25–6)) and great interest in fulfilling the obligations of friendship towards Allius.

We come back therefore to the question of the unity of 68A/B. One can, I think, go two ways. (i) The two addressees are different, the poems being juxtaposed to show two distinct attitudes arising from the same basic realization of the paramount importance of fraternal love.<sup>21</sup> Mallius had insufficient claims to breach the walls of Catullus' grief. He had perhaps openly accused Catullus of an improper sense of obligation, of a malicious state of mind and of an attitude inconsistent with his supposed status as a socially cultivated individual (this is to attribute to Mallius the accusations that Catullus explicitly rebuts in 11 f., 37 f.). He had certainly said that Catullus' presence in Verona, when he heeded him in Rome, was *turpe*, which either means 'disgraceful' (i.e. a round condemnation) or, somewhat playfully and deprecatingly (and therefore in the circumstances almost insultingly) 'a damned bad show'. On this reading, 68A is a dignified, but angry poem. In 68B, on the other hand,

<sup>20</sup> cf. Wohlberg, *CP* 50 (1955), 44–5; Copley, *ibid.* 52 (1957), 31–2; Vretska, *WS* 79 (1966), 323–5; Wiseman, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 70 ff.

<sup>21</sup> I accept *argumenti causa* that Catullus was responsible for the arrangement of the poems.

Catullus was faced with a friend whose claims were great. Being capable, when not angered, of a more balanced view, he produced an extremely complex expression of gratitude – though one still informed by his new attitude to Lesbia. (ii) The addressees of the two poems are the same. But 68A is to be read as written in sorrow not anger, and 68B represents a change of mind – or a realization that the claims of friendship on which M.' Allius had relied were great enough to command a *munus Musarum*, though not a *munus Veneris*; indeed, the combination of the lesson learned by Catullus not to over-react to desertion by a mistress with the wish addressed to Allius *sitis felices tu simul et tua vita* (155) makes Catullus in effect tell Allius not to get so upset. Of these two scenarios I slightly prefer (i). Either way it is worth stressing that the consideration of the relative importance of the obligations to grieve for a brother and to satisfy the desires of a friend is not unique to 68A/B; 65 has an exactly similar theme. Catullus explains to Orthalus that *cura* and *dolor* have separated him from the Muses because of his brother's death. None the less, and amidst such grief, he sends him the translation of the *Coma Berenices*, lest Orthalus think that his words of request have got lost; and in an extraordinary image he compares those words to a secret love-token sent by a *sponsus* to his intended,<sup>22</sup> an image that illustrates the huge value put by Catullus on the words of a friend. It is also to be noted, in view of the obsessive concern about marriage displayed, in my view, in 68B, that marriage is a repeated theme of the long poems (61–8), with the exception of 63; and even 63 contains the theme of the wrongness of allowing *furens rabies* to carry one away from one's fatherland, friends, parents, and proper social interests,<sup>23</sup> a theme not without its relation to the concerns of 68 as a whole.

## II

In the midst of the important passage whose purpose is to cast a shadow over the relationship of Catullus and Lesbia (70–148; cf. above pp. 117 ff.) the poet writes that the surges of love carried Laodamia into a *barathrum*. This *barathrum* is then compared with one built by Herakles at Pheneus (a city in northern Arcadia):

tanto te absorbens vertice amoris  
aestus in abruptum detulerat barathrum  
quale ferunt Grai Pheneum prope Cyllenaeum  
siccare emulsa pingue palude solum  
quod quondam caesis montis fodisse medullis  
audit falsiparens Amphitryoniades,  
tempore quo certa Stympalia monstra sagitta  
perculit imperio deterioris eri,  
pluribus ut caeli tereretur ianua divis,  
Hebe nec longa virginitate foret.  
Sed tuus altus amor barathro fuit altior illo,  
qui tamen indomitam ferre iugum docuit.

This is a remarkable simile. A *barathrum* is, after all, a somewhat prosaic object, merely a hole in the ground into which water drains, preventing the surrounding land from becoming marshy. Moreover, the whole description is developed at what may seem to be surprising length. True, the poem is characterized in general by the use of lengthy similes (cf. 53–65, 137 f.) and the whole of 73–130 is made up of a prolonged comparison of Catullus/Lesbia with Protesilaus/Laodamia. But in these other cases there has commonly been a recognition of the relevance of detail to general context such as has not been accorded to the *barathrum* simile. Consequently the passage has

<sup>22</sup> Further comment on this passage below, p. 136.

<sup>23</sup> cf. P. Y. Forsyth, *CJ* 66 (1970/1), 66 f.; G. N. Sandy, *AJP* 92 (1971), 185 f.

evoked hostile (and sometimes inaccurate) comment from modern critics.<sup>24</sup> One naturally wonders, therefore, what made Catullus write it.

There are two ways of considering that problem. (i) What put Catullus in mind of *barathra* and, in particular, the ones at Pheneus?; (ii) Why did the latter appeal to him as a simile in the context of poem 68? As to (i), scholars have sometimes pondered the possibility of a Greek source. P. Weidenbach<sup>25</sup> thought the simile 'Callimachean' (by which, however, he meant little more than 'Alexandrian'). More recently, T. P. Wiseman has mentioned the name of Rhianus in this context (without, however, indicating that he would stake much on the suggestion).<sup>26</sup> As to (ii) there is, as already hinted, surprisingly little comment in the modern literature, voluminous though it is. Since poem 68 is, by any account, one of Catullus' most remarkable poetic achievements, no effort ought to be spared to understand all its constituent parts, and it is the purpose of this section to attempt to stimulate more serious discussion of this striking passage.

## A. SOURCE

### 1. The nature of the source

#### (a) General character of lines 107–18

Clearly we are dealing with something Greek. *Ferunt Grai* (109) is an explicit warning of this;<sup>27</sup> *fodisse... audit* (111) is a unique example of the Latinization of the Greek construction ἀκούειν c. inf.;<sup>28</sup> *falsiparens* (112) recalls Callimachus' ψευδοπάτωρ;<sup>29</sup> *Amphitryoniades* (112) is a patronymic found in Hesiod and Theocritus.<sup>30</sup> At 114 (*imperio deterioris eri*) there is a clear reminiscence of Homer (*Od.* 11, 621), while in 118 (*qui tamen indomitam ferre iugum docuit*) we have a Latin version of the idea παρθένος ἄδμης.<sup>31</sup> In 117 we find *altus amor*, which may seem an entirely natural expression but is hard to parallel in Latin.<sup>32</sup> What it calls to mind is, rather, Theocritus' ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἄλατ' ἔρωτα.<sup>33</sup> Above all there is the word *barathrum* itself. This is of course simply the Greek word βάραθρον or (in its epic form)

<sup>24</sup> 'Farfetched' (C. Witke, *Ennarratio Catulliana* (Leiden, 1968), 48); 'irrelevant in its details' (C.J. Fordyce, *Catullus: a commentary* (Oxford, 1961), ad loc.); 'a style bordering on the grotesque' (F. Copley, *CP* 52 (1957), 31); 'almost impossible to take seriously' (K. Quinn, *Catullus: an interpretation* (London, 1972), p. 188); 'an outrageously long and often unclear comparison', '... the ludicrous tastelessness of comparing Laodamia's love to oozy soil (sic!) or possibly a drainage channel' (J. P. Elder, *HSCP* 60 (1951), 103).

<sup>25</sup> *De Catullo Callimachi Imitatore* (Leipzig, 1873), 39–40. A. Baehrens (*N. Jhb. Phil.* 115 (1877), 412–13; *Catulli Veronensis Liber* Vol. II (Commentarius) (Leipzig, 1885), on LXVIII b 33–4), followed by G. Lafaye (*Catullus et ses modèles* (Paris, 1894), 217) speculated about Callimachean sources for Laodamia and Protesilaus, but there is, of course, no reason why the *barathrum* should come from the same source as that story.

<sup>26</sup> op. cit. (n. 3), p. 72 n. 39.

<sup>27</sup> On phrases of this sort see e.g. E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig/Berlin 1926), 123ff.

<sup>28</sup> LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. ἀκούω III, 3; cf. Fordyce, op. cit. (n. 24) ad loc., Kroll, *Catullus* (Leipzig/Berlin 1923), ad loc.

<sup>29</sup> *Hymn* 6. 98. (The sense of the words in the two passages is, of course, different.)

<sup>30</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 317; *Scut.* 165; 416; 433; 465; fr. 25. 23; 26. 33; 33a. 32M/w; Ps.-Theoc. 25. 71; 113; 152. It was later picked up by Vergil (*Aen.* 8. 103; 214), Propertius (4. 9. 1) and Ovid (*Met.* 9. 140).

<sup>31</sup> e.g. *Od.* 6. 109. 228; *Hom. Hym. Aphr.* 82, 133; Aesch. *Supp.* 149; Soph. *Elec.* 1239; *O.C.* 1056, 1321; *Aj.* 450.

<sup>32</sup> Apul. *Met.* 2. 5 (*serit blanditias, invadit spiritum, amoris profundi pedicis aeternis alligat*) comes as close as anything.

<sup>33</sup> Theoc. 3. 42, where the point is, as in Catullus, the suddenness and totality of the seizure by love.



βέρεθρον. There are, however, certain problems surrounding its treatment in modern discussions.<sup>34</sup>

(b) *The word barathrum*

Fordyce (ad loc.) reckoned that the word *barathrum* was an old borrowing from Greek and therefore, presumably, naturalized in Latin. If that were so we could envisage the process by which Catullus arrived at the simile as a twofold one; first he culls from his general vocabulary the word *barathrum* in the sense of pit or abyss (though with a metaphorical overtone); then he thinks of comparing that *barathrum* with the sinkhole at Pheneus, which also happened to be called a βάραθρον. There would then be two senses of *barathrum* present, and the passage would depend on an equivocation between them. This is not a rare view<sup>35</sup> and is made explicit by Quinn when he writes that the linking of the two meanings 'smells of the lamp'.<sup>36</sup> No doubt it is encouraged by the facts that the Pheneus *barathrum* is introduced as a simile and that the reference to Laodamia's *barathrum* is, in sense and grammar, complete in itself. Nonetheless, it is probably incorrect. As far as the identification of the source of the Hercules/Pheneus story is concerned, it might seem of little importance whether there is an equivocation on *barathrum* in Catullus, since there is undoubtedly a reference to Pheneus. But it does perhaps matter if we are interested in the way that features of Roman poems are influenced by Greek models. To view the passage as Fordyce and Quinn (and implicitly others) do is to devalue the Greekness of *barathrum* and to imply that the source that told of Hercules' building activities at Pheneus was used merely for decking out (and some would say confusing) an existing idea. But if it is denied that there are two sorts of *barathrum* in question then it may emerge that the source has been put to more creative use, for it may have triggered off the whole idea of the comparison of Laodamia's passion with a *barathrum*.

There are two lines of argument against the Fordyce/Quinn view.

