No. 14. February, 1972.

P E G A S U S

UNIVERSITY OF EXETER CLASSICAL SOCIETY MAGAZINE.

Editor : Roger May

CONTENTS

THE 'ANTIGONE' AND ITS EPILOGUE

In the latter part of the 'Antigone' we are presented with the complete collapse of Creon. The warnings of Haemon and Teiresias have been, as so often, heeded too late. Disaster has started upon its unalterable course. With harassed mind Creon seeks advice from the Chorus of Theban elders who have thus far shown little sure thought. It is prudent counsel that is so greatly needed. He must free Antigone and prepare a tomb for the corpse of her brother Polyneices. But on the king's arrival at the cave of her imprisonment Antigone, the Messenger tells us, hangs by the neck. Beside her stands Haemon, her lover, wild-eyed and with loathing in his face. Embracing his departed lover the youth drives a sword deep into his side.

Hereafter Creon, for so long self-righteous and convinced that he is above reproach, realizes the error of his ways. It is the light after the darkness. A complete reorientation of his method of judging human nature is required. Now he can only reproach himself. Disaster's course adds the death of his wife to his present set of woes - a death for which Creon well knows he is completely responsible, albeit unwillingly. In his final utterance Creon again laments his foolishness. He resigns himself to the fact that before the gods one is of little account, one must exercise humilith. But Creon exists no more than as a nonentity; he is finished.

It is at this culmination of events that we are left with the Choral epilogue which unquestionably stands as the most decisive and emphatic ending in Sophoclean tragedy.

> πολλῷ τὸ φρονεῖν εὐδαιμονίας
> πρῶτον ὑπαρχει· χρὴ δὲ τά γ' ἐς θεοὺς
> μηδὲν ἀσεπτεῖν· μεγάλοι δὲ λόγοι
> μεγάλας πληγὰς τῶν ὑπεραύχων
> ἀποτείσαντες
> γήρᾳ τὸ φρονεῖν ἐδίδαξαν. (1347-53)

"Wisdom is by far the primal part of happiness; we must in no way be irreverent to the gods. The mighty words of the proud exact mighty blows and in old age teach wisdom."

There is no further misery that can befall the king for the present. Any additional change in Creon's condition would be divorced from his treatment of Antigone. Our sympathies may be divided, but the action is complete. We must of course blame Creon for his lack of wisdom. This is, in effect, what the Chorus do. They are not concerned with the future (1334-5); they are singularly retrospective; they are as judicial as they are aphoristic. Their words constitute a final condemnation of Creon whose irreverence is shown in his refusal to permit the burial of Polyneices, whose lack of wisdom has reduced him to a nothing and whose proud words have not gone unpunished. Whatever judgment of Antigone can be inferred from such a condemnation of Creon it

is not a political or practical one. Rather the final lines act as a moral vindication of her sense of duty and limitation which are part and parcel of wisdom in its fullest sense.

Here in the epilogue we find the emphasis placed heavily upon wisdom. The repetition of φρονεῖν in the first and last lines of the epilogue makes it a highly pointed climax. We cannot miss the φρονεῖν-ἀφροσύνη motif. The central importance throughout the play of the question of knowledge is heavily underscored in these closing verses. To deny any significance to the final repetition of as Jebb was able to do is to ignore the importance of the motif.[1] There is throughout the play a recurrent emphasis on terms signifying thought, especially wherever a leading character expounds upon his or her 'right thought'.[2] Creon, to whom all opposition is folly, is particularly forthcoming in this respect, although initially the theme is developed in relation to Antigone. Until Haemon's address to his father (683ff.) no assertion of righteousness by Antigone is answered with any effective support.[3] The Chorus, although sympathetic, timidly toe the party line. The king, of course, will stand for no such vociferous support as Haemon offers. In fact, thus far it is all Creon's way. Each speaker perseveres with his or her sense of wisdom until the emergence of Teiresias (988) whereupon the motif turns swiftly and viciously against Creon. The king then three times laments his folly (1261-9), repeating the theme which is twice uttered by the Chorus in the final five lines. None is now so blind as to fail to recognize the real folly of Creon's apparent wisdom. First by the prophet Teiresias and lastly by the Chorus in its final words the king's inevitable suffering is thus irrevocably associated with his folly and pride which has seen itself as justice. In sharp contradistinction on the other side lies justice which so many have seen as pride.

A development of the prolific φρονεῖν motif is found especially in those passages where the language of thought suggests, even openly expresses, that dangerous quality of presumptuous pride (459, 473, 479ff., 768).[4] It is precisely that quality which is brought to our close attention in the concluding verses of the play (1350-1). Here we find an emphatic repetition of μέγας juxtaposed to ὑπέραυχος with its denotation of excessive pride. Just as the repetition of φρονεῖν at the play's close acts as a forceful reminder of the φρονεῖν motif so the repetition of μέγας, I feel, serves to underline those earlier instances where the word is also used in conjunction, significantly, with terms denoting thought or speech (126, 479, 768). The important ὑπέραυχος, however, casts our minds back to the outset of the play and the Chorus' first ode where, in virtual anticipation of the close and in very similar terms, they refer to the destruction of Capaneus to illustrate the price Zeus makes men pay for the boastings of a proud tongue (127ff.).[5]

There is a further issue with which the Chorus are concerned at the close. We are reminded of the question of piety which, like the issue of pride, is closely linked to the problem of knowledge. Piety, a form of τὸ φρονεῖν in its fullest sense, is most clearly an elemental question deeply rooted in the play's complex structure. As a verbal motif it is seen to centre round the key verb σέβειν,, primarily a religious term which can, as in this play, sometimes denote 'respect'. Prefixed derivatives and, at times, semantic equivalents give an added force to the expression of this central theme.[6]

Antigone introduces the theme in the prologue (74-7). Piety and kinship are immediately asserted as her principal claims - claims which are to reappear later in her central exposition of principle (450-70, 511-23). But there are also the assertions of Creon whose words strongly imply that the act of burial is to be viewed as an act of impiety (301).[7] But, more significantly, the king is equally convinced both of divine sanction of his edict (184ff., 304-5) and of divine disinterest in matters of burial (282ff; also 1040-4). With the two protagonists' arguments already shewn to be diametrically opposed, Antigone and Creon continue their confrontation with an exchange of terms (511, 514, 516). This same pattern of subtle exchange is twice more employed in successive verses during the altercation between Haemon and Creon (730-1, 744-5) where the latter continues to err in equating piety with obedience to his law. Thus not only is the problem of piety itself consistently emphasized by reiteration of the key terms but also the stark division of understanding is highlighted and contrasted by the differing interpretation of common terminology within stichomythia. Such instances are closely followed by a further combination after Haemon's departure where Creon[8] shows himself so scornful of Antigone's respect for Hades (777, 780). The Chorus now pick up the motif which suddenly switches from Creon to Antigone in its application. In repeated terms of piety and power they pass their judgment upon Antigone, conceding a connexion between the action and state of piety (872-5). In her last iambic speech (891-928) the prisoner stands condemned; yet her words bring the motif more forcefully to the fore than at any preceding point. Confident in her convictions and using the language of her foes Antigone says of herself:

τὴν δυσσέβειαν εὐσεβοῦσ' ἐχτησάμην. (924)

"Impiety is what through piety I have brought upon myself." Her actions have not been impious; yet she has acquired a name for impiety. The paradoxical nature of her words effectively illustrates and echoes through verbal correspondence the preceding conflicting viewpoints of the king, his son and the Chorus.[9]

In continuation of the motif Antigone places in her final words an emphatic stamp upon her chief claim of piety. In bold defiant language she expresses in reiterated terms of piety both the bitter contempt she has for her oppressors and the conviction she carries in her world of justice. Her attitude thus stands as a parallel to the Chorus' final acclaim of piety when she cries:

οια.....πάσχω,
τὴν εὐσεβίαν σεβίσασα. (942-3)

"What suffering I endure.....for having held piety in reverence!" This passage represents a vivid occurrence of the motif, standing in direct relation to Antigone's initial religious claims but, more especially, to the Chorus' closing comment. Yet the point at which the Chorus of Theban elders take up the motif stands in striking contrast to their final evaluation. Launching forth into fresh criticism of Antigone they make the following judgment:

σέβειν μὲν εὐσέβειά τις,
χράτος δ', ὅτῳ χράτος μέλει,
παραβατὸν οὐδαμῇ πέλει,
σὲ δ' αὐτόγνωτος ὤλεσ' ὀργά. (872-5)

"There is some reverence in reverent action. But power, to whoever it is entrusted, must in no way be transgressed. Your self-assured temper has destroyed you." Together with the Chorus' final condemnation of irreverence (which is the unmistakeable criticism of Creon) we have two instances of comment which contribute significantly to the play's thematic structure. Here the Chorus state the crux of the play. They are divided between sympathy for Antigone's piety and disapproval at her disobedience and self-assurance which is as much reminiscent of Creon as it is of his intended victim. On the question of piety they show themselves to incline to the side of Haemon, yet at the same time exercising a degree of cautious moderation found wanting in the young man's more extreme view. But state-justice, which is their prime concern throughout, must be upheld. Obedience and affection are thus seen to conflict. Their judgment is on a practical and political basis. In contrast the final moral evaluation with its whole-hearted condemnation of Creon serves to exonerate Antigone of blame. The Chorus can only place their sympathy and loyalty on her side once they have seen the illegality of Creon's law through the wise words of the blind Teiresias.

