

Erotic Magic, Elegy, and Iambic in Horace's *Epodes*

ZARA CHADHA
University of Glasgow
Zara.Chadha@glasgow.ac.uk

The narrators of Latin love elegy enthusiastically praise the beauty of their *puellae*: they present it as the reason for their *servitium* to their mistresses and they illustrate its power to captivate them by claiming that it is more enchanting than magic *carmina*¹. By contrast, Canidia, the old and grotesquely ugly witch of Horace's *Epodes* and *Satires*, is forced to use practical erotic rituals to attract lovers. On the surface, Canidia and the elegiac *puellae* appear to be polar opposites but they share a fundamental similarity: they all embody the text and the poetics of their respective genres. Canidia's identity as a witch is integral to her metapoetic roles as Horace's "anti-Muse" and the embodiment of his iambic poetry². In this article, I argue that Canidia and the elegiac *puellae* are constructed in

1 — *Servitium* here refers to the elegiac lover's representation of his relationship with his *puella* as a form of enslavement, both to the girl as his mistress and to his passion for her. For an overview of *servitium amoris* (the enslavement of love) in elegy, see: Fulkerson 2013. *Carmina* is a multivalent term which can mean poems, songs, incantations, or prayers: the Latin elegists play on this polysemy to characterise their poetry as magic incantations. For this use of *carmen* in elegy: Sharrock 1994: 50-86.

2 — For Canidia as Horace's iambic "anti-Muse": Oliensis 1991: 110-119. For Canidia personifying Horatian iambic: Barchiesi 2002: 51-52 and 63-64; see also Andrisano 2012: 294-297.

tandem as part of an ongoing dialogue between Horace's *Epodes* and the developing genre of Latin love elegy, as exemplified by the first books of Propertius and Tibullus³.

After a survey of elegy in the *Epodes*, my argument falls into two parts. In the first part, I suggest a new reading of the function of magic in Latin love elegy, both within the fictional narrative of the elegiac affair and on the level of genre. I argue that, within the elegiac narrative, the lovers collapse the distinction between magic and beauty which they use to flatter their *puellae* and imply that their mistresses use erotic magic to control and dominate them. The suggestion that their passion is the result of erotic magic shifts the elegiac lovers' responsibility for their *servitium* to their *puellae* and presents it as something less desirable than they would like to suggest that it is. On a metapoetic level, I argue that the connection of the *puella's* beauty with magic suggests that she also embodies elegy's enchanting power over its audiences and over the elegiac lover himself. Overall, the connection of magic with the elegiac *puellae* and with the poet's text suggests that this theme is central to Latin love elegy's self-construction and self-representation as a genre⁴.

In the second part of my argument, I explore Horace's engagement with elegy through the motif of magic in *Epodes* 5 and 17. I argue that Horace parodies the elegiac lovers' metaphorical attribution of magic to their *puellae* by representing it as practical magic used by Canidia to control male desires. Through this, Horace foregrounds the self-serving nature of the elegiac lovers' claim that their mistresses have enchanted and enslaved them by magic. As magic plays a metapoetic role in the *Epodes* as much as in Latin love elegy, I argue that this use of magic in *Epodes* 5 and 17 also allows Horace to make a statement about his own Roman iambic: the elegiac element in Canidia's construction illustrates the multiplicity of genres with which Horace enriches his *Epodes*. Identifying the elegiac element in *Epode* 5, in particular, indicates that love elegy is central to Horace's poetics throughout the *Epodes*, not simply in the second half of the book, and that the generic experimentation and flexibility which comes to the fore in the metrical and thematic variety of *Epodes* 11-16 is already embodied in Horace's iambic anti-muse⁵.

3 — Barchiesi 1994b: 212-213 and 216-217 and Barchiesi 1995: 339-342 identify Lesbia, Lycoris, and Cynthia as metaliterary constructions who parallel Canidia. Damer 2016: 56 argues that the women in Horace *Epodes* 8 and 12 who embody Horace's iambic text are evidence of a "two-way influence between the poets of Roman iambic and elegiac erotic poetry".

4 — Rimell 2005: 177-205 notes a poetic element in the connection between the *puella's* beauty and magic in Ovid's erotodidactic work; see also Sharrock 1994: 74-76. As I aim to demonstrate here, this connection is fundamental to Latin love elegy from the beginning of the genre as we have it.

5 — For the metrical variety of *Epodes* 11-16 and the enrichment of Horace's iambic with contemporary elegy, including Propertius and Tibullus, in the second half of the *Epodes*: Harrison 2007:

Elegy in the Epodes

Horace engages with elegy throughout his poetic career. He regularly caricatures the genre – particularly the lover's slavish devotion to a single beloved – and uses it as a foil for his own poetics⁶. *Epode* 11 is a well-established example of this in his iambic collection: the narrator enacts the elegiac *exclusus amator's* ("locked-out lover's") submission to a single unrequited love before the final lines undercut this with the admission that not only has his passion for Lyciscus freed him from his love for Inachia but that another pretty boy or girl would cure his current obsession⁷. Previous scholarship, despite using parallels from Tibullus and Propertius to illustrate the elegiac nature of *Epode* 11, has largely considered Horace to be reacting to Cornelius Gallus. This is because the traditionally accepted chronology of publication for the *Epodes*, Propertius Book 1, and Tibullus Book 1 dates Propertius' first book to 29-28 B.C., Tibullus' to 27 B.C., and the *Epodes* to late 31 or early 30 B.C.⁸. This dating should not, however, preclude dialogue between the early work of Propertius, Tibullus, and Horace. The three poets will have been composing their works contemporaneously: Horace compiled the *Epodes* over approximately ten years between 42-30 B.C.; Propertius and Tibullus likely worked for comparable periods on their books⁹. The mingling of contemporary circles of poetic patronage, the release of individual poems ahead of the completed books, and the pre-publication circulation of work through recitations and early drafts would have provided ample opportunities for contact between the three authors, and for their continual access to and mutual

120-135; Bather and Stocks 2016: 12. The interaction between early love elegy and Horace's *Epodes* that I suggest may, of course, be read from the opposite direction; it seems more probable, however, that Horace comically amplifies this subtextual element of early elegy. For suggestions that the lover's curses on the *lena* ("procuress") at Tibullus 1.5.49-56 draw on *Epode* 5.83-102: Luck 1962: 50-51; Wimmel 1987: 239-241. Magic becomes more prominent in later love elegy, particularly in the figure of the *lena* in Propertius 4.5 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8, two figures who are very likely responding to Horace's Canidia: see, for example, Myers 1996: 6.

6 — For Horace's critique of the elegiac fixation on a single beloved in *Odes* 1.5, 2.8, and 2.9, and *Epistles* 1.4: Davis 1991: 29-60; Lowrie 1997: 77-93 and 266-297 (*Odes* 3.7 and 3.11). See also: Putnam 1972: 81-88; Ball 1994: 409-414.

7 — Leo 1960: 139-157 at 146-153; Luck 1976: 122-126. Lyne 1979: 117-130; Fabre-Serris 2010: 881-895. For *Epode* 11 engaging with Alexandrian sources shared with Latin elegy rather than with the contemporary Roman genre: Grassmann 1966: 34-46; Fedeli 1978: 117-118; Ezquerro 1997: 7-26.

8 — Recent re-evaluations of the criteria for dating Propertius Book 1 and Tibullus Book 1 have also suggested that these books were composed, and perhaps published, before Actium. Heslin 2010: 54-61 dates Propertius Book 1 to "most probably" early 33 B.C.; Luther 2003: 801-806 dates Propertius Book 1 to before 30-29 B.C. Knox 2005: 204-216 dates Tibullus Book 1 to before Actium; Ingleheart 2010: 346 and 356 convincingly critiques Knox's arguments. Even if they are not entirely convincing, Knox's arguments nevertheless demonstrate the flexibility of the criteria for dating Tibullus' book.

9 — For the composition period of Horace's *Epodes*: Watson 2003: 1 and Carruba 1969: 15-17.

creative involvement with one another's work¹⁰. It is likely that Horace will have been aware of the key motifs and language of love elegy, including, as I will argue, the metapoetic function of magic in the genre and its connection with the elegiac *puellae*. These forms of literary interaction are regularly cited as, for example, the means for Horace and Tibullus alluding to Vergil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid* before their publication¹¹. What, then, should prevent the same means of interaction between Horace's *Epodes* and the first books of Propertius and Tibullus?

Recent scholarship has begun to trace such interaction between Horace's *Epodes* and Propertius Book 1. Lyne and Heslin have demonstrated that *Epode* 11 may be responding to Propertius Book 1 as well as to Gallus' *Amores*¹². Heslin reads *Epode* 11 as the culmination of a poetic exchange between Horace's *Satires* and *Epodes* and Propertius Book 1, in which Horace responds, in particular, to Propertius 1.4 and 1.1. Most notably for my purposes, Heslin highlights the irony of "Bassus", the iambographer whom Propertius' narrator addresses in 1.4, praising the beauty of other women to the elegiac lover considering the vitriolic treatment of women in the *Epodes* and comments that: "the ugliness of Canidia has almost as prominent a role to play in Horace's early work as the beauty of Cynthia has in Propertius; they might even be considered mirror-images"¹³. Damer and Skinner have recently built on Heslin's work to argue that the women in *Epodes* 8 and 12 respond to early love elegy, particularly to Propertius. Damer reads the women of *Epodes* 8 and 12 as embodiments of Horace's iambic poetics who engage with the elegiac characteristics of *mollitia* ("softness and effeminacy") and *inertia* ("inactivity") to define Horace's work against the developing genre of love elegy¹⁴. Skinner argues that the old woman of *Epode* 12 responds to Cynthia's attack on the elegiac lover in Propertius 1.3 to parody elegiac gender dynamics, incorporating polemic with Propertius' early work into

10 — For poetic interaction and circulation in Rome: Quinn 1982: 75-108; White 1993: 35-63.

11 — For example, Maltby 2002: 39-40 ("Possible echoes of Virgil's *Aeneid* in Tib. 2.5 need not mean that book two was composed after the publication of the *Aeneid*, but simply that T. had heard pre-publication recitations of parts of the work") and Watson 2003: 76-77 ("That the *Georgics* were published after the *Epodes* proves nothing ... it seems virtually certain that Horace, as a fellow poet and close friend, was party to [Vergil's] occasional recitations ... and that in consequence Horace was acquainted with the *Georgics* long before their formal publication").

12 — Lyne 1979: 117-130; Heslin 2011: 51-66. For *Epode* 11 and Propertius 1.4, see also Barchiesi 1994a: 127-138, at 133-134. On Propertius 1.4 as an iambic elegy: Suits 1976: 86-91.

13 — Heslin 2011: 59. Richlin 1984: 75: "The ludicrous monster in Hor. *Epod.* 12 reverses the norms of elegy". Oliensis 1991: 115-116 and 1998: 71 describes Canidia as "a debased version of Catullus's Lesbia"; in the extant Catullan corpus, however, Lesbia herself is not connected with magic. Canidia's magic suggests that she is more likely to be commenting on the elegiac *puellae*.

14 — Damer 2016.

Horace's self-definition against Catullus as part of the Latin iambic tradition¹⁵.

Collectively, these readings highlight a persistent pattern in the *Epodes*: women and their bodies are used as a focus for parodying the gender dynamics and the rhetoric of the elegiac lover in early Propertian and Tibullan love elegy. This use of female figures contributes to the gender dynamics of the *Epodes*, which share with love elegy a concern with weakened masculinity and disrupted identity at the end of the Republic¹⁶. Horace's engagement with elegy in connection with these themes allows him both to assert his iambic aggression in contrast to the elegists' subservience to their *puellae* and to underline the iambic narrator's *mollitia* and impotence throughout the *Epodes*.

I suggest that it is possible to gain a fuller understanding of Horace's engagement with early Propertian and Tibullan elegy by investigating the relationship between the elegiac *puellae* and Horace's Canidia. To do this, I focus on the connection of Canidia, Propertius' Cynthia, and Tibullus' Delia and Pholoe with erotic magic, a motif which is central to the narrative and metapoetic roles of these women. As outlined above, I begin by exploring the connection between beauty and magic in the first books of Tibullus and Propertius and the narrative and metapoetic functions of this connection. I then move on to Horace's expansion of the elegiac magical subtext into a main narrative element in *Epodes* 5 and 17 to caricature the power which the elegiac *puellae* are presented as wielding over their lovers and the same lovers' self-serving rhetoric.

Puellegy

Erotic magic features prominently in the first books of Propertius and Tibullus. Both poets construct their elegy in terms of magic *carmina* which reflect the characteristic themes of the elegiac affair – flattering and seducing girls, opening doors, and deceiving husbands and guards – and which illustrate the enchanting power of their verses for their extratextual audiences. Within the narrative of the elegiac affair, the representation of poetry as magic *carmina* expresses the lover's attempts to seduce his mistress in terms of magical enchantment. The alignment of poetry with magic highlights that the lover aims to deceive his *puella* with his poetry; the doubts which the lover casts on the power of magic, however, fores-

15 — Skinner 2018. Reading this dialogue from the opposite direction, Gowers 2016: 120-121 identifies parallels between the relationship dynamics of *Epode* 12 and Propertius 1.5: "Binding, poison, anger: elegiac male entrapment in female toils is easily translated into the terms of iambic debilitation. Indeed, Cynthia is pushing at her elegiac limits".

16 — For masculinity and political upheaval in the *Epodes*: Fitzgerald 1988; Oliensis 1991; Oliensis 1998: 64-101. For these concerns in early elegy: Wyke 1989a: 41-43; Nikoloutsos 2011.

hadow his failure to seduce his mistress and indicate that, as his verses continue to offer the hope of successfully persuading his mistress to love him, their deception works more effectively on him than on her¹⁷.

This connection between magic and elegiac *carmina* is expressed most explicitly in Propertius' programmatic elegy 3.3, where Calliope explains to Propertius what his poetry should include (47-50):

quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantis
nocturnaeque canes ebria signa morae,
ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas
qui volet austeros arte ferire viros.