(i) The vocabulary of 107–8 makes it clear that, from the beginning, Catullus is thinking of a *barathrum* with water in it.<sup>37</sup> Modern commentators (Fordyce included) have recognized this, but are inclined to think of the water as sea water (cf. n. 35), so that there is still a distinction of type between the *barathrum* in 108 and the sink-hole at Pheneus. But this is unnecessary. Vergil did indeed once use the word *barathrum* in relation to sea water, but that was in the rather special context of Charybdis and under the influence of a Homeric parallel.<sup>38</sup> Otherwise it is hard to find βάραθρον

<sup>34</sup> I consign to a note Kroll's belief (op. cit. (n. 28) ad 109) that Catullus was unclear whether the *barathrum* was a hole or a canal; 110 does not *pace* Kroll require the latter; cf. also Copley, op. cit. (n. 24) 139–40; Elder, op. cit. (n. 24) 103.

<sup>35</sup> Beside Fordyce and Quinn (next note) cf. F. Copley, *Catullus – The Complete Poetry* (Ann Arbor, 1957), who translates *barathrum* as 'gulf', suggesting sea-imagery, and Baehrens (op. cit. (n. 25), *Commentarius*) ad 108 who translates *barathrum* as *periculum*, *perniciēs* and regards the water-image as being from the sea.

<sup>36</sup> Catullus, *The Poems* (London, 1970) ad 108–10.

<sup>37</sup> cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* s. vv. *absorbeo*, *aestus*, and Lewis and Short s.v. *vertex*.

<sup>38</sup> *Aen.* 3. 420 f. (cf. *Od.* 12. 94). R. D. Williams, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius* (Oxford, 1962) ad loc. observes that Vergil's phraseology is markedly similar to Catullus' words in 107 f. There may be some conscious or unconscious connection, but I doubt that this shows that Vergil thought Catullus' *barathrum* had anything to do with the sea. In Sidon. *Carm.* 9. 203 we find *Syrtilium barathrum*, but this probably refers not to the sea, but the desert (as well as having overtones of 'hiding place' or the like). For that usage elsewhere in Sidonius cf. *Carm.* 16. 91 ff.; 17. 13 f.; *Epist.* 8. 12. 1 and 4. *Carm.* 5. 263 f. and 549 are ambiguous, but probably also refer to desert. In *Carm.* 5. 594 *Syrtes* might be either land (like the Alps immediately before) or sea (like the *mare magnum* immediately after). I wonder if in *Carm.* 9. 203 f. Sidonius might have had in mind the information in Seneca, *Epist.* 90. 17: *non in defosso latent Syrticae gentes*

or *barathrum* used of the sea in Greek or Latin poetry before or after Catullus' time (for example, where Vergil had it of Charybdis, Homer (*Od.* 12, 94) had applied it to the cave of Scylla), and throughout Greek literature at least *βάραθρον* when used non-metaphorically and in a context involving water<sup>39</sup> refers to phenomena like that of Pheneus.<sup>40</sup> Pre-Catullan Latin usage of *barathrum* will be discussed below, but nothing to be said there will suggest that the alert and educated reader was likely to take 107–8 as referring to the sea (or other undefined stormy water) rather than to something like what is described in the following simile.

(ii) The proposition that *barathrum* was a naturalized Latin word in the mid-first century, and that, therefore, the notion of *barathrum* was readily available to Catullus without specific impulse from a Greek source, seems to me to be open to objection. There are five earlier or contemporary uses of the word in surviving Latin literature. Two of these, in Lucretius,<sup>41</sup> simply copy the Greek epic application of the word to the pit of Tartarus, a usage that is hardly, in the first instance, relevant to Catullus 68.<sup>42</sup> The other three occurrences (all from Plautus) demand a little more discussion.

(a) LYDUS: o *barathrum* ubi nunc est? ut ego usurpem lubens.

vixisse nimio satiast iam quam vivere.

magistrum quemquam discipulum minitarier?

(*Bacchides* 149–51)

Here *barathrum* is a place of death and punishment<sup>43</sup> and therefore, again, not an immediate parallel to Catullus 68. 107 f. Moreover consideration of the figure of Lydus casts doubts on the naturalization of *barathrum* for, as a pedagogue, he is characterized by a tendency to learned and pompous comment. Compare, for example, *namque ita me di ament ut Lycurgus mihi quidem/videtur posse hic ad nequitiam adducier* (111–12); *etiam me adversum exordire argutias? qui si decem habeas linguas mutum esse addeceat* (127–8), clearly a Homeric comment (e.g. *Il.* 2. 489); *pol metuo magis ne Phoenix tuis factis fuam/teque ad patrem esse mortuom renuntiem* (156–7). The habit has rubbed off on his pupil Pistoclerus as well (*quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thales*

*quibusque propter nimios solis ardores nullum tegumentum satis repellendis caloribus solidum est nisi ipsa arens humus?*

<sup>39</sup> Excluding, therefore, references to the underworld (*Iliad* 8. 14; Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 2. 642; 4. 1698; Nonnus, 2. 70, 378; 4. 55; 27. 84; 30. 159; 36. 101, 204; 44. 260; Lucian, *Ikaromen.* 33) the Athenian punishment-pit (Herod. 7. 133; Aristoph. *Eq.* 1362, *Nub.* 1450, *Ran.* 574, *Plut.* 431 (cum schol.), 1109; Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 20; Plato, *Gorg.* 516d; Plut. *Arist.* 3; Suda s.v. *μητρ-αγύρτης* Harp. s.v. *βάραθρα*; Bekker, *Anec. Graec.* 1. 219) and other pits of various sorts (Plut. *Lyc.* 16 (the *apothetai*, into which deformed children were put)); *Od.* 12. 94, Joseph. *B.J.* 1. 405–6, Heliod. *Aeth.* 5. 2, Galen 17 (1) 10, Antig. Caryst. 135 (various caves, mostly sinister); Nonn. 26. 107, 128, 136; 30. 129; 45. 282 (prisons); Pherecyd. *FGrH* 3F51b (a mantrap); Nonn. 9. 102 (a secure hiding place).

<sup>40</sup> Poseid. *FGrH* 87F89 (R. Timavus); Strabo 289c (Lake Stymphalos/R. Erasinos); Ps. Aristot. *Probl.* 947a 19 f. (of Arcadia in general); Joseph. *B.J.* 1. 406; 3. 509 f. Strabo loc. cit. (quoting Eratosthenes, and using the Arcadian dialect form *ζέρεθρον*), Theophr. *Hist. Plant.* 3. 1. 2; 5. 4. 6, Plut. *Mor.* 557c, Paus. 8. 14. 1; 20. 1 (all of Pheneus). The appearance of *βάραθρον* and its cognates in connection with marshy land belongs in the same context (Polyb. 3. 78. 8; 5. 80. 2; Diod. 1. 30; 16. 46. 5; Steph. Byz. s.v. *βάραθρα*; Non. Theoph. *Ep. de cur. morb.* 1, 446; Strabo 614c.) *βαπαθρώδης* is used of the sea above the lost continent Atlantis in Philo, *de incorr. mund.* 26 = *de mundo* 21.

<sup>41</sup> *de rer. nat.* 3. 966; 6. 606. For Greek examples, cf. n. 39. Later Latin authors followed Lucretius' lead: Verg. *Aen.* 8. 245; Val. Flacc. 2. 86, 192; Stat. *Theb.* 1. 85; 8. 15; Colum. 10. 62; Apul. *Met.* 2. 6 (cf. 2. 5), etc.

<sup>42</sup> Whatever the significance of the evil overtones of this, and other, metaphorical usages of *barathrum* may be for the interpretation of the poem as a whole; see below, p. 132.

<sup>43</sup> Lydus is replying to Pistoclerus' *iam excessit mi aetas ex magisterio tuo*, and the whole context here and throughout the play of Lydus' vain attempts to keep Pistoclerus on the straight and narrow suggests that in despair Lydus feels he should be punished for his failure.

(122); *fiam, ut ego opinor, Hercules, tu autem Linus* (155) and there is also linguistic characterization (*o praeligatum pectus* (136) is clearly paratragic,<sup>44</sup> and at the next appearance of Lydus we find insistent alliteration and use of invented compound words).<sup>45</sup> I suggest, therefore, that *barathrum* in 149 is part of this characterization and that the passage demonstrates nothing about the latinization of the word.

(b) LABRAX: intro rumpam iam huc in Veneris fanum.

CHARMIDES: in barathrum mavelim.

(*Rudens* 570)

Here the reference is surely to the Athenian punishment-pit, and will be taken straight from Diphilus (Old Comedy shows that the execution-pit was a fruitful source of comic threats and curses). There is no cause to think that the passage is evidence for naturalization of the word in any sense, certainly not 'sink-hole'.

(c) PALINURUS (*offering drink*): age, ecfunde hoc cito in barathrum, propere prolue cloacam. (*Curculio* 122)

Here we are somewhat closer to Catullus, for the reference is to a drainage-hole, as is clear from the parallel mention of a *cloaca*. The Cloaca Maxima originally drained the marshes between the Seven Hills<sup>46</sup> and was thus something very like the *barathra* at Pheneus and elsewhere. So the word does appear in a Latin author before Catullus in the same connection as in Catullus 68. But it is hardly being used as a Latin word. Patently, *propere prolue cloacam* is a Latin gloss on a Greek phrase that might otherwise be lost on the audience. Moreover, the metaphor is a very different one from that in Catullus.<sup>47</sup>

We may conclude therefore that (i) only one sort of *barathrum* is involved throughout 107–12 and that, consequently, the initial metaphor of 107–8 and the simile that expands that metaphor (109 f.) hang very closely together, and (ii) there is nothing commonplace or 'latinized' about the idea. On the contrary it is ostentatiously Greek.

### (c) Conclusion

The discussion under (a) and (b) above has shown that Catullus 68. 107–18 is thoroughly Greek. It is, therefore, not unnatural to infer that a Greek source was the stimulus (which is, after all, what Catullus says – *ferunt Grai*). Where are we to look for this Greek source? Callimachus is always a favoured object of attention in such contexts but in this case the relevant evidence is slight in quantity and indecisive in quality and is most conveniently considered separately (Appendix I). All that need be said here is that Pheneus does appear in the surviving fragments, that one passage may argue knowledge of the hydrological peculiarities of the Pheneate plain, but nothing compels us to believe that Callimachus knew or wrote of Herakles as the builder of the *barathra*; whereas there is very probably evidence that another prominent Hellenistic poet did write of just that. It is to that evidence that I now turn.

## 2. The identification of a possible poetic source

### (a) *Herakles and Pheneus in literature other than Catullus 68*

Ancient sources do not have a great deal to say about Herakles and Pheneus.<sup>48</sup> The following passages, however, are pertinent.

<sup>44</sup> It is also the only example of metaphorical use of *praeligare* in Lewis & Short and the *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*

<sup>45</sup> Esp. 371–4; notice *desidiabula* (376), *gerulifigi* (381).

<sup>46</sup> cf. S. B. Platner/T. Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1919), 126.

<sup>47</sup> Application of *barathrum* to the stomach is found also in Hor. *Epist.* 1. 15. 31; Mart. 1. 87. 4; Sidon. *carm.* 5. 325; Venantius Fortunatus 6. 7. 3.