The lyric kommos (806ff.) displays most intensely the significant contribution which the Chorus of the 'Antigone' make to the thought of the play. As elders of Thebes the Chorus have a keen interest in events, showing varying degrees of concern for religious and state-justice. They are at all times aware of the element of nobility in Antigone's piety and in their very first words to Creon hint at a latent feeling of apprehension about his edict (211-4). But in the main the Chorus play the part of supporters of state-law. To them this is right; they are concerned with keeping an order which is severely menaced by any practical opposition to the edict. From this standpoint arises their stern criticism of Antigone's offence against state-justice (853-5, 873-4) and uneasiness about her stubborn spirit (821, 875, 929-30; cf. 471-2) intermixed with tinges of sympathy stemming from their admiration of her piety (800-5, 817-9, 836-3, 872).[10] But the Chorus' ambiguous and wavering viewpoint (which shows the initial symptoms of crystallization in the crucial fourth stasimon), through the unmasking of the king by the blind prophet, finally divests itself of all ambivalence and doubt.

Whereas the tenor of prior judgments has been both practical and political the conclusion instructively restates in a positive condensed form key issues which focus on ethics and religion as well as intellection. These issues are interrelated and complex, yet in the final analysis they offer a deeper insight into the conditions of an existence both moral and human. We are left, then, not with a precise answer to the question of whether Antigone's act was justifiable in the political sense in which the Chorus were judging right and wrong. Rather we have an underlying acclaim of Antigone's noble and devoted attention to what she considered to be right and to be her duty. We have the call for wisdom, no longer simply on the rationalistic level, but wisdom which incorporates "a feelingful sense of human obligations and limitations. It includes not only the means of work-a-day success but also a pious reverence for the gods and theinstruction which comes through suffering."[11] We have

the final judgment of Creon condemning not so much his concrete rationalism as the limitations and intransigence of his wisdom. In sum, the conflicts are answered by that saving virtue of 'understanding' blended with those religious motives which are seen in emotional terms as the instinctive regard for the fundamental laws of humanity.

The concluding lesson, a tragic response to the joyful ode to Man (332ff.), has been proclaimed by events. But the lines embody more than the wisdom preceding events may seem to have taught; they rise to a superior significance. Up to a point we are obliged to reserve our judgment until we are sure where right lies. Further we may feel doubt and indignation at the death of Antigone. But such feelings are dispelled when the side of right is clearly shown through the tyrant's punishment and, more conclusively, through his condemnation expressed within the moral at the close. For in the final reckoning the debts are paid and the issues are resolved.

EDWARD J. SUMMERSON

Notes

1 See R.C.Jebb's notes on vv. 1347ff. in his edition of the play, Sophocles:The Plays and Fragments:Pt.III, The Antigone, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1891, pp. 237ff.

2 For an excellent tracing of the motif see C.Knapp's article, "A Point in the Interpretation of the Antigone of Sophocles," AJP 37, 1916, 300-16. See also R.F.Goheen's summary and notes in The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone, Princeton 1951, pp. 83-4ff. for the chief terms of the motif. The principal passages are 49, 95, 176, 279, 383, 469ff., 557ff., 683ff., 707ff., 996, 1015, 1023ff., 1050ff., 1090, 1242, 1261ff., 1347, 1353.

3 It should be noted that Haemon is first to foreshadow the conclusions of the Chorus. So too does Teiresias (1050) with, of course, far more dramatic effect.

4 The terms employed are essentially those of the φρονεῖν motif but are loaded with an additional force or coloured in such a way as to indicate, broadly, excess. The development can, perhaps, be best expressed by the progression from the 'middle term' φρονεῖν to the sometimes derogatory and ironical use of φρόνημα and μέγα φρονεῖν.

5 A manifestation of pride is seen in the closely related topic of 'transgression', an image structured around the verb ὑπερβαίνειν (449, 481, 663; cf. 455 and 604ff.).

6 Instances of the root σεβ- (excluding ἀσεπτεῖν in the epilogue) occur at 166; 301 and 304; 511, 514 and 516; 730 and 731; 744 and 745; 777 and 780; 872 bis; 924bis; 943 bis. It is far from insignificant that with one minor exception (166) every occurrence of the key root is never more than three lines distant from a

recurrence and three times found twice within the same verse. These two motifs of wisdom and piety are briefly treated by G.M.Kirkwood, A Study of Sophoclean Drama, Ithaca 1958, pp. 233ff., and A.A.Long, Language and Thought in Sophocles, London 1968, pp. 149ff.

7 Observe the verbal echoes and word-play in Creon's remark here (301) and Antigone's at 74. The first (and only isolated) instance of the key root occurs in Creon's opening speech (166) where he praises the Chorus for their loyalty to the state. The usage is identical at 744.

8 The key verb σέβειν here (780) stands as the final word of Creon's speech and is thus particularly emphatic.

9 Observe also the paradoxical nature of Antigone's initial claim of a holy duty (74ff.).

10 The dual consideration of the Chorus is most readily detected in their correlation of 'the laws of the land and the gods' sworn justice' (368-9). As a combined criterion of justice it is seen to provide a link for the antithetical viewpoints of the two protagonists. For various interpretations of these important verses see V.Ehrenburg, Sophocles and Pericles, Oxford 1954, pp. 62ff.

11 R.F.Goheen, op. cit., p.84.

****

Auctoris incerti fragmentum nuper repertum, haud scio an Marci Valerii Martialis

En! hodie nigris gaudet Priscilla capillis,
quae quondam flavis conspicienda fuit.
Cras eadem rutilos crines, nisi fallor, habebit,
incedetque novum rursus adepta caput.
Haec tu mira putas? Nescis quibus artibus illi
Utantur, pretio qui tegumenta parant!

V.A.L.HILL

****

" WHERE AT COCKCROW THE STOCKBROKER YAWNS"

or

HOW TO ENSURE THE CLASSICS AREN'T DULL

We all know the feeling - you've just been introduced to someone, and sooner or later the question comes up :

"Well, what are you studying, then?"
"Classics".
"Oh".

End of conversation.

This is a myth we must dispel. Those who study Classics aren't, or at any rate shouldn't be, dull. Scientists and chemical engineers, perhaps harking back to the days when they struggled through "Aeneid II" or "Pro Archia" for O-level, brand the Classics "boring", "useless in this modern day and age". I don't suppose I can argue - I never could do differential equations. But the next stage in the argument, that those who study such "boring" subjects must themselves be boring or dull, is manifestly false, as we all know. But just as a second line of defence, I propose that we should make it our business to ensure that the Classics themselves are not dull. This is, as I will show, not at all difficult, and the rewards are enormous.

Now I suppose at least some Classics students will teach Classics - here indeed is a golden opportunity to impress your sense of the ridiculous on your unsuspecting pupils. The early years are, of course, the most important for the acquisition of the right state of mind. Make sure that you confront your pupils with enormous lists of unintelligible Latin words set against enormous lists of unintelligible English words - "indefatigable", "subornation", "cognizance" and so on. Then sit back and await the results of your labours :

"Nonne ea seditio turpissima esse videtur?"
"Surely this woman is sitting on her very base?"

One must also teach pupils to cultivate a feeling for the immediacy and direct relevance of what is translated - "barbiton" or "cithara" should be of course "guitar" rather than "lyre", and κοθυρνος should be "bovver-boot". So in the case of :

"Sub galli cantum consultor ubi ostia pulsat", "where at cockcrow the tenant must open his cowshed" is just passable; but full marks should only be given for the inspired rendering, "where at cockcrow the stockbroker yawns".

Also remember that picturesqueness of expression counts for much more than strict, sterile accuracy - hence :

ὠ δυσταλαινα της ἐμης αὐθαδιας. "Woe is me because of my flute-player", and κρεοκοπουσι μελη (they cut up the limbs, like butchers), "They sang disjointed poems of lamentation".

You will also have to instruct your honoured pupils in the art of unseen translation. There are two distinct schools of thought as to the proper method to employ - one is to instruct them to fabricate a reasonably coherent narrative and to guess what is untranslatable - this has its own particular charm. The other is to teach them to translate each individual phrase as a separate entity and let coherence go hang, which to my mind has far more interesting results.

The first method is the one usually adopted, perhaps unfortunately, for on occasions it may lead the poor translator astray and cause him to translate part of the unseen correctly.

