Love and Death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius, and Others

R. O. A. M. Lyne

The Classical Quarterly, New Series, Vol. 48, No. 1 (1998), 200-212.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%281998%292%3A48%3A1%3C200%3ALADLAP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C

The Classical Quarterly is currently published by The Classical Association.

Classical Quarterly **48** (i) 200–212 (1998) *Printed in Great Britain*

LOVE AND DEATH: LAODAMIA AND PROTESILAUS IN CATULLUS, PROPERTIUS, AND OTHERS[1]

I. LOVE CONQUERS DEATH? PROTESILAUS AND LAODAMIA. CATULLUS 68

In one form or another an elevated, pleasure-transcending view of love is common, we might say natural. For readers of Latin poetry Catullus is perhaps the most impressive spokesman. In many respects, of course, Catullus is special. His particular values and choice of terminology, in his time and situation, mark him out from his crowd; in the Roman world indeed, 'whole love', perhaps rather its utterance, is hard to document before him.[2] But a belief that love is powerful and profound, an important if not the most important thing in life, this is not a rarity. Roman tombstones attest to love and devotion, and myths inherited from Greece enshrine love's power, endurance, and transcendence.

Hand in glove with such attitudes goes—often—something else: a belief, or a need to believe, that supreme love may in some way survive even death. At one end of the scale, the Roman tombstones: they can show an unwillingness to accept that death ends love—the reunion of devoted couples is imagined.[3] The myths: love's triumph over death is the climax of famous myths of love—for example, Orpheus, in his pre-Vergilian incarnation. The desolated and devoted Orpheus persuades the Lords of the Underworld to give back the breath of life to his beloved: see Hermesianax fr. 7.1–14, and cf. Eur. *Alc.* 357–62.[4] Or Alcestis. She so loved Admetus that she died for him. But 'when she had done this deed, it seemed so noble not only to men but to gods that, although among all the doers of noble deeds there are few to whom the gods have granted the honour of sending their souls up again from Hades, hers they sent up in admiration of the deed'. By another route (divine honour for courage and nobility shown in love), love again overcomes death (Plato, *Symp.* 179b–d).[5]

[1] I have profited much from the kindness and learning of Bruno Currie. My thanks are also due to *CQ*'s editor, Dr Stephen Heyworth, and to the journal's anonymous referee.

[2] For the definition of the quoted phrase, see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford, 1980, reprinted with updated introduction, etc., 1996), pp. viii–ix. The claim made in this sentence is supported in chs 1 and 2; see especially pp. 17–18.

[3] J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London, 1985), pp. 157f. Griffin quotes *CIL* 6.11252 *domine Oppi marite, ne doleas mei quod praecessi: sustineo in aeterno toro aduentum tuum*, 'Oppius, lord, husband, do not grieve for me that I have gone before you: I endure (wait for) your arrival on an eternal bed', *CE* 1325 *Iulius cum Trebia bene uixit multosque per annos:/ coniugio aeterno hic quoque nunc remanet*, 'Julius lived with Trebia well and for many years: in eternal marriage he also now continues', and others; and he refers to R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1942), pp. 247ff. Cf. too K.Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 226–9.

[4] Before Vergil, Orpheus was traditionally successful in his quest for the return of his beloved. Hermesianax calls this beloved Argiope. For the introduction of the name Eurydice, and for more information on the myth, see R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1990) on *Georg.* 4.453–527. Plato's Phaedrus has an amusing variant, *Symp.* 179d: the gods of the Underworld did not restore to Orpheus the actual woman, 'merely showing him a wraith (φάσμα) of the woman for whom he had come', since they regarded him as a mere musician and softy, a trickster and manipulator who did not dare actually to die for love as Alcestis had done (on whom, see above).

[5] Euripides in *Alcestis* offers a different version. Struck by the nobility of what Alcestis has done, Heracles canvasses the option of going to the Underworld to beg for her restoration, but in the event secures her return more immediately and physically, by fighting Death: *Alc.* 843–60,

And there is the story of Protesilaus and Laodamia. But the development of this story should be summarized.

By the time of the action of the *Iliad* Protesilaus is dead. In the Catalogue of Ships we find a terse but pregnant summary of his tragic love, marriage and death (*Il.* 2.698–702). He was the first Greek to be killed at Troy; he left behind him in Phylace a 'wife tearing both cheeks' (ἀμφιδρυφὴς ἄλοχος) and a 'half-complete house' (δόμος ἡμιτελής). The desperate grief in his wife's gesture is clear. The exact significance of 'half-complete' was disputed in antiquity;[6] I think it simply means 'half-built'. Protesilaus did not even have time to complete his house before the end of his marriage and life, a concrete but eloquent detail. Compare and contrast how Odysseus 'built his bridal-chamber, until he *finished* it', θάλαμον δέμον, ὄφρ' ἐτέλεσσα (*Od.* 23.192). It was proper that a heroic bridegroom should build his own married quarters, and Protesilaus was called away and killed before being able to complete the task.[7] Anyway, this detail aside, the essence of Homer's story is perspicuous. With extreme economy and suggestiveness he gives us a picture of love cut down at its inception, and leaves us with an expressively grieving (unnamed) wife, poised perhaps on the brink of tragedy. What happened to her? Homer's restraint leaves this to our fearful imagination, or to our knowledge from other sources.

Other early epic: according to Pausanias, the composer of the *Cypria* identified Protesilaus' wife as Polydora, daughter of Meleager (Paus. 2.4.7 = *Cypria* fr. XVII Allen = fr. 18 Davies); but the information in Pausanias that she and two others 'slew themselves over their husbands who died before them' seems Pausanias' comment rather than demonstrably attributable in any part to the *Cypria*; similarly, the clause saying that it was Protesilaus who first dared to land at Troy—a fact which is virtually but not quite explicit in Homer's account[8]—this too is Pausanias', and cannot with certainty be attributed to the *Cypria*. But Davies conjectures that a story that the first to land at Troy was fated to be the first to die was already in the *Cypria*.[9]

Euripides wrote a tragedy entitled *Protesilaus*, and it is here that a full romantic and tragic story of Protesilaus and Laodamia (as she was later called)[10] was developed and

1140–2. Cf. Lucian, *Dialogues of the Dead* 28 for the rejected option. Euripides' choice of version may rest on Satyric influence; see A. M. Dale's edition of *Alcestis* (Oxford, 1954), p. xi.