<sup>48</sup> Sources relevant to the Pheneate *barathra* but not mentioning Herakles include Diod. 15. 49. 5; Theophr. *Hist. Plant.* 3. 1. 2; Eratosth. ap. Strab. 389c; Pliny, *NH* 31. 54; Ael. *Nat. Anim.*

(i) Pausanias 8. 14. 1 f. (cf. 19. 4): Herakles built two chasms beneath the mountains Oryxis and Skiathis at Pheneus to receive the water from the plain and also constructed a channel through the plain to direct the water into these chasms. This occurred, according to the people of Pheneus, when Herakles was living in the city at the house of his Pheneate grandmother Laonome. Pausanias does not know when that was, but speculates that it was after Herakles left Tiryns and before he went to Thebes.<sup>49</sup>

(ii) Pausanias 8. 14. 9 f.: 15. 5 f.: Iphikles and other heroes killed during Herakles' expeditions against Elis were buried at Pheneus, and after the final victory over the Eleans Herakles also built a sanctuary of Apollo in the Arcadian city.

(iii) Pseudo-Aristotle 834<sup>b</sup> 18 f., Callimachus fr. 407. III Pf. and Diodorus 4. 33 all agree that Herakles used Pheneus as his base against Elis and erected statues there when the war was over.

(iv) Dionysius, *Ant. Rom.* 1. 34. 2 (cf. 42. 3, 60. 3): the early settlers of the Capitoline Hill in Rome were followers of Herakles, left behind in Italy on the hero's return from Spain, and they included *Φενεᾶται τε καὶ Ἐπειοὶ οἱ ἐξ Ἥλιδος οἷς οὐκέτι πόθος ἦν τῆς οἴκαδε ὁδοῦ διαπεπορθμένης αὐτοῖς τῆς πατρίδος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἡρακλέα πολέμῳ*. I take this to be at least consistent with the supposition that only Epeion had been destroyed by Herakles; in that case, Pheneus could be supposed to have been his base of operations as in (iii) above.<sup>50</sup>

(v) Plutarch, *de sera numinis vindicta* 12 (557c): in a list of examples of belated revenge, Timon mentions three concerning the god Apollo. The first of these is the blocking of the *barathra* and resultant flooding of the land of Pheneus, said to have occurred because, one thousand years earlier, Herakles had stolen the Delphic tripod and removed it to Pheneus.

The connections between these various associations of Herakles and Pheneus will have to be considered in due course (though it is worth noting at this stage that only items (i) and (v) connect Herakles and the *barathra* in any way). First, however, it will be convenient to turn attention to the Plutarch passage, (v), which may prove to point to a Hellenistic poetic source that dealt with the Pheneate *barathra*.

As has already been remarked, the story of Pheneus is only one of three examples of Apolline revenge. The other two are the three destructions of Sybaris in accordance with an oracle that this was necessary to appease the wrath of Hera, and the sending of the Locrian Maidens to Troy in atonement for the rape of Cassandra by Ajax. In connection with this last story Plutarch quotes three hexameter verses:

3. 58; (Athen. 331 D/E confuses the Pheneate R. Aroanios with the Kleitorian one). For a possible further reference to Herakles building the *barathra* see next note. The ultimate outlet of the water was the R. Ladon (Eratosth. loc. cit.) See also J. Baker-Penoyre, *JHS* 22 (1902), 228–40 for recent appearances and disappearances of the lake. At present (Sept. 1978) the plain is dry.

<sup>49</sup> The association of Herakles and feats of engineering concerning water is not limited to Pheneus; cf. e.g. Paus. 9. 38. 7; Diod. 4. 18. 6 (Lake Copais); Strabo, 7, fr. 44 (Lake Bistonis); Diod. 4. 18. 5 (Pillars of Hercules); *ibid.* 6; Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 286 (R. Peneius); Diod. 4. 35. 8, Strabo 458c (R. Achelous); ? *FGrH* 40F1, line 2 (Orchomenus). C. Robert (*Die griech. Heldensage* ii (Berlin, 1921), pp. 528–9) thought that *FGrH* 40F1, line 15 referred to Pheneus; Jacoby (*ad loc.*) and Bölte, *RE* xix 1978, take it as referring to Aetolia (R. Achelous). The state of the text (on the Tabula Albana) is far too poor to allow any decisive conclusion.

<sup>50</sup> In view of these passages Vergil's connection of Evander and Pheneus (*Aen.* 8. 165) may (*pace* Servius) be painful, for Evander also had Heraklean connections; he is first encountered sacrificing to Herakles (102 f.) and his son's belt (*Aen.* 10. 495 f.) has associations with Herakles. (For this latter point I am indebted to an unpublished paper by Margaret Hubbard.) Dion. *Perieg.* 347 (*Geog. Graec. Min.* ii. 124) and Eustathius *ad loc.* (*GGM* ii. 278. 9 f.), bringing Evander to Rome from *ἡ κατὰ Ἀρκαδίαν Κυλλήνη* (i.e. the area of Pheneus) may also be registered in this context, as also the claim (Varro and Greek authors ap. Serv. *Aen.* 3. 167) that the Trojan forebear Dardanus came from Pheneus.

αἱ καὶ ἀναμπέχονοι γυμνοῖς ποσὶν ἤντε δοῦλαι  
 ἡοῖαι σαίρεσκον Ἀθηναίης περὶ βωμόν  
 νόσφι κρηδέμνοιο καὶ εἰ βαρὺ γῆρας ἰκάνοι.

These verses have sometimes been attributed to Euphorion, and Powell printed them together with the reference to Pheneus (though, for some unstated reason, not that to Sybaris) as fragment 53 of that poet.<sup>51</sup> The view has not, however, commanded universal assent. Pfeiffer magisterially declared that the attribution was made *sine iusta causa* and recent editors of Euphorion have shared this scepticism.<sup>52</sup> The matter therefore requires some discussion, and it will be argued that all three stories do indeed come from a poem of Euphorion.

(b) *The source of Plutarch's three stories of Apolline revenge*

Firstly, we may take it that all three stories have a poetic source. Two arguments may be advanced for this: (i) the quotation of lines of verse about the Locrian Maidens (which there is no reason to believe to be an alien importation by Plutarch) makes a poetic source explicit in one case; (ii) considerations derived from the disposition of examples in this part of Timon's speech lead to the same conclusion. The first examples in chapter 12 (Aesop, Branchidae and Agathocles) could come from historical sources;<sup>53</sup> the two examples at the end of the chapter (the tattooing of Thracian women and the black clothes worn by inhabitants of the Po valley) are clearly poetic and perhaps derive from Phanocles, since *Erotes e Kaloi* fr. 1 (Powell) refers to the Thracian custom, while fr. 6 mentions the story of Cynus, a relative of Phaethon, who died of grief on seeing the latter's body being washed on the banks of the Eridanus (i.e. Po).<sup>54</sup> The three Apolline examples come in between these groups of 'historical' and 'poetic' examples and seem to go with the latter group. True, the cases of the Thracian women and the Po valley inhabitants are contrasted with the Apolline examples as being less heinous instances of unjust delayed revenge. But the terms of the last part of this contrast (αἱ δὲ τῶν θεῶν ὄργαι τίνι λόγῳ παραχρῆμα δυνόμεναι καθάπερ ἔνιοι τῶν ποταμῶν, εἶτα ὕστερον ἐπ' ἄλλους ἀναφερόμεναι πρὸς ἐσχάτας συμφορὰς τελευτῶσιν;) clearly reflect, metaphorically, the case of Pheneus, and that suggests that the Apolline stories should be grouped with Thrace

<sup>51</sup> J. Toup, *Epistola Critica* (London, 1767), 162 f.; idem., *Analecta Alexandrina*, 13 f. (non vidi); E. Thraemer, *Hermes* 25 (1890), 55; J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925), 40–1; A. Barigazzi, *Athen.* 26 (1948), 50 f.

<sup>52</sup> *Callimachus* i (Oxford, 1949), ad *Aetia* i, fr. 35. He proposed no alternative attribution. H. van Herwerden (quoted in A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 14 (1911), 173) thought the lines came from Arctinus' *Iliupersis*, but what his reasons were is not stated. B. A. van Groningen (*Euphorion* (Amsterdam, 1977)) puts the lines among *Fragments douteux* (no. 192) and claims the style is much too simple for Euphorion (or Callimachus). But it is not obvious that the style is damagingly simpler than e.g. fr. 2, 23, 34, 58, 84, 92, 96, 98, etc. (P). Moreover there are features of the lines that would at least make their attribution to archaic epic dangerous. (i) ἀναμπέχονοι is unknown to archaic epic, and indeed to most authors except the Hellenistic Pythaeetus (*FGH* 299 F 3). (ii) νόσφι κρηδέμνοιο is not an archaic epic way of saying 'without a headdress' (Hes. *Op.* 91, 113; *Scut.* 15 are hardly comparable, and anyway the presence of ἄτερ makes a difference). (iii) The use of ἡοῖαι can be paralleled in [Hes.] *Scut.* 396 and *Hom. Hym. Herm.* 17, but is more common in Hellenistic poets (Call. fr. 59. 18; 75. 10; *Epigr.* 20; Ap. Rhod. 2. 688, 899). In short, the lines do not look un-Hellenistic. L. Alberto de Cuenca (*Euforion de Calcis* (Madrid, 1976)) prints the lines with the other fragments of *Chiliades* as no. 79 but marks it *Incertum*.

<sup>53</sup> As is clear from their content and the identity of the parallel sources (Herodotus and Curtius in the first two cases).

<sup>54</sup> Polyb. 2. 16. 3 f. discusses the Phaethon story as an example of the sort of *poetic* story that ought to be excluded from historiography.

and the Po valley as against the historical examples earlier in the chapter. That being so, it seems reasonable to suppose that like the former and unlike the latter they had a poetic source.

Secondly, it is not implausible that the three Apolline stories (as a sub-group within the group of poetic stories) should have the same poetic source. Further support for this may be found in a number of features that tie them together. (i) Apollo's oracle is instrumental in all of them. (ii) In all there is, or could be, the idea of periodic punishment over a long time. That is explicit for Sybaris and Locris, and could apply also to Pheneus, which was flooded on several occasions.<sup>55</sup> (iii) One of the destructions of Sybaris was achieved with the help of the waters of the R. Crathis, which normally, like the water at Pheneus, drained through a sink-hole.<sup>56</sup> (iv) The 1,000-year period mentioned in connection with Pheneus also appears in the story of the Locrian Maidens; the tribute was due for 1,000 years and terminated when that period had elapsed.<sup>57</sup> One may speculate whether a long period of this sort might also have figured in the story of Sybaris. Since the version in this passage is otherwise unknown, it is hard to say, but the following considerations might be relevant. (a) Only two destructions of the city on the Crathis are known (c. 510 and 448 B.C.).<sup>58</sup> A much earlier destruction in the mythical period could make up the total of three. (b) Many cities of Magna Graecia claimed mythical foundations in the time of the Nostoi. Lycophron (*Alexandra* 919 f.; 1075) knew a story about a Trojan captive burning some Greek boats near the Crathis and another about the burial of Philoctetes between the Crathis and Nauethus (the rivers of Sybaris and Croton). One source (Solinus) explicitly accords Sybaris a mythical foundation.<sup>59</sup> (c) The idea of Hera's wrath would be based on existing stories about the destruction of Sybaris, in which she appeared as an offended diety.<sup>60</sup> By 448, of course, on any mythological chronology, 1,000 years could not quite have elapsed since the foundations of Sybaris (or *a fortiori* the oracle). But if we do not insist on complete accuracy, 700–900 years might do well enough. It cannot, of course, be proved that any of this construction is correct; but if it were, it would not be unduly prejudiced to regard the sort of invention involved as Hellenistic. But in any case, two of the examples are connected by the 1,000-year period and in this, as in some of the other connections noted above, the shared feature is not explicit in Plutarch. That may suggest that he is not solely responsible for the selection and collocation of the examples; i.e. that he has taken them over from a single poetic context.