However, the following example gives a good indication of what may be expected from a person of intelligence with a real feeling for his material. The passage quoted comes from Iliad XI; scholars will tell you (showing a distinct lack of imagination) that it is a simile about an ass which escapes from the boys guarding it, runs into a cornfield and eats all it wants before being driven out :

ὡς δ' ὁτ' ὀνος παρ' ἀρουραν ἰων ἐβιησατο παιδας
νωθης, ᾧ δη πολλα περι ῥοπαλ' ἀμφις ἐαγη,
κειρει τ' εἰσελθων βαθυ λητον· οἱ δε τε παιδες
τυπτουσιν ῥοπαλοισι· βιη δε τε νηπιη αὐτων·
σπουδη τ' ἐξηλασσαν, ἐπει τ' ἐκορεσσατο φορβης.....

"Just as when a sluggish dotard goes up to children and molests them, only to be driven back by a plethora of truncheons, he goes to a deep stream and jumps in, and the children beat him up with their truncheons though their strength be but juvenile; they drive him off in haste after kicking him in the groin....."

The best example I can find of the second method is the following passage, the combat of Eteocles and Polyneices from Euripides' "Phoenissae" (l's 1404-24). I feel that in this case there is little need to quote the Greek, since the translation below admirably conveys the clarity and movement of the original.

"Then when they had both snatched up the handles of their swords, they came towards the same place, and clashing and moving around they were involved in the great hullaballoo of battle. Even now while Eteocles of Thessalian wisdom was planning strategy smothered Polyneices in a heap of earth. For when he was trapped by the toils of his opponent, Polyneices kick him from behind with his hefty foot, in front he was well beaten with the blows against the stomach walls and going forward he drove the deadly wooden spear through his temples and then thrust it in the buttocks. But Polyneices when he had broken Eteocles' ribs, he feeling terrible injured his chest with blood-stained knuckles. But Eteocles, as he was winning and in fact had won in battle, thinking the sword had done a good job he skewered him to the ground since he had his mind not on this, but on other matters. And so he killed Polyneices; for still having a little breath, Polyneices keeping the iron on the head of the spear-shaft, he with difficulty withdrew the sword and from the front drove it into Eteocles' belly."

I would add that the above examples were copied from the original MSS and have not been emended or altered in any way.

It must be agreed, I feel, that translation periods may very occasionally seem ever-so-slightly boring - so let it be your job to inject an element of interest and fun-and-games into your teaching. But take great care to ensure that any pronouncements made with this in mind appear accidental - if they should appear contrived the effect is lost. For example, when reading about the Persian court in Herodotus:

"Anyone who doesn't know what a eunuch is, come and see me afterwards",

and suppose one of the class is translating Livy 21 :

"The army halted at a distance of seven miles....."

You are of course using a different text - "Hum. My editor reads 'sex'. What do you read?"

You must also try to smooth the pupils' way in the difficult task of translating Homer. Say a boy translates ἐκ διφροιο (wrongly) as "from his chariot". You rush to the rescue: "No, that's wrong. The word means a thing that's got two of anything. It can be used of a chariot, but here it's used of a two-legged.....er...er....chair."

And then we come to Prose Composition. As well as cultivating a lively, questioning mind in your pupils, you must, on your own part, be virulent and forceful and have all the answers at your fingertips:

- "Sir, if this clause was transposed here and became dependent on "constituit", would its verb stay in the infinitive or go into the subjunctive?"
- "Yes."

The class will occasionally need your advice :

"Don't translate names into Greek prose in a stupid way, like :
'When Rip Van Winkle woke up after his 1000 years' sleep.....'
ὁ δε Περικλῆς.....

but on the other hand, when there's no Ancient Greek equivalent for a certain character, you have to improvise :
'Lord Nelson left Plymouth on the morning tide.....'
ὁ δε Νελλιδης....."

However, beware that you do not over-instruct your class, so that they should wish to turn the tables on you. It is said that the great P.H.Vellacott once set his class a prose which happened to be a translation of part of a speech by Isocrates. One of the class found the original, copied it out and gave it in. It duly came back a week later, bearing comments such as "Again, you use a participle where a clause is required", marked eight out of ten and with the encouraging comment at the top - "Good, getting better".

Lastly there is the thankless task of teaching Ancient History. In this case take every opportunity to bring it up-to-date and show its relevance to modern affairs. So when discussing Roman provinces :

"Dobrudje was the territory taken by the Russians from the Roumanians in the last war - or the Roumanians from the Russians (becoming more indistinct) or the Germans or something like that (muttering)."

The same qualities I mentioned with respect to Prose Composition must also apply here :

- "Sir, who was Emperor in 274?"
- "Do you mean B.C. or A.D.?"

and

- "Sir, was Tiberius Gemellus the son of Tiberius Claudius Drusus the son of Tiberius?"
- "As opposed to whom?"

To sum up, I think I may safely say that if these suggestions are followed, Classics teaching will become more enjoyable for all concerned. No longer will you bear the stigma of teaching or studying a "boring" subject, and Classics will be recognised for what it is.

Finally, I would leave you with a piece of sound advice given me by one of my Classics teachers :

"In everything, concentrate on the original language. Don't use English translations - they tend to be all obfuscated with verbiage.

ROGER MAY.

****

The Editor wishes to thank Professor T.Robert S. Broughton for his kind conferment of Honorary Professorship of the University of North Carolina; he would be more than pleased to return the compliment, but regrets that this is not at the moment within his powers. (Being no more than a humble (?) 3rd-year undergraduate).

THE MERLIN FRAGMENT.

Since this was published in the last issue of Pegasus (vol. 13) I have received a letter from Mr. L.D.Benson, assistant editor of Speculum (published in Cambridge, Massachusetts), in which - at last! - he suggests a source for our fragment, namely a Latin version of the Seven Sages of Rome. "Unfortunately," he writes, "our library's copy of Buchner's edition (Erlanger Beiträge, V, 1889) has been loaned out, so I could not check your fragment against the printed edition, but I am practically certain you will find that it is from the eleventh section ("Sapientes") and that the obscured name is that of one of the sages, Malguidrac (-roc, in your MS.). There is a good discussion of all the versions in Killis Campbell's edition of the English version, The Seven Sages of Rome (Boston, 1907)."

F.W.CLAYTON

Editor's Note

Mrs. Audrey Erskine, under whose name the Merlin fragment was first published in Pegasus (vol. 13, p.37), has asked me to point out that she considers Professor Clayton to have done at least as much work on the interpretation of the fragment as she did herself, and that the article should, therefore, have appeared under the names of Professor Clayton and Mrs. Erskine jointly.

CATULLUS AND THE GODS

A study in treatment and symbolism

Kinsey[1] says, "Catullus' references to the gods are usually conventional". It will be the purpose of this article to show that this statement is not wholly correct, but that often Catullus draws away from divine conventional interpretations and instead treats the gods as expressions of his own personal symbolism.

In poem 7, in which Catullus makes direct reply to Lesbia's question, implied in lines 1-2, "How many kisses do you want from me?", Jove is described as "aestuosus" (1.7). At first sight this epithet is completely innocent. It is describing the locality of the Egyptian desert, where Ammon, the Egyptian version of Jove, had his oracle. "Aestuosus" elsewhere nearly always refers to hot weather, cf. Horace Odes 1.22.5, "per Syrtes aestuosas", and 1.31.5, "aestuosae Calabriae". However in Plautus' "Bacchides" (470ff.), a meretrix is described as "acerrume aestuosam", or as seething fiercely with passion. Can this meaning of "aestuosus" be applied to Jove and hence to Catullus? I believe it can. Beside the oracle of "aestuosi Iovis", stands "the sacred tomb of ancient Battus" (1.6). The effect after the heat and fervour of "aestuosus" is one of calmness or "coldness", as Commager[2] calls it; in other words the contrast is a simple one between hot and cold, or more specifically, as representing Catullus' own feelings, between high emotional passion and stark impassivity. What Catullus is giving us here, in fact, is not a topographical account of the number of kisses he will bestow, but instead his own personal attitude towards his sweetheart. He is both emotional (aestuosus) and soberly calm (sanctus) towards her. We are aware of this division of feeling experienced by the poet from poem 85 l.1, "Odi et amo", and from poem 76, where in his plea for freedom from passions, Catullus brings out a striking contrast of his feelings, by comparing his love ("amor", 1.13) with the tortures which it brings to his soul ("excrucies" 1.10, "pestem perniciemque" 1.20, "morbum" 1.25).

"Aestuosus" is used once more by Catullus, in poem 46, where in describing his joy at leaving Bithynia he refers to the capital town, Nicaea, as "aestuosus" (1.5). Strabo (XII.564) describes the town as οὐ πανυ δε ὑγιεινον του θερους & this statement fits in very well with the description "aestuosus". However, are there not undertones pervading the adjective which mean us to refer to "aestuosi Iovis" of poem 7?