[6] The scholia propose among other explanations of the 'half-complete' house: its childlessness, that it was deprived of (the masculine) one of the δεσποταί, that it was physically unfinished (which I favour). For this last, they suggest that Protesilaus was still in the process of building his wedding-chamber when he sailed away to war, which, in view of the parallels I cite, is interesting. See below for what Catullus and/or a predecessor make(s) of it.

[7] Cf. too how Menelaus was said to have made Hyperenor's wife a widow μυχῷ θαλάμοιο νέοιο, Hom. *Iliad* 17.36.

[8] Hom. *Iliad* 2.701f. reads τὸν δ' ἔκτανε Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ/ νηὸς ἀποθρῴσκοντα πολὺ πρώτιστον Ἀχαιῶν, which Lattimore translates 'A Dardanian man had killed him/ as he leapt from his ship, far the first of all the Achaians'. As evidence in court, this could not be forced to mean more than that Protesilaus was the first to be killed. But there is certainly ambiguity in the reference of πρῶτιστον. J. O'Hara (*True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* [Ann Arbor, 1996], p. 10) thinks that Homer is alluding to an etymology in Protesilaus' name, 'the first to leap' (πρῶτος, ἅλλομαι). I doubt this particular explanation, but would accept that Homer is etymologizing his name: πρώτιστον is surely picking out πρῶτος, and Ἀχαιῶν may be pointing to the surely true etymological component λᾶος. For Homer's etymologizing in general, see O'Hara, pp. 7ff. (with bibliography).

[9] M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol, 1989), p. 47. Davies cites the version found in Apollodorus, *epit.* 3.29: 'Thetis charged Achilles not to be the first to land from the ships, because the first to land would be the first to die.'

[10] We may infer from Dio Chrysostomus, who preserves Euripides fr. 655N², that Euripides named his heroine Λαοδάμεια; Hyginus too, who is assumed to be dependent on Euripides (see

presumably became canonical. Nauck thinks that Hyginus *fab.* 103 and 104 closely mirror Euripides' plot.[11] In gist: Protesilaus, the first to land at Troy, was the first to be killed, in fulfilment of an oracle. Overcome with grief, Laodamia besought the gods that she might converse again with him for a brief time. Her entreaty was successful: Hermes brought Protesilaus back from the dead, and, for a short time, they were able to converse again together. Then, when Protesilaus was returned to the dead, Ladoamia could not bear the pain. As a substitute she secretly made a wax image of him, and embraced and adored it. This stratagem was discovered and condemned. Laodamia's father ordered the image to be burnt on a pyre, and Laodamia, finding her grief unendurable, committed suicide on the pyre. So: a story of tragic interruption, death for love, and, briefly, *love overcoming death*: Protesilaus returned from the dead because of the power and eloquence of Laodamia's devotion.[12]

We infer therefore that Euripides—with whatever preceding help was available and attractive to him—picked up and developed the tragedy which Homer had left suggestively suspended. But the most immediately important point for us to infer is that Euripides' presumably classic account of Protesilaus included and staged the conquest of death by love—something not in Homer at all. Once again a story of love so powerful and elevated that someone will die for it (cf. Alcestis) naturally encompasses the converse idea that love can overcome death. To reassure ourselves that we are indeed talking about a Euripidean element in the story, we may note that, among other items in Hyginus' summary which are seemingly paralleled in Euripides' own fragments (the motif of the substitute image, for example, fr. 655N^2),[13] is the motif of Protesilaus' return. Fr. 646a (in Snell's *Supplementum* to Nauck^2 [Hildesheim, 1964]), which is identified by Photius as coming from the *Protesilaus*, seem to be words of command by Hermes to Protesilaus on his journey back to the living:[14] ἕπου δὲ μοῦνον ἀμπρεύοντί μοι, 'only follow me when I lead you'; the verb ἀμπρεύειν is

below), names her Laodamia, and so do Apollodorus and Philostratus. Lucian, *Dialogues of the Dead* 28 gives her no name. Eustathius also refers to Protesilaus' wife as Λαοδάμεια in his note on *Iliad* 2.701 mentioned below n. 29. I have no example of the name of Laodamia, as the wife of Protesilaus and daughter of Acastus, actually written in Greek before the imperial writers cited; but another Λαοδάμεια was (for example) daughter of Bellerophon and mother of Sarpedon (Hom. *Iliad* 6.196–205), and another was nurse of Orestes according to Stesichorus (*PMG* 218 Page). Protesilaus' wife is Laodamia in Latin as least as early as Laevius, for whom see below. I doubt she was ever called Laudamia: see below n. 20.

[11] A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (2nd edn with supplement by Snell, Hildesheim, 1964), p. 563: 'Euripidem potissimum sequi videtur Hyginus fab. 103 et 104.' Cf. too T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967), pp. 97–8 for a reconstruction of the play.

[12] Hyg. *fab.* 103 *Protesilaus* Achiuis fuit responsum, qui primus litora Troianorum attigisset periturum. cum Achiui classes applicuissent, ceteris cunctantibus Iolaus Iphicli et Diomedeae filius primus e naui prosiluit, qui ab Hectore confestim est interfectus; quem cuncti appellarunt Protesilaum, quoniam primus ex omnibus perierat. quod uxor Laodamia Acasti filia cum audisset eum perisse, flens petit a diis ut sibi cum eo tres horas colloqui liceret. quo impetrato a Mercurio reductus tres horas cum eo collocuta est; quod iterum cum obisset Protesilaus, dolorem pati non potuit Laodamia. *fab.* 104 *Laodamia* Laodamia Acasti filia amisso coniuge cum tres horas consumpsisset quas a diis petierat, fletum et dolorem pati non potuit. itaque fecit simulacrum cereum simile Protesilai coniugis et in thalamis posuit sub simulatione sacrorum, et eum colere coepit. quod cum famulus matutino tempore poma ei attulisset ad sacrificium, per rimam aspexit uiditque eam ab amplexu Protesilai simulacrum tenentem atque osculantem; aestimans eam adulterum habere Acasto patri nuntiauit. qui cum uenisset et in thalamos irrupisset, uidit effigiem Protesilai; quae ne diutius torqueretur, iussit signum et sacra pyra facta comburi, quo se Laodamia dolorem non sustinens immisit atque usta est.