For you will sing about garlanded lovers at another's doorway
and the drunken signs of nocturnal delays,
so that he who would wish to trick strict husbands
may learn from you how to charm out locked-in girls with magic.

Excantare ("to charm out", 49), which is used as early as the Twelve Tables for the magic effect of words, implies that Propertius' elegy has an influence on his *puella* that is similar to the effect of magic¹⁸. 3.3 is a polite rejection of epic poetry (*recusatio*) in which Calliope and Apollo advise Propertius to return to the elegiac subject matter with which he launched his career; the poem highlights that Book 3 will take Propertius' elegy in a new direction from that of his previous books¹⁹. The characterisation of Propertius' elegy as a form of magic enchantment here suggests that this is a construction of earlier elegy which readers would have been familiar with.

Indeed, Propertius uses magic programmatically to characterise his poetry in the first elegy of Book 1²⁰. In the centre of 1.1, the lover appeals to witches, asking them to change Cynthia's mind and make her love him even more than he loves her (19-24):

at vos, deductae quibus est fallacia lunae
et labor in magicis sacra piare focus,
en agedum dominae mentem convertite nostrae,
et facite illa meo palleat ore magis.
tunc ego crediderim vobis et sidera et amnes
posse Cytæines ducere carminibus.

But you, who know the trick of the drawn-down moon

17 — Sharrock 1994: 50-86.

18 — O'Neill 1998: 63.

19 — Willis 2018: 41-45.

20 — For the parallel between magic *carmina* and elegiac *carmina* at 1.1.19-24: Ahl 1974: 91 n. 24 and 92-93; Commager 1974: 34; Zetzel 1996: 97; O'Neill 1998: 74; Prince 2003: 210-211.

and who perform sacred rites on magic hearths,
 come on, change the mind of my mistress
 and make her face paler than my own.
 Then I may believe that you can lead stars
 and rivers with Colchian songs.

The expression *deductae ... lunae* (“drawn-down moon”) in the opening line of the lover’s appeal (19) suggests that magic is used to represent poetic *carmina* in this passage: *deducere* (“to draw down”) is used programmatically by Roman poets for the composition of refined Callimachean verse, indicating the connection between magic *carmina* and poetry here²¹. This connection is made explicit in lines 23-24, where *carmina* are introduced emphatically as the final word of the passage and *deductae* (19) is echoed in *ducere* (“lead”, 23)²². Propertius explicitly calls the effect of these *carmina* a “trick” (*fallacia*, 19), highlighting deception as a defining feature of elegy – one which is connected similarly with magic in 3.3.49-50. Medea’s introduction alongside *carmina* in line 24 underlines this by alluding to Medea’s ability to control the Moon with “deceitful spells” at Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica* 4.59-60 (δολιήσιν ἁοιδαῖς, 59)²³. The suggestion that *fallacia* characterises Propertius’ elegy in 1.1 is also reinforced by the programmatic 4.1, which opens his final book. The astrologer Horos, attempting to dissuade Propertius from his new program of aetiological elegy, reminds him of Apollo’s past order that Propertius compose love elegies: *at tu finge elegos, fallax opus* (“but you, create elegies, deceitful work”, 135)²⁴. In 1.1, the appeal to *carmina*

21 — Vergil employs *deducere* in *Eclogue* 6 in his adaptation of Callimachus’ *Aetia* prologue: Apollo tells Tityrus that “a shepherd should rear a fat flock but sing a fine-spun song” (*pastorem, Tityre, pinguis | pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen*, 4-5). *deducere* also occurs in *Eclogue* 6 during the elegist Gallus’ poetic initiation: Linus, handing Gallus the pipes of the Muses, recalls how Hesiod “was accustomed to draw trees down from the mountains with their singing” (*ille solebat | cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos*, 70-71). For *Eclogue* 6.5: Ross 1975: 19 and 26-27 with 27 n. 1; Deremetz 1987: 764-770; Zetzl 1996: 78 and 97. Parca 1988: 585 n. 6 notes that Propertius links his elegy to the Neoteric tradition through *deducere*.

22 — On the simple verb expressing the same meaning as its compound: Ross 1975: 65-66. For the “chiastic” arrangement of 1.1.19-24: Cairns 1974: 100.

23 — *Cytaeines* (“Colchian” 1.1.24) is an emendation of the MSS †*Cythalinis*†. Enk 1946, Rothstein 1966, and Richardson 1977 adopt *Cytaeines*; Butler and Barber 1933, Camps 1961, and Heyworth 2007 adopt *Cytinaeis* (“Thessalian”); Fedeli 1980 retains the MSS reading. For discussion: Butler and Barber 1933: 155-156; Enk 1946: 15-16; Fedeli 1980: 82; Prince 2002: 64-65. Shackleton Bailey 1949: 22 highlights *Argonautica* 4.59-60 as a parallel for Propertius 1.1.19 but does not develop the significance of this parallel for magic in 1.1.

24 — Most editors retain the dominant reading *fallax* at 4.1.135, as most editors retain *fallacia* at 1.1.19. Stroh 1971: 108, discussing Propertius 4.1.135, notes that *fallacia fingere* (“to create tricks”) concisely expresses *carmina fingere* (“to compose poems”) and the seductive, bewitching effects of elegy. On *fallax*: Butler and Barber 1933: 332; Shackleton Bailey 1967: 224-225; Stroh 1971: 107-108 n. 169; Nethercut 1976: 30-38; Kidd 1979: 177; Coutelle 2005: 533. Murgia 1989: 268 and Goold 1990 adopt *pellax* (“deceitful”). For *elegos* (4.135) denoting love elegies specifically: Butler

with the power to trick indicates the lover's attempts to deceive Cynthia with his poetry and illustrates the enchanting power of Propertius' elegy. At the same time, the subjunctive *crediderim* ("I may believe", 23) and the mention of Medea, who does not use erotic magic to win love, hints at the failure of the elegiac lover's poetry to deceive Cynthia and suggests that he is the one tricked into hoping that he will be able to win her with his elegies²⁵.

Tibullus connects his poetry with magic in his first *paraclausithyron* ("lament outside a locked door"), 1.2. The lover claims that an honest witch has written a spell that will enable Delia to deceive her husband: *nec tamen huic credet coniunx tuus, ut mihi verax | pollicita est magico saga ministerio* ("nevertheless, your husband will not believe it, as an honest witch has promised me with her magic aid", 43-44); *haec mihi composuit cantus quis fallere posses* ("she has composed me a spell which will enable you to deceive", 55). To convince Delia of the witch's abilities, the lover catalogues the powers of her magic (45-54):

hanc ego de caelo ducentem sidera vidi;
 fluminis haec rapidi carmine vertit iter;
 haec cantu finditque solum manesque sepulcris
 elicit et tepido devocat ossa rogo.
 iam tenet infernas magico stridore catervas;
 iam iubet aspersas lacte referre pedem.
 cum libet, haec tristi depellit nubila caelo;
 cum libet, aestivo convocat orbe nives.
 sola tenere malas Medae dicitur herbas,
 sola feros Hecatae perdomuisse canes.

I have seen her drawing the stars from the sky;
 she turns the course of the rapid river with her song;
 with her song she splits the earth and calls forth ghosts
 from the tombs and calls down bones from the warm pyre.
 Now she holds back the infernal hoards with her magic shriek;
 now she orders them, sprinkled with milk, to retreat.
 When she wants, she expels the clouds from the sad heaven;
 when she wants, she summons snow in the summer sky.
 She alone is said to understand Medea's evil herbs,
 she alone to have tamed Hecate's wild dogs.

and Barber 1933: 332; MacLeod 1976: 147 and 148; Hutchinson 2006: 84. For the likelihood that Propertius and his audience did not distinguish amatory from non-amatory elegy: Sandbach 1962: 268 and Courtney 1969: 75.

25 — For Medea alluding to the failure of love elegy in Propertius 1.1.23: Prince 2003: 209-211.

Tibullus attributes the witch's power to her words, foregrounding speech: *carmine* (46), *cantu* ("song", 47), *devocat* ("calls down", 48), *stridore* ("shriek", 49), *convocat* ("summons", 52). This focus on words, together with the use of *compono* ("compose") for the composition of the witch's spell (55), aligns her erotic magic with the lover's – and Tibullus' – composition of elegy in 1.2 which is designed to flatter and seduce Delia: *blandaue compositis abdere verba notis* ("and hide seductive words with pre-arranged signals", 22), and *et sibi blanditias tremula componere voce* ("and rehearses seductions with a trembling voice", 93)²⁶. The urban *paraclausithyron* of 1.2 disrupts both the pastoral fantasy and the poetic programme established by Tibullus 1.1, developing and clarifying the image of the lover chained outside Delia's door at 1.1.51-56 to reassert a new and complementary programme for Tibullus' book, one which highlights the power of elegy to enchant its readers and to create fantasies²⁷. The framing of the passage with questions of belief and deception (1.2.43-44 and 55) and the inclusion of Medea at 1.2.53 implies that the lover's poetry will be incapable of seducing Delia and that he is the one who is deceived by the false hope of his elegy²⁸.

Magic is also associated with the elegiac *puellae*, specifically with their beauty and its effect on their lovers, in both Propertius Book 1 and Tibullus Book 1: the lovers illustrate the irresistible force of their attraction by favourably comparing their mistresses' appearances with magic. At first glance, this favourable comparison of beauty and magic compliments the girls. I argue, however, that the terms in which the lovers draw these comparisons collapse the distinction between magic and beauty, implying that their *puellae* bewitch them magically after all²⁹. Metaphorically equating the effects of magic and beauty suggests that the power the elegiac mistress holds over her lover originates from a source external to her. This justifies the lover's *servitium* and removes his responsibility for it by implying that it stems from a supernatural power beyond his control, rather than from his physical attraction to a pretty girl. The elegiac lover's implicit characterisation of his beloved, her attractiveness, and his love for her in terms of magic betrays an ambivalence towards his mistress and his passion for her which lurks beneath his flatteries and his apparently willing servile devotion which is, ironically, self-imposed and from which he rarely attempts to remove himself. Connecting his mistress with an

26 — Putnam 1973: 68. Bright 1978: 147, with n. 54, calls *compono* a "key-word" of 1.2, highlighting 1.2.93 as "a reflection of the poetic process" alongside 1.2.22 and 1.2.55.

27 — For this relationship between 1.1 and 1.2: Bright 1978: 133-148; Mutschler 1985: 50 and 63-64; Lee-Stecum 1998: 71 and 100; Maltby 2002: 50 and 153.

28 — For Medea suggesting the failure of love elegy at Tibullus 1.2.53: Prince 2003: 213-215.

29 — For the elegiac "pseudo-opposition" between magic and love, rather than magic and beauty: Sharrock 1994: 58-61.

illegitimate, artificial, and potentially harmful source of power suggests a resentment of his situation and his awareness of a need to justify it to himself and to his peers³⁰. The introduction of magic into his relationship ultimately reveals more about the lover than about his beloved, highlighting his capacity for self-deception and for justifying his actions to himself and to his readers – both of which extend to constructing the image of his mistress best suited to his current needs – and illustrating his fallibility and untrustworthiness as a narrator³¹.

Tibullus 1.5 and 1.8 include the most explicit examples of this use of magic. In 1.5, the lover, separated from Delia after a quarrel, repeatedly attempts to make love to another woman. When he is unable to perform, the woman accuses Delia of using a binding spell to control his body and his desires (39-44):

saepe aliam tenui sed iam cum gaudia adirem
 admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus.
 tunc me discedens devotum femina dixit,
 heu pudet, et narrat scire nefanda meam.
 non facit hoc verbis: facie tenerisque lacertis
 devovet et flavis nostra puella comis.

Often I embraced another: but as soon as I came to the point of joy
 Venus reminded me of my mistress and deserted me.
 Then, departing, the woman called me bewitched –
 oh, the shame! – and she says that my girl knows unspeakable arts.
 She does not do this with words; my girl bewitches with her appearance
 and soft arms and golden hair.

Tibullus initially appears to contrast Delia's beauty with the effects of magic, saying that she has no need to use this because her beauty is enough to captivate her lover. The use of *devoveo* ("bewitch") for the effects of both magic and beauty draws attention to the similarity of their effects on the lover, collapsing the difference between the two even as he attempts to stress it and implying that magic is the source of his obsession with Delia – and of his impotence – after all³². This repetition causes the explicit characterisation of magic and its effects as unspeakable (*nefanda*, 42) and shameful (*pudet*, 42) to be carried over to the effects of Delia's beauty, too. By associating Delia's beauty with a force which is described as

30 — For the social function of accusations of magic for rationalising or justifying behaviour in Greco-Roman culture: Gordon 1999: 194-204.

31 — For accusations of magic revealing more about the accuser than their target: Winkler 1991: 215.

32 — Elder 1962: 65-105 at 77-78 highlights Tibullus' equation of beauty and magic in 1.5.41-44; see also Fauth 1980: 274-275.

shocking and harmful, the Tibullan lover presents his experience of loving Delia as something which is similarly disgraceful but which is beyond his control, removing his responsibility for both his infatuation and his inability to perform with another woman.

The narrator of Tibullus 1.8 uses a similar technique to illustrate the power of Pholoe's beauty over her young lover, Marathus, who is also the narrator's own beloved (15-26):

illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore
 nec nitidum tarda compserit arte caput.
 num te carminibus num te pallentibus herbis
 devovit tacito tempore noctis anus?
 cantus vicinis fruges traducit ab agris,
 cantus et iratae detinet anguis iter,
 cantus et e curru Lunam deducere temptat,
 et faceret si non aera repulsa sonent.
 quid queror heu misero carmen nocuisse, quid herbas?
 forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis;
 sed corpus tetigisse nocet sed longa dedisse
 oscula sed femori conservisse femur.

That girl pleases, even though she arrives with no make-up on her face
 and her glittering hair arranged by no measured art.
 Has some old woman, in the quiet hour of the night,
 cursed you with songs or with pallor-inducing herbs?
 Song draws the crops from a neighbouring field,
 song also halts the path of the angry snake,
 song attempts, too, to draw down the Moon from her chariot
 and it would do so if the bronze did not ring when it was struck.
 Why do I complain, alas, that spells have harmed the wretched boy,
 why herbs?
 Beauty uses no magic aids,
 but the touch of a body harms, giving long kisses harms,
 thigh pressing close to thigh harms.