Both poems talk about strong desire. In poem 7 Catullus is madly eager ("vesanus", 1.10) to give thousands of kisses to Lesbia; in poem 46 the poet is all of a quiver ("praetrepidans", 1.7) at the prospect of leaving Bithynia, and his feet are ready and willing ("laeti studio pedes", 1.8). Not only is the theme of strong will common to both poems, but the will itself is, as I believe, directed towards the same end in both, namely to Lesbia. The association of the ideas of leaving ("linquantur", 1.4) and heat ("aestuosuae", 1.5) in poem 46 is certainly not accidental; they are deliberately combined to emphasise Catullus' desire to see his Lesbia and the phrase "mens praetrepidans" (1.7) can only refer to his own anticipation of the meeting.

If this symbolic interpretation of "aestuosae" in poem 46 be accepted[3], we have further reason for believing that Jove in poem 7 represents Catullus in his highest emotional state. That Jove is a fitting representative of love in all its forms is evident from poem 68, l.140, where he is described as "omnivolus plurima furta".

Both Kinsey[4] and Elder[5] see humour in poem 7, although Elder[6] concedes that the image of "aestuosi Iovis" may have appealed to Catullus to suggest indirectly the heat of his own passion, which would naturally destroy any humorous effect the poem might have intended.

There is certainly no humour about Catullus' love, cf. pm. 85, l.2 and pm. 72, l.5, not even when it is coloured by the oracle of Jove or the tomb of Battus.

The reference to Jove in poem 68 (l.140) as "omnivolus" is interesting both for the interpretation of the "Manlius and Julius" poem and in providing, like poem 7, an unconventional treatment of a god. Jove elsewhere has the epithet "summus" (poem 55, l.5), to suit Kinsey's interpretation of the gods, mentioned above, or has no epithet at all e.g. poem 34, l.6 and poem 72, l.2. At lines 136ff. of poem 68, Catullus says he will put up with the "rara furta" of his mistress to avoid appearing intolerable in her eyes. Behaving in that way Catullus follows the example of Juno, who like him was angry, yet managed to contain her own feelings :

"Saepe etiam Iuno, maxima caelicolum,
Coniugis in culpa flagrantem concoquit iram
Noscens omnivoli plurima furta Iovis" (pm. 68, l's 138-140)

"Omnivoli", following Merrill's[7] interpretation, means "omnes puellas volens" and links up with Catullus' description of Lesbia at line 128 as a "multivola (multos amores volens) mulier". Also the love affairs (furta) are common to both Lesbia and Jupiter. These strong word-sassociations make identification between Lesbia and Jove easy. When Catullus talks of "plurima furta Iovis", he is really referring to Lesbia's amours as described in poem 11, l's 17 ff. and when he alludes to an "omnivoli Iovis", he is really picturing the Lesbia of poem 58.

Harkins[8] had pointed the way to this identification when he said, "Lesbia, who is multivola, is like omnivolus Jove"[9]. Poems 11 and 58 show that Lesbia consorted with many men, and that therefore she suited the epithet "multivolae". Harkins continues, "Catullus is like Juno in restraining his wrath at Lesbia's lapses"[10]. The identification of Catullus with Juno is obvious from the fact that both must keep their anger within bounds to avoid appearing possessive ("molesti", poem 68, l.137) in their opposite's eyes.

Catullus, according to Elder, intended consciously to compare Lesbia with three heroines, Laodamia, Helen and Juno, and unconsciously to identify himself with two of these three - Laodamia and Juno. At line 142 of poem 68, says Elder, "the unconscious identification ceases, for Catullus goes on to remind himself that Lesbia was not led to him by a father's hand, and so then he looks at the furta from her point of view, as furta from her husband";

"Sed furtiva dedit mira munuscula nocte
Ipsius ex ipso dempta viri gremio" (l's 145-6)

The 'furtiva mira munuscula" recall the "furtivos amores" of poem 7 and this link adds further to the hypothesis that Jove in poem 68 symbolizes Lesbia and her infidelities.

While Jove, on the one hand, represents the bad side of Lesbia in poem 68, Cupid at lines 133ff. portrays the good:

"Quam (i.e. Lesbia) circumcursans hinc illinc saepe
Cupido
Fulgebat crocina candidus in tunica."

Here Catullus ascribes to Lesbia the attributes of Venus, cf. Horace Odes 1.2.33, "Ercyina ridens, quam locus circumvolat et Cupido". Cupid represents the force of love in the world and portrays Lesbia, as she once was to Catullus - a faithful lover. The idea of "Love" watching over someone is repeated in poem 45, where Amor (1.94 and 1.17ff.) is shown as sneezing her auspicious omens on the young couple. It will be noted that Acme and Septimius are happy lovers, cf. l's 25ff.

The singular form "Cupido" occurs once more in Catullus, at line 3 of poem 36, "nam sanctae Veneri Cupidinique", where Lesbia is portrayed as having made a promise to Venus and Cupid, that if Catullus stopped writing slanderous poetry about her, she would destroy the worst poems of the worst poet in the world. The very fact that Lesbia had invoked Cupid and Venus, is proof of the sincerity of her promise and possibly of her love for Catullus, whether it be as strong or weak. There is no evidence in poem 36 that Cupid represents an unfaithful Lesbia.

Elsewhere in Catullus, "Cupido" is found in the plural, linked with the Loves (Veneres), i.e. poem 3, l.1 and poem 13, l.11. Both terms are borrowed by Martial (ix.11.9, xi.13.6) and the plural forms result from Catullus' conception of Venus and Lesbia. As Merrill[12] says, "in the type of Venus (Veneres Cupidinesque) were summed all the graces and charms of mind and body". In other words "Veneres Cupidinesque" represent all the good physical and mental qualities, which Catullus considered were possessed by Lesbia. Consequently there is nothing from the subject matter of poems 3 and 13 which deals either with Lesbia in person (puella, pm. 13 1.4) or alludes to her through her pets, e.g. the sparrow of poem 3, which prevent our treating the references to "Cupidines" as anything other than complements to the picture of a "fidelis Lesbia" and this fact in turn links up with the initial hypothesis that Cupid, in poem 68, symbolizes Lesbia as a good and faithful lover.

For a possible further identification between Cupid and Lesbia, we may refer to the Peleus and Thetis poem (64) at line 95, where Cupid is addressed as "sancte puer". Catullus describes Ariadne's reaction to Theseus' form at 91ff :

"Non prius ex illo flagrantia declinavit
Lumina, quam cuncto concepit corpore flammam
Funditus atque imis exarsit tota medullis".

Cupid is introduced at 1.95 as the agent of Ariadne's passion and frenzy :

> "Sancte puer, curis hominum qui gaudia misces,
> Qualibus incensam iactastis mente puellam
> Fluctibus....."

This is not the Cupid of poem 68, "resplendent in his saffron robe" (crocina candidus in tunica, 1.134). Instead we have before us a mischievous god, who puts flame into lovers' hearts (incensam,1.97) and causes them to grow pale (expalluit 1.100). In fact some of the symptoms of Ariadne's love are similar to those of Catullus. Ariadne is aflame (incensam) at Theseus' form and her eyes are ablaze (flagrantia.. lumina, l's 91ff). Catullus, likewise, burns (poem 72, 1.5) when he addresses Lesbia, and at line 2, poem 85, he is tortured by the fact that he is in love (excrucior). It seems likely, therefore, that Catullus means to identify himself with the "puella" of line 97. In addition the emotion and frenzy implied in the words flagrantia (91), flamma (92), exarsit (93), furores (94), incensam iactatis (97), fluctibus (98) and fulgore (100) signify Catullus' love as of the "hate-love" (poem 85) type in his relations with Lesbia.

If the "puella" of poem 64 symbolizes Catullus, the "sanctus puer" can only be identified with Lesbia. In poem 109 Catullus prays to the gods that Lesbia's wish be sincere that their relationship be everlasting and that he may share a holy bond of friendship (sanctae foedus amicitiae - 1.6) with her for the whole of his life. Does the "sanctae amicitiae" link up with the "sanctus puer"? It does not seem very likely, at first hand, for Catullus alludes both to himself and Lesbia, by using the term "amicitia".

However, if we accept my suggestion that the "Loves" in poem 3 symbolize a "Lesbia fidelis", then a link between "sanctus puer" and "sanctae amicitiae" becomes more apparent. In poem 36 Lesbia makes a vow to Venus who is described as "sanctae" (1.3). By a process of simple logic, we can say that if Lesbia is symbolized by Venus, and Venus is "sancta", then Lesbia is "sancta". Moreover, if Cupid is portrayed as "sanctus", then Lesbia is symbolized by Cupid. A criticism may be made at this point that logistic methods of reasoning have no place in Catullan scholarship, especially in such a subjective field as the treatment of symbolism. However, I feel in this case that this method of reasoning helps to prove an important link between the poems, and even without the aid of logic there exists an intentional tie between "sancta puer" and "sanctae amicitiae" which is sufficiently strong to make an identification between Lesbia and Cupid very feasible.