[13] Cf. too fr. 656N2: Laodamia debates her method of suicide. Nauck and Webster seek to place other fragments.

[14] This interpretation of fr. 646a follows Snell who however places an obelus before μοῦνον.

recherché and befits a god (it is so recherché that it attracted the attention of the lexicographer).[15] We may envisage a scene in which Hermes leads back Protesilaus as Heracles leads back Alcestis in *Alcestis*.[16] And the motif of Protesilaus' return endures in other accounts, corroborating our evidence that it featured in Euripides' classic and influential tragedy. It, and the stratagem of the waxen image, are registered by Apollodorus, *epit.* 3.30[17] (with some variation of detail from, say, Hyginus). Cf. too Lucian *Dialogues of the Dead* 28, a dialogue of Protesilaus, Pluto, and Persephone: in Lucian's version it is Protesilaus who asks for a brief return to life, for love of his wife; he says he will persuade her to follow him back to death, and he appeals to the precedents of Alcestis and Eurydice; and Lucian thinks it worthwhile to spell out that Protesilaus will be allowed to return for his short sojourn in his beautiful bridegroom's form, not as the 'bare, unsightly skull' that he now is. In Philostratus' *Heroicus* (ed. Kayser II.130) Protesilaus 'died because of Helen in Troy, but came to life again in Phthia loving Laodamia' (he then returned to the dead, persuading his wife to follow him—cf. Lucian—but for the purposes of this dialogue he has returned to life yet again). We may note then that the scholia on Aelius Aristides, *On Behalf of the Four* 228 Jebb (printed in Dindorf, vol. III, pp. 671f.) know that Euripides wrote a drama *Protesilaus*; and they tell us among other things that the dead Protesilaus 'asked the gods below, and was released for one day, and was with his wife'. But whatever the probability we cannot quite extract from these scholia the explicit information that the motif of Protesilaus' return from the dead was in Euripides' play; I admit and state this point because I think that some who cite the scholia are misled.[18] And finally

Webster (n. 11), p. 97, accepting *μοῦνον*, thinks that the fragment 'is perhaps more likely to be said by Hermes when he takes Protesilaos back again to Hades'.

[15] Photius' entry is: *Ἀμπρεύοντι· Εὐριπίδης Πρωτεσιλάῳ· ἔπου δὲ μοῦνον ἀμπρεύοντί μοι. ἀντὶ τοῦ προηγουμένῳ καὶ ὁδηγοῦντί σε καὶ οἷον ἕλκοντι.*

[16] Eur. *Alc.* 1008ff., climax 1097ff. It is worth noticing that there is already contact between the two plays: *Alc.* 348–53 alludes to the substitute image of Protesilaus: cf Dale (n.5), citing Wilamowitz. It is hard to believe that Euripides resisted the drama of Protesilaus' entrance, led by Hermes. (Hermes speaks the prologue of Euripides' *Ion*.)

[17] '. . . his wife Laodamia loved him even after his death, and she made an image (*εἴδωλον*) very like Protesilaus and consorted with it (*προσωμίλει*). The gods had pity on her, and Hermes brought up Protesilaus from Hades. When she saw him, Laodamia thought it was himself returned from Troy, and she rejoiced; but when he was again carried back to Hades, she killed herself.'

[18] Indeed reference to the scholia is sometimes made which does not suggest acute inspection of them and their lemma. Aristides' lemma is: *καθάπερ τὸν Πρωτεσίλαον φασὶ, παραιτησάμενον τοὺς κάτω, γεγενῆσθαι μετὰ τῶν ζώντων*]. The scholia comment: *ὁ Πρωτεσίλαος δρᾶμα γέγραπται Εὐριπίδῃ. λέγει δὲ ὅτι γαμήσας καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν μόνην συγγενόμενος τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, ἠναγκάσθη μετὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατὰ τῆς Τροίας ἐλθεῖν, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπιβὰς τῆς Τροίας ἐτελεύτησε. καὶ φασὶν* [*φησὶν*] *ὅτι τοὺς κάτω δαίμονας ᾐτήσατο, καὶ ἀφείθη μίαν ἡμέραν, καὶ συνεγένετο τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ.* '*Protesilaus* is a drama written by Euripides. He says that Protesilaus, having married and having been with his wife for one day only, was compelled to go with the Greeks to Troy; and having been the first to go on Trojan soil died; and they say [he says] that he asked the gods below, and was released for one day, and was together with his wife.' We have BDOxon versions of this scholion; it is only D which gives *φησίν*. Up to '. . . on Trojan soil died', it seems fair to assume that the note is drawing on knowledge of Euripides. But Aristides himself referred to the restoration to life of Protesilaus, in order to lay the scene for an imagined restoration of 'the four', to plead their case with Plato: *καθάπερ τὸν Πρωτεσίλαον φασὶ* . . ., 'just as they say Protesilaus, having pleaded with the gods of the underworld, came among the living . . . '. It looks to me as if the commentators may simply be expanding (*φασίν*) Aristides' reference to Protestilaus' return (*φασί*) with their own information. It is hard to prove otherwise. The D reading *φησίν* seems produced by a desire conscious or unconscious to attribute the information on the return to Euripides. We should finally note that Oxon reads *λέγεται*; and there are other more minor variations.

(before Catullus) I should like to mention Laevius. Interesting fragments survive from Laevius' poem *Protesilaodamia* (frs. 13–19 in E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* [Oxford, 1993], pp. 130–5), including moments from the wedding and wedding night (14 and 15); but none bears directly on the topic most immediately concerning us. However Courtney (p. 119) conjectures plausibly that this pre-Catullan innovator drew on Euripides in his *Alcestis*, *Ino*, and *Protesilaodamia*. It is a notable and perhaps surprising fact that no Roman tragedian is known to have essayed a *Protesilaus*.