The narrator introduces the question of whether magic is the source of Marathus' obsession with Pholoe in line 17, immediately after emphasising Pholoe's natural beauty (15-16). After cataloguing the powers of magic spells (19-22), he rejects this as the reason for Marathus' attraction and returns to the idea of beauty being more powerful than magic (24). As in 1.5, however, Tibullus uses the same verb to express the harmful effects of magic and physical contact with a beautiful girl, repeating *noceo* ("harm") in lines 23 and 25³³. Tibullus also uses the structure of 1.8.15-

33 — Sharrock 1994: 76 highlights that Tibullus uses the repetition of *noceo* to equate magic and love in 1.8.23-26. For Tibullus 1.8.17-26 opposing beauty and magic: Luck 1962: 51-52;

26 to equate Pholoe's beauty with magic. In lines 19-22, the anaphora of *cantus* ("song") and the ascending tricolon of *cantus ... cantus et ... cantus et e* emphasises the power of spells. This is echoed in lines 25-26, where the anaphora of *sed* ("but") and the repeated perfect infinitives (*tetigisse* ("touch"), 25; *dedisse* ("give"), 25; *conservisse* ("press close"), 26) connect the catalogue of the effects of beauty with the powers of magic. The perfect infinitives in lines 25-26 also pick up *nocuisse* ("harm"), which is used of the harmful effects of magic in line 23. Through these features, Tibullus collapses the opposition between magic and beauty to suggest that Marathus' infatuation is caused by magic after all. As in 1.5, the focus on harm presents the experience of elegiac love as something negative and debilitating, despite the overt praise of Pholoe's beauty.

A similar connection between magic and beauty occurs in the opening couplet of Propertius 1.1:

Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis,
contactum nullis ante cupidinibus.

Cynthia was the first who captured me, wretched, with her eyes,
though I had been seized before by no desires.

As Duncan Kennedy has highlighted, *cepit* (1) has a range of meanings: it can characterise the experience of love as capture, in both military and hunting settings, and it can equally suggest magical enchantment. Similarly, *contactum* (2) can mean both touched and infected by disease. These senses are all active in Propertius 1.1.1-2 and they are all expanded as the elegy progresses: military capture is developed immediately in the image of Amor pressing his foot on the lover's head (3-4); hunting is central to the narrative of Milanion and Atalanta (9-16); the lover appeals to magic in the centre of the poem (19-24) and then to friends for medical assistance in the following lines (25-28)³⁴. The subtext of magic in 1.1.1 is underlined by Cynthia's name which, as the feminine of "Cynthius", the Callimachean epithet for Apollo, associates her with chthonic Hecate and celestial Luna, the aspects of the triple goddess which complement Apollo's sister, the earthly Diana³⁵. The association of Cynthia and her appearance with magic at the very beginning of his elegiac corpus indi-

Wimmel 1968: 59-61; Putnam 1973: 130; Tupet 1976: 345; Bright 1978: 242-243; Cairns 1979: 140; Maltby 2002: 307.

34 — Kennedy 1993: 47-48. Sharrock 1994: 57 interprets Propertius 1.1.1 as implying that Cynthia has performed a binding spell on Propertius with her eyes, describing Cynthia as "both the essence and agent" of the magic she uses to enchant Propertius. Fauth 1980: 265-282 discusses the opposition between "internal" physical magic and "external" magic in Propertius 1.1.1-4.

35 — For Cynthia's etymological connection with *luna* in 1.1.21-22: O'Neil 1958: 2-3; Ahl 1974: 81 and 91; Commager 1974: 33-34; Bicknell 1984: 69. For "Cynthius" as an epithet for Apollo: Clausen 1976: 245-247; Wyke 1987: 59; Wyke 1989a: 33.

cates that Propertius wishes his audience to recall this connection between beauty and erotic magic throughout the narrator's relationship with his beloved.

Propertius connects Cynthia and her effect on her lovers with magic again in 1.5. The narrator warns his friend Gallus (31) against pursuing Cynthia: his beloved is angry, insensitive to prayers, and tortures her lovers (1-10); insomnia, disorientation, pallor, and emaciation result from devotion to the jealous and possessive girl who will slander unfaithful men (11-26). Propertius can offer his friend no cure, only the promise of comfort and a warning to stop enquiring about his mistress (27-32). The symptoms of elegiac love listed in 1.5 correspond with the effects wished on the targets of erotic attraction spells (ἀγῶγαι)³⁶. These symptoms also reflect those of lovesickness in antiquity. The narrator of 1.5, however, compares his infatuation with Cynthia to the effects of drinking Thessalian potions in the opening lines of the elegy: *et bibere e tota toxica Thessalia* ("and to drink all the poison brews of Thessaly", 6)³⁷. By prefacing the physical and mental torments of elegiac love with this comparison with magic, Propertius implies that magic is the cause of the lover's physical and mental torments and characterises Cynthia, metaphorically, as a practitioner of erotic enchantment. Cynthia's beauty is not mentioned in 1.5, but it plays a prominent role in the preceding elegies, including, and significantly for my purposes, 1.4, with which 1.5 has close thematic and structural connections. Both of these elegies are addressed to poets: the iambographer, Bassus (1.4), and a "Gallus" (1.5), who evokes Propertius' elegiac predecessor Cornelius Gallus; the delayed introduction of Gallus' name until the end of 1.5 elides the division between this poem and 1.4 and encourages the reader to understand 1.5 as still addressing Bassus, making him the victim of her erotic magic³⁸. The initial implicit continuation of 1.4 carries over the previous emphasis on Cynthia's attractiveness (1.4.5-14) as the source of the narrator's love, associating the effects of this beauty with those of the Thessalian potions³⁹.

36 — Zetzel 1996: 95 compares the symptoms of love in 1.5 with those in an ἀγῶγῆ spell, *PGM* IV.1508ff. and 350ff. Gowers 2016: 120-121 suggests that the narrator of 1.5 constructs Cynthia as a "heartless Thessalian witch".

37 — For Propertius 1.5.6 illustrating the narrator's experience of love: Luck 1962: 39; Fauth 1980: 279-280. For 1.5.6 contributing to Cynthia's characterisation as a "magical spirit" in 1.5: Zetzel 1996: 92-97, though Zetzel argues that Propertius opposes magic and Cynthia's enchanting effect on her lovers to his poetic enchantment.

38 — For the delayed introduction of Gallus as the addressee in 1.5 and for 1.4 and 1.5 as a pair: Cairns 1983: 61-103. For identifying "Gallus" in 1.5 with Cornelius Gallus: King 1980: 212-230; Cairns 1983: 79-88; Miller 2004: 60-94; Cairns 2006 Chapters 3-7. *Contra*: Syme 1978: 99-103; Anderson *et al.* 1979: 154-155; Fedeli 1980: 153.

39 — I return to this connection between the two poems below.

By this point, I hope to have demonstrated that Tibullus and Propertius collapse the distinction they create between beauty and magic, justifying their amatory *servitium* and removing their responsibility for it by implying that it stems from a supernatural power beyond their control rather than from their own weakness for pretty girls. This metaphorical association of the mistress' beauty with magic has, I argue, a corresponding metapoetic dimension which is a natural extension of her role as the Muse and embodiment of the elegiac text: the enchanting power of the girl's beauty reflects the same feature of the poet's *carmina*⁴⁰. This level to the bewitching force of the *puella*'s beauty adds humour to the narrator's self-serving association of his beloved with magic, as the magic which enables the *puella*'s hold over him is none other than his own poetry. Propertius 1.1 provides an example which suggests that this connection is programmatic in early elegy. As I noted above, Cynthia's name associates her with Callimachean poetics, while *deducere* evokes the composition of fine, Callimachean verse: it is thus possible to read Propertius 1.1.19 as addressing witches whose *carmina* have the *fallacia* "of the drawn-out moon", with Cynthia's enchantment symbolising the composition of the elegiac text and its effect as much as the intended seductive effect of the elegiac lover's poetry on his beloved⁴¹. If elegy is constructed as an erotic spell, then Cynthia, as a *scripta puella* ("written woman"), also embodies the magic inherent in the elegiac text. This connection at the centre of Propertius' first elegy prompts us to re-read the opening effect of Cynthia's beauty at 1.1.1-2 as expressing the elegiac poet's enchantment by his own poetry and his own poetic creation.

Through the Looking-glass

Horace's Canidia provides a contemporary precedent for this relationship between magic, poetry, and female appearance. I suggest that Canidia is constructed as a direct parody of the elegiac *puellae*: her advanced age, white hair, and grotesque appearance invert the metaphorically bewitching youth and beauty of the elegiac mistresses, leaving her with only

40 — For Cynthia illustrating Propertius' poetics, as well as being a fictional beloved in the narrative: Wyke 1987: 47-61; Veyne 1988: 3-14 and 50-63; Wyke 1989a: 25-47; McNamee 1993: 215-248; for Delia and Pholoe in Tibullus Book 1: Bright 1978: 99-123; Veyne 1988: 50-66. Commentators do not relate the metapoetic role of the elegiac beloveds to the motif of magic as I do here.

41 — Wyke 1987: 58-60 argues that Cynthia's "stupefaction" by poetry represents the composition of elegy at Propertius 2.13.3-8, highlighting that the effect of Propertius' elegy on Cynthia "is expressed in the same vocabulary as the spellbinding of *natura*" (*sed magis ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia versu: | tunc ego sim Inachio notior arte Lino*, "but rather that Cynthia should marvel at my poetry: | then I would be more famous in my art than Inachian Linus", 2.13.7-8) and that this illustrates "an analogous yet favoured form of poetic production" to that expressed in *Eclogue* 6.71 (*cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos*).

practical magic to bind suitors to her. By presenting Canidia as engaging in erotic magic in *Epodes* 5 and 17, Horace literalises the elegiac metaphor of erotic enchantment and presents an iambic vision of what the elegiac lover's situation would be if his *puella* were a real witch rather than possessed of magical beauty, highlighting the hypocrisy of the elegiac lover's voluntary submission to a woman whom he presents as responsible for controlling his desires and his actions⁴². Focusing this parody through the figure of Canidia enables Horace to use elegy as a foil for defining his poetics in the *Epodes* while simultaneously highlighting the variety of genres he incorporates into his Roman iambic.

Epode 5 presents Canidia and her accomplices – Sagana, Veia, and Folia – attempting to produce a love-philtre capable of attracting back Canidia's lover, Varus. They construct an ἐπιθύμα – a burnt-offering of trees, animal parts, and herbs from Iolchos and Hiberia (17-24) – and purify the area with water from Avernus (25-28), preparing for the key component of their magic: the burial and starvation of a Roman citizen boy (32-40). This process will imbue his organs with an intense desire to be transferred to Varus via Canidia's philtre. The poem is framed by the boy's words to his captors: his initial attempts to soften Canidia's heart (1-10) and his final curses on the witches (87-102), which are inspired by Canidia's central prayer to Nox and Diana (49-82).

In addition to the poetic aspect of Canidia, scholars agree that *Epode* 5 incorporates a comment on Horace's iambic. The contrasting descriptions of the boy and his words at either end of the epode – his pitiful appearance (11-13) and his soft words (*mollire*, "to soften", 14; *mollibus | lenire verbis impias*, "to mollify the impious women with soft words", 83-84), and his vengeful curses (*Thyesteas preces*, "Thyestean prayers", 86; *humanam vicem*, "human retribution", 88)⁴³ – have been interpreted meta-poetically by Oliensis and by Johnson. The curses' stated aim of revenge on the witches and the emphasis on their active effect (*diris agam vos*, "I will pursue you with curses", 89) mark them as iambic⁴⁴: Oliensis reads the child's speeches as illustrating the "origins of invective in impotence", with *Epode* 5 enacting the "symmetrical progression" between Canidia's *carmina* and those of the iambic poet as "one vengeful speech (Canidia's against Varus) begets another (the little boy's against Canidia)". Johnson charts a similar progression, though he associates the rage and violence of

42 — Horace targets the power of the elegiac *puella's* beauty to reduce her lovers to a servile status in his *Odes*, most notably through Barine in *Odes* 2.8. For Barine's elegiac characteristics: Syndikus 1972: 388; Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 123.

43 — For *Thyesteas preces* (86) and revenge: Mankin 1995: 133-134; Watson 2003: 243; Johnson 2012: 108-109. On *humanam vicem* (88): Mankin 1995: 134; Watson 2003: 243-244.

44 — For *agere* characterising Horatian iambic: Barchiesi 2001: 145-146; Barchiesi 2002: 44 and 64; Lowrie 2009: 104-105 and 108-110.

the boy's reaction to Canidia with the "Archilochean-Lykambid invective" which Horace later denies for his *Epodes* (*Epistles* 1.19.19-25)⁴⁵. *Epode* 5 ends, however, with the suggestion that the boy's revenge will take effect only after his death at the hands of his captors; the implicit failure of his curses to change his fate suggests that Horace's iambic may be as practically ineffective as any other poetry⁴⁶.

The clear association of the child's curses with iambic invites a similar literary reading of his opening appeals. I suggest that their repeated description in terms of "softening" the witch's heart (*mollire*, 14; *mollibus | lenire verbis impias*, 83-84) evokes elegy. *mollis* ("soft, effeminate") is already a key term in early elegiac self-definition, particularly in Propertius Book 1. In 1.7, for example, the Propertian narrator polemically contrasts his "soft verse" (*mollem ... versum*, 19) with Ponticus' epic⁴⁷. By evoking elegy in the child, Horace incorporates an element of self-definition against this genre into the boy's words: rather than maintaining the futile appeals which will lead to a death through tantalisation and desire, the boy fights to avenge himself with "active" curses. The implicit failure of these curses collapses the surface contrast with elegy, emphasising the questionable nature of poetry's power to influence the world and, at the same time, illustrating that contemporary elegy is one of the many genres with which Horace enriches his Roman iambic.