Elder [13] saw in the identification between line 133 of poem 68 and the "Veneres Cupidinesque" of poems 3 and 13 a possible pointer to the nature of Catullus' love. He asks the question : "does the line (133) "quam circumcursans hinc illinc saepe Cupido" suggest the romantic desire on the part of Catullus to endow Lesbia with the Cupids and Venuses that hovered over her in earlier days?" The answer to this question is, as I believe, that Catullus had no romantic desire to have his "fidelis Lesbia" back. The imperfect tense of "fulgebat", 1.134 ("used to shine"), was surely deliberately chosen by Catullus to show that the Lesbia of poem 5 ceased to exist any more and that there remained instead the whore of poem 8.

Just as Cupid in poem 64 (l.95) is described as mixing cares with joy, so Venus in poem 68 (l.51) is said to be of a twofold nature (duplex) and the occasioner of Catullus' anxiety (mihi dederit curam - l.51). Why is Venus "duplex"? Kelley[14] and Fordyce[15] think that the epithet has the same meaning as when Horace applies it to Ulysses at Odes 1.6.7, "cursus duplicis Ulixei", where the adjective takes on the meaning of "treacherous". However, in poem 68, Catullus is detailing an honest account, direct to Allius, of his own love for Lesbia, which, as we know from poem 85, is twofold in nature, i.e. of the "odi et amo" type. It is to this love, peculiar to Catullus, that the adjective "duplex" refers and therefore it must be taken quite literally as meaning that Catullus both loves and hates his girl. The twin idea of love and pain is mentioned earlier at line 18 in the phrase "dulcem amaritiem", where Venus is shown as a goddess not in the slightest ignorant of Catullus' love life, "non est dea nescia nostri", and this reference, in turn, validates a literal rendering of "duplex".

While Venus symbolizes both the love and grief in Catullus' soul, Cybele in the Attis poem (63) symbolizes his madness. As Harkins[16] had said, "the only clear clue that poem 63 contains an allegory applicable to Catullus himself, comes in the short prayer to Cybele at the end of the poem (l's 91-93).

"Dea magna, dea Cybelle, Didymei dea domina,
Procul a mea tuus sit furor omnis, era, domo:
Alios age incitatos, alios age rabidos!"

Why is this petition for release from "furor" made to Cybele herself? Because she, as the symbol of the frenzy (animo aestuante, l.47) experienced by those like Attis who were initiated into her rites, had put the "furor" into Catullus' heart. The worship of Cybele was orgiastic, and accompanied by the frenzied sound of the tympana, cymbale, tibiae and comu, and culminated in scourging, self-mutilation, syncope from excitement, and even death from haemorrhage or heart-failure. (cf. Lucretius, II.598ff., Varro Sat. Men. 131ff. Ovid Fast. IV. 179ff).

The symptoms of the initiates, brought on by these musical instruments, can be well applied to the frenzy of Catullus' love. The "furor animi" (l.38) of Attis corresponds to Catullus' picture of his own passions as a "vesana flamma" (poem 100, l.7); Attis' faintness, "langor" (l.37) after his frenzied revel (l.4ff) reminds us of the numbness which Love infused into Catullus' limbs at line 21 of poem 76 - "Hei mihi subrepens imos ut torpor in artus"; finally the affliction which goads Attis to frenzy (furenti rabie, l.4) anticipates Catullus' own plea at line 93 - "alios age incitatos, alios age rabidos".

Harkins (p.107) comments, "throughout 63, "furor" represents the state of soul wrought in a worshipper of Cybele". This statement is true of both the mental dispositions of Attis and Catullus. Both discovered a love that proved detrimental to themselves; Cybele's love for Attis caused him to mutilate himself; Catullus' love for Lesbia proved torturous to himself ("excrucies", poem 76, l.10). Further, the fact that the "furor" is associated with the goddess, through the adjective "tuus" (l.92), indicates strongly that Cybele in poem 63 symbolizes Catullus' frenzied passions for Lesbia.

Elder[17] considered that Catullus, who as an external observer had witnessed the goddess' rites in Bithynia, took an objective view to Cybelean frenzy, and that it was the awesome effect on mankind of such a sweeping passion that attracted him to write poem 63. However, how can Catullus be an objective observer, if he makes a personal prayer to the goddess that he be kept away from the madness, to which he had for a long time been so akin? Harkins[18] makes a more apposite remark to the question, when he offers the suggestion "Perhaps Catullus may be said to pray at l.91 (poem 63) that he be spared a <u>return</u> to frenzy as Attis suffered".

While Cybele is pertinent to poem 63, whose theme is madness, in epitomizing the frenzy of her own initiates and in revealing Catullus' own state of mind, the characteristics of the gods in poem 64 who are invited as guests to the marriage feast of Thetis and Peleus are such that neither can they offer significance to the related themes of the poem - the marriage of Peleus and Thetis and the desertion of Ariadne, nor can they lend much truth to a view that they are treated symbolically by Catullus. The divine guests are Chiron (l.278), Penios (l.285), Prometheus (l.294) and Jupiter and Juno (l.298) together with most of their children; Apollo alone is left in heaven (l.299).

Chiron is described as "portans silvestria dona" and loaded with enough flowers to perfume the palace (l.284); in fact he brings so many flowers that they cannot be arranged artistically ("indistinctis", l.283). The treatment of Chiron can be nothing other than humorous, as no other parallel to this type of description of the centaur can be found in any literature before Catullus, except possibly in Apollonius' "Argonautica", IV. 1143-5, where the treatment is very much less detailed.

Penios is treated with burlesque. He arrives "non vacuos" (l.288) which is an understatement, in view of what he has brought (l's 288-291). I concur with Kinsey's[18] view of the treatment of these two minor gods, that Catullus is going out of his way to poke fun at them without being ill-humoured. In being able to treat the gods light-heartedly, Catullus has divorced himself from any identification with them for it is not his intention to poke fun at himself, cf. his own gravity of character in poem 76.

On lines 294 ff. Kinsey[19] remarks: "One would expect after Chiron and Penios that the great gods and their more splendid gifts would now be described at greater length. This does not happen. Prometheus comes next"(l.295-7). This comment implies a pattern to the description of the divine guests and to the order in which the gods enter. But Catullus surely in his portrayal of the divine guests is being purely descriptive, and in so doing, is making a colourful build-up to what is far more important to the theme of the poem, namely the utterance of the Fates to Peleus and Thetis.

Prometheus is described at line 294 as having an inventive heart ("sollerti corde") and as bearing the traces of his old punishment ("veteris vestigia poenae", l.295). The adjective "sollers" corresponds to the Greek compound adjectives πολυμητις and ποικιλοβουλος and refers

to the old myth of Prometheus in Aeschylus' "Prometheus Vinctus", where the god gave fire to mortals, πασαι τεχναι βροτοισιν ἐκ Προμηθεως (1.506). If we ignore the erroneous statement of Fordyce[20] that the noun "cor" is the seat of the intelligence, not of the emotions (cf. Plautus, "Truculentus" 1.2.75, "aliquem amare corde atque animo suo", and Horace Odes 1.28.8 "corde tremit"), we may conjecture that Prometheus' inventiveness is a possible allusion to Catullus' own skill either in controlling the emotions of his love or in finishing the relationship with Lesbia. The latter hypothesis may be strengthened by the "veteris vestigia poenae"[21] which can be taken as symbolic of "the healing of old wounds" or, to make it more specific, of Catullus' cure from the pains he used to endure, when he was Lesbia's lover.

Putnam[22] says that the appearance of Prometheus "somehow breaks the enchanting spell". Accepting a symbolic interpretation of Prometheus, the loss of the enchanting spell will be doubly emphasized; Prometheus both destroys the picturesqueness of the flowers of Chiron and the descriptive portrayal of the various trees of Peneus, by bearing visibly the scars from the attacks of the vulture, and at the same time provides an image of a wounded Catullus, gripped by old memories.

Jupiter and his wife, together with most of their children, are dismissed in a line and a half (1's 298 ff.) and their treatment may be described as nothing other than conventional.

Other references to the gods in Catullus deserve little comment for the purposes of symbolic interpretations. The address to Diana (poem 34) is purely a festival hymn and was probably suggested by the annual festival to the Diana of the famous temple on the Aventine, held at the time of the full moon in the month of August. Similar invocations to Diana may be found in Horace, Odes I.21, IV.6, and in the "Carmen Saeculare".

Vulcan in poem 36 (1.7) is described as "tardipedi deo". The adjective "tardipes" is a stock epithet of the lamed god, cf. Hephaestus in Nicander's "Theriaca" where he is described as χαλαιπους, and again in Callimachus, fr. 228.63 (Pfeiffer) where he is δυσπους. Likewise "uterque", the epithet of Neptune in poem 31 (1.3) is conventional, in that it points to the twofold function of the god, as ruler over "stagna" and "mare" (cf. Martial, "Liber Spectaculorum" 13.5., "numen utriusque Dianae", as goddess both of hunt and of birth).