And now we come to Catullus. In poem 68 Catullus wishfully attributes love beyond description and compare to Lesbia. To this end he takes a great story of love, Laodamia and Protesilaus. He assimilates Lesbia to Laodamia, telling us Laodamia's story, and endeavouring to communicate to us Laodamia's love for Protesilaus.[19] Catullus directs his story of Protesilaus and Laodamia through Laodamia, since Laodamia is his focus—initially as a comparison for Lesbia. But it was open to him to include as much of the whole story as he wished (a point I shall take up below). 68.70–86:

> quo mea se molli candida diua pede
> intulit et trito fulgentem in limine plantam
> innixa arguta constituit solea,
> coniugis ut quondam flagrans aduenit amore
> Protesilaeam Laodamia[20] domum
> inceptam frustra, nondum cum sanguine sacro
> hostia caelestis pacificasset eros.
> nil mihi tam ualde placeat, Rhamnusia[21] uirgo,
> quod temere inuitis suscipiatur eris.
> quam ieiuna pium desideret ara cruorem,

[19] I use the phrase 'beyond compare' advisedly, enlightened by D. C. Feeney's article 'Shall I compare thee . . . ?: Catullus 68B and the limits of analogy', in T. Woodman and J. Powell (edd.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 33–44. The explosion of simile, the sequence of comparison within comparison, makes the point that what Catullus is talking about (Lesbia's imagined love, and so on) is beyond description and satisfactory comparison. In what follows I discuss only part of the significance of Catullus' use of the Protesilaus–Laodamia story, the part relevant to my present subject. There is more in Lyne (n. 2), pp. 52–60, 87. Cf. too H. P. Syndikus, *Catull. Eine Interpretation. Zweiter Teil* (Darmstadt, 1990), pp. 275–80, 283–7; C. Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 159–65; G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven and London, 1980), pp. 50–61. Macleod (pp. 161f.) and Williams (p. 59) well bring out the way the Protesilaus myth also conveys the tragic effect on Catullus of his brother's death.

[20] Like Goold and Lee I cannot accept that Catullus wrote *Laudamia*, an orthography inspired by V; the influential Mynors prints *Laudamia*, though his note on line 74 reveals clear doubt. The etymology of Laodamia's name protected the spelling *Lao-* for those who, like Catullus, knew Greek (there are also metrical difficulties with *-au-*). It is worth noting that what OGR actually show in 74, 80, and 105 is *laudomia*. It is a habit of this manuscript tradition simply to find and write Latin words which it recognizes, regardless of the sense of the context (e.g. *sed michi ante* at 61.213), and what V is finding at 68.74, 80 and 105 is *laudo*. This habit of the tradition has encouraged editors, in particular Mynors, to find interesting but perhaps unwarranted orthographies elsewhere. E.g., at 63.47 Mynors (and Lee) print Victorius' *rusum*; Mynors bases himself on V and appeals to Lucretian spelling. What V actually transmits is *usum*; it has simply found a word in a jumble of letters which it recognizes; Goold is rightly sceptical, and prints *rursus* (we might prefer *rursum*). It is worth noting that Laevius' title *Protesilaodamia* clearly played on etymology, and Catullus may well allude to that title in 68.74.

[21] Surely Catullus, not only knowledgeable of Greek, but sensitive to aspiration (poem 84), wrote *Rhamnusia* (Ῥαμνούσια), as Goold prints. Mynors printed *Ramnusia* (*rammusia* O : *ranusia* GR). When Catullus wrote *Rhamnusia* at 66.71, as again he surely did, he was actually translating Callimachus, although that portion of the Callimachus papyrus does not survive. Cf. the previous note.

docta est amisso Laodamia uiro,
coniugis ante coacta noui dimittere collum,
quam ueniens una atque altera rursus hiems
noctibus in longis auidum saturasset amorem,
posset ut abrupto uiuere coniugio,
quod scibant Parcae non longo tempore abesse,
si miles muros isset ad Iliacos.

And my fair goddess betook herself there with gentle step; she set her shining foot on the worn threshold, halting, her sandal sounding—just as once upon a time burning with love came Laodamia to the house of Protesilaus—a house that was begun vainly, for not yet with holy blood had a victim appeased the lords of heaven. May nothing, maid of Rhamnus (Nemesis), so mightily appeal to me that it be undertaken rashly with our lords unwilling. And how hungrily the altar desires the pious blood Laodamia learnt, losing her husband, compelled to loose her bridegroom from her arms before the coming of a first and a second winter had satisfied eager love in length of nights so that, her marriage sundered, she might bear to live. And *that* the Fates knew was close at hand if once Protesilaus went a soldier to the walls of Troy.

Then, in lines 105ff. he develops the devastation wrought upon Laodamia by the death of her husband, and expands upon the depth of her love and passion (simile within simile):[22]

quo tibi tum casu, pulcherrima Laodamia,
ereptum est uita dulcius atque anima
coniugium: tanto te absorbens uertice 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...
sed tuus altus amor barathro fuit altior illo,
qui tamen indomitam ferre iugum docuit.

By that disaster, most beautiful Laodamia, marriage sweeter than life and soul was snatched from you: in such a whirlpool of love had passion engulfing you borne you down into a precipitous chasm, of the sort which the Greeks say dries the rich ground draining the marsh near Cyllenean Pheneus, which once upon a time the falsely-fathered son of Amphitryon (Hercules) is said to have dug, cutting out the vitals of a mountain. . . . But your profound love was deeper than that chasm, which taught you though untamed to bear the yoke (i.e. marriage).

Two more comparisons within the Laodamia comparison follow, one conveying non-physical love (119ff. *nam nec tam carum confecto aetate parenti . . .*),[23] the other passion (again), lines 125ff.:[24]

nec tantum niueo gauisa est ulla columbo
compar, quae multo dicitur improbius
oscula mordenti semper decerpere rostro,
quam quae praecipue multiuola est mulier.
sed tu horum magnos uicisti sola furores,
ut semel es flauo conciliata uiro.

[22] On which see Syndikus (n. 19), pp. 283–5. See too C. J. Tuplin, *CQ* 75 (1981), 119ff. The story that Hercules built a drainage sink-hole at Pheneus is recorded by Pausanias 8.14.1f.; Tuplin conjectures it figured in Euphorion. Tuplin has suggestive comment on the negative implications of the *barathrum* lines as an image of love (pp. 131f.), suggestive comment too on Hercules and Hebe as figures which contrast with the other lovers in the poem (133–6).