Plutarch writes of present-day Pheneates (*Φενεάτας* . . . *τοὺς νῦν*) and says that it is

<sup>55</sup> Plin. *NH* 31. 54.

<sup>56</sup> cf. *RE* ivA 1005. It is interesting to note that the original R. Crathis, after which the one at Sybaris was named, was near Pheneus (Hdt. 1. 145; Strab. 386c; Paus. 8. 15. 8–9; 18. 4). Can we conceivably detect here the basis on which a poet might effect a transition from one story to the other?

<sup>57</sup> Call. *Aet.* i, fr. 35 (Pf); Lycophr. *Alex.* 1153; Tzetz. ad Lycophr. *Alex.* 1141; Schol. Lycophr. 1155; Schol. *Iliad.* 13. 66; Apollod. *Epitome* 6.22; Iamblichus, *Vita Pythag.* 8. 42.

<sup>58</sup> Diod. 11. 90. 3–4; 12. 9 f. I take the expulsion of the former Sybarites from Sybaris/Thurii (a different site), and their descendants' sufferings at the hands of the Bruttians to be irrelevant, since they do not concern the city on the Crathis.

<sup>59</sup> Solinus, 2.10. Intriguingly, the founders are said to have been the Troezenians and Sagaris, son of *Locrian Ajax*. Could this be another hidden connection between the three Apolline stories? cf. n. 56.

<sup>60</sup> In these versions her anger was due to (i) the murder of some Crotonian ambassadors (Phylarchus, *FGrH* 81 F45), or (ii) the murder, at altars, of the supporters of a deposed ruler (Heracleides, *On Justice*, fr. 49 Wehrli) or (iii) an occasion on which a master stopped beating a slave not when the latter took refuge at an altar but when he fled to the tomb of the master's father. (Steph. Byz. s.v. *Σύβαρις*; cf. Timaeus, *FGrH* 566 F50).

not long since the cessation of the Locrian tribute. On the face of it, then, there was a flood at Pheneus in the first century A.D. and the Locrian tribute ceased in the first century A.D. or B.C. Some scholars, however, have thought that these apparent references to Plutarch's own day are spurious and carried over from his source.<sup>61</sup> This is not impossible. The 1,000 years from the theft of the tripod ought to bring one to a date in the fourth or third century (depending on the system of mythological dating adopted). The 1,000 years from the rape of Cassandra could point to the same period. Moreover, according to Apollodorus and Tzetzes<sup>62</sup> the Locrian tribute ceased on the completion of the 1,000 years *μετὰ τὸν Φωκικὸν πόλεμον*. Whether that refers to the Sacred War of 356/346 as is usually assumed<sup>63</sup> or to the Gallic attack on Delphi in the early third century (as E. Manni suggests)<sup>64</sup> we are once again dealing with the late classical or early Hellenistic period. It is true that the tribute seems to have started again in the latter part of the third century.<sup>65</sup> But there is no independent evidence that it lasted as late as the first century B.C. or A.D. nor that, if it did, it was precisely then that it stopped again. Plutarch displays no knowledge of the temporary cessation of the tribute and in this respect his treatment resembles that in those Hellenistic authors who wrote before the re-starting of the custom.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, the reference in the quoted verses to the priestesses staying into their old age fails to tally with their annual replacement in the version of the tribute that operated in the later third century.<sup>67</sup>

All these indications, therefore, make it tempting to suppose that the three Apolline stories in *de sera numinis vindicta* come from a single, Hellenistic poet. It cannot be Lycophron (for the three lines quoted in Plutarch are not from the *Alexandra*) nor Callimachus, whose treatment of the story of the Locrian Maidens was in elegiac metre.

Euphorion is much the most likely candidate, and one looks in particular to his poem *Chiliades*. The content of this poem is described in the Suda (s.v. *Εὐφορίων*) as follows: *ἔχει δὲ ὑπόθεσιν εἰς τοὺς ἀποστερήσαντας αὐτὸν χρήματα ἃ παρέθετο ὡς δίκην δοῖεν κἄν εἰς μακράν. εἶτα συνάγει διὰ χιλίων ἑτῶν χρησμούς ἀποτελεσθέντας*. This passage has been the object of much dispute.<sup>68</sup> For the present purpose two points are important. (i) Heyne and Meineke emended *ἑτῶν* to *ἐπῶν*, making the poem take its title from its construction out of sections of 1,000 lines (cf. Tzetzes' *Chiliades*). Modern editors have generally, and rightly, rejected this.<sup>69</sup> (ii) The meaning of

<sup>61</sup> e.g. Momigliano, *Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici* (Rome, 1960), 448. For the opposite assumption see e.g. Baker-Penoyre, op. cit. (n. 48), 236, 240. Diodorus' reference (15. 49. 5) to the lake being empty *ἐν τοῖς προτέροις χρόνοις* is also probably (*pace* Baker-Penoyre) taken over from his source.

<sup>62</sup> Apollod. *Epitome* 6. 20 f.; Tzetz. ad Lycophr. *Alex.* 1141.

<sup>63</sup> e.g. Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 61), 446.

<sup>64</sup> *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Turin, 1963), 167–8.

<sup>65</sup> A. Wilhelm, op. cit. (n. 52), 163; cf. Momigliano, loc. cit., Manni, loc. cit.

<sup>66</sup> e.g. Timaeus, Lycophron (cf. Momigliano, loc. cit.)

<sup>67</sup> Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 61), 448 f.

<sup>68</sup> Most recently, L. Alberto de Cuenca, op. cit. (n. 52), 11 f. and B. A. van Groningen, op. cit. (n. 52), 4 f.

<sup>69</sup> C. G. Heyne, *Excursus III ad Bucolica*, p. 258 Wagner; A. Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina* (Berlin, 1843), 15. The following counter-arguments may be advanced. (i) The *marginale* in the Suda (*περί χρησμών ὡς διὰ χιλίων ἑτῶν ἀποτελοῦνται*) implies that someone thought the reading *ἐπῶν* correct. (ii) *χιλιάς* can mean a period of 1,000 years (cf. *Alexan. Aet. fr.* 4. 4 (Powell) and the title of a work of Asinius Quadratus variously called *Ῥωμαϊκὴ χιλιάς* and *Ῥωμαϊκὴ χιλιετηρίς* (testimonia in H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*<sup>2</sup> ii (Leipzig, 1906), 142 f.)). (iii) The passage of *Aetia* i where Callimachus describes the *ἄεισμα διηνεκές* as written *ἐν πολλαῖς χιλιάσι* hardly encourages the idea that a poet of Euphorion's type would willingly

διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν has recently been called into question. The phrase has generally been supposed to signify that the oracles were fulfilled after a period of 1,000 years. Van Groningen (loc. cit. (n. 68)) disputes this, arguing that 1,000 years was approximately the length of the mythical and historical history of Greece down to Euphorion's day and that all the author of the Suda meant was that the stories Euphorion used in *Chiliades* all fall within that period. This seems to make the statement a rather superfluous one and (*pace* von Groningen) the most natural reading of the passage makes διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν pick up *κἂν ἐς μακράν*, so that the figure of 1,000 years becomes an example of the great length of time that may have to elapse before justice is done. It is not true that διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν 'n'est point du tout l'équivalent de μετὰ χίλια ἔτη' (van Groningen loc. cit.). Compare for example Isocrates, *Archidamus* 27 (ταύτην [sc. Μεσσήνην] δὲ διὰ τετρακοσίων ἐτῶν μέλλουσι κατοικίσειν) as well as the common use of διὰ = μετὰ in phrases such as διὰ χρόνου,<sup>70</sup> διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ,<sup>71</sup> διὰ μακροῦ,<sup>72</sup> διὰ μακρῶν χρόνων,<sup>73</sup> δι' ὀλίγου and διὰ πολλοῦ.<sup>74</sup> Notice also that in the Isocrates example the point of the use of διὰ appears to be to stress the length of time involved (διὰ τετρακοσίων ἐτῶν amounts to 'after 400 years and despite that being such a long time'). Just the same point is relevant in the Suda and accounts for the author using διὰ c. gen. rather than μετὰ c. acc. Linguistically, therefore, there is no difficulty in the usual view of διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν.<sup>75</sup> If then, *Chiliades* was a poem about oracles fulfilled over 1,000-year periods, it fits the requirements of Plutarch, *de sera numinis vindicta* 12 very well. Plutarch quotes Euphorion elsewhere<sup>76</sup> and it would be very natural for him to think of the poem when writing a treatise precisely about delayed divine vengeance. The theft of the tripod from Delphi, the seizure of Cassandra from a Trojan altar and the sin of the Sybarites (which probably turned on desecration of altars (cf. n. 60)) would (*pace* van Groningen) make very apposite parallels for Euphorion's purposes; the sanctity of altars ought to have protected Cassandra and the tripod just as the good faith of his banker ought to have protected Euphorion. It is interesting to note, in view of the points made above about a mythical foundation of Sybaris being part of the story of the three destructions, that *Chiliades* fr. 46P (= 50 van Groningen = 75 de Cuenca) may be connected with the burning of Greek ships at the R. Nauethus; that is, *Chiliades* dealt with Italian *nostoi*.

As far as the story of Pheneus is concerned, there are two more points: (i) Barigazzi's suggestion that the play on words 'Ἀπόλλων... Φενεάτας ἀπόλλυσι might have been

label a poem *Chiliades* in this sense. (iv) The text of Suda as it stands is perfectly acceptable linguistically, whereas the proposed emendation (συνάγει διὰ χιλίων ἐπῶν meaning 'collected together in groups of 1,000 verses') is less easily paralleled; it would have to be either an instrumental construction analogous to διὰ λόγων συγγίγνεσθαι (e.g. Plat. *Polit.* 272B) or a (metaphorical) spatial one like διὰ δέκα ἐπαλξέων (Thuc. 3. 21), neither of which seems very happy. (v) Above all, the point of the poem (ὡς δίκην δοῖεν, κἂν εἰς μακράν) seems to require an indication of time in the title.

<sup>70</sup> Soph. *Phil.* 758; Xen. *Cyr.* 1. 4. 28; 5. 5. 41; idem, *Mem.* 4. 4. 5; idem, *Oec.* 9. 10; idem, *Cyneg.* 5. 3; Lys. 1. 12; Plat. *Rep.* 328B.

<sup>71</sup> Hdt. 3. 27. 3; Aristoph. *Plut.* 1045.

<sup>72</sup> Thuc. 6. 15. 4; 6. 91.

<sup>73</sup> Plat. *Tim.* 22D.

<sup>74</sup> Thuc. 5. 14. 1 and Luc. *Nigr.* 2 respectively.