It is possible to develop this elegiac element in the boy's construction further and to identify parallels between the erotic ritual in *Epode* 5 and the elegiac relationship. Canidia tortures the boy, arousing and manipulating his desire as part of her ritual, while she pursues Varus with her magic. This dynamic evokes the elegiac 'triangle' of the lover, his mistress, and his rival, particularly the situation of Tibullus 1.8, where Pholoe – whose dazzling beauty needs no magic aids to bewitch suitors (1.8.24), but who will find it difficult to attract any lovers when she ages (39-46) – torments the *puer delicatus* ("effeminate boy") Marathus while she courts an

45 — Oliensis 1998: 73-77 and 95-96, citing (96 n. 79) Maurizio L. (1989), "Engendering Invective", American Philological Association meeting, Boston, December 1989, for "the 'educational' value" of *Epode* 5; for the "origins of invective in impotence" in *Epode* 5 and the mirroring of witch and poet: Oliensis 1998: 73-77. Johnson 2012: 101-109. For the boy as an iambic poet: Andrisano 2012: 298.

46 — For the boy's curses suggesting the "pragmatic" ineffectiveness of iambic: Lowrie 2009: 110-111. *Epode* 6 reinforces this impression: the narrator undercuts the effectiveness of his iambic tirade by asking if he will weep like an unavenged boy (*an si quis atro dente me petiverit, | inultus ut flebo puer?*, "and if anyone attacks me with a black tooth, I will weep like a boy unavenged?", 15-16): Fitzgerald 1988: 185-187; Oliensis 1998: 76-77; Lowrie 2009: 110; Johnson 2012: 106-108. Pace Watson 2003: 187-190.

47 — On Propertius 1.7.19: Stroh 1971: 18-21. Horace *Odes* 2.19.17-18 characterises Valgius' elegies as "soft complaints" (*mollium ... querelarum*), defining Horace's lyric against elegy's excessive love and grief: Commager 1962: 239-241; Putnam 1972: 81-88; Davis 1991: 39-60 and 184-186; Lowrie 1997: 77-93.

older lover (*canus amator*, 29)⁴⁸. In *Epode 5*, Canidia's seizure of the boy's emblems of Roman citizenship, the *toga praetexta* and *bullā* (*purpurae decus*, 7; *insignibus*, 12) symbolises, I suggest, his removal from society and demotion to the status of a slave, dramatising the elegiac lover's social detachment through his emasculating *servitium* to his *puella*. The boy's youth and sexual purity also develops the documented use of young boys in magic – for example, the non-fatal use of sexually pure boys as divinatory mediums – by combining it with popular Roman superstitions regarding the victimisation of children by magic-workers. This is evident in Cicero's accusations in his invective *in Vatinius* that Vatinius honoured the gods with the entrails of young boys, and in a gravestone for a girl which records her abduction by witches; equally relevant for *Epode 5* is the belief that screech-owls fed on the blood of male children⁴⁹. By drawing on these superstitions and, as I will argue, the realities of magic rituals, Horace exaggerates the elegiac lover's youth and *mollitia*, and the *puella's* cruelty and offers a grimly literalised and suitably iambic image of the lover's experience in his description of the boy's torture.

This torture is central to Canidia's ritual in *Epode 5*, and the narrator describes the planned burial and its effects in detail (32-40):

quo posset infossus puer
 longo die bis terque mutatae dapis
 inemori spectaculo,
 cum prominere ore, quantum extant aqua
 suspensa mento corpora,
 exsecta uti medulla et aridum iecur
 amoris esset poculum,
 interminato cum semel fixae cibo
 intabuissent pupulae.

In which the boy, placed in the earth,

48 — The older, rather than richer, rival in Tibullus 1.8 is unique in extant love elegy and Horace's *Odes* 1.33 suggests that Horace was alert to Tibullus' distinctive use of age: the lyric narrator comforts the mourning elegist, Albius (*Albi*, 1) – whom commentators identify with Tibullus – over losing Glycera to a younger rival (*cur tibi iunior \ laesa praeniteat fide*, “why, when faith has been broken, a younger man outshines you”, 3-4). For Horace *Odes* 1.33 ridiculing Tibullus' exaggeration of age: Cairns 1995: 72-73 with n. 12. For debate over the problem which this focus on age creates for equating “Albius” with Tibullus: Postgate 1903:183; Ullman 1912: 153. Watson 2003: 186 compares Tibullus 1.8.24 (“an argument widely canvassed in love-poetry”) with witchcraft as “Canidia's only hope of holding onto Varus”.

49 — Cicero *in Vatinius* 14. On Cicero's allegation as evidence of public attitudes towards magic rather than of real events: Tupet 1976: 206-208; Beard-North-Price 1998: 155-156; Rives 1995: 72-74. Ovid *Fasti* 6.101 testifies to the superstition regarding screech-owls and young boys: Ingallina 1977: 116-119. For the use of young, chaste boys in magic: Watson 2003: 197. On “boy-mediums”: Ogden 2001: 196-201; for analysis of male and female children as divinatory mediums: Johnston 2001: 97-117. Sexually pure boys are specified most explicitly at *PDM* xiv.68 and *PDM* xiv.805-40.

could die slowly amid the sight, over a long day,
of the meals changed twice three times,
with his head standing out, his chin prominent
as one whose body is suspended in water,
so that his bone marrow and dried out liver, having been cut out,
could be made into a love potion,
when his eyeballs, fixed once and for all on the forbidden food,
had withered away.

Horace's use of contemporary magic for the imagery in *Epode 5* has been explored by previous scholarship on the poem⁵⁰. Eitrem, for example, highlights *PGM XII.15-95* – a ritual for producing an “Eros assistant” to serve the practitioner – as a parallel for the length of the boy's tantalisation (*Epode 5.33*); while this is not a specifically erotic ritual, it does aim to make targets love the practitioner and submit to his or her will⁵¹. It is possible to extend this parallel. The spell instructs the practitioner to consecrate the figurine by placing before it offerings which include fruit, birds, sweetmeats, and honey-wine, as well as inedible objects (21-24), “perfecting” it and preparing it for use as a ritual object⁵². These meals correspond to those repeatedly placed before the boy in *Epode 5*. Canidia's treatment of her victim, which prepares his organs for use in her philtre, parallels that of the waxen figurine at *PGM XII.15-95*; strikingly, a live human replaces the inanimate statue here.

I suggest that Horace combines and exaggerates details of magic rituals in *Epode 5* to construct the boy as a tendentious portrait of the elegiac lover. The description of the boy as someone whose body is suspended in water with his head above the surface (35-36) so that he can see the forbidden food as he dies evokes Tantalus in the Underworld, an allusion Horace explicates at *Epode 17.65-66* when Canidia compares her victim

50 — Magic was practised throughout the Greek and Roman worlds in all periods. Though much of the extant evidence is of a late date – the majority of the texts compiled in the *PGM* date to the third-fourth centuries A.D. – it transmits material with a far longer heritage. For the validity of using the *PGM* as evidence for earlier practices: Faraone 1999: 33-36.

51 — Eitrem 1933: 30-88 at 37. On the connection between the attraction desired in *PGM XII.15-95* and the “more focussed” passion of erotic spells: Winkler 1991: 214-43 at 220. For “Eros assistants” in the *PGM*: Ciruolo 1995: 279-295; Scibilia 2002: 71-86; Collins 2008: 97-101.

52 — *PGM XII.21-24*: πάντα ταῦτα | ἀποτ[ε]λέσας ἀφιέρωσον | ἡμέρας γ'. παραθήσεις δὲ αὐτῶν παντοῖα γένη καρπῶν νέων | πόν[α]νά τε ζ', στροβ[ί]λους ζ', τραγημάτων πᾶν γ[έ]νος, λύχνους ἀμιλτώ[τους ζ'] καὶ [τρι]α μικρὰ δίπα[λ]τα, πνακίδας, τόξα, μῆλα φο[ι]νίκια, κρατήρα κεκρ[α]μένον ο[ι]ν[ο]μέλιτι (“When you have completed all this, prepare a three-day consecration. Present to it [Eros] fresh fruits of every variety and seven round-cakes, seven pinecones, every kind of sweetmeats, seven lamps not painted red; also [three] small double-edged knives, votive tablets, a bow and arrows, Phoenician apples, a bowl mixed with honey-wine”). For the meals in *PGM XII.14-95* “perfecting” the figurine: Johnston 2002: 344-358 at 355-356 with n. 30. Johnston's discussion of “perfecting” objects through sacrifices focuses on *PGM IV.26-51*, in which the practitioner's body is “The ‘tool’ that [he] must perfect”. Mankin 1995: 120 compares the boy's meals with those given to Greek scapegoats; *contra*, Watson 2003: 212-213.

with Tantalus (*optat quietem Pelopis infidi pater | egens benignae Tantalus semper dapis*, “Tantalus, the father of treacherous Pelops, prays for | rest, forever desiring the rich meals”, 65-66)⁵³. Tantalus is used as a paradigm for the elegiac lover’s unattainable desires in both Tibullus Book 1 and Propertius Book 1, most explicitly at Tibullus 1.3.77-78⁵⁴:

Tantalus est illic et circum stagna sed acrem
iam iam poturi deserit unda sitim.

And Tantalus is there, and around him the pools, but
now already the wave slides away from his bitter thirst.

Tibullus depicts Tantalus in the pool, unable to drink the water he craves. Propertius 1.9 alludes to the Titan’s punishment in the context of literary polemic with the epicist Ponticus: *nunc tu | insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam* (“now you, madman, are searching for water midstream”, 14-15)⁵⁵. While Horace emphasises the starvation of Canidia’s victim, the desiccation (*aridum*, 37) of his organs parallels the thirst which the elegists foreground⁵⁶. I suggest that we can read the boy’s torture – physically trapped in the ditch and reduced to an implement for Canidia’s spell – as encapsulating the elegiac lover’s amatory *servitium* and his expression of his love and fidelity to his *puella* in terms of his eroticised death and burial⁵⁷. Horace literalises and caricatures the elegiac lover’s connection of his enslavement to a single beloved with magical enchantment and expresses it in terms which are more fitting to his lower iambic invective.

So far, I have highlighted parallels between Canidia’s treatment of her victim and rituals for consecrating Eros assistants, figurines which are

53 — For Tantalus at *Epode* 5.35-36: Mankin 1995: 120; Watson 2003: 213.

54 — On Tibullus 1.3.77-78: Houghton 2007: 158-160. For Tantalus’ applicability to elegiac poetics: Sharrock 1995: 155-156.

55 — Smyth 1949: 123; Baker 1990: 100. Propertius’ allusion to Ixion at 1.9.20 (*et magis infernae vincula nosse rotae*, “and rather be bound to the infernal wheel”) underlines the allusion to Tantalus.

56 — Horace also uses Tantalus in the pool to illustrate misplaced or excessive desires in *Satires* 1.1.68-69 and 1.2.107-108. Freudenburg 1993: 195-197 highlights that Horace connects Tantalus with parody of early Roman love elegy in *Satires* 1.2, where he is mentioned in the context of adulterous love and “vain amorous pursuits” (1.2.101-120) and shortly before an explicit reference to Cornelius Gallus (*illam ‘post paulo’, ‘sed pluris’, ‘si exierit vir’ | Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait . . .*, “that woman [who says] ‘after a short time’, ‘but with more’, ‘if my husband is absent’, she, Philodemus says, is fit for the Galli”, 120-121): “As a plural form of Gallus, couched in a distinctly elegiac context, the expostulation would be heard not only as a reference to the castrated priest of Cybele but also as an allusion to Gallus himself, Rome’s most famous elegiac poet to date and a famous emulator of Callimachus. ‘For the Gauls’, then, becomes ‘For the Galluses’, as a type of woman becomes a type of poetic pursuit”. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for highlighting the significance of *Satires* 1.2 for my argument.

57 — For comparison see Horace *Odes* 2.8.19-20, where Barine’s elegiac suitors are physically unable to leave her house despite their threats.

created to perform a practitioner's bidding. A separate use of wax, lead, or clay figurines occurs in erotic binding spells. The effigies in these rites, which are found bound, pierced, or arranged in pairs alongside written spells or curse-tablets, represent the target of the magic and the intended effects upon them – namely, the torturous symptoms of passionate love⁵⁸. I suggest that Horace combines these two distinct uses of figurines in *Epode 5* so that Canidia's victim embodies the physical effects of elegiac love as though they were the result of magical enchantment, within the framework of a modified ritual for consecrating an Eros assistant.

The final lines of the boy's torture describe his wasted eyes and his fixation upon the food placed in front of him as he dies (*Epode 5.39-40*). I suggest that these features evoke the physical emaciation and sleeplessness which are characteristic of the elegiac lover. At Propertius 1.13.15, the narrator states that love conquers and enfeebles its victims (*vincunt languescere*, "languishing conquered"); at 1.9.27, he stresses that love does not permit its victim to rest his eyes (*quippe ubi non liceat vacuos seducere ocellos*)⁵⁹. Both features are listed in Propertius 1.5 among the torments resulting from the narrator's unrequited love for Cynthia – he declares that love has caused his entire body to be reduced to nothing (*aut cur sim toto corpore nullus ego*, "or why my whole body is reduced to nothing", 22) and claims that Cynthia controls his eyes and denies him sleep (*non tibi iam somnos, non illa relinquet ocellos*, "Now you will not sleep, she will not relinquish your eyes", 11). As discussed above, Propertius 1.5 characterises the experience of elegiac love as equivalent to drinking magic potions (*et bibere e tota toxica Thessalia*, "and to drink all the poison brews of Thessaly", 6) – a statement made early in the elegy, which colours the subsequent narrative with the suggestion of magical enchantment⁶⁰. Horace expands this metaphorical comparison between witchcraft and overwhelming physical attraction into an overtly magical scene, exploiting the similarities between the elegiac symptoms and the effects wished on targets of erotic spells to represent them as caused by a practical magic ritual.

58 — Gager 1992: 15; Graf 1997: 136-141; for the argument that the treatment of statues in amatory magic generated, by means of "persuasive analogy", the same effects in the targets they represented: Faraone 1999: 41-42 and 51-53. For an alternative interpretation of the function of figurines in erotic binding spells and the differences between these figurines and those designed as magical assistants: Collins 2008: 92-103.