[23] Catullus gives his comparison Roman colouring, but the simile derives from Pindar, *Ol.* 10.86–90: cf. Syndikus (n. 19), p. 286.

[24] For the dove as an illustration of passion (as well as devotion) see Syndikus (n. 19), pp. 286–7.

Not so much in the snowy dove has any (female) mate rejoiced, which is said to gather kisses with biting bill far more wantonly than any woman who is especially much-desiring. But you vanquished the great passion of these when once you were brought together with your fair husband.

This is Catullus' account of the story of Protesilaus and Laodamia. A comparison of the female Lesbia to Laodamia precipitates the narrative; and this is how Catullus rounds it off, though now he grants some slight discrepancy: 131 *aut nihil aut paulo cui tum concedere digna/ lux mea se nostrum contulit in gremium*, 'in no wise or hardly worthy then to give place to her, she who is my light brought herself to my bosom'.

But it was of course in the main a wishful comparison. Superficial points of contact between Lesbia and Laodamia may be thought to abide (e.g. appearance and movement). But on the profound question, love, a sad truth emerges: it is Catullus' rather than Lesbia's devotion which is imaged in the devotion of Laodamia.[25] One simple and decisive point: Laodamia's inability to support life without her love (84 *posset ut abrupto uiuere coniugio*, 106f. *ereptum est uita dulcius atque anima/ coniugium*) is effectively or virtually paralleled by Catullus, and certainly not by Lesbia: cf. lines 159–60, the last lines of the poem: *mihi quae me carior ipso est,/ lux mea, qua uiua uiuere dulce mihi est*, 'she who is dearer to me than myself, my light of life; while she is alive, life is sweet for me'; contrast the sobered description of Lesbia and her affections at 135ff.[26] The female mythical figure, advanced as an image of Lesbia, in fact more truthfully figures the male.[27] Other details might have alerted us to the idea that Catullus is moved more by his own feelings of love in his depiction of Laodamia than by enduring belief in a parity between Laodamia and Lesbia. But yet further details then forbid complete identification of Laodamia and Catullus.[28]

Anyway, embodying many Catullan feelings and only an imagined Lesbia's, the story of Laodamia in poem 68 is an example for Catullus of the power and potential of love. More particularly, it is a story of love and death. The way Catullus presents this story should allow insight into his views on love and death. We shall now set aside

[25] Cf. Macleod (n. 19), p. 160, though in my opinion he draws this conclusion prematurely, making late amends 163–4; Lyne (n. 2), p. 58.

[26] Lyne (n. 2), pp. 57f.; Macleod (n. 19), pp. 162–4 amplifies contrasts between Lesbia and Laodamia.

[27] Such interesting and suggestive sex role-reversal happens elsewhere in poem 68 and in other poems of Catullus: 68.137–9, 11.21–3, 65.19–24. Cf. Macleod (n. 19), pp. 160–1, who also cites poem 70 as an example, correctly I think. An important expressive device for Catullus, it has other but less devoted users: Propertius, for example, at 1.11.23–4, playing Andromache to Cynthia's Hector (noted by J. C. McKeown, *PCPhS* 25 [1979], 75).

[28] Details showing similarity between Catullan love and the love of Laodamia: (i) The simile suggesting Laodamia's non-physical love (119ff.) has a similar provenance, the area of Roman family bonds (but cf. n. 23 above), to Catullus's expression of his own non-physical devotion to Lesbia in 72.3–4. (ii) The comparison suggesting Laodamia's passion (125ff., the dove's mate *quae multo dicitur improbius/ oscula mordenti semper decerpere rostro/ quam quae praecipue multiuola est mulier*) might remind us of Catullus' own kisses poems, 5 and 7 and indeed 8 (8.18 *cui labella mordebis*). And see further Macleod (n. 19), pp. 163–4. Details forbidding an assumption of complete identity: (i) Catullus, poem 7 in fact proclaims insatiability; in Laodamia's case Catullus admits (a perhaps surprising detail) that her love might eventually have been sated (83). (ii) Observe the fine wedge which careful wording in poem 68 itself puts between Laodamia and Catullus. Life without love for Laodamia *is* impossible and she does commit suicide: the narrator takes us to the imminence of that very event (84, 106f.). For Catullus himself, Lesbia is dearer to him than himself, life is sweet if the light of his life lives (159–60). But if she doesn't? He dies? Or life is unsweet? Catullus' devotion is *virtually* the same as Laodamia's. But we cannot say that the two descriptions are *exactly* the same. (The question of death for love emerges again in Catullus' own poetical biography at 76.17–20: another time, another mood.)

the similes within the simile, and consider Catullus' strategy regarding the bare story of Laodamia and Protesilaus. I repeat that it was open to Catullus to include, by allusion or whatever, any detail from the tradition that he chose. Who for example would have guessed that he would find room for the motif of neglected sacrifice?

The notion that Protesilaus was fated to die is not in Homer's reference to the story in *Iliad* 2.698–702, but may in some form be as early as the *Cypria* (see above). In Catullus we are told (68.85–6) that Laodamia's felicitous marriage was condemned to be snatched from her, if Protesilaus went as a soldier to Troy. A sense of doom, even of supernatural opposition to the love is thereby given. A sense of divine hostility is certainly given by the motif of the neglected sacrifice, 68.74ff. This too is (apparently) not in Homer. The sacrifice that Catullus has in mind is simply, I think, an offering that should, in the gods' view, have been made before the construction of the married couple's house: the same sort of offering which the Greeks too neglected to make before building the wall round their ships (*Il.* 7.449–50, 12.3–9).[29] So the couple were guilty of a small ritual neglect. But because of it the gods contribute to the disaster of the marriage's destruction: this is the inescapable implication of 68.79–81. Catullus is giving tragic colour to his story, a sense of inevitable and unmerited calamity. So far from blessing a marriage which we might say was 'made in heaven', divinity here is hostile: the Parcae have their conditional clause, and the gods react in brutal disproportion to the neglect of an ancillary sacrifice.