<sup>75</sup> Van Groningen (loc. cit.) further objects that even the riches of Greek myth and history may have been unable to provide Euphorion with a large enough store of stories where the fulfilment of oracles took 1,000 years; but it is better to approach the interpretation of the Suda without any presuppositions on that score. For one thing, we do not know on what scale Euphorion treated his stories or, therefore, how many he needed to fill his poem. But assuming that his interest was in writing poetic narratives (the affectation of teaching his enemies a lesson being merely an excuse) it could be that the scale was fairly large.

<sup>76</sup> *Quaest. Conv.* 676F (= fr. 84P = 89 v. Gron. = 20 de Cuenca); ? *ibid.* 683B (= fr. 175P = 190 v. Gron. = Dub. 1 de Cuenca).



taken over from Euphorion, who was fond of the learned game of etymologizing names;<sup>77</sup> and (ii) what is perhaps a clinching argument from another fragment of Euphorion, preserved in the *Etymologicum Magnum*: (148 P = 148 van Groningen = 169 de Cuenca): βέθρον· βέρεθρον καὶ συγκοπῇ βέθρον· Κράτης καὶ Εὐφορίων οὕτως. It is tempting to think that this otherwise unplaced fragment came from a description of Herakles at Pheneus.

It emerges therefore that the probable source of the Apolline revenge stories in Plutarch, *de sera numinis vindicata* 12 is Euphorion's *Chiliades* and, consequently, that Euphorion wrote about the *barathra* at Pheneus.

(c) *Catullus and the other sources*

(i) Catullus asserts that Herakles built that *barathrum* at Pheneus. At first sight that finds a parallel only in Pausanias' account (item (i) above), there being nothing explicit about the origins of the *barathra* in Euphorion/Plutarch. But this is deceptive for it is surely easy to see that the idea (which *is* in Euphorion/Plutarch) that it was in punishment for a crime of Herakles that the *barathra* were blocked and Pheneus flooded arose because Herakles had benefited the Pheneates by building those *barathra*. There was also, of course, the simple fact the Herakles had taken the tripod to Pheneus. One may observe that this feature of the story makes all the more sense if it were the case in Euphorion (as in Pausanias) that Pheneus was in some sense Herakles' home. On the face of it the relation between Pausanias and Euphorion/Plutarch is slight enough (apart from the bare mention of the *barathra*) for the Elean War has no place in Euphorion/Plutarch while the tripod is absent in Pausanias. But there is no obvious objection to the idea that Pausanias reflects an esoteric tradition of Herakles as a Pheneate hero and that Euphorion, knowing such a tradition independently,<sup>78</sup> made it the basis of the idea that Herakles took the tripod there, an idea that then allowed him to make the spectacular results of the blockage of the *barathra* into a story of divine revenge of a suitably *recherché* sort.<sup>79</sup>

We have now, therefore identified a poetic work, earlier than Catullus, which could well have narrated, or made some substantial reference to, Herakles' building of the *barathra* at Pheneus. Is it reasonable to suppose that Catullus might have lighted on the tale precisely in that source? Traces of Euphorion have been detected elsewhere in Catullus. Some<sup>80</sup> think 64, 30 a recollection of Euphorion fr. 122 P (= 189 van Groningen = 154 de Cuenca); others find a parallel between *funera nec funera* (64, 83) and ἄταφος τάφος in a fragment of Euphorion.<sup>81</sup> Again it has been argued in some quarters that Euphorion was the source to whom Catullus turned on the subject of

<sup>77</sup> op. cit. (n. 51), 51 n. 3 (cf. fr. 57, 86, 87, 101, 196 (P)). Some but not all of the other arguments advanced here about the attribution of the Apolline stories to Euphorion appear also in Barigazzi's article.

<sup>78</sup> The connection of Herakles/Pheneus/Elean War was already known to Callimachus (cf. p. 124, Appendix I). It might also be that the association of Apollo and Pheneate flooding in Call. *Hymn* 4.71 (cf. Appendix I (iii)) assisted the invention.

<sup>79</sup> One might also note the temple of Apollo mentioned by Pausanias 8. 15. 5. Stories linking Apollo and Herakles in an amicable fashion are rare enough (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), 80; H. W. Parke & J. Boardman, *JHS* 77 (1957), 278); another one is the story that Gytheium was a joint foundation of Apollo and Herakles as a gesture of reconciliation after the theft of the tripod (Paus. 3. 21. 8). One might hypothesize that knowledge of the Heraklean Apollo temple at Pheneus combined with knowledge of this version of Gytheium's foundation could have helped inspire the idea of the tripod being taken to Pheneus.

<sup>80</sup> cf. e.g. Fordyce, op. cit. (n. 24) ad. loc., K. Latte, *Philol.* 90 (1935), 154.

<sup>81</sup> Catullus' phrase refers to victims of the Minotaur; Euphorion's (fr. 24c61 Van Groningen = 38c, 59 de Cuenca) to the death of Comaetho's father, eaten by wild beasts. For the comparison, cf. Latte, loc. cit. (n. 80).

Theseus and Adriadne.<sup>82</sup> In any case, the status of Euphoriion in Hellenistic and later literary milieus<sup>83</sup> makes him *a priori* a likely enough object of interest to Catullus. It might be added that, if it is correct to suppose that Parthenius played an important role in the poetic generation of Catullus,<sup>84</sup> he would quite likely have brought the poetry of Euphoriion to the attention of Roman writers.<sup>85</sup>

(ii) There is only one problem. Catullus synchronizes the building of the *barathra* with the Labour of the Stymphalian Birds. That seems to have no point of contact with Euphoriion (or Pausanias). Either, therefore, Catullus has altered things somewhat or he was not following Euphoriion after all. If the latter were the case then no doubt Rhianus is the best alternative hypothesis to date, given his authorship both of a *Herakleia* and of several poems on Peloponnesian myths.<sup>86</sup> It should be noted, however, that there is no evidence for the *barathra* appearing explicitly in any poet but Euphoriion nor any sign of the bringing together of Herakles at Pheneus (with or without the *barathra*) and the Stymphalian Birds except in Catullus. Of course, one can see one way that the synchronism might have been achieved. The major association of Herakles and Pheneus turns on the Elean War resulting from Herakles' failure to receive his reward for cleansing the Augean stables. Anyone who supposed that the *barathra* were built at the time of the war and that the war followed straight on the cleansing of the stables could produce an approximate synchronism with the next Labour in the list; and in many versions that was the Killing of the Stymphalian Birds.<sup>87</sup> There is, however, not a scrap of evidence that the mainstream mythological tradition ever thought of this. The nearest one can find is the claim of Mnaseas that the Birds were really women killed by Herakles because they had entertained the Moliones, Augeas' supporters in the Elean War,<sup>88</sup> but I doubt that that gets us very far. By and large the sources keep the War quite separate from the series of Labours; the two authors who date the period at Pheneus at all (Pausanias and Diodorus) both put it later than the time of the Labours,<sup>89</sup> and Pausanias, who alone mentions both the war and the building of the *barathra*, deliberately avoids dating them together.<sup>90</sup> In short the position is this: if there was a poem about Herakles fighting in the Elean War with Pheneus as his base (and even if it synchronized the War with the pursuit of the Stymphalian Birds), it cannot be proved to have mentioned the building of the *barathra*.

Perhaps therefore the synchronism is Catullus' own contribution,<sup>91</sup> or even comes from some intermediate source, for example the *Chronika* of Cornelius Nepos, an

<sup>82</sup> E. Maas, *Hermes* 24 (1889), 528 f.; L. Castiglioni, *Studi Alexandrini*, i: *Arianna e Theseo* (Pisa, 1907); A. Barigazzi, *Miscellanea*... *Rostagni* (cf. n. 64 above), 422 f. idem, *Maia* 17 (1963), 163; Fordyce, op. cit. (n. 24), 272.

<sup>83</sup> The large number of fragments is one indication of this. The catchphrase *Cantores Euphoriionis* is another (cf. my 'Cantores Euphoriionis', Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar i (= *Arca* (Classical and Medieval Papers and Monographs) ii) (Liverpool, 1977), 1 f. and 'Cantores Euphoriionis Again', *CQ* N.S. 29 (1979), 358 f.).

<sup>84</sup> cf. Wiseman, op. cit. (n. 3), 47–59 (and further literature quoted there).

<sup>85</sup> He knew Euphoriion's poetry (cf. *Erot. Path.* 13, 26, 28) and, if the reported tastes of the emperor Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 70) are a consistent indicator, his own poetry may have owed something to Euphoriion.

<sup>86</sup> cf. Wiseman, op. cit. (n. 3), 72 n. 39.

<sup>87</sup> *RE* Supplbd. iii. 1021–2. The geographical proximity of Pheneus and Stymphalos (and the fact that L. Stymphalos is drained by *barathra*) would help.

<sup>88</sup> *FHG* iii. 151, fr. 8.

<sup>89</sup> Diod. 4. 33; Paus. 8. 14. 1 f.

<sup>90</sup> cf. above p. 124.

<sup>91</sup> cf. Friedrich, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1908), ad 109; M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *Catullo* (Turin, n.d.) ad 112; J. Granarolo, *L'Oeuvre de Catulle* (Paris, 1967), 123 n. 1 (all without arguments).

author arguably having much in common 'with the preoccupations of Alexandrian-type poets, especially in the *doctrina* of legendary pseudo-history'.<sup>92</sup> Possibly, however, we should not too readily deny it to Euphorion. After all, when in relation to the theft of the tripod did Euphorion hold the *barathra* to have been constructed? The only connection between the *barathra* and the tripod necessary for Euphorion's purposes was that Herakles had built them at *some* time (so that their blockage and subsequent flooding of the plain could be seen as a punishment for Herakles' sin). Since there is no particular reason to suppose Euphorion thought the construction later than, or contemporary with, the theft of the tripod we are at liberty to imagine he dated it earlier, and precisely at the time of the Killing of the Stymphalian Birds.<sup>93</sup> This would mean that he took a different view from that in the tradition reflected by Pausanias (having in common with him only Herakles' building of the *barathra* and his status as a Pheneate hero). But since the theft of the tripod was itself, so far as we know, an item unknown to that tradition, this is hardly a very worrying fact.

I conclude, therefore, that a passage of Euphorion's *Chiliades* played an important role in stimulating Catullus to write the *barathrum* simile. It is time to turn to consideration of the result.

## B. SIGNIFICANCE

What was the attraction for Catullus of the idea of the *barathrum*? Let us be clear at the outset that the *barathrum* symbolizes the original love of Laodamia for Protesilaus. Alternative views espoused by Friedrich, Baehrens and others are unacceptable.<sup>94</sup> Proceeding on that assumption, what are the characteristics of that love?