59 — *Languescere* is synonymous with *intabescere* (*TLL* s.v. *intabesco*, 2066, 60), used of the disintegration of the child's eyeballs at *Epode 5.40*; the applicability of both verbs to the physical condition of the elegiac lover reinforces Horace's gory representation of elegiac conventions in the murder of the child.

60 — Zetzel 1996: 73-100 at 92-6 demonstrates the prevalence of magical language throughout Propertius 1.5, illustrated by parallels from the *PGM*; see also Fauth 1980: 279-280.

The denial of food, drink, and sleep, as well as physical wasting, were torments regularly wished upon victims of amatory spells. *PGM* IV.1496-1595 (εἰ πίνει, μὴ πινέτω, | εἰ ἐσθίει, μὴ ἐσθιέτω, “if she is drinking, let her not keep drinking, if she is eating, let her not keep eating”, 1515-1516; and εἰ κοιμάται, μὴ κοιμάσθω, “if she is sleeping, let her not keep sleeping”, 1521), and *PGM* XXXVI.134-160 (πεινώσαν, διψώσαν, ὕπνου μὴ τυγχάνουσιν, “let her be hungry, thirsty, let her not find sleep”, 149-153) are two examples of curses which deny victims both nourishment and rest. One second century A.D. erotic curse (Preisendanz Ostrakon 2 = Gager 35) specifically demands that the victim be tormented by “starvation” (ἀσιτω, 35); the spirit invoked at *PGM* XVI.1-75 is repeatedly commanded to make the target “pine and melt away” with passion (ποίησον | φθείνειν καὶ κατατήκεσθαι ... ἐπὶ | τῷ ἔρωτι, 11-12). In *Epode* 5, the torments of starvation and thirst are graphically expressed by the wasting of the boy’s eyeballs (*intabuissent pupulae*, “eyeballs withered away”, 40), and the dehydration of his organs (*medulla et aridum iecur*, “bone marrow and dried out liver” 37); the unrelenting fixation of his eyeballs upon the food (*fixae cibo | ... pupulae*, “eyeballs ... fixed on the food”, 39-40) evokes the insomnia and the single-minded focus on the practitioner of the spell commonly wished upon victims of erotic magic. By highlighting the physical deterioration of the child, Horace lingers upon the grim, visceral reality of magic, creating an iambic adaptation of the elegiac metaphor of magical enchantment.

Erotic deprivation curses aim to cause the target’s “isolation from the land of the living”⁶¹. This is particularly notable for my purposes, as asserting his detachment from the normal course of society is central to the rhetoric of the elegiac lover and he illustrates this through his willing enslavement to his beloved⁶². In *Epode* 5, as I suggested above, the child’s entrapment in the ditch and loss of his emblems of citizenship physically illustrate the lover’s isolation and his domination by his beloved. Horace exploits these similarities between the effects of deprivation curses and the elegiac self-presentation to expose the lover’s self-serving rhetoric and parody his *servitium* in overtly magical terms.

In addition to literalising the metaphorical use of magic in elegy, I suggest that the child’s burial and torture evokes the eroticisation of the narrator’s death and burial in the first books of Tibullus and Propertius. The elegiac lovers repeatedly imagine their death and burial, anxious that they should occur during their love for their mistresses, who will faithfully

61 — Martínez 1995: 358.

62 — Wyke 1989a: 41-3 discusses the elegiac lover’s presentation of his social isolation by emphasising his domination by his mistress; Allen 1950: 264-70 examines the programmatic presentation of a universal experience as unique to the elegiac lover of Propertius 1.1.

perform their funeral rites. The lovers use death as a metaphor for their amatory experiences and to illustrate the strength of their passion and fidelity to their beloveds. Canidia's live inhumation of her victim reworks these elegiac concerns in a representation of literal magic practice, dramatising the elegiac narrator's romanticised equation of love with death and his vision of dying in and through love. I highlight some examples of how love and death are treated in Tibullus' and Propertius' early work before looking at Horace's adaptation of the motif more closely.

Tibullus 1.1 offers an extended vision of the narrator's death (57-68) in which he hopes to see Delia as he dies in her arms (*te spectem suprema mihi cum venerit hora; | te teneam moriens deficiente manu*, "Let me gaze on you when my final hour comes; | as I am dying, let me hold you with my failing hand", 59-60) and imagines her tears and kisses as she places him on his funeral bier (*flebis et arsuro positum me, Delia, lecto, | tristibus et lacrimis oscula mixta dabis*, "You will weep for me, Delia, when I have been placed on the funeral bier, | and you will give me kisses mixed with sad tears", 61-62); echoes of his earlier wish to hold Delia in his arms in bed by the fire (45-48) underline the narrator's eroticisation of his funeral⁶³. The Tibullan lover's envisioned death provides the framework for 1.3: the elegy begins with the narrator lamenting the absence of his mother, his sister, and Delia at his funeral (5-10); the epitaph he recites (55-56) introduces his catabasis into an elegiacised Underworld (57-82). This eroticisation of death features more frequently in Propertius Book 1: the Propertian lover treats this theme in 1.6, 1.14, 1.17, and 1.19. The lover's earliest expression of his devotion to Cynthia as death occurs in 1.4: after stressing Cynthia's beauty, the narrator asserts that she has many more attributes for which he would willingly perish: *haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoris; | sunt maiora quibus, Basse, perire iuvat* ("But this beauty is the smallest part of my frenzy; | she has more qualities, Bassus, for which I would gladly perish", 1.4.11-12)⁶⁴. This may provide a jumping off point for Horace's literalisation of the elegiac lover's equation of love and death in the eroticised burial of Canidia's victim.

Propertius also expresses the elegiac lover's wish for his love to last until his death. In 1.6, the narrator envisions his death and burial in the earth during his continuing devotion to love, equating his demise with

63 — Bright 1978: 129-130; Papanghelis 1987: 53; Bassi 1994: 56-57. For Tibullus' "conflation" of love and death in 1.1: Bassi 1994: 53-61. It is perhaps significant for my elegiac reading of Canidia that the Tibullan narrator's imagined funeral introduces his encouragement to Delia to love him before death comes or old age makes love and elegy unsuitable (1.1.69-74): *iam subrepet iners aetas neque amare decebit | dicere nec cano blanditias capite* ("now useless age will steal up, and it will not be fitting to love, nor to flatter with white hair", 71-72).

64 — On *perire* (1.4.12) meaning "to die from love" and "to be in love": Fedeli 1980: 133; Baker 1990: 54.

his desire through *periere: multi longinquo periere in amore libenter, | in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat* (“many have gladly died in a long-lasting love, may the earth cover me, too, as one among these”, 27-28). Propertius creates the same impression in 1.17, where the lover twice specifies his burial in the ground: firstly, separated from Cynthia following a shipwreck (*haecine parva meum funus harena teget?*, “will this small tract of sand cover my corpse?”, 8); secondly, concluding his vision of Cynthia attending his funeral in Rome at 1.17.19-24 (*ut mihi non ullo pondere terra foret*, “that the earth may not weigh on me at all”, 24). At the beginning of this passage, he imagines his burial taking place during his love for Cynthia (*illic si qua meum sepelissent fata dolorem*, “there if any fates might have buried my love”, 19)⁶⁵. The narrator expresses the wish to remain in love at his death, without reference to burial, at 1.14.14 (*quae maneat, dum me fata perire volent*, “and may they remain until the fates wish that I should perish”). The burial of Canidia’s victim in *Epode 5* – whose slow demise centres around the desire he experiences for the food before him (*longo die ... mutatae dapis | inemori spectaculo*, 33-4) – dramatises elegy’s eroticisation of death. It also evokes the lover’s liminal status in this theme, simultaneously dead and holding the position of poet and narrator⁶⁶. Canidia’s attendance at the boy’s burial, meanwhile, distorts the elegiac lover’s desire for his mistress’ presence at his funeral as an indication of her fidelity and expands his fears on this score as Canidia plunders the child’s remains in pursuit of another man.

The boy’s murder will cause his desire to become distilled into and endure in his remains, echoing the elegiac narrator’s claims of his eternal love and fidelity to his *puella*. Propertius 1.19 is the most developed treatment of this idea in early elegy. The narrator declares that his “great love will cross over the shores of fate” into the Underworld (*traicit et fati litora magnus amor*, 12), and claims that his passion is so strong that it will endure even in his ashes (*non adeo leviter nostris puer haesit ocellis, | ut meus oblito pulvis amore vacet*, “not so lightly has the boy fastened on my eyes | that my ashes should be free from forgotten love”, 5-6). Lines 5-6 evoke the physicality of the lover’s desire which stems from his mistress’ beauty, underlining this through the emphasis on his eyes⁶⁷. Horace adapts the elegiac lover’s emphasis on desire lasting in physical remains to the context of a magic ritual. The boy’s starvation deflates the lover’s eternal fidelity by substituting forbidden and desired food for the mistress, distorting

65 — Baker 1990: 178 notes the equation of *dolor* with elegiac love in 1.17.19.

66 — Flaschenreim 1997: 266 suggests that death metaphorically enables Propertius’ narrator “to have it both ways: to be present in the poem’s discourse and absent in its governing fiction”.

67 — Papanghelis 1987: 12-13; Michels 1955: 175 cites 1.19.6 as exemplifying the physicality of Propertius’ vision of death.

the elegiac expression of fidelity into a magical practice and mocking the lover's desire by indicating that it can be felt as strongly for frequently changed plates of food as for the woman the lover professes to hold above all others.

Propertius 1.19 provides a further parallel for the Horatian boy's torture and imagined return as a vengeful ghost through the narrative of Protesilaus and Laodamia (9-10):

sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis
 Thessalus antiquam venerat umbra domum.
 But desiring to touch his delight with false hands,
 the Thessalian came as a shade to his former home.

Propertius stresses Protesilaus' carnal desire for Laodamia (9), whom his ethereal form renders him unable to touch. The returning ghost acts as a model for the narrator, illustrating Propertius' passion for, and separation from, Cynthia, as well as his eternal love for her⁶⁸. In *Epode 5*, Horace presents the child in the ditch as one similarly stranded between life and death and unable to reach the object of his desire (39). The continuation of the child's spirit after death as an ἄωρος or a βαιοθάνατος – those who have died prematurely or violently – for Canidia to control also echoes the returned Protesilaus; unlike the Propertian ghost, who remains desirous of the woman he cannot touch, the child's closing curses threaten that his spirit will return and assail the witches in their sleep: *petamque voltus umbra curvis unguibus, | quae vis deorum est Manium, | et inquietis assidens praecordiis | pavore somnos auferam* ("as a ghost I will attack your faces with my curved claws, | – such is the power of the gods below – | and perching on your anxious hearts | I will snatch away your sleep with fear", 93-96). The boy's resistance to this fate in his closing curses highlight the difference between slavish elegiac devotion and iambic aggression.

To close this section, I would like to return briefly to Propertius 1.4 and 1.5. I have suggested that the child's torture in *Epode 5* literalises the symptoms of elegiac love which the narrator of Propertius 1.5 expresses in magical terms, picking up on the lover's emaciation, sleeplessness, and fixation on his beloved. I have also highlighted the close link between Propertius 1.5 and 1.4 which creates the initial impression that "Bassus" is the imagined victim of Cynthia's erotic magic in 1.5. In 1.4, the narrator threatens Bassus with unbridled defamation by Cynthia, who will adopt the role of the iambist, and with his consequent exclusion from the girls of Rome (17-22). At lines 17-18, Propertius' narrator highlights the expansive range of Cynthia's potential abuse: *haec insana puella | ... tibi*

68 — Papanghelis 1987: 11-12; see also Lyne 1998: 210 and Boyle 1974: 903.

non tacitis vocibus hostis erit ("this crazy girl | ... will be an enemy to you with no quiet words"). Instead of offering Cynthia's speech, however, the narrator outlines his mistress' extensive efforts to retain his love before praying that she will never change and reaffirming his devotion (27-28). I suggest that we can read Canidia's speech in the *Epodes* as filling the gap in Propertius 1.4 by giving the Propertian lover – and the poet himself – a taste of a real iambic *puella* at home in her own genre. The Horatian narrator's introduction of Canidia's speech in *Epode 5 – quid dixit aut quid tacuit?* ... ("what did she say, or what did she keep silent? ...", 49) – picks up the verbal cue at Propertius 1.4.17-18, introducing the witch's monologue as simultaneously a response to his elegiac contemporary and a characterisation of his iambic. Canidia's demand that Night and Diana direct their divine wrath towards keeping Varus, her enemy (*hostilis*, 53), from the doors and the beds of other women shows her attempting to carry out the slanderous actions of Cynthia only imagined in 1.4; at the same time, Canidia's incapability of barring doors to Varus responds to Propertius' characterisation of his poetic magic as perennially ineffective in love, showing this failure in action. Canidia's uncensored words also reflect both the tendency of iambic to concentrate on low subject matter that would otherwise be unspeakable and the particular concerns with impotence in the *Epodes*, which are illustrated in the narrative of *Epode 5* by the inability of her magic to control Varus and in the final curses of the boy⁶⁹. While *Epode 5* begins to fill the gap of the elegiac *puella*'s unwritten invective, it is *Epode 17*, in which Canidia takes over as speaker in the second half of the poem and ultimately closes the book of *Epodes*, which develops this engagement with contemporary love elegy.