I say that the motif of neglected sacrifice is not apparently in Homer. But it is worth adding the thought (which has no doubt occurred to others) that Catullus, or, more likely, a Hellenistic predecessor, inventively found the germ of it in Homer. Catullus' *domus incepta frustra* is an echo, with variation, of Homer's disputed δόμος ἡμιτελής—which I am inclined to interpret simply as 'half-built' (see above). But an inventive poet could have glossed the epithet differently, finding in it an allusion to sacrifice. That is to say, just as 'Apollonius connects the disputed Homeric hapax ἀμφιλύκη, 'morning twilight', with Lycia and derives κερτομέω from κέαρ', so another etymologizing poet may have found in -τελής an allusion to the many uses of τέλος and its cognates of sacrifice.[30] As O'Hara and others note, Hellenistic poets enjoyed glossing and etymologizing disputed Homeric words, and ἡμιτελής was

[29] Thus J. Van Sickle, *HSCP* 84 (1980), 91–5, following one of the paths offered by Ellis's commentary, and responding to another interesting, but not finally convincing, interpretation offered by R. F. Thomas at *HSCP* 82 (1978), 175–8 (the sacrifice at Aulis is in mind). A pre-building sacrificial offering is the simplest inference from the wording *domum inceptam frustra, nondum cum* . . . The disproportion between the relative triviality of the sin and the devastating consequences smacks convincingly of the tragic tradition (Aristotelian ἁμαρτία), and contributes to Catullus' overall message (see text). Other ideas: Eustathius' note on Hom. *Iliad* 2.701 (1.507.1ff. in the edition of van der Valk) includes stories which refer to anger on Aphrodite's part. Syndikus (n. 19), p. 278 with n. 164 infers some sort of sacrificial omission in the pre-Catullan tradition (but not to do with building), of which he thinks Eustathius preserves relics. But it is to later events in the story, to (i) Protesilaus' continuing love for his wife after death and (ii) Laodamia's love for her dead husband, to which the wrath of Aphrodite is tied by Eustathius ('P. even after death loving his wife in accordance with μῆνις of Aphrodite . . . '; 'others say that L. even when P. had died burnt with love because of the χόλος of A.'), and Macleod (n. 19), p. 164, thinks these stories are irrelevant to the *domus* sacrifice in Catullus's text. He thinks (as others e.g. Kroll on 75 [with useful information], and Ellis in his note on *hostia* in line 76 do) that the couple in Catullus neglected to placate the gods before their wedding (the customary προτέλεια to which Clytemnestra refers in Eur. *I.A.* 718), and Macleod concludes that 'this detail is, on the evidence as we have it, Catullus' invention'.

[30] Cf. προτέλεια in n. 29, LSJ τέλος 6 'services or offerings due to the gods', τελέω III.3 'also of sacred rites, perform, ἱερά . . . ', the Homeric τελήεσσας ἑκατόμβας (e.g. *Iliad* 1.315); and the LSJ entry for τέλειος opens '*perfect*, of victims,' and we find e.g. Thuc. 5.47.8 ἱερῶν τελείων.

disputed. So I suggest that some poet found in Homer's ἡμιτελής an allusion to an unfinished sacrifice, τέλος, in connection with Protesilaus' δόμος, which Catullus then develops with the effect described above.[31] Since Homer himself was already (arguably) etymologizing Protesilaus' name in *Il.* 2.702 (above n. 8), a poet might have felt himself pressingly invited to etymologize the disputed adjective in the previous line.

Whatever germ for the motif of neglected sacrifice we may think to find in Homer, it and the motif of Protesilaus' fated death are substantially additions to Homer's account. In other essential respects Catullus' version of the story is a clear reversion to Homer.[32] Catullus gives us a picture of love cut down at its inception, as Homer had; Homer left Protesilaus' wife 'poised perhaps on the brink of tragedy', as I put it above. Catullus develops this suggestively suspended text to the extent that it is surely clear in his account that Laodamia will commit suicide (84, 105–7); but still the suicide is not actually described, still Laodamia is on the brink of tragedy. And here is Catullus' climax and emphasis: the imminent suicide of Laodamia, death for love.

In this way Catullus narrates the story of Laodamia and Protesilaus, an instance for him of the power and potential of love. We may now summarize all the ingredients (bringing back the similes). A supernatural obstacle at the outset, more or less inscrutable (85–6); divine anger disproportionate to the possible offence (75–84). The lover's physical passion (73 *coniugis . . . flagrans . . . amore*, the similes at 107ff., 125ff.). Feelings of joy and love absolutely unphysical (119ff.). Vast and engulfing profundity (107ff.). And climactically, in spite of a surprising admission that satiety was imaginable (83), love turns out to be sweeter than life; life without love is not worth living: when the union is destroyed at its inception, we have, imminently, death-for-love, the lover's suicide, *Liebestod* (84, 105–7). Catullus' story of Protesilaus and Laodamia enshrines a view of love that is tragically romantic: love starts unblessed, exhibits huge intensity, and ends in death.

To construct this story, Catullus' narrative strategy has been substantially to revert to Homer. He makes significant additions to it, but substantially he reverts to the summary in the Catalogue of Ships. Most noticeably, Catullus has cut out the entire post-Homeric development of the Protesilaus story, staged by the influential Euripides; in particular he has no hint of Protesilaus' return from the dead. This is a most remarkable silence, not something that can lack significance.[33] It is not just that Protesilaus' return must have been a star part of the story in the post-Euripidean world, and could easily have been incorporated in an allusion in poem 68. I said above that a belief that love may somehow overcome death goes almost hand in glove with a belief in a mighty power of love. The evidence ranged from tombstones to myths, from

[31] O'Hara (n. 8) is most concerned with the etymologizing of proper names, but pp. 38ff. deals with Hellenistic poets' etymologizing of common words. The quotation in the text above comes from p. 38. O'Hara has extensive bibliography of course, and his book is now a most useful entry into the whole topic of etymologizing in antiquity. For Callimachus' enjoyment of effects in between pun and etymology, see too e.g. the indexes to N.Hopkinson's *Callimachus Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge, 1984) and *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge, 1988) under 'etymologis(z)ing'.

[32] Cf. R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus* (2nd edn, Oxford, 1889), p. 416; contrast Kroll's note (Stuttgart, ^{4}1960) on 68.70–88, conjecturing that Catullus draws on a Hellenistic source dependent on Euripides.