(i) It is inescapable. The removal of its object does not diminish it, but rather leads to Laodamia's destruction. (I assume that *ante...quam...hiems...avidum saturasset amorem posset ut abrupto vivere coniugio* (81-4) and *vita dulcius atque anima* (106) hint at her death, a regular part of the myth.)<sup>95</sup>

(ii) There are hints that Laodamia was not an entirely willing victim. If *indomita* (118) is supposed to correspond to *παρθένος ἄδμής*,<sup>96</sup> then we might note that that concept is associated with virgin goddesses (who *remain* virginal)<sup>97</sup> and with certain ostentatiously virginal mortals (e.g. Atlanta, the Danaids)<sup>98</sup> whose attitude could be thought excessive and hybristic and who are not sympathetic characters (*quid fuit asperius*

<sup>92</sup> T. P. Wiseman (letter, 22 April 1978). The point will be discussed in his forthcoming book *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature* (Leicester University Press); cf. also F. Cairns, 'Catullus I', *Mnemos.* 22 (1969), 153 ff.

<sup>93</sup> There is at least as much (or as little) evidence that this synchronism had been thought out before Catullus' time as there is for the other one hypothesized above (p. 130); more if Catullus' use of it and claim that it derived from *Grai* count as evidence.

<sup>94</sup> Friedrich, op. cit. (n. 91) ad 107 (grief at loss of Protesilaus); A. Riese, *Gedichte des Catullus* (Leipzig, 1884), ad 117 (misfortune of losing her husband); Baehrens, op. cit. (n. 25, Commentar.), ad loc. (fate of unrequited love at Protesilaus' death); Wohlberg, *CP* 50 (1955), 44 ('love in grief'). All these views have difficulty with 117-18 and require *detulerat* (108) to signify the speed of Laodamia's fall rather than to be taken at its face value (viz. that Laodamia's falling in love preceded her loss of Protesilaus). cf. also n. 118.

<sup>95</sup> cf. G. Lieberg, *Puella Divina* (Amsterdam, 1962), 209 ff.

<sup>96</sup> cf. above p. 120.

<sup>97</sup> Artemis: Soph. *Elec.* 1239; Athena: idem. *Aj.* 450. In *Od.* 6. 109 it is applied to Nausicaa, who is also compared to Artemis.

<sup>98</sup> Atalanta: Soph. *O.C.* 1321; Danaids: Aesch. *Suppl.* 149. Antigone and Ismene, who spend their lives with their blind father/brother Oedipus instead of marrying are *τὰς διαστόλους ἀδμητας ἀδελφάς* (Soph. *O.C.* 1056).

*Nonacrina Atalanta?* as Ovid wrote).<sup>99</sup> They resist but must ultimately fall. It is striking that the Theocritean parallel for *altus amor* quoted above<sup>100</sup> is applied precisely to Atlanta's eventual collapse from chaste standoffishness. In any case, the yoke image, though present in neutral words like *coniugium* and *σύζυγος*, when spelt out, as here (118), connotes resistance.<sup>101</sup> True Catullus writes that love *taught* Laodamia to bear the yoke, which may sound innocuous enough. But compare *quam ieiuna pium desideret ara cruorem/docta est amisso Laudamia viro* (79–80), another case of *force majeure*.

(iii) Willing or not, Laodamia was overwhelmed<sup>102</sup> and dangerously so, for her passion turned out to involve sin against the gods<sup>103</sup> (the house she came to was *inceptam frustra nondum cum sanguine sacro/hostia caelestis pacificassset eros* (75–6). Her love is therefore sinister, and since the result of the sin was the loss of Protesilaus (and her own death), destructive.

How do lines 107 ff. match all this? First a general point. The metaphor of falling in love, so familiar to us, is distinctly rare in antiquity. The things one falls into metaphorically are generally unpleasant.<sup>104</sup> When Philostratus (*Epist.* 50) contemplates falling in love, it is connected with inescapability (it is even worse than being caught by Charybdis). Callimachus (*Epigr.* 45) *fears* lest he be thrown into love. In *Bacchae* (813) Pentheus falls in love with the idea of spying on the bacchantes, which proves to have been hardly a beneficial state of mind. Atalanta leaping into deep love fits the same pattern.<sup>105</sup> In these circumstances, the ancient reader might well consider the idea of falling in 107 f. as by itself picking out the sinister aspect of Laodamia's love. As for the *barathrum* in particular, there are three points.

(i) A *barathrum* affords no escape, as is clear from many of the word's uses and associations.<sup>106</sup> To fall into one is to be lost for ever.

(ii) The unwillingness of Laodamia is paralleled by the sudden and irresistible falling of the water. Love forced her out of her previous attitude; the *barathrum* carries off water that has previously been flowing along quite placidly.

(iii) The sinister quality of her love, which is so important for the poem, is matched by the *barathrum*. Compare 107 f. with another passage of poem 68 using water-imagery in connection with love, viz. 57 ff. In this passage there is much more light. Catullus escapes from a black whirlwind (63) thanks to Allius, whose help is like a stream at first careering down a mountain, but then proceeding more gently to bring *levamen* to a weary traveller in the parched plain. Contrast Laodamia's *barathrum*, which has the turbulence of a whirlwind (*vertex, aestus*) and which involves falling water and a dry plain, but which affords no *levamen*.<sup>107</sup> Moreover, it is legitimate to recall that all other metaphorical uses of *barathrum*/βάραθρον have sinister connotations of darkness, error, punishment and destruction (see Appendix II). I believe Catullus intended these overtones to be present in the reader's mind.<sup>108</sup> That does not mean

<sup>99</sup> *Ars Am.* 2. 185.

<sup>100</sup> p. 120 and n. 33.

<sup>101</sup> cf. e.g. Prop. 2. 3. 47 f.; Hor. *Od.* 1. 33. 10 f.; 3. 9. 18 f.

<sup>102</sup> *flagrans... amore* (73); *avidum... amorem* (83); *sed tu horum magnos vicisti furores...* (129).

<sup>103</sup> cf. Lieberg, op. cit. (n. 95), 241 f.; L. Pepe, *GIF* 6 (1953), 107 f.; Witke, op. cit. (n. 24), 34 f.; Quinn, op. cit. (n. 24), 181 f., 266. Others have, of course, questioned Laodamia's guilt (e.g. G. Pennisi, *Emerita* 27 (1959), 89 f., 213 f.; H. Bardon, *Propositions sur Catulle* (Brussels, 1970), 98; W. Hering, *Acta Classica Univ. Scient. Debrecen.* 8 (1972), 36 f. (I am indebted to Dr Hering for sending me a copy of this article).

<sup>104</sup> LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v. *πίπτειν* BIII2; *ἐμπίπτειν* 4b.

<sup>105</sup> cf. nn. 33, 100.

<sup>106</sup> n. 40 above and Appendix II. (It would be unduly pedantic to object that with sink-holes it was sometimes the case that the water that disappeared into them reappeared elsewhere.)

<sup>107</sup> cf. a similar point in Witke, op. cit. (n. 24), 36.

<sup>108</sup> Witke, op. cit. (n. 24), 36; Offerman, *Philol.* 119 (1975), 65.

that more than one lexical sense of *barathrum* is present (cf. above, p. 121), but it does afford a reason why Catullus should be particularly attracted to *barathrum* as an image. It was capable of combining suddenness, inevitability and evil.

The continuation of the simile at *tempore quo...* brings Hercules' deification and marriage to Hebe into the picture. Examination of the text suggests a series of contrasts between, on the one hand, Hercules and Hebe and, on the other, the other pairs of lovers who play a part in the poem.<sup>109</sup>

(i) The other matches in the poem are improper and ill-fortuned. Catullus and Lesbia are adulterers (despite the language used of them at 70 f. and 113 f.; cf. above, p. 117); Helen is a *moecha* (103) and Paris is to be prevented from enjoying her by the efforts of the youth of Greece sallying forth from their *penetrales foci*<sup>110</sup> in defence of marital propriety; Laodamia's marriage was rendered improper by the omission of sacrifices.<sup>111</sup> Hercules and Hebe, on the other hand, are a quite legitimate pair and one with no sinister overtones (unlike, let it be noted, any of Hercules' other liaisons with women). Moreover their marriage was part of Hercules' regard for carrying out labours for the benefit of mankind (hence the final clause, *pluribus ut caeli tereretur ianua divis*...). The relationships of Catullus and Lesbia, Protesilaus and Laodamia, and Paris and Helen had no such justification, but were the results of passion leading them to take what they ought not to have.

(ii) Hercules acted *imperio deterioris eri* (114). Protesilaus and Laodamia came to a bad end because they did not do the right thing by the *caelestes eri* (76). Catullus describes Lesbia as *verecunda era* (136), that is, a mistress who is to be treated properly;<sup>112</sup> he has already prayed never to want anything so much as to have it *invitis eris* (77–8). Hercules affords another example of the desirability of keeping on the right side of one's *eri*, even bad ones (and from Catullus' point of view Lesbia might seem, in honest moments, a *deterior era*). This may seem a lot of weight to put on the word *erus/era*,<sup>113</sup> but the uses in 76 and 78 are unusual<sup>114</sup> and the repetition suggests that one is supposed to notice and remember. Notice also that though *imperio deterioris eri* is a Homeric reminiscence (above, p. 120, the concept *erus* represents Catullus' addition; Homer has *χείρωνι φωτὶ δεδμήμην*).

(iii) Hercules' deification is expressed in terms of the *ianua* of heaven (115), a curious affectation which recalls the arrival of Lesbia at Allius' house and her treading on the

<sup>109</sup> Notwithstanding the various 'Chinese-box' analyses of poem 68 (F. Skutsch, *RhM* 47 (1892), 138 f. = *Kl. Schr.* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1914), 49; J. Wohlberg, op. cit. (n. 94), 42; K. Vretska, *WS* 79 (1966), 313 ff.; W. Hering, *Wiss. Zeitschr. der Univ. Rostok, Gesellsch. und sprachwiss. Reihe* 19 (1970), 599 f.; idem, op. cit. (n. 103), 40 f., 51 f.) which would bring 105/7–18 into at least formal relation with passages as diverse as 51–6 (plus eight conjecturally lost lines) (Hering), 73–86 (Skutsch) and 85–104 (less 91–100) (Vretska, Wohlberg), one is surely entitled to find parallels and contrasts for the *barathrum* passage anywhere in the poem. The diversity of the schemata hitherto proposed suggests that no single one can assimilate all the cross-references that the poem contains.

<sup>110</sup> The centre of a 'proper' home, cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* s.v. *focus* 1a, 2ab.

<sup>111</sup> cf. above p. 117. Notice also: (i) Laodamia's passion exceeds the attachment of a grandfather to his new grandson and a dove to her mate (119 ff.). Doves were an *exemplum* of conjugal propriety and fidelity (e.g. Prop. 2. 15. 27); the grandfather and grandson have a legitimate blood-relation. Laodamia's exceeding of what was proper in such cases is another sign of the impropriety of her love. (ii) *concordata* (130), a neutral word instead of 'married', and the overtones could be sinister (cf. Lucr. 5. 963 f., Suet. *DJ* 50).

<sup>112</sup> Lieberg, op. cit. (n. 95), 253 f.; H. Reynen, *Mus. Helv.* 31 (1974), 150 f.

<sup>113</sup> But cf. Witke, op. cit. (n. 24), 32 ff.