Epode 17 is a dialogue between a male poet and Canidia: in the first half, the poet prays for release from Canidia's magic and offers to recant his earlier insults of her character (1-52); in the second, Canidia rejects his appeals and promises that she will torment him for eternity with her magic in revenge for his slander (53-81). Previous scholarship has proposed a range of metapoetic readings of *Epode 17*. Barchiesi argues that *Epode 17* treats the "principles of iambic poetry and its effects", among which magic is prominent: the poet and Canidia employ iambic spells against one another and both embody the genre – in the narrator's case, thanks to Canidia's magic. Through the symmetry of the poet and the witch, Horace demonstrates the tendency of iambic verse to be as harmful to the practitioner as to its victim. Barchiesi also suggests, in keeping with the theme of reversability which he traces through the poem, that

69 — Oliensis 1998: 97 highlights that *quid dixit aut quid tacuit* (*Epode 5.49*) could equally well characterise Horace's invective in *Epodes 8* and *12* and connects the "inability to repress speech" with *impotentia* in the *Epodes*.

the introduction of the Cotyia (*Epode* 17.56) – a festival which involved male transvestism – raises the possibility that Canidia is Horace in drag, a figure through whom the iambic poet speaks but who also has the power to problematise his words⁷⁰. Spina's metaliterary interpretation draws out a similar chiasmic relationship between Horace and Canidia and suggests that the content and structure of *Epode* 17 emphasises the variety of genres, styles, and traditions – Archilochean, Alexandrian, and Neoteric – which Horace experiments with in the *Epodes*⁷¹. The power and effectiveness of poetry is central to *Epode* 17, which presents the poet's *carmina* as magic incantations – a performative category of verse which, like iambic, aims to have tangible influence on the world – before raising doubts about their capabilities in the closing lines⁷².

Johnson's metapoetic reading acknowledges the significance of elegy in the second half of the *Epodes*. Johnson argues that Horace's speech in the first half of *Epode* 17 tries to engage Canidia through epic, lyric, and elegy, reflecting the variety of genres in *Epodes* 11-16 and concluding the book by anticipating Horace's lyric. Johnson reads the narrator's mental and physical torments at *Epode* 17.21-26 as characterising him as an elegiac lover addressing Canidia as his beloved; Johnson, however, focuses only on the first half of *Epode* 17 and does not comment on elegiac elements in Canidia's response⁷³. Bushala also identifies elegiac resonances in the poem: after arguing that the male narrator is Canidia's lover and the victim of her erotic magic, Bushala closes his article by quoting E. K. Rand's suggestion that *Epode* 11 “laughs prophetically forward at” Propertius and Tibullus and proposing that *Epode* 17 ridicules the “enclosed, absurd, and morbid world” of Roman elegy and the lover's anguished relationships with an “uncanny, voracious Charybdis-Cimaera”⁷⁴. I develop these readings of elegy to argue that Horace literalises the metaphorical use of magic in elegy to parody the dynamics of the elegiac relationship across *Epode* 17 and, by making this a framework for the final poem of the book, to illustrate the integration of love elegy into his iambic.

In *Epode* 17, I suggest, Horace draws on the connection between age and poetic immortality in early elegy which is expressed through the elegiac lover's idealised future with his *puella*. The lover wishes for a fai-

70 — Barchiesi 1994b: 216-217; Barchiesi 1995: 341. Spina 1993: 181 expresses reservations about a similar interpretation. For the link between Horace and Canidia ensuring their “mutual destruction”: Heyworth 1993: 92-93.

71 — Spina 1993: 163-188.

72 — On *Epode* 17, magic, and poetic power: Barchiesi 1994b: 205-217; Lowrie 2009: 108-110.

73 — Johnson 2012: 163-179.

74 — Bushala 1968: 9-10, citing Rand E. K. (1937), “Horace and the spirit of comedy”, *The Rice Institute pamphlet* 24.2, 51-52; Johnson 2012: 167-168.

thful relationship with his *puella* which will last until their old age, even though his mistress rarely reciprocates his affection and is rarely loyal to him. This concern with love lasting into old age features in both Tibullus Book 1 and Propertius Book 1. In Tibullus 1.6, the narrator concludes his lament over Delia's deceitfulness and infidelity (1-36), his promises to submit to punishments from his mistress if he mistreats her (43-74), and his predictions of an old age of loneliness, poverty, and mockery for unfaithful women (75-84) by wishing that "these may be curses for other couples" and that he and Delia "may be a model of love in our old age": *haec aliis maledicta cadant. nos, Delia, amoris | exemplum cana simul uterque coma* (85-86). Propertius expresses a similar sentiment in the closing lines of 1.8B. The narrator celebrates Cynthia's positive response to his elegiac prayers and seductions and the fidelity to him that she has proven by refusing to accompany a rival to Illyria (1.8B.1-45) as she had threatened to do in 1.8A. He concludes by declaring that nobody will steal his love, "a boast which will last into my old age": *ista meam norit gloria canitiem* (46). On a metapoetic level, the theme of age and lasting love comments on poetic immortality. Propertius 1.8A and B dramatise the power of Propertius' elegiac seductions by showing that they can successfully persuade Cynthia to stay with him in Rome, and the imagery of old age and the poet's own catasterism (*nunc mihi summa licet contingere sidera plantis*, "now I may touch the highest stars with the soles of my feet", 1.8B.43) predict the lasting fame of Propertius' elegy⁷⁵. Tibullus 1.6 concludes the Delia elegies of Book 1: ending this sequence on the theme of love lasting into old age again gives the lover's wish an undertone of literary achievement and longevity. It is, of course, ironic that although the lovers imagine sharing their old age with their mistresses, the fame that Propertius, Tibullus, and their work will enjoy through the ages will depend on, and preserve, the immortal youth and beauty of the fictional lover and his beloved.

Horace, I argue, exploits this irony to parody the dynamics of the elegiac relationship in *Epode 17* in terms which reflect the characteristics of his iambic and the enduring power and fame of his *Epodes*. Through Canidia, Horace grants the elegiac lovers' wish for a faithful mistress to share their old age, but he gives them one whose old age and ugliness compel her to use magic to bind them to her: *Epode 17* inverts elegiac dynamics by reversing the *exclusus amator's* pleas for admittance and presenting the narrator as begging for release from Canidia's spells which prolong his amatory torture. Through this, Horace again literalises the elegiac metaphor of magically enchanting beauty, playing on erotic curses

75 — Stroh 1971: 36-54; Pasoli 1977: 101-111; Zetzel 1996: 97-99. On 1.8B.46: Pasoli 1977: 109; Coutelle 2005: 222-225.

which wish that their targets should love the practitioners for the rest of their lives and using this to illustrate the potency and longevity of the *Epodes* and the importance of elegy to his iambic⁷⁶.

The opening lines of *Epode* 17 introduce this connection between elegy and magic (1-7):

iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae
 supplex et oro regna per Proserpinae,
 per et Dianae non movenda numina,
 per atque libros carminum valentium
 refixa caelo devocare sidera,
 Canidia, parce vocibus tandem sacris
 citumque retro solve, solve turbinem.

As I suppliant, I surrender now to your powerful
 knowledge, and by the kingdom of Proserpina,
 and by the divine authority of Diana, which is not to be provoked
 rashly,
 and by the books of spells which have the strength
 to call down the loosened stars from the sky, I beg you,
 Canidia, stop your sacred words at last
 and reverse, reverse your swift top.

Supplex (“suppliant”, 2) characterises the iambic narrator in elegiac terms, evoking the *exclusus amator* prostrate at his mistress’ threshold⁷⁷. The reason for the narrator’s supplication, however, is not to seduce his *puella* but to beg Canidia to release him from her erotic magic: her *carmina* and her *turbo* (“top”)⁷⁸. Tibullus uses the image of a spinning top to metaphorically illustrate the *servitium* and madness of elegiac love in the opening lines of elegy 1.5, where the narrator recants his previous harsh words towards Delia and his desire to end their relationship (1-8):

asper eram et bene discidium me ferre loquebar,
 at mihi nunc longe gloria fortis abest;
 namque agor ut per plana citus sola verberare turben
 quem celer assueta versat ab arte puer.
 ure ferum et torque, libeat ne dicere quicquam
 magnificum posthac: horrida verba doma.

76 — One explicit example of this wish exists in a fourth-century A.D. curse-tablet from Pella, in which the practitioner requests that she and her beloved “grow old together” (συνκαταγηράσαι, Voutiras 1998 line 5).

77 — For the *exclusus amator* as *supplex* in the first collections of Propertius and Tibullus: Propertius 1.9.3 and 1.16.4; Tibullus 1.2.87, 1.4.72.

78 — For the *turbo* used in place of *rhombus* or ἰσχυξ (both terms for a magic wheel) here: Watson 2003: 545-546. For a survey of the debate over the identification and function of the *rhombus*, *turbo*, and ἰσχυξ: Faraone 1999: 63 n. 102.

parce tamen per te furtivi foedera lecti
per Venerem quaeso compositumque caput.

I was harsh and I said that I was bearing our separation well,
but now my courageous pride is long gone;
for I am driven like a swift top whipped across level ground,
which a nimble boy spins with his accomplished skill.
Burn and torture the wild beast, so that he will not want to say any-
thing
proud in future: tame his savage words
but spare me, by the pacts of our stolen bed,
by Venus, and, I beg, by the head that lay together with mine.

I suggest that Horace evokes the elegiac imagery of madness and servile punishment in the context of magic in *Epode* 17, literalising the elegiac lover's metaphorical illustration of his mental and physical suffering and parodying this by having his iambic narrator beg for release from Canidia's spells rather than demanding further punishment⁷⁹. Horace also suggests the limitations of Canidia's power here: *Epode* 17.1 echoes Canidia's declaration that a stronger witch must be controlling Varus at *Epode* 5.71-72 (*a, a, solutus ambulat veneficae | scientoris carmine!*, "Ah, ah, he walks free by the spell of a more knowledgeable witch!"). By recalling the weakness of Canidia's magic, Horace undermines the seriousness of the narrator's surrender in *Epode* 17 and brings out the humour in the elegiac lover's submission to a metaphorical magic which he himself attributes to his mistress⁸⁰.

The physical and emotional effects of Canidia's magic on the narrator of *Epode* 17 continue to literalise the elegiac metaphor of magic (21-27):

fugit iuventas et verecundus color,
relinquor ossa pelle amicta lurida,
tuis capillus albus est odoribus;
nullum a labore me reclinat otium,
urget diem nox et dies noctem neque est
levare tenta spiritu praecordia.

My youth and my boyish complexion have fled,
I am left as bones clothed in sallow skin,

79 — There are several correspondences between *Epode* 17.1-7 and Tibullus 1.5.1-8. *turbinem* (*Epode* 17.7) echoes the unusual form *turben* at Tibullus 1.5.3; both passages emphasise the speed of the top using a form of *citus* ("quick") (Tibullus 1.5.3; *Epode* 17.7); both narrators appeal for mercy in similar terms (1.5.7; *Epode* 17.6); both passages use the anaphoric *per* ("for") to evoke hymns (1.5.7-8; *Epode* 17.2-5). Cairns 1978: 546-552 and Cairns 1979: 168-171 highlight parallels between *Epode* 17 and Tibullus 1.5, focusing on the palinode element in both poems. For *turben*: Murgatroyd 1980: 162; Maltby 2002: 242.

80 — For *Epode* 17.1 recalling *Epode* 5.71-72: Johnson 2012: 165.

my hair is white thanks to your magic odours;
 no respite releases me from my pain,
 night presses on day and day on night and it is not possible
 relieve my tight chest with breath.

The narrator's pallor (21-22), emaciation (22), insomnia (24-25), wretchedness (27), and light breathing (26) evoke the elegiac lover; in the following line (27), the narrator describes himself as *miser* ("wretched"), a term which is virtually programmatic of the lover in early elegy⁸¹. In addition to the effects of the curses I discussed above in connection with *Epode* 5, erotic curses frequently demand that their victims become pale and suffer torments day and night⁸². While extant curses focus on their targets' breathing only occasionally⁸³, light breathing is a characteristic of the elegiac *exclusus amator* which Horace also parodies in *Epode* 11: *latere petitus imo spiritus* ("the breath sought by my deepest lung", 10)⁸⁴. *spiritus* is used for breath only in *Epodes* 11 and 17 and this echo reinforces the element of elegiac parody – this time in connection with the metaphorical use of magic in the genre – in the narrator's symptoms in *Epode* 17. As I highlighted above, the narrator's appearance in these lines also embodies the characteristics of iambic poetry. The victim of Canidia's magic in *Epode* 17, therefore, blends the elegiac and iambic elements which were kept separate in the words of the boy which framed *Epode* 5 and embodies the enrichment of Horace's iambic with contemporary elegy.

Epode 17.21-27 contains further echoes of *Epode* 11 which reinforce this reading of Canidia's victim. The narrator of *Epode* 17 laments the loss of his *verecundus color* ("boyish complexion", 21) which recalls *inverecundus deus* ("shameless god") at *Epode* 11.13. Although *inverecundus* describes Bacchus, it also characterises the effect of the undiluted wine on the narrator (*fervidiore mero arcana promorat loco*, "coaxed out my secrets with fiery wine", 11.14). The repetition of *verecundus* in *Epode* 17.21,

81 — On *miser* indicating an amatory context at *Epode* 17.27: Bushala 1968: 8. *miser* appears elsewhere in the *Epodes* only of Maecenas' amatory misery at 14.13, underling the erotic meaning in *Epode* 17. For *miser* and the elegiac lover: Allen 1950: 258-560.

82 — *Suppl. Mag.* 42.16; *PGM* XVIIa.10-12. Barchiesi 1994b: 214-215 n. 31 quotes *PGM* 4.1496 and Audolent [*DT*] 270 as parallels for the narrator's torments in *Epode* 17. Watson 2003: 534-584 argues for a non-erotic reading of magic in *Epode* 17.

83 — *PGM* IV.149 ("I will bewitch her breath ... until she comes to me"); *PDM* xiv.655-65 includes the lungs of the victim among the places of her body to be burnt (Johnson H. J. (tr.), in Betz 1986: 231). Breathing occurs in Jordan 1985 7 and 8, erotic curses for separation: Jordan 1985: 223-227; Jordan 1985: 251-255 Inv. No. 1737 is a possible curse for erotic attraction which targets the victim's lungs and complexion. For non-erotic curses affecting a target's breathing: Watson 2003: 556.