From the poems which I have discussed, two conclusions may be drawn about Catullus' treatment of the gods. First of all, he associated the gods closely with Lesbia, cf. poem 68, 1.70, where she is described as "diva", and secondly on the occasions when honest words failed, he resorted to the gods as symbolic expressions of his own love for Lesbia. Daniel[23] aptly comments: "When the reality of love was painful to express and the usual forms of epigram and elegy seemed inadequate to convey Catullus' concept of what love might be, the poet turned to mythology to add a new dimension to his philosophy of love". This statement is especially true of poem 68, where, as we have seen, Jove and Juno are made to represent, so to speak, the opposite extremes of love.

Allen in his paper on Propertius[24] notes that "the figures of mythology are the prototype and models of humanity, and their character and conduct provide the norms for the character and conduct of contemporary man; what is true in myth is also true and significant

in the immediate present". These ideas, I consider, in the main approximate to Catullus' own philosophy of the gods as mythological and symbolic figures. The mythological view is the conventional view and the symbolic view is the poet's view. Catullus often had both these outlooks in mind when treating the gods, andtherefore the statement that Catullus' view of the gods is normally conventional, that is, mythological, should be treated with some qualification.

J.F.WOOLLAM.

Select Bibliography

H.A.Musurillo, Symbol and myth in ancient poetry, New York, Fordham University Press (1961).

Northrop Frye, L.C.Knights and others, Myth and Symbol, ed. Bernice Slote, Lincoln, Nebraska Press (1962).

G. Norwood, Pindar (Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 19), Berkeley, 1945.

Notes

1 T.E.KINSEY, "Irony and Structure in Catullus", LATOMUS, T.24, 1965, p. 911-931. Quotation from p.930.

2 S. COMMAGER, "Notes on some poems of Catullus", H.S.C.P., 70, 1965, p. 83-110. Quotation from p. 85.

3 J. MAROUZEAU, Traité de stylistique latine (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2nd ed., 1946), p. 23, states that the repeated vowel sounds of line 5 (pm. 46) create "le charme 'exotique'!" Might not this effect be symbolic of an exotic Lesbia?

4 KINSEY, op. cit., p. 922.

5 J.P.ELDER,"Notes on some conscious and subconscious elements in Catullus' poetry" H.S.C.P., 60, 1951, p. 101-136. "Most of the effect of these (sc. topographical) references is, I believe, humour", p.109.

6 ELDER, op. cit., p. 109.

7 E.T.MERRILL, Catullus (Ginn and Comp, 1st ed., 1893), p. 190.

8 P.W.HARKINS, "Autoallegory in Catullus 63 and 64", T.A.P.A., 90, 1959, p. 102-116.

9 HARKINS, op. cit., p.103.

10 HARKINS, op. cit., p.103.

11 ELDER, op. cit., p.127.

12 MERRILL, op. cit. p.6

13 ELDER, op. cit., p.127.

14 W. KELLEY, Poems of Catullus and Tibullus (1854) - note on l.51 of poem 68.

15 C.J.FORDYCE, Catullus - A commentary (O.C.P. 1961, 1st ed.), p. 349.

16 HARKINS, op. cit., p.107.

17 J.P.ELDER, "The Art of Catullus' Attis", T.A.P.A., 71, 1940, xxxiii - xxxiv.

18 HARKINS, op. cit., p.111.

19 KINSEY, op. cit., p. 923.

20 FORDYCE, op. cit., 313. He compares Lucretius V, 1106, "ingenio praestare et corde vigere".

21 Quoted from Kinsey, op. cit., p. 923, who says that l's 295-7 invalidate a symbolic interpretation. However, I cannot accept this statement.

22 M.C.J.PUTNAM, "The art of Catullus 64", H.S.C.P., 64, 1960, p. 191.

23. M.L.DANIELS, "Personal revelation in Catullus 64", C.J. 62, 1967, p 351-356; quotation from p. 351.

24 A.W.ALLEN, "Sunt qui Propertium malint" in Critical essays on Roman Literature, ed. J.P.Sullivan, (London, 1962), p. 142.

THE NIRZEIRI LYRICS

A manuscript discovery in Western Turkey

(The following contribution was submitted by Professor Maurice Cooper, Head of the School of Classical and Byzantine Studies at Baldwin-Wallace College, Ohio, who is a personal friend of Ben Benzinski. Upon hearing that the Classical Society in Exeter published a magazine, the Professor mentioned that the Editor might be interested in specimens of the late Greek lyric poems discovered in 1970 in Western Turkey. About a month later the Editor received the excerpts which are reproduced here; they were previously published in the Baldwin-Wallace College Journal, Insight, Vol. 23, April 1971).

These lyric poems are two out of a total of fifteen from a fifteenth-century manuscript discovered by chance in a monastery library in the small town of Nirzeiri, in Western Turkey. The poems were written in a miniscule hand on four sheets of rather poor parchment, measuring approximately 6 ins. by 8 ins; the poems are almost certainly considerably earlier than the date of the manuscript. The line-divisions are as they appear in the manuscript, although the looseness of the metre is puzzling, and we may possibly suppose that the poems were sung to an improvised tune in a similar fashion to the later Greek "mantinadha".

The poems, which on the whole display a marked fatalistic tone, were almost certainly composed at the time of marauding raids by large bands of heathen Turks, or possibly Mongols, which eventually drove the Greek settlers from the fertile interior of Turkey and forced them to congregate on the western coast. Clearly at the date of the poems' composition the time of migration was not far away. This would date the poems somewhere around 1270-1300.

The full text of the lyrics, with parallel translation and comprehensive annotation, will be published by York State University Press in the spring of 1972.

1. λιτῶ, Ζάκωρνά,
σε τινα κόρην,
ἄ·
εἰ τιν' ἧς
χρήσιμα σπάει
ἠπότιν εἰς θύμην·
πόλλα δ' οὔτ' ἦ
πελόμενος ἦ
δωότα γ', οὐδὲ
βῶ ἵεμαι.

"I pray to you, Zakorna, about a certain girl - ah! alas! - for she drags her beauty into my anger, which makes me cry out; but I do not even rush around a great deal, or look for gifts from her, nor do I long to go to her."

ii. λιτῶ : a late form of λίττομαι taking a double accusative: λιτῶ σε τινα, "I pray to you about someone". As far as can be ascertained the iota is short.

Ζαχώρνα : apparently a Persian equivalent of Aphrodite, probably from "ze kare", "the maiden", the second element of this being cognate with the Greek κόρη , with the etymologically common intrusive ν.

iii. ἄ : a cry from the heart.

iv. εἰ : the apodosis is suppressed. Translate "since" or "seeing that".

τιν' ἧς χρήσιμα : the interpretation of this sentence is uncertain and largely depends on the assumption ἧς = αὕτης . The subject must be ἡ κόρη understood. τινα must go with χρήσιμα , and, as the text stands, ἧς with τινα χρήσιμα : "she drags her certain useful things into my anger". χρήσιμα is a superb understatement of the lady's charms, but expresses perfectly the fatal attraction they have for the poet.

v. σπάει : lack of contraction metri gratia.

vi. θύμην : we cannot tell why anger should have become a feminine emotion among the settlers in Turkey. Possibly a sarcastic reference to shrewish wives.

ἠπότιν : the derivation of this word is uncertain, though there is an Ionic word found in Homer, ἠπύτα , a masculine adjective meaning "calling" or "crying", from the verb ἠπύω , "to shout out loud". In the absence of further evidence we must assume our form is a feminine adjective agreeing with θύμην and take the sense as "causing one to cry out".

ix. δωότα : this has the appearance of a participial form, but we may assume this is accusative plural of a neuter noun δωότον "a gift". The sense is considerably compressed, but quite clear; the wistful irony of the last four lines is unmatched in Greek lyric poetry.

2.

Σίγκα σὸν ὄψιξ
πεῖν' οὔ πω' ἔιτο.
φύλ' ὀφραῖ φόρον.
τήν τε βλάβως
ἐβῆ κτείν', ὠ παῖ.
χοὖ ἔνθα παιδὸς
οὐ πεινᾷ διὰ βύρσαν γ'
ἄν τε συνουσία,
ἐδει τε δίσσον
σ' εἶτα φορακεῖν.

A father's lament over his young son killed in a raid.

"Singka, the Late One, was not yet lying in hunger for you. Whole tribes went to render her tribute, and with grievous injury to kill in her name, my son! And when the clash of battle did not hunger after such a child, for it had carnage enough of its own, it was your fate to pay her twofold tribute."

i. Σίγκα : obviously a female equivalent of Ares. There is a minor underworld deity of the Hindu religion called Singkala, but I can trace no resemblances.

σον : a late Ionic variant form of σε.