<sup>114</sup> It is the only example of *eri* used of the gods collectively in *Thes. Ling. Latin.* H. Heusch, *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls* (Bonn, 1954), 42 f. regards the use of *erus* in Catullus in general as a deliberate archaism, but has no specific comment about 68. 76, 78.

threshold (71). In the latter case, the action is ill omened in terms of Roman marriage rites<sup>115</sup> (corresponding, one might say, to Laodamia and Protesilaus omitting proper sacrifices). But Hercules' treading on the threshold of heaven has no such overtones; rather it makes him like the other gods.<sup>116</sup>

(iv) The deification is significant in itself. Catullus toys with the idea of divine status for Lesbia; she is *mea...diva* (70) and is accompanied by Cupid as though she were Venus (132 f.). But he is compelled to admit that this will not do (cf. 141), any more than it will do to regard her as a wife (143 f.). Hercules on the other hand genuinely became part of the divine household, and Hebe had been divine all along.

(v) Why *falsiparens* in 112? The poem makes great play with family relationships that are not what they seem and with the idea of the *domus*.<sup>117</sup> Hercules, it seems at first sight, fits into this category. But, unlike the other figures of the poem, he comes out all right. After all, he does end up in his *real* father's *domus*; the falsity of his position has been corrected.<sup>118</sup>

(vi) *ut...Hebe nec longa virginitate foret* (116). The disposition of the simile brings this into close proximity with *qui tamen indomitam ferre iugum docuit* (118). If the overtones of that line have been correctly interpreted (above, p. 131) there is here a covert contrast between Hebe and Laodamia. Conversely the short virginity perhaps hints at a long non-virginity (i.e. marriage) and that may be contrasted with (a) Laodamia/Protesilaus (*coniugis ante coacta novi dimittere collum/quam veniens una atque altera rursus hiems/noctibus in longis avidum saturasset amorem* (81 f.)), (b) Catullus/Lesbia (*quare illud satis est si nobis is datur unis/quem lapide illa dies candidiore notat* (147–8)) and (c) Paris/Helen (*ne Paris abducta gavisus libera moecha/otia pacato degeret in thalamo* (103/4)). (This is of course just another aspect of the fact that Hercules and Hebe are 'properly' married and the others are not.)

(vii) The passion<sup>119</sup> of both Catullus and Laodamia is described in terms of water imagery with Herculean connections. Laodamia fell in love like water falling in the Pheneate *barathrum*; Catullus burned like *lymphaque in Oetaeis Malia Thermopylis* (54). The spring at Themopylae was supposedly made for Hercules and the hero later died and found immortality on Oeta.<sup>120</sup> But whereas Hercules' experience at Oeta led to immortality and legitimate marriage, Catullus' 'Oetean' suffering led to adultery and mere pretence of immortality (cf. above, item (iv)).

<sup>115</sup> cf. above n. 18. A comparison of 68. 71–3 with Theocr. 2.103–4 (drawn by K. Gantar, *Grazer Beiträge* 5 (1976), 117 f.) helps to highlight the fact that Catullus has made Lesbia step on the threshold, for in Theocritus we read ἐγὼ δὲ νῦν ὡς ἐνόησα/ἄρτι θύρας ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἀμειβόμενον ποδὶ κούρω.

<sup>116</sup> A referee suggests that the prominence of the *ianua*-motif might, if anything, draw attention to the propriety of Hercules' marriage.

<sup>117</sup> cf. Part I, above.

<sup>118</sup> The eventual acceptance into Olympus of *falsiparens Amphitryoniades* (the product of one of Jupiter's *furta*) might also be seen as an example of that capacity to control anger which Catullus implicitly praises in Juno (138–40).

<sup>119</sup> Unrequited in the case of Catullus; and the same may be true of Laodamia in 107–18. Contrast *qui tamen indomitam ferre iugum docuit* (118) with *ut semel es flavo conciliata viro* (130). The second two similes deal with Laodamia's passion after the *conciliatio*, the first with the love that compelled her to undergo the *conciliatio* (cf. Hering, op. cit. (n. 103), 51).

<sup>120</sup> Thermopylae: Suda s.v. *Θερμοπύλαι*; *Et. Mag.* 447.19; Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 1047; Strabo, 428; Hdt. 7. 176. The association of Oeta and Hercules' immortality is very strong: cf. Accius (ap. Cic. *de nat. deor.* 3. 41); Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 2. 19; Prop. 1. 13. 24; 3. 1. 31 (*Oetaeus deus*); Ovid *Ibis* 345 (*Oetaeus gener*); idem. *Met.* 9. 135 ff.; idem. *Heroid.* 9. 147; Lucan, 8. 800; 3. 177; Stat. *Theb.* 4. 158, etc. Oeta was of course associated with marriage in its own right (cf. Cat. 62. 7; Verg. *Ecl.* 8. 30; *Culex* 203). It has recently been independently argued (A. G. Robson, *TAPA* 103 (1972), 433 f.) that 53 should read *cum tantum arderem quantum Trachinia rupes*. If that were correct then Catullus' love is described in purely Herculean terms.

(viii) Hercules' actions in 107 f. are beneficial. The drying of the marshes produces rich soil (*pingue* in 110 is to be understood proleptically), and the Stymphalian Birds are called *monstra* to stress the desirability of their destruction. Thus Hercules is the type of the benefactor rewarded with immortality.<sup>121</sup> It is pertinent to compare the figure of Allius. His benefactions are what the poem is written to celebrate and his reward is to be precisely (literary) immortality (43–50, 151–2). We have already seen that the (simile-) description of Allius' benefaction (57 f.) bears a relation to the (simile-) description of Laodamia's love (or looked at another way, Hercules' benefaction).<sup>122</sup> One might note also that the draining of the marshes and the killing of the Stymphalian Birds would open up the plains of Pheneus and Stymphalus. Compare *clausum lato patefecit limite campum* (67). Again, Allius' help to Catullus is compared to a favourable wind brought *iam prece Pollucis, iam Castoris implorata* (65). Castor and Pollux are a traditional example of human benefactors raised to immortality and often appear as such coupled with Hercules.<sup>123</sup> They might moreover be described as *falsiparentes Tyndaridae*, so their parallel with Hercules is exact. We are therefore entitled to see Allius' *officia* as being both explicitly (Castor and Pollux) and implicitly (Hercules) compared with those of the classic benefactors of mythology. (This is perhaps part of the explanation of *huc addent divi quam plurima quae Themis olim / antiquis solita est munera ferre piis* (153–4)).

(ix) By the same token there is a contrast to be drawn between Hercules and Catullus. Already idealized in the fifth century as ἀριστος ἀνδρῶν<sup>124</sup> and upholder of νόμος and δίκη,<sup>125</sup> Hercules came to acquire the character of one who deliberately chose to abandon a self-centred life of pleasure<sup>126</sup> to devote himself to the improvement of men's lot, conferring on them the benefactions of a civilized life secure from the ravages of lawless and monstrous beings and (in some presentations) winning thereby their friendship<sup>127</sup> as well as his own deification. Viewed in this light the figure of Hercules is perhaps of some relevance to Catullus, who had previously opted for the pursuit of his own improper pleasure at the expense of others' greater claims on him and who is now inclined to think better of it. But even if one eschews detailed reference of this sort to the ethical idealization of Hercules, the mere fact that the Hercules myth was the object of much idealization and that Hercules was commonly seen as an *exemplum virtutis* is clearly pertinent to Catullus' selection of a story about him for the purposes that it is here argued the *barathrum* simile serves in poem 68.

In a number of ways, therefore, the detail of the *barathrum* passage seems to be related to the rest of the poem. It may seem odd for Catullus to introduce a significant model, in the person of Hercules, in such a roundabout manner, so that he is not *directly* parallel (formally speaking) to any of the figures with whom he is implicitly compared. But, granted that it is oblique, is not that the manner of the whole poem? One might compare the way in which Catullus himself turns out to be paralleled by

<sup>121</sup> cf. Witke, *op. cit.* (n. 24), p. 42.

<sup>122</sup> cf. above, p. 132.

<sup>123</sup> e.g. Hor. *Od.* 1. 12. 25; 3. 3. 9; 4. 5. 35–6; *Epp.* 2. 1. 5 ff.; Cic. *de leg.* 2. 19; *TD* 1. 28; *de nat. deor.* 2. 62; Curt. 8. 5. 8; Xen. *Symp.* 8. 29; Aristot. (*Poet. Mel. Graec.* 842, 9 f.); Arr. *Anab.* 4. 8. 3; Dio Chrys. 69. 1, etc.

<sup>124</sup> Soph. *Trach.* 811; Eur. *HF* 183; Aristoph. *Nub.* 1049.

<sup>125</sup> Esp. Pindar; see G. K. Galinsky, *The Hercules Theme* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 23 ff.

<sup>126</sup> Most famously, Prodicus, Diels-Kranz 84B 1, 2. cf. also Cic. *de off.* 3. 25; Sen. *Const.* 2. 1; Epict. 1. 6. 32 f. Also, the allegorization of the Labours as conquests over one's own improper desires and pleasures in e.g. Herodorus, *FGrH* 31F 14; Dio Chrys. 5. 22 f. (and cf. Epict. 2. 16. 44 f.; Apul. *Florid.* 22).

<sup>127</sup> cf. Epict. 3. 24. 13 f. Note also the idea in e.g. Cic. *de fin.* 3. 65 (= Chrysipp. *SVF* iii. 84. 6); 2. 118–19; *de off.* 3.25, that one should play one's role as part of the community of mankind and not seek to live in self-centred separation from it, an idea exemplified by Hercules.

both Laodamia and Protesilaus, something that has caused scholars unnecessary distress.<sup>128</sup> In any case, the model of Hercules was not one that the real characters of the poem (Catullus and Lesbia) could follow; their relationship was irredeemably not of the legitimate sort, bound up with a properly recognized *domus*. The examples of Protesilaus and Laodamia and Paris and Helen are, of course, foils for the attitude that Catullus is going to have to take up, but they are directly relevant in that their principals had affected a propriety to which they were not entitled and had suffered for it. Catullus is not going to make that mistake any more. But Hercules was quite entitled; he is thus a foil at a greater remove, and the oblique introduction may reflect that. A parallel may be drawn with the treatment of Catullus' brother. Catullus' reaction to his death is of no small importance for the poem and for Catullus' attitude to personal relationships in it.<sup>129</sup> But the connection between the brothers was another relationship of a type contrasted with that of the relationship with Lesbia, since it conferred mutual obligations and was founded in a *domus*. It too is introduced obliquely (or as some would have it, irrelevantly).

To sum up, my suggestion is that Catullus, in search of a *recherché* metaphor/simile for Laodamia's love, recalled a passage of straight description in Euphronion and saw that it fitted the bill. It is not at all unlike a case in another poem of the same period, viz. 65. Here, needing a simile to describe the way Hortensius might think his requests had gone unheeded, Catullus lighted on a descriptive passage of Callimachus' *Acontius and Cydippe* about the accidental dropping of a love-token. Once again straight description is transformed into significant simile in an entirely different context. To modern tastes an apple and a drainage-hole may not seem equally available for poetic use. But, whatever the temptation to think of Catullus as a 'modern' and 'accessible' poet, it is vital to realize that late romantic sensibilities are not always to be brought to bear on his poetry.<sup>130</sup>

University of Liverpool

C. J. TUPLIN

## APPENDIX I

### *Callimachus and Pheneus*

1. Callimachus certainly evinces a fondness for rivers, springs and lakes throughout his poetic and other output (I have found some 100 different items of this sort in the extant remains), so the proposition that he might have mentioned Pheneus and its *barathra* in some lost context is not a wholly unreasonable one.