84 — Tibullus 1.8.57-58 (*ut lenis agatur* | *spiritus*, "how breath is drawn softly"); Propertius 1.9.32 (*spiritus iste levis*, "light puff of breath that you are"). Mankin 1995: 198, citing Propertius 1.16.32 and Horace *Epode* 11.10, notes that Propertius and Horace are the earliest extant poets to use *spiritus* in this way. *Contra*: Watson 2003: 556.

the sole parallel in the *Epodes*, prompts the reader to recall Horace's earlier recasting of elegy in iambic terms in *Epode* 11⁸⁵. I suggest that the significance of these adjectives for engaging with contemporary elegy can be pressed further. *verecundus* and *inverecundus* connote moral as well as physical characteristics: the narrator's loss of his youth and *verecundus color* since coming into contact with Canidia evokes the shamelessness (*nequitia*) which characterises the elegiac lover and his experiences. The Gallus fragment from Qaṣr Ibrîm suggests that *nequitia* was central to love elegy from the genre's earliest appearance⁸⁶. *nequitia* and shamelessness feature prominently in the first elegies of Propertius and Tibullus. The narrator of Propertius 1.1, for example, claims that love for Cynthia has caused him to lose his moral purity and propriety (*tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus*, 3) and to live aimlessly and senselessly (*et nullo vivere consilio*, 6)⁸⁷. In Tibullus 1.1, the lover's *nequitia* is indicated by his desire to remain "lazy and idle" in love with Delia (*segnis inersque*, 58)⁸⁸. In *Epode* 17, the iambic narrator's loss of modesty literalises the elegiac metaphor of magic enchantment by echoing the demand of erotic spells that their targets come "without shame" to the practitioners (*PGM* XVIIa.21), shifting the emphasis from the effect of the woman's beauty to her erotic magic and amplifying the elegiac narrator's characterisation of his experience as negative. In addition to reinforcing the elegiac element in *Epode* 17, the echoes of *Epode* 11 in the final poem of the *Epodes* draw together Horace's engagement with elegy across the book to cement this genre's role as a constituent element of his iambic.

Canidia's reply continues to literalise the metaphorical application of magic to the elegiac mistress. It also, I argue, finally fills the gap left by Cynthia's suppressed iambic words in Propertius 1.4 by presenting, at the climax of the *Epodes*, the fully-fledged iambic curses of Horace's anti-elegiac *puella*⁸⁹. This elegiac element to Canidia is established at the beginning of her monologue, where she proclaims that she is deaf to her victim's pleas: *quid obseratis auribus fundis preces?* ("Why do you pour forth prayers to bolted ears?", 53). The description of her ears as "bolted" evokes the elegiac *paraclausithyron*, creating a witty reversal of the elegiac beloved by refusing to listen to pleas for escape rather than for entry. Canidia goes on to illustrate her unresponsiveness by comparing herself

85 — For correspondences between *Epode* 17.30 and *Epode* 11.4 and 11.27 underlining the amatory, though not elegiac, theme of *Epode* 17: Schmidt 1990: 158 n. 116.

86 — Anderson *et al.* 1979: 140; Sharrock 2013: 151.

87 — *OLD* s.v. *constans* 1b and 4a. Stahl 1985: 33-34 discusses the emphasis on moral purity at 1.1.3-4.

88 — Gardiner 2013: 88-91.

89 — I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments on the relevance of *Epode* 17 for Cynthia's suppressed iambic speech and the significance of *Epode* 17 for my argument.

to a rock which will never hear the prayers of sailors battered by Neptune (54-55), drawing out the hard characters of the elegiac *puellae* implicit in their etymological links with the mountains Cynthus and Pholoe⁹⁰.

After assuring the narrator that magic will not help him (60-61), Canidia promises that his punishments will last for eternity (62-69):

sed tardiora fata te votis manent:
 ingrata misero vita ducenda est in hoc,
 novis ut usque suppetas laboribus.
 optat quietem Pelopis infidi pater
 egens benignae Tantalus semper dapis,
 optat Prometheus obligatus aliti,
 optat supremo collocare Sisyphus
 in monte saxum: sed vetant leges Iovis.

However, a slower death waits for you than you would wish:
 your wretched life is to be drawn out by this misery,
 so that you will be constantly available for new sufferings.
 Tantalus, the father of treacherous Pelops, prays for
 rest, forever desiring the rich meals,
 Prometheus, bound for the bird, prays,
 Sisyphus prays to erect his rock
 on the mountain top: but Jove's laws forbid it.

Barchiesi has highlighted that the sinners' punishments which Canidia lists here regularly symbolise insatiable desire⁹¹. Tantalus' prominent position at the beginning of this catalogue (65-66) recalls the burial and starvation of the boy at *Epode* 5.35-36, particularly as, here, Horace chooses the alternative tradition of Tantalus' torment and represents him as unable to reach "food" (*dapis* (66), echoing *dapis* at *Epode* 5.33) rather than water. This is underlined by the reference to Prometheus (67), where the mention of the bird alludes to its consumption of his liver: Canidia's future punishment of the narrator of *Epode* 17 recalls her harvesting of the boy's liver for her erotic ritual and her revenge against Varus in *Epode* 5. This echo of the boy's tantalisation in *Epode* 5 reinforces Horace's literalisation of the elegiac lover's experience through magic in *Epode* 17 and continues to draw together the threads of Horace's engagement with elegy across the *Epodes*.

Epode 17.65-69 also plays on the elegiac motif of love extending beyond death. I suggest that Canidia's list of eternal torments at lines 62-69 evokes the repeated wishes of erotic spells that the practitioners may control

90 — Spina 1993: 176. For Cynthia, Delia, and Cynthus: Maltby 2002: 43; for Pholoe: Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 373.

91 — Barchiesi 1994b: 214-215 n. 31.

their targets for eternity (ποίησον τὴν δεῖνα | ἀγρυπνοῦσάν μοι διὰ παντὸς [αἰῶνοσ], “make her lie awake for me through all eternity”, *PGM* IV.2965-2966) or for a lifetime (ὑποτεταγμένην εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς μου, “submitting herself [to me] for the entire time of my life”, *Suppl. Mag.* 47.26). *PGM* XVI.1-75 includes a formulation of this wish which is particularly pertinent for *Epode* 17: the practitioner demands that their victim conform to their will and love them “until he reaches Hades” (ἕως ὅτ[αν εἰ]ς [Ἄδ]ην ἀφίκηται, 16)⁹². This evocation of contemporary magic ritual continues to literalise the elegiac lovers’ passion and their eroticisation of death in ways that are similar to those which I have identified in *Epode* 5, reinforcing the elegiac parody in both poems.

The eternal punishments in these lines pick up the thread of poetic immortality in *Epode* 17, developing the paradox of this theme in love-elegy in terms suited to Horace’s work. As I highlighted above, the narrators of Tibullus 1.6 and Propertius 1.8B predict that their happy, faithful relationships with their mistresses will last into their old age; while the fame of each book will grow as the years pass, however, the lovers and their *puellae* will remain young and beautiful and their idealised future relationship will remain forever out of the lover’s reach. Canidia, by contrast, is already old and unattractive; she has accelerated her victim’s age to match her own (*Epode* 17.21-27) and her spells will keep the aged poet alive forever in eternal torture. Canidia’s focus on punishment expands the element of revenge which remains suppressed in the elegiac *puellae* of Propertius Book 1 and Tibullus Book 1 but which is a central component of the iambic genre. This reversal also allows Horace to use the same imagery of old age and immortality to illustrate the longevity of his iambic collection and its fame.

Poetic power is the focus of the final lines of *Epode* 17 (76-81):

an quae movere cereas imagines,
 ut ipse nosti curiosus, et polo
 deripere lunam vocibus possim meis,
 possim crematos excitare mortuos
 desiderique temperare pocula,
 plorem artis in te nil agentis exitus?

Or will I, a woman who manipulates wax figurines,
 as you discovered by prying, and can
 tear the moon down from the heavens with my words,
 can rouse the cremated dead
 and can concoct love-potions,
 lament because the results of my skills are useless against you?

92 — For a non-amatory reading of *Epode* 17.62-69: Watson 2003: 536-537 and 578.

Canidia concludes the poem, and the *Epodes*, by cataloguing the powers of her magic. Her list reflects the rituals that she has performed in *Epode* 5, in *Epode* 17, and, beyond the *Epodes*, in Horace's *Satires* 1.8⁹³. She also claims for herself the power to draw down the moon (78), which, in *Epode* 5, was attributed to her accomplice, Folia (*Epode* 5.45-46). This expresses the power of Horace's poetry in terms which are suited to a genre that is rooted in magic, revenge, and attack, as underlined by Canidia's control of the moon⁹⁴. In elegy, the ability to draw down the moon (*deducere lunam*) represents the composition of the elegiac text. Unlike *deduco*, *deripio* ("tear", *Epode* 5.46 and 17.78) has no literary connotations. It does, however, reflect the speed and violence associated with the iambic metre and subject matter⁹⁵. The balanced and chiasmic structure of *Epode* 17, alongside the theme of magic which runs through it, tightens the association of poet and witch; by the final lines, they speak as one voice, an impression underlined by the iambic poet's lack of response to Canidia's speech⁹⁶. At the same time, Canidia's last question and the repeated subjunctive *possim* ("can", 78-79) destabilise the power of her erotic magic, recalling the limitations which she acknowledges at *Epode* 5.71-72 and which are implied by the echo of these lines at the beginning of *Epode* 17.

93 — *Epode* 17.76 and 79 allude to Canidia calling forth the spirits of the dead at *Satires* 1.8.28-29 and her manipulation of wax figurines as part of her erotic ritual at *Satires* 1.8.30-33 and 43-44. In *Satires* 1.8, Horace uses Canidia and Sagana to define his satiric programme, embodying the invective attack of Lucilian satire against which Horace characterises the focus of his own satire on laughter, defence, and community whilst also highlighting – through Priapus' invective against Canidia – the similarity between the satirist, his targets, and the tradition of Lucilian invective which he tries to distance himself from. For discussion of *Satires* 1.8 and Horace's poetic programme in *Satires* 1: Anderson 1972; Schlegel 2005: 98-107; Oliensis 1998: 68-72, in connection with Horace's poetics in the *Epodes*. Alluding to *Satires* 1.8 in the conclusion of the *Epodes* underlines the simultaneous use of elegy for Horace's definition of his iambic and his innovation of the Roman genre by incorporating elegy. In light of the emphasis on raising the dead and lament in *Epodes* 17.76-81 and *Satires* 1.8.25 (*ululantem*, "wailing"), 28-29, and 41 (*triste*, "sad") and Horace's parody of Gallan elegy in *Satires* 1.2, it may also be possible to read Horace as engaging with elegy through magic and Canidia in *Satires* 1.8, too. If so, the echoes of *Satires* 1.8 in *Epode* 17.76-81 would reinforce Horace's incorporation of elegy into his poetic programme in the *Epodes*. The setting of *Satires* 1.8 on Maecenas' gardens on the Esquiline may also be picked up in Propertius' later elegies 3.23 (*dominum Esquilis scribe habitare tuum*, "write that your master lives on the Esquiline", 24), a poem in which he imagines Cynthia accusing him of slandering her (*an tu | non bona de nobis crimina ficta iacis?*, "or are you hurling wicked slanders against me?", 13-14), and 4.8, in which Cynthia attacks Propertius after finding him on the Esquiline in Maecenas' gardens (*Esquilias ... aquosas | ... vicina novis ... agris*, "the lush Esquiline | ... in the neighbourhood of the new gardens" 1-2) in the company of other women.

94 — Lowrie 2009: 108-109 notes that *Epode* 17.81 relates Canidia's abilities to "iambic effectiveness" but does not relate the witch's powers to Horace's poetry.

95 — For Horace's unique use of *deripio* at *Epode* 5.46: Ingallina 1977: 136-138 and Watson 2003: 220, noting that the verb introduces "a violence ... normally absent from the procedure".

96 — Oliensis 1998: 95-96 reads Horace's silence at the end of *Epode* 17 as the reassertion of masculine self-control after the *impotentia* of invective throughout the *Epodes*.

I suggest that the evocation of the elegiac connection between magic and poetry in Canidia's final lines has two functions. First, it literalises the metaphorical connection between magic, the *puella*, and the poetic text in early elegy to define Horace's iambic poetics in contrast to this genre through the figure of Canidia. Second, it concludes the *Epodes* with the blending of elegy, magic, and iambic that I have traced through *Epodes* 5 and 17. This is underlined by the emphatically placed *plorem* ("lament", 81) which brings to mind both elegy's connection with unsuccessful lament and the iambic narrator's question at the end of *Epode* 6: *an si quis atro dente me petiverit, | inultus ut flebo puer?*, ("and if anyone attacks me with a black tooth, I will weep like a boy unavenged?", 15-16). Horace evokes both the enchanting power and the failure of erotic magic in elegy to underline the questions of poetic power, *impotentia*, and masculinity that run through the *Epodes* and which remain unresolved, and literally unanswered, at the climax of the book, illustrating that elegy's treatment of magic and gender is fundamental to defining and constructing his unique brand of Roman iambic.

Conclusion

I conclude by drawing together the implications of my discussion for reading early love elegy and for Horace's *Epodes*. In the narrative of the elegiac affair, the lover uses the metaphor of magic to simultaneously compliment his *puella's* beauty and imply that she has used magic to cause his obsession with her. This self-serving insinuation highlights the ambivalence in his feelings towards her and towards his voluntary submission to elegiac *servitium*, characterising him as a hypocritical lover and as a fallible and untrustworthy narrator. The expression of the *puella's* attractiveness in terms of magical enchantment in Propertian and Tibullan elegy also functions metapoetically: the attribution of magic power to the girls who embody the elegiac text complements elegy's self-construction as an erotic spell which is designed to seduce the *puella*. Connecting magic with the *puella's* beauty gives a physical dimension to the enchanting effects of poetry and its influence over the lover and poet as well as the extratextual audience. This three-way relationship between magic, elegy, and the *puella* in the earliest extant collections of Latin love elegy provides new evidence for the importance of magic as a central metaphor of the genre.