ὄψιξ : "the Late One", from root ὄψε . I take this epithet to be a grim euphemism akin to the "Euxine" or the "Eumenides" : a death in this kind of warfare must have come early rather than late.

ii. πεῖν' : for πεῖνα , "in hunger". The elision of long syllables is common in these poems - cp. κτείναι, l.5.

iii. ὄφραι : we must suppose this to be a lengthened form of ὄφρα (metri gratia, as αἶει for ἀεί), meaning "in order that". We must supply some verb of which φόρον is the object. I take the sense to be φύλα (ἔβη) ὄφραι φόρον (ὑποτελήσειεν). For the image cp. Soph. Antigone l.1183. ἔλιπον Ζηνὶ τροπαίῳ πάγχαλκα τέλη.

iv. την : for αὐτην . I prefer to take this as an accusative of the person interested, with κτείναι intransitive : to take την as the object of κτείναι makes very poor sense.

κτείναι : epexegetic, as common after verbs of motion.

βλάβως : adverb from βλάβος, "injurious", a corrupt adjectival form from βλάβη.

vii. διὰ βύρσαν : βύρσα is, properly, an animal-hide before tanning. I take διὰ βύρσαν here as "on account of the skin-torn-off", a savage metaphor for the carnage of battle. Such a "farmyard" image is not inappropriate at a time when good weapons were scarce and the yeoman soldiers would have gone into battle armed with flails, scythes and pickaxes.

viii. συνουσία : "being-together" indicates an almost continuous state of battle and war to protect one's lands against the invading barbarians.

ix. δίσσον : why the tribute should be "twofold" we cannot tell . Perhaps there is a hint at human sacrifice to heathen gods.

x. φοραχεῖν : if this reading be correct, we must suppose an otherwise unknown verb φοραχῶ , of similar meaning to φόρον ὑποτελῶ.

Professor Maurice S. Cooper, B.A.,R.C.

CASAUBON GOES FORTH AGAIN

In what follows, I take issue once more with a view expressed many years ago, and held with great tenacity ever since, by Professor Gordon S. Haight. I should like to make it clear that whatever I have to say on this point has not diminished the great respect in which I hold George Eliot's literary genius and Professor Haight's massive erudition and sympathetic appreciation for the great novelist to whom he has devoted his life's work. I do, however, believe that no mortal, however great his work, is perfect, and no scholar, however expert he may be, is infallible. It would do only honour to Professor Haight's justifiably solid and established reputation if he admitted that on one small point his former view has been shown, albeit by other people, to be in need of correction.[1]

****

In an article published in this magazine more than three years ago,[2] I gave my support to the view expressed by Mr. John Sparrow in a recent work,[3] in which he argued that Mark Pattison was to a large extent the model drawn on by George Eliot for her character the Reverend Edward Casaubon in Middlemarch. There was nothing new in this, but what was so obvious to many contemporaries had called forth public denials from those who were closest to any of the persons involved, and these public denials, however feeble they may seem, had been taken seriously in later years by more than one person. Both Mr. Sparrow and myself realized and stated in our publications that Casaubon in Middlemarch was a caricature, not a photographic representation of an original; that it is absurd to say that Casaubon is Pattison, and that there were, of course, differences between the two (or else George Eliot might as well call him Pattison and make him the Rector of an Oxford College with special interests in the history of Classical scholarship etc., etc.)[4] I went ever further and conceded the possibility that some of the traits of the fictitious Edward Casaubon may have belonged to Dr. Robert Herbert Brabant of Devizes, Professor Haight's candidate, whose research interests were nearer 'The Key to all Mythologies' than Pattison's[5]. But in order to establish it beyond doubt that George Eliot did have Pattison in mind while working on the creation of the Reverend gentleman[6], I quoted in my article a hitherto unpublished section of Sir Charles Dilke's diaries from the British Museum Additional MS 43132, in which Mrs. Pattison's second husband admits that he had himself, ever since the appearance of Middlemarch, believed that Casaubon and his wife had been drawn from the Pattisons, and that George Eliot admitted to him that the letter of proposal was based on Pattison's own letter[7]. This, I believed, coming from a man as closely related to one of the main characters in this saga as anyone could wish, might settle the problem. What an optimist I was!

Professor Haight's review of Mr. Sparrow's book[8] was already in the press when he received a complimentary copy of my article. In his review he was concerned mainly with suppressing the new attempt to claim any connection between Pattison and Casaubon of the novel, and at the end of it he referred to his own Brabantine view of the matter as the final and satisfactory answer to this problem,

from which it was tiresome of Mr. Sparrow to secede. Mr. Sparrow was not slow to answer [9], and in his reply he now quoted - in an extended and more accurate version - two of the passages from the Dilke diaries which I had already quoted in my article. Professor Haight was asked by the editor of Notes and Queries to reply to this challenge, and his rejoinder followed Mr. Sparrow's answer [10]. It was a sad affair, and the arguments he was able to summon forth in order to discredit the clear and distinct evidence of Sir Charles Dilke were easily answered by Mr. Sparrow in a rejoinder published two months later [11].

I do not know when exactly in 1968 Professor Haight's great biography of George Eliot [12] was published. It appears that at the time of writing (or revising), the author was already familiar with Mr. Sparrow's book [13], but his rejoinder of November 1968 only reached him when the book was in the press [14]. It is therefore a matter of conjecture what he would have said to Mr. Sparrow's last reply [11]. So far, this has been the last word in this debate, and there I would have let the matter rest, but for two pieces of evidence which have since come to my notice, one new (though the reader may discover that it ought not to have been new), and one already quoted by Mr. Sparrow, but neglected during this debate.

To start with the new one. In 1885, five years after George Eliot's death, her second husband, John Walter Cross, published his George Eliot's Life [15]. The editor of The Nineteenth Century gave the new book to Lord Acton to review. His review appeared in the same year [16], and was later reprinted among Lord Acton's Historical Essays and Studies [17]. Acton's perceptive and rather intense article is twice mentioned in Professor Haight's biography [18]. In the second of these passages (p.489), Haight mentions Acton's identification of Julius Klesmer as the composer Liszt. It is therefore all the more surprising that another passage in the same review by the same reviewer and bearing on a very similar issue would have escaped Professor Haight's vigilant eye. I refer to Acton's statement on p.480 of the original article (Historical Essays p.296). The context is that of George Eliot's life with Lewes after their move into the Priory near Regent's Park in October 1863 [19]:

"When George Eliot came to live near Regent's Park her house was crowded with the most remarkable society in London. Poets and philosophers united to honour her who had been great both in poetry and philosophy, and the aristocracy of letters gathered round the gentle lady, who, without being memorable for what she said, was justly esteemed the most illustrious figure that had arisen in literature since Goethe died. There might be seen a famous scholar sitting for Casaubon, and two young men - one with good features, solid white hands, and a cambric pocket-handkerchief; the second with wavy bright hair and a habit of shaking his head backwards, who evoked other memories of the sane Midland Microcosm - while Tennison read his own last poem, or Liebreich sang Schumann's Two Grenadiers, and Lewes himself, with eloquent fingers and catching laugh, described Mazzini's amazement at his first dinner in London, or the lament of the Berlin professor over the sunset of England since Mr.Gladstone had put an Essay-and-Reviewer on the throne of Philpotts."

There is no need to argue that such a graphic description of George Eliot's salon could only be based on the first-hand experience (compressed here into one 'group painting') of a man who must have been a frequent visitor to the Priory himself. There is nothing strange about that. Lord Acton's German background made him a close acquaintance of Lewes, whose Life of Goethe was at the time held in high esteem even in Germany, and of George Eliot herself, who was always more attached to Germany and her culture than to any other European country. Acton's close relations with the Leweses are attested in some passages in Professor Haight's biography[20]. I do not know when Dr. Brabant died. But if he obtained his M.D. in 1821[21], he could not have been born much later than 1796.[22] George Eliot's strange affair with him occurred in 1843. In July 1854, the Leweses met him by accident on their visit to Cologne, and he introduced them to his friend David Friedrich Strauss[23]. On 28 October, 1874, we are told by Professor Haight[24], the Leweses came to Devizes, 'where Marian had visited Dr. Brabant in 1843', and stayed there for three days. Not a word is said about any meeting with him, nor are we ever told that he used to frequent the Priory. When the Leweses moved there in 1863, Brabant must have been in his late sixties or early seventies, and by 1874 one presumes he was dead. If he were a 'famous scholar', one could have expected to find more information about him available even in 1971. But not even that treasure-house of vanished supremacies, the Dictionary of National Biography, has a word to say about him. An acquaintance with the latest findings of German theology and the friendship of men like David Friedrich Strauss - who was admittedly a famous scholar himself - were rare among country doctors in Victorian England, but they were not enough to confer on their holders the title of a famous scholar. Even more so when the compliment comes from the lips of 'the most learned Englishman of his age', Lord Acton, who was the friend of many of the greatest scholars in Europe, and whose standard of scholarship became higher and more exalted as he grew older. Even if Dr. Brabant were a frequent visitor to the Priory (and we have no evidence for this)[25], Lord Acton was most unlikely to call him 'a famous scholar'. Pattison was one of the few contemporary British scholars who were famous on the continent, and who, despite his limitations[26], would satisfy even Acton's standards of scholarship. Need I say more?