2. Three passages in the extant writings refer to Pheneus. (i) Fr. 407, XXX describes the so-called waters of Styx as being in Pheneus (cf. Paus. 8. 19. 3, Strab. 389c, Ael. *Nat. Anim.* 10. 40; also Hdt. 6. 74, Plin. *NH* 31. 26, Stat. *Theb.* 4. 291, Suda s.v. *Φένεος*). The spring is also mentioned in fr. 413 as *ἐν Νωνακρίνῃ*. According to Aelian, loc. cit. the spring was created by Demeter; this is clearly connected with the story that Demeter came to Pheneus during her wanderings and was well received there (Paus. 8. 15. 1-4; cf. Konon, *FGrH* 261F1, xv and fourth-century Pheneate coin-types showing Demeter, C. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London, 1976), p. 102). (ii) Fr. 407, III relates that Herakles' statues at Pheneus were made of submarine bronze from Demonesos. The statues are presumably those erected after the Elean War

<sup>128</sup> See now C. W. Macleod, op. cit. (n. 4), 82 f.; and above, p. 121.

<sup>129</sup> cf. Part I above.

<sup>130</sup> cf. W. V. Clausen, *HSCP* 74 (1970), 90 f. for comments to this effect.



(cf. above, p. 124) – though notice that there is no need to assume that the version of the Elean War in *Aetia* III (fr. 76–77a Pf.) had anything to do with Pheneus (cf. Schol. A II. 11. 700 quoted ad loc. by Pfeiffer). (iii) *Hymn* 4.71: among the places that fled at Leto's approach (i.e. would not afford her refuge) is Pheneus. Why Pheneus in particular? K. McKay (*Erysichthon: Callimachean Comedy* (Leiden, 1962), pp. 150 ff.; *Antichthon* 3 (1969), 27–8) has argued that Callimachus selected as places that refused Leto refuge localities that later suffered some sort of disaster or decline (referring to the examples of Helike/Bura, Corcyra, the Echinades and Thebes, in which last case, of course, Callimachus explicitly draws attention to a later 'punishment' in the shape of the Niobids' death). If this is right (and one would still like to see an explanation of Arcadia, Parthenion, the Isthmian Peloponnese, Anauros, Larisa and Cheiron's cliffs along these lines) it might be argued (as a referee points out) that, just as Helike and Bura represent Achaea because of the earthquake of 373/2 (*RE* iii 1059; vii 2835–8) so Pheneus comes in because of the floods caused by blockage of the *barathra*. Such an interpretation, however, only commits Callimachus to knowledge of the existence of the *barathra*. There is no proving, for example, that Herakles at Pheneus in (ii) above had, for Callimachus, anything to do with them.

3. McLennan (*Callimachus: Hymn to Zeus. Introduction and Commentary* (London/Urbino, 1977), ad 18) suggests that, in conceiving the idea of Arcadia having once been waterless, Callimachus had in mind the lake at Pheneus which 'disappeared and reappeared quite often' (i.e. water in Arcadia came and went even in historical times, therefore it might once have all been absent). If so, then we would have evidence for Callimachus knowing about the *barathra* and perhaps some strengthening for the hypothesis that he wrote about them. But (i) in his desire to explain why it was necessary for Rheia to create the River Neda Callimachus could have thought of the claim that Arcadia once lacked water altogether quite independently of actual hydrological facts about the region; (ii) if he had Pheneus in mind he could surely have mentioned it in l. 18 f. (I doubt that the fact that the lake was not a *ῥόος ὕδατος* (15) need have prevented that); (iii) the salient fact about Pheneus was not that sometimes there was no water at all, but that there was an alternation between a lake and a river. A similar objection applies to Cahen's idea (*Les Hymnes de Callimaque: Commentaire*, Paris, 1930, ad loc.) that l. 27 was suggested by the prevalence of *katavothrai* (i.e. *barathra*) in Arcadia – and in any case *ὑπὸ ποσσίν* does not mean that the rivers were underneath the ground that the traveller walked on, but that the ground he walked on would one day contain *πολλὸν ὕδωρ*. In my view the over-riding consideration in l. 18 f. was to detach Neda from Arcadia by suggesting that she was not the Arcadian nymph of an existing river but a handmaiden of Rheia after whom the River Neda happened to have been called, and that this suggestion was made in order to undermine the Arcadian claim that Zeus was not only born in Arcadia but reared there by Neda (e.g. Paus. 8. 38. 3). In any event, McLennan's view, though ingenious, is not sufficiently mandatory to impose any particular conclusion in the present context.

4. The claims of Callimachus' *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένη ποταμῶν* as a possible source for Catullus 68. 109 f. were advanced at the Liverpool Latin Seminar meeting (cf. n. 1). This cannot be excluded. But one may note that Catullus mentions very few rivers/lakes/springs in his poetry (and none of them *recherché*), which rather tells against the likelihood of his having ransacked Callimachus' *περὶ ποταμῶν* (probably a scholastic work on rivers mentioned in Greek poetry) for poetic material. A poetic source (whether Callimachean or, as here argued, not) is much more probable.

## APPENDIX II

*Metaphorical uses of barathrum/βάραθρον*

## 1. Images of death/destruction:

Plut. *Coriol.* 13: ἀνθρώπους πένητας ὥσπερ εἰς βάραθρον ὠθεῖν ἐκπέμποντας εἰς πόλιν ἀέρος τε νοσηροῦ καὶ νεκρῶν ἀτάφων γέμουσαν.

Vitr. *de arch.* 10. 16. 11 (where the *barathrum* is prepared as a 'killing ground').

Apul. *Met.* 2.25: *nec mora, cum me somnus profundus in imum barathrum repente demergit, ut ne deus quidem Delphicus ipse facile discerneret duobus nobis iacentibus quis esset magis mortuus.*

Ps.-Dem. 25, 76: τουτῷ δ' οὐδεν' ὀρῶ τόπων τούτων (sc. references to liturgies, to one's own sophrosyne etc.) βάσιμον ὄντα, ἀλλὰ τάντ' ἀπόκρημα, φάραγγας, βάραθρα (to approach such inaccessible *barathra* would be disastrous).

Ps.-Luc. *Amor* 5: ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ὑπερφνωὺς παιδικοῖς ἤδετο τὴν θήλειαν Ἀφροδίτην βάραθρον ἡγούμενος...

cf. also n. 32.

## 2. Images of evil reached by error:

Liban. 1. 8: ἦν κίνδυνος ἡγεμόσι τυφλοῖς ἐπόμενον εἰς βάραθρον ἀμαθίας πεσεῖν.

Philo, *Leg. all.* 1. 23: ἀνάγκη γὰρ καὶ ἀπειρία καὶ κακία ἡνιόχου τὰ ὑπεξευγμένα κατὰ κρημνῶν φέρεσθαι καὶ βαράθρων.

Tatian, *contra Graecos* 163A: κεχηνότες δὲ εἰς οὐρανὸν κατὰ βαράθρων πίπτετε.

Marius Mercator, *subnot.* 9. 2: *ad hanc te quaestionem reducens patefaciam... tuum barathrum.* This apparently means '...expose the sinfulness of your views' or '...the sinfulness into which you have fallen'. Comparable is Rufinus, *Hist.* 5. 15: *plurimos de ecclesia in suum barathrum deducebant* and, in a different way, Jerome, *contra Vig.* 8: *de barathro pectoris caenosam spurcitiā evomens*, in reference to the wrong views of those who disapprove of worshipping relics.

Lucian, *de merc. cond.* 30, Dem. 8. 45 (quoted below, 5) imply that one ought not to end up in a *barathrum* of one's own accord.

## 3. Images of punishment:

Lucian, *Pseudolog.* 17: εἴ τις ἴδοι κίναιδον καὶ ἀπόρρητα ποιοῦντα καὶ πάσχοντα... μονονουχὶ τοῦνομα τῶν ἔργων ὀνομαζόμενον, ἀπατεῶνα, γόητα, ἐπίορκον, ὄλεθρον, κύφωνα, βάραθρον (i.e. = 'one who deserves punishment'). Agathias, 2. 23: τὴν ψυχὴν ἄδικος καὶ βαραθρώδης.

Philo, *de agr.* 32: θολερῷ δὲ καὶ βαραθρώδει βίῳ καὶ τοῖς αἰσχίστοις ἐμφερομένοις.

## 4. Images of darkness:

Lucian, *de calumn.* 32: ὡς εἶγε θεῶν τις ἀποκαλύψειεν ἡμῶν τοὺς βίους οἷχοιτο ἂν φεύγουσα ἐς τὸ βάραθρον ἢ διαβολὴ χώραν οὐκ ἔχουσα ὡς ἂν πεφωτισμένων τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας.

Apul. *Apolog.* 83: *fraudes hiant... veritas... velut alto barathro calumniae emergit.*

(A *barathrum* of any sort was a place of darkness; cf. Schol. Arist. *Plut.* 431).

## 5. Images of general suffering:

Dem. 8. 45 (= 10. 16): nobody can be foolish enough to think that Philip is really interested in only τὰ μὲν ἐν Θράκῃ κακά (i.e. the villages of Drongilus, Cabyle and Manteira) and does not care about Athenian ships and shipyards but is prepared ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἑλινῶν καὶ τῶν ὀλυρῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς Θρακίοις σιροῖς ἐν τῷ βαράθρῳ χειμάζειν. (Demosthenes has in mind, perhaps, the Athenian execution-pit, an 'institution' ironically parallel to the shipyards.)

Lucian, *de merc. cond.* 30: ὦ δέιλαιος ἐγὼ καὶ ἄθλιος οἷας τὰς πάλαι διατριβὰς ἀπολιπὼν καὶ ἐταίρους καὶ βίον ἀπράγμονα καὶ ὕπνον μετρούμενον τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ καὶ περιπάτους ἐλευθέρους εἰς οἶον βάραθρον φέρων ἐμαυτὸν ἐνέσεικα.

6. Phrases in form βάραθρον/barathrum c. gen. rei:

Liban. (loc. cit. 2)

A whole range of phrases of the type *barathrum voluptatum, concupiscentiae, sordidissimae conluvionis, haereseos, credulitatis* in late Latin authors (cf. *TLL* s.v. *barathrum*).

7. Uses associated with women:

(a) sens. obsc. of pudenda muliebria: Aristoph. *Plut.* 431; id. fr. 320; Mart. 3. 81. 11; Claud. 26. 345.

(b) Theoph. *ap. Athen.* 587F: Τοῦ μηποτ' αὐτὸν ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς Λαῖδα φερόμενον ἢ Μηκωνίδ' ἢ Σισύμβριον ἢ Βάραθρον ἢ Θάλλουσαν ἢ τούτων τινα ὧν ἐμπλέκουσι τοῖς λίνοις αἱ μαστροποὶ, ἢ Ναννάριον ἢ Μαλθάκην (i.e. used as a mock-name for a prostitute).

(c) Ps.-Luc. *Amores* 5 (cf. above 1).