[33] Syndikus (n. 19) passes by the fact in a footnote: p. 277, n. 163. G. O. Hutchinson gives it more weight, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988), p. 316 'Catullus suppresses entirely the supernatural events of the myth (such as the brief resurrection of Protesilaus)', but without further comment.

the wife of Oppius, from Julius and Trebia,[34] to Orpheus, Alcestis—and Protesilaus. But the two beliefs are not hand in glove in Catullus. That really is my point here. Catullus shows us in his Protesilaus and Laodamia a love so powerful that it can persuade a lover to commit suicide: romantic and powerful if you like. But he does not show us, he will not show us, he *excludes* the demonstration that love can overcome death. His view of love in 68 shows the hand without the glove. Love is powerful, love is life. But love cannot overcome death. For his time and place this is a distinct and stark romanticism. He takes issue on the question of love and death with exponents of love's power like Plato's Phaedrus and Euripides.

II. PROPERTIUS 1.19 AND CATULLUS 68: DIALOGUE

And then Propertius takes issue with him.

In a poem (1.19) which I have discussed elsewhere,[35] Propertius tries precisely to maintain the belief that love can overcome death: *traicit et fati litora magnus amor*, 'great love crosses even the shores of death' (12). But he tries to maintain this belief alongside a simultaneous belief in the destructive power of death. The poem is one of grim internal struggle. The attempt to believe in the power of love to overcome death generates—given Propertius' views of death—powerful paradoxes: Propertius must envisage dust, ashes, and bones as capable of love: *puluis, ossa, fauilla* (6, 18, 19, 22). We can if we like see Propertius here in dialogue with a poem like Asclepiades 2 Gow-Page = *AP* 5.85 in which it is the resonant and obvious *datum* that ὀστέα ('bones') and σποδιή ('ash') are the negation of love.[36] The more important dialogue is with Catullus. Propertius illustrates his belief that love conquers death with, of course, the myth of Protesilaus, restoring the motif that Catullus omitted: the hero's return from the dead. 1.19.5–12:

> non adeo leuiter nostris puer haesit ocellis,
> ut meus oblito puluis amore uacet.
> illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros
> non potuit caecis immemor esse locis,
> sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis
> Thessalus[37] antiquam uenerat umbra domum.

Not so lightly has Cupid clung to my eyes that my dust could be void and forgetful of love. There in the regions of darkness the hero Protesilaus could not be unmindful of his sweet wife, but, desirous to reach his joy with false hands, the Thessalian came to his ancient home a shade.

[34] See n. 3.

[35] Lyne (n. 2), pp. 100–2, 140–5. Propertius' treatment of love and death is brilliantly discussed by T. D. Papanghelis in his book *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge, 1987), but he gives his most fruitful attention to poems in Book 2. I have considerable disagreement with Papanghelis (pp. 10–19) on Prop. 1.19; and he has no inkling of a dialogue with Catullus.

[36] *Φείδῃ παρθενίης· καὶ τί πλέον; οὐ γὰρ ἐς Ἅιδην/ ἐλθοῦσ' εὑρήσεις τὸν φιλέοντα, κόρη./ ἐν ζωοῖσι τὰ τερπνὰ τὰ Κύπριδος, ἐν δ' Ἀχέροντι/ ὀστέα καὶ σποδιή, παρθένε, κεισόμεθα*, 'You grudge your maidenhood. What does it profit you? When, girl, you go to Hades you will find no lover there. The delights of Aphrodite are among the living. In Acheron, maiden, we shall lie as bones and ashes.'

[37] Goold here adopts *Thessalis* of some *recc.* I would resist this. According to the inherited myth, Protesilaus did return a full man (a *Thessalus* therefore). Propertius' conviction of the truth of this myth falters in, so to speak, the telling, as I describe below. It is effective therefore that the final revelation of inadequacy (*umbra*) should be delayed until the last moment; it fits in with the strategy of the rest of the poem.

And as it was for Protesilaus, so it will be for Propertius:

> illic quidquid ero, semper tua dicar imago;
> traicit et fati litora magnus amor.

There, whatever I shall be, I shall always be called your image. Great love crosses even the shores of death.

Fedeli in his commentary (Florence, 1980) sees echoes of Catullus 68 in Propertius' Protesilaus. He observes that *coniunx* reappears, transferred by Propertius to Laodamia; likewise the passion of Catullus' Laodamia (*coniugis flagrans amore*, etc.) is now transferred to the male (*cupidus attingere gaudia*); Fedeli also remarks the reappearance of the key word and concept *domus* (1.19.10, Catull. 68.74, the *domum inceptam frustra*). Fedeli sees echoes—but senses no dialogue.

Dialogue and disagreement between the two poets there certainly is, focused on Protesilaus. But the disagreement is not clear-cut, and Propertius' version of the story must be followed closely. He directs the story through Protesilaus, for it is Protesilaus who images Propertius himself and his belief that love, his love, can overcome death. He suggests a version of the return story, dissimilar to the one assumed to be Euripidean (if we follow Hyginus),[38] which is most suited to making his point. In Propertius it seems to be the sheer power of Protesilaus's love—no piteous weeping appeals—that overcame death: *non potuit, sed cupidus, uenerat.*

That overcame death . . . But in the expression of the myth, Propertius shows his conviction faltering. 'False' or 'cheated' hands, a mere 'shade' or 'shadow' returned. The myth seeks to project belief, but betrays doubt. As Lucian's Persephone saw (see above), Protesilaus must return in full human form for the reunion to mean anything, and this is how it must traditionally have been shown, implicitly or explicitly. By admitting terms of deception and insubstantiality, Propertius shows incipient lack of confidence in the fact of Protesilaus' return. His belief that love can overcome death is rather an *attempt* to believe; his attempt to confute Catullus via Protesilaus is an attempt which as the poem progresses collapses. It collapses before the facts of ash and bones. Propertius too, in 1.19, seems to find death finally triumphant. His sense of death's triumph is the most important justification for, it must be the essential logic behind, his conclusion (25f.): '*wherefore*, while it is *possible*, let us love and be glad together . . . '.[39] Propertius 1.19 is a dynamic attempt to confute Catullus. This time it retreats. There will be other attempts.[40]

We might note that Propertius' conclusion picks up and agrees with Catullus 5, and with the partner of that poem, Catullus 7. Prop. 1.19.25f.:

> quare, dum licet, inter nos laetemur amantes
> non satis est ullo tempore longus amor.