Now to the second piece of evidence, dealt with briefly by Mr. Sparrow and forgotten, or at least left out of, a discussion where it provides an important clue. But before I come to the document itself, it would be useful to clear up one premiss and save it from the fate of many a divergent argument.

Professor Haight himself quotes twice[27] Henry Nettleship's obituary of Mark Pattison published in The Academy on August 9, 1884. In it, Nettleship appears[28] to deny the relation between Pattison and Casaubon - this, of course, suits Haight's argument. But if we accept Nettleship's evidence on this point, we should also accept the second half of it, quoted by Haight in the same context[27], and relating to Rhoda Broughton's Belinda:

> It was reserved for a vulgar and frivolous spirit to dare, in a more recent and inferior novel, such a foolish insult to good taste.

Whatever Nettleship has to say on the Middlemarch problem, where I have no evidence that he possessed first-hand knowledge of the sort which Dilke did, he was qualified to speak of Belinda. He had lived in Oxford since 1873 as fellow of Corpus and since 1878 he had been the Corpus Professor of Latin. In the small world of late Victorian Oxford, everyone knew of the horrid Miss Broughton and her shocking novels [29]. Belinda aroused a furore in Oxford on its appearance precisely because it was a roman à clé and everyone knew who were the real characters [30]. Professor Haight himself does not appear to contest the claim that James and Belinda Forth are based on Mark and Emilia Pattison. Unlike George Eliot, Miss Broughton was, as we would call her today, a 'trashy' novelist, and a naughty woman to boot.

It is therefore all the more significant that only a few years after the publication of Belinda and Mark Pattison's death, Andrew Lang published in The St. James's Gazette among his Essays in Epistolary Parody, a correspondence between Forth and Casaubon, Mrs. Forth and Rivers, Mrs. Casaubon and Ladislaw and Mrs. Casaubon and Mrs. Forth - all later reprinted in one and the same chapter (since the continuity between them is obvious) in his Old Friends, a book dedicated to Miss Rhoda Broughton [31]. Any reader informed about the background will hardly fail to observe that the connection between these four characters is not meant to be that of mere resemblance. Lang's prefatory note to this correspondence [32] would lose all its subtle irony if we took it to mean merely that he had detected some similarity between Miss Broughton's characters and those of Middlemarch. It can only be appreciated if we assume that he knew (from Miss Broughton herself, if not from other sources), that while the differences between the two fictitious couples were due to their appearance in works of fiction, the striking resemblances were due to their derivation from common archetypes. We do not know how intimate a friend of Miss Broughton Andrew Lang was [33], but a shy and reserved man like him would hardly dedicate a book to a chance acquaintance - especially if many of his friends may well consider he also a persona non grata - unless they were good friends. It is not very likely that either he or Miss Broughton ever met Dr. Brabant of Devizes.

****

J. GLUCKER

Notes

1 See Richard Porson, Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, London 1790, pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

2 The Case for Edward Casaubon, Pegasus 9 November, 1967, pp. 7-21 (henceforth called The Case).

3 John Sparrow, Mark Pattison and the Idea of a University, Cambridge 1967, Chapter 1. (Henceforth : Sparrow).

4 Sparrow pp. 9ff. See also note 6 below.

5 The Case, pp. 12-13.

6 No one has contested the fact that this appeared to be obvious to numerous contemporaries who felt like Dilke (The Case, p.11) that 'the portrait of the author of the life of Casaubon under the name of Casaubon, was a cruel one'. It was because this was so obvious, and, I assume, well known in literary and academic circles, that those close to the main protagonists had to produce their unconvincing denials. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that George Eliot was an extremely intelligent and sensitive woman, and it could hardly escape her notice that nobody would be prepared to be deceived by any denials if the name was so significant. I remember hearing the novelist Angus Wilson on the radio the other day, talking of his Anglo-Saxon Attitudes. The hero is a professor of mediaeval history, and the book was already about to be printed when a friend told Mr. Wilson that there was, in fact, a professor of mediaeval history in one of the English universities who bore the same name as the hero of the novel. This was pure co-incidence, and Mr. Wilson had never heard of this professor before, but he immediately contacted his publisher and had the professor's name in the novel changed. I may add a rhetorical question. What would be Professor Haight's reaction if he came across a novel by a close friend of his in which the hero was called George Eliot, was a distinguished American scholar whose expertise had won him international reputation, and displayed a number of other distinguishing marks which were known to be unique to Professor Haight? Would he look for dissimilarities and try to find some other candidate?

7 The Case, pp. 10-11

8 Notes and Queries May 1968, pp. 191-194

9 Notes and Queries November 1968

10 Ibid. p. 435.

11 Notes and Queries December 1968, p. 469.

12 Gordon S. Haight, George Eliot, a Biography, Oxford 1968.

13 See p. 449, note 6.

14 On p. 656, he refers to his own review of May 1968 (note 8 above), but not to Mr. Sparrow's answer.

15 George Eliot's Life as related in her Letters and Journals, arranged and edited by her husband J.W.Cross. In three volumes. London and Edinburgh 1885.

16 The Nineteenth Century vol. XVII, 1885, pp. 464-485. Acton had already offered his encouragement to Cross during the compilation of this book: see his Letters to Mary Gladstone, ed. Herbert Paul, London 1(04, p.64.

17 Edited by J.N.Figgis and R.V.Laurence, London 1907, pp. 273-304.

18 George Eliot p. 393, note 1; p.489 and note 6, Haight does not mention the fact that the essay has also been reprinted in a more accessible form in Acton's Historical Essays. He does, however, quote it as George Eliot's Life, the correct form in which it appears there. In The Nineteenth Century it is entitled George Eliot's 'Life'.

19 For the date see Haight, George Eliot, p. 372.

20 Ibid, p. 406 and note 5; p.544, note 3. Both based on unpublished MS notes in the Cambridge University Library.

21 Ibid, p. 47.

22 Ibid, pp. 49-50.

23 Ibid, pp. 150-151.

24 Ibid, p. 475.

25 Pattison 'called often at the Priory' after the publication of Middlemarch (ibid. p.448) - but also before (although I have not the evidence before me at the moment). I wonder how much more information of a revealing nature may still be lurking among the MS notes of Lord Acton in the Cambridge University Library.

26 Acton was not unaware of Pattison's prejudices and limitations, especially in the field of church history. See his Letters to Mary Gladstone pp. 206-7.

27 George Eliot p. 563; Notes and Queries May 1968, pp. 192-3

28 On a close reading of the passage, he does not quite deny this rumour in the categorical manner one could expect of him. If he had any proof that, despite the similarity in name, circumstances of marriage and other details, Pattison had absolutely nothing to do with Casaubon, he would have said so. What he does say is that 'There was, however, nothing in common between the serious scholar at Lincoln and the mere pedant frittering away his life in useless trivialities' (but there was a lot in common, as has been pointed out by Dilke in his diaries and by Mr. Sparrow, pp. 12-13. I should add, in connection with 'frittering away his life in useless trivialities', that we know from Pattison's Memoires that he intended to write a great History of Renaissance Scholarship until the end of the French period, and his Casaubon, unfinished Scaliger and most of his essays were merely 'brands plucked out of the fire'). He goes on to say: 'Nor was George Eliot, Mark Pattison's friend, at all likely to draw a caricature of one she loved and valued'. But this is begging the question, for we are not concerned here with a lost text which has to be reconstructed according to likelihood, but with an extant novel, in which the caricature has many similarities with the model. Nettleship's argument is as convincing as if someone had argued that the 'Supermac' of the

cartoonist Vicky had, despite his name and many strikingly similar features, nothing in common with the Right Hon. Harold Macmillan, M.P.

29 Michael Sadleir, Things Past, London 1944, pp. 81 ff.

30 Ibid, pp. 109-110.

31 Chapter XV. First printed 1880. In the 'new edition, 1892' which I have used, pp. 108-117. The correspondence is briefly discussed by Sparrow, pp. 18-19, but I cannot remember seeing it used later in the debate on this issue.

32 1892 edition p.108.

33 The first and only serious biography of Lang is Roger Lancelyn Green's Andrew Lang, a Critical Biography, Leicester 1946. In his Preface, p. ix, Mr. Green explains that Lang left instructions that no ' official biography' should be written and that his papers were to be destroyed. His wife reluctantly carried out the latter of these instructions. We are therefore very unlikely to find more evidence than that available in his printed work as to his personal relationships with those who were already dead when Mr. Green started working on his book, nor do I know whether any of her papers have been preserved. I would, however, never dream of dedicating, say, to Miss Muriel Spark, a book of mine which included parodies of some characters from her novels, unless I were a very good friend of the author.

****