[38] But cf. somewhat similar versions in Lucian and the scholia on Aristides, referred to above p. 203.

[39] This and other points made in this paragraph are unpacked in Lyne (n. 2), p. 101. Of course, other considerations may contribute to the 'wherefore' conclusion, as I grudgingly allow (loc. cit.); the other considerations are stressed by Jacoby, *Kleine philologische Schriften* (ed. H. J. Mette, Berlin, 1961), vol. II. p. 163. But the fact of death and the end that it brings is by far the the most important.

[40] One of the best is 2.15: this poem clearly picks up 1.19 and its themes, and engages not only with that poem but directly again with Catullus 5, 7, and 68. But it does so in an apparently much lighter manner. 2.27.15–16 challenge the victory of death in Catullus 3.

Wherefore, while it is possible, let us love and be glad together: love is not long enough in any extent of time.

This is the Propertian version of Catullus 5 *uiuamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus . . . // nobis cum semel occidit breuis lux,/ nox est perpetua una dormienda*, 'let is live, Lesbia, and let us love . . . when once our brief light has set, there is just one everlasting night to be slept'; and it conveys too the insatiability of Catullus 7 *quam magnus numerus . . . tam . . . satis*. It is also the Propertian version of Asclepiades' 'the delights of Aphrodite are among the living', Gow-page 2 = *AP* 5.85 (n. 36). But Propertius emerges from a dense and morbid dialectic (can love overcome death?), he reaches this limpid conclusion with, surely, regret: *dum licet* is a sad retreat from *traicit et fati litora magnus amor*. Asclepiades endures no such conflict to come to the same result. Some would say that Catullus in poem 5 draws his conclusion with a facility similar to Asclepiades'.

From this view of Catullus 5 I would be inclined to dissent. Asclepiades—and, say, Horace in *Ode* 1.11—have relatively limited, relatively hedonistic views on love, and the gist of their message is not so very terrible. We die, there are pleasures, love is one of them, death ends everything, so take pleasures while you can, love included. But Catullus has a huge and sublime view of love (shown in, say, poems 72, 87, and 109, not to mention 68): it is what we live for, it should be eternal (*aeternum foedus*). So when Catullus shows death ending love in poem 5, it ought perhaps, unless we keep this poem in hermetically sealed isolation, to seem more lamentable than the superficially similar message in Asclepiades and Horace—even if Catullus chooses not to spell out the gravity (as it were running away from it, *da mi basia mille . . .*).

III. PROP. 1.19 CONT.; THE WAX IMAGE MOTIF

It is worth a final look at the details in which Propertius' conviction concerning Protesilaus' return seems to falter: the 'false hands' and so on (1.19.9–10):

> sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis
> Thessalus antiquam uenerat umbra domum.

but, desirous to reach his joy with false hands, the Thessalian came to his ancient home a shade.

Dubiety spills over into his own inference from the myth (11):

> illic quidquid ero, semper tua dicar imago.

'There, whatever I shall be, I shall always be called your image.' Matching the insubstantiality of the shadowy (*umbra*) Protesilaus is the mere semblance (*imago*) that the dead Propertius presents. Fedeli suggestively remarks that line 9 is influenced by the vain embraces of the dead in Homer (*Il.* 23.99–101, etc.). I think there is another point.

In his account of the Protesilaus and Laodamia story Propertius restored the motif of Protesilaus' return, attempting to confute Catullus. He brings in echoes of another motif, to show that attempt faltering. Propertius' Protesilaus, returning from the dead, and Propertius' own reflection of Protesilaus in the Underworld, nudge memories of the waxen image of Protesilaus which Laodamia constructed in her vain and pathetic effort to cheat death. Hyginus' summary (*fab.* 103–4) talks of Laodamia 'embracing and kissing a *simulacrum* of Protesilaus'. Euripides' allusion to the image story in *Alc.*

348–53, where the idea of an image of Alcestis recalls Protesilaus' image (n. 16), runs thus:

> σοφῇ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων δέμας τὸ σὸν
> εἰκασθὲν ἐν λέκτροισιν ἐκταθήσεται
> ᾧ προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας
> ὄνομα καλῶν σὸν τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις
> δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν·
> ψυχρὰν μέν, οἶμαι, τέρψιν . . .

a likeness of your body made by the skilled hands of craftsmen will be stretched out in our bed, and I will embrace it, clasping it in my hands. Calling your name, I will seem to have my beloved wife in my arms, yet not having her: a cold delight, I think . . .

Cf. in Prop. 1.19 the cheated hands, the *umbra*, and Propertius' *imago*, a word whose meanings extend through 'image', 'apparition', 'likeness', and 'statue'. The embraces permitted to the *umbra* of Prop.1.19.9 and 10 and permissible to the *imago* of 11 are if we think about it no more substantial than, indeed very similar to, the false embraces provided by Laodamia's waxen image of Protesilaus, referred to by Hyginus (and a fragment of Euripides himself, 655N^2), and the cold embraces that the Alcestis image would provide. Propertius' narration of the return of Protesilaus prompts recollection of the waxen, false Protesilaus of Laodamia's construction, and the latter undermines the former.

IV. *NACHLEBEN*

Catullus' Laodamia dying for love seems to have had more influence on subsequent Roman poets than Propertius' Protesilaus essaying the conquest of death. For the former, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.447, Ovid *Am.* 2.18.38, *Ars* 3.17, *Trist.* 1.6.20, *Pont.* 3.1.109f.; in Ov. *Her.* 13 Laodamia anticipates her suicide (80, 163f.), and, too, brings forward in time the motif of the waxen image (151–8, an *imago* of *cera*); this motif is also mentioned in *Rem.* 723f. On the other hand the dream fantasies of Laodamia in *Her.* 13.105–10 recall Propertius' Protesilaus, aspiring to return (*gaudia falsa*, *imago*, cf. too 115 *cupidis amplexa lacertis*); and Statius, *Silv.* 5.3.273 is a direct echo of the returning Protesilaus of Propertius.

Balliol College, Oxford R. O. A. M. LYNE