Recognising the connection of the *puella's* beauty with magic in early elegy also opens a new avenue for reading the figure of the *scripta puella* and the motif of magic as means of communication between poetic genres – dramatising literary polemic through female personifications of

the poetic text who are associated with witchcraft⁹⁷. My interpretation of Horace's *Epodes* 5 and 17 as responding to Propertius' and Tibullus' first books illustrates this use of the motif and its importance from the very beginning of the elegiac genre as we have it, and testifies to a contemporary awareness of the metaliterary dimension to the *puella's* magical attractiveness. As an inversion of the elegiac *puellae*, Canidia replaces their metaphorically bewitching beauty with literal erotic rituals, embodying the negative view of the elegiac mistresses which lies beneath their lovers' flattery. Horace's exaggeration of this subtext indicates that it was an aspect of early Tibullan and Propertian love elegy which was not only recognisable to a contemporary audience, but which was central enough to the presentation of the *puellae* to merit him targeting it as part of his engagement with this genre. Readers returning to the elegies in light of Horace's work would no doubt bring an extra awareness of this subtext and would perceive more keenly the irony and humour in the elegiac lover's character and relationship with his *puella*.

So far, I have focused on the implications of this dialogue for reading magic and the mistress in Propertius and Tibullus. The question now is: what impact does this engagement with elegy have on Canidia and on Horace's *Epodes* more broadly? I suggest an answer to this by posing a second question: why is Canidia a woman, rather than a male personification of genre or victim of iambic aggression in the vein of Lycambes and Bupalus, the targets of Horace's Greek predecessors Archilochus and Hipponax, or even Ovid's later Ibis? Several answers to this present themselves: misogyny is a prominent element of iambic; laughter provoked by the lewd behaviour of elderly women is associated with the roots of the genre; the contemporary political climate associated Rome's chaotic state with licentious, "masculine" women⁹⁸. Based on the interaction I have traced between the *Epodes* and Tibullan and Propertian elegy, it is possible to add a more specific, literary reason: that Canidia, as much as being a positive embodiment of Horatian iambic, is composed as a pointedly anti-elegiac *puella*. Horace's Canidia and her companions vividly expose the grim "reality" behind the elegiac appeal to witchcraft and de-romanticise the metaphorical application of magic power to the *puella*, using this parody to define and enrich the iambic poetics of the *Epodes*. Instead of detracting from Canidia's independence and originality as a literary entity, reading her as constructed symbiotically with the female beloveds of

97 — For a similar use of female personifications of genre in Ovid *Amores* 3.1: Wyke 1989b: 113-143 (esp. 118-124).

98 — For old women as the targets of invective in Roman satire: Richlin 1983 and 1984. For the association between the health of the state and female conduct influencing witch-figures in Augustan literature, with reference to Horace *Epodes* 5 and 17: Stratton 2007: 71-105; for Canidia as a personification of Rome: Mankin 1995: 301.

Propertius and Tibullus adds a new dimension to Horace's witch and, by extension, to his *Epodes*. Canidia's inversion of the elegiac *puella* necessarily incorporates the generic characteristics she reverses and rejects, uniting both traditions to embody the literary variety of Horace's iambic.

Bibliography

- Ahl F. M., (1974), "Propertius 1, 1", *Wiener Studien* 8, 80-98.
- Allen A. W., (1950), "Elegy and the Classical Attitude Toward Love: Propertius I, 1", *Yale Classical Studies* 11, 255-277.
- Anderson W. S., (1972), "The Form, Purpose, and Position of Horace's *Satire* I, 8", *The American Journal of Philology* 93.1, 4-13.
- Anderson R. D., Parsons P. J. and Nisbet R. G. M., (1979), "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrîm", *Journal of Roman Studies* 69, 125-155.
- Andrisano A. M., (2012), "Multiple Models and Horace: *Epodes* 1, 3 and 5", in Cairns F. (ed.), *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar Fifteenth Volume*, ARCA 51, Cambridge, 285-302.
- Baker R. J., (1970), "*Laus in amore mori*: Love and Death in Propertius", *Latomus* 29.3, 670-698.
- (ed.) (tr.), (1990), *Propertius I*, Armindale.
- Ball R. J., (1994), "*Albi, Ne Doleas*: Horace and Tibullus", *Classical World* 87.5, 409-414.
- Barchiesi A., (1994a), "Alcune difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico. Giambo ed elegia nell' epodo XI", in Tovar R.C. and Corte J. C. F. (eds.), *Bimilenario de Horacio [ponencias del Congreso celebrado en Salamanca en 1992]*, Salamanca, 127-138.
- (1994b), "Ultime difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico: L'epodo XVII", in Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni del Bimillenario della Morte di Q. Orazio Flacco (ed.), *Atti dei convegni di Venosa Napoli Roma novembre 1993*, Venosa, 205-217.
- (1995), "Poetica di un mito sessuale: la strega giambica", in Raffaelli R. (ed.), *Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma: atti del convegno, Pesaro, 28-30 aprile 1994*, Ancona, 335-342.
- (2001), "Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian", in Cavarzere A., Aloni A. and Barchiesi A. (eds.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Lanham, 141-164.
- (2002), "Palingenre: Death, Rebirth and Horatian Iambos", in Paschalis M. (ed.), *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, Rethymnon, 47-69.
- Bather P. and Stocks C. (eds.), (2016), *Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception*, Oxford.
- Bassi K., (1994), "Desired Silence: *Amor* and *Mors* in Tibullus 1.1", *Syllecta Classica* 5, 53-61.

- Beard M., North J. and Price S., (1998), *Religions of Rome Volume 1: A History*, Cambridge.
- Betz H. D. (ed.), (1986), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation: Including the Demotic Spells*, Chicago.
- Bicknell P. J., (1984), "The Dark Side of the Moon", in Moffat A. (ed.), *Maistor: Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, Canberra, 67-75.
- Boyle A. J., (1974), "Propertius I, 19: A Critical Study", *Latomus* 33.4, 895-911.
- Bright D. F., (1978), *Haec Mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in his World*, Leiden.
- Bushala E. W., (1968), "Laboriosus Ulixes", *Classical Journal* 64.1, 7-10.
- Butler H. E. and Barber E. A. (eds.), (1933), *The Elegies of Propertius*, Oxford.
- Cairns F., (1974), "Some Observations on Propertius 1.1", *Classical Quarterly* 24.1, 94-110.
- (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge.
- (1983), "Propertius 1,4 and 1,5 and the 'Gallus' of the Monobiblos", in Cairns F. (ed.), 1984: *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Fourth Volume*, Liverpool, 61-103.
- (1995), "Horace, *Odes* 3.7: Elegy, Lyric, Myth, Learning, and Interpretation", in Harrison S. (ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford, 65-99.
- (2006), *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*, Cambridge.
- Camps W. A. (ed.), (1961), *Propertius: Elegies Book I*, Cambridge.
- Carruba R. W., (1969), *The Epodes of Horace: A Study in Poetic Arrangement*, The Hague.
- Ciraolo L. J., (1995), "Supernatural Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri", in Meyer M. and Mirecki P. (eds.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Leiden, 279-295.
- Clausen W., (1964), "Callimachus and Latin Poetry", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5.3, 181-196.
- (1976), "Cynthivs", *American Journal of Philology* 97.3, 245-247.
- Collins D., (2008), *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*, Malden.
- Commager S., (1962), *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, New Haven.
- (1974), *A Prolegomenon to Propertius*, Norman.
- Coutelle E., (2005), *Poésie et métapoésie chez Properce: de l'ars amandi à l'ars scribendi*, Leuven.
- Courtney E., (1969), "Three Poems of Propertius", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 16, 70-87.
- Damer E. Z., (2016), "Iambic Metapoetics in Horace, *Epodes* 8 and 12", *Helios* 43.1, 55-85.

- Daniel R. W. and Maltomini F. (eds.) (trs.), (1990-1992), *Supplementum Magicum I-II, Papyrologica Coloniensia Vol. XVI.1-2*, Opladen.
- Davis G., (1991), *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*, Berkeley.
- Deremetz A., (1987), "Le *carmen deductum* ou le fil du poème: à propos de Virgile, *Buc.*, VI", *Latomus* 46.4, 762-777.
- Eitrem S., (1933), "Exkurs: Die 5. und 17. Epode des Horaz", *Symbolae Osloenses* 12, 30-38.
- Elder J. P., (1962), "Tibullus: *Tersus Atque Elegans*", in Sullivan J. P. (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, London, 65-105.
- Enk P. J. (ed.), (1946), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum: Liber I (Monobiblos). Pars Prior: Prolegomena et Textum Continens*, Leiden.
- Fabre-Serris J., (2010), "La réception des *Amores* de Gallus dans un *lusus horatien*: lectures de l'*Epode* 11", in Alvarez Moran C. and Iglesias Montiel R. (eds.), *Perfiles Grecia y Roma II (Actas del XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos)*, Madrid, 881-895.
- Faraone C. A., (1999), *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, Cambridge.
- Fauth W., (1980), "Venena Amoris: Die motive des Liebeszaubers und der Erotischen Verzauberung in der augusteischen Dichtung", *Maia* 32, 265-282.
- Fedeli P., (1978), "Il V epodo e i giambi d'Orazio come espressione d'arte Alessandrina", *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 3, 67-138.
(ed.), (1980), *Sesto Propertio: il primo libro delle elegie*, Firenze.
- Fitzgerald W., (1988), "Power and Impotence in Horace's Epodes", *Ramus* 17.2, 176-191.
- Flaschenreim B., (1997), "Loss, Desire, and Writing in Propertius 1.19 and 2.15", *Classical Antiquity* 16.2, 259-277.
- Freudenburg K., (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton.
- Fulkerson L., (2013), "Seruitium Amoris: the Interplay of Dominance, Gender and Poetry", in Thorsen T. S. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge, 180-193.
- Ezquerro A. A., (1997), "Los Epodos eróticos de Horacio y los inicios de la elegía Latina", *Estudios clásicos* 111, 7-26.
- Gager J. G. (ed.), (1992), *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, Oxford.
- Gardiner H. H., (2013), *Gendering Time in Augustan Love Elegy*, Oxford.
- Goold G. P. (ed.) (tr.), (1990), *Propertius: Elegies*, Cambridge.
- Gordon R., (1999), "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic", in Ankarloo B. and Clark S. (eds.), *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe Volume 2: Ancient Greece and Rome*, London, 161-275.

- Gowers E., (2016), "Girls will be Boys and Boys will be Girls, Or What is the Gender of Horace's *Epodes*?", in Bather P. and Stocks C. (eds.), *Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception*, Oxford, 103-130.
- Graf F., (1997), *Magic in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.
- Grassmann V., (1966), *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz: Literarischer Hintergrund und sprachliche Tradition*, Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 39, München.
- Houghton L. B. T., (2007), "Tibullus' Elegiac Underworld", *Classical Quarterly* 57.1, 153-165.
- Harrison S., (2007), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*, Oxford.
- Heslin P., (2010), "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Dating of Propertius' First Book", *Journal of Roman Studies* 100, 54-68.
- (2011), "Metapoetic Pseudonyms in Horace, Propertius and Ovid", *Journal of Roman Studies* 101, 51-72.
- Heyworth S. J., (1993), "Horace's *Ibis*: On the Titles, Unity, and Contents of the *Epodes*", in Cairns F. and Heath M. (eds.), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar Seventh Volume*, Leeds, 85-96.
- (2007), *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford.
- Hutchinson G. (ed.), (2006), *Propertius Elegies Book IV*, Cambridge.
- Ingallina S. S., (1977), *Orazio e la magia: Sat. 1.8, Epodi 5 e 17*, Palermo.
- Ingleheart J., (2010), *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2*, Oxford.
- Johnston S. I., (2001), "Charming Children: The Use of the Child in Ancient Divination", *Arethusa* 34.1, 97-117.
- (2002), "Sacrifice in the Greek Magical Papyri", in Mirecki P. and Meyer M. (eds), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Leiden, 344-358.
- Johnson T. S., (2012), *Horace's Iambic Criticism: Casting Blame (Iambikē Poiësis)*, Leiden.
- Kennedy D. F., (1993), *The Arts of Love: Five studies in the discourse of Roman love elegy*, Cambridge.
- Kidd D. A., (1979), "Propertius Consults His Astrologer", *Greece & Rome* 26.2, 169-180.
- King J. K., (1980), "The Two Galluses of Propertius' Monobiblos", *Philologus* 124.2, 212-230.
- Knox P. E., (2005), "Milestones in the Career of Tibullus", *Classical Quarterly* 55.1, 204-216.
- Leo F., (1960), "De Horatio et Archilocho", in Fraenkel E. (ed.), *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften II*, Rome, 139-157.
- Lowrie M., (1997), *Horace's Narrative Odes*, Oxford.
- (2009), *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*, Oxford.
- Luck G., (1962), *Hexen und Zauberei in der römischen Dichtung*, Zürich.

- (1976), "An Interpretation of Horace's Eleventh Epode", *Illinois Classical Studies* 1, 122-126.
- Luther A., (2003), "Ein *Terminus ante quem* für die *Monobiblos*' des Properz", *Latomus* 62.4, 801-806.
- Lyne R. O. A. M., (1979), "Servitium Amoris", *Classical Quarterly* 29.1, 117-130.
- (1998), "Love and Death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius, and Others", *Classical Quarterly* 48.1, 200-212.
- Macleod C. W., (1976), "Propertius 4.1", in Cairns F. (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar First Volume*, Liverpool, 141-153.
- Maltby R. (ed.), (2002), *Tibullus: Elegies, Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge.
- Mankin D. (ed.), (1995), *Horace: Epodes*, Cambridge.
- Martinez D., (1995), "'May She Neither Eat Nor Drink': Love Magic and Vows of Abstinence", in Meyer M. and Mirecki P. (eds.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Leiden, 335-359.
- McNamee K., (1993), "Propertius, Poetry, and Love", in DeForest M. (ed.), *Women's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, Illinois, 215-248.
- Michels A. K., (1955), "Death and Two Poets", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 86, 160-179.
- Miller P. A., (2004), *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*, Princeton.
- Murgatroyd P. (ed.), (1980), *Tibullus I: A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, Pietermaritzburg.
- Murgia C. E., (1989), "Propertius 4.1.87-88 and the Division of 4.1", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92, 257-272.
- Mutschler F.-H., (1985), *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls: Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Nethercut W. R., (1976), "Propertius' 'Fallax Opus' (4.1.135)", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 119.1, 30-38.
- Nikoloutsos K. P., (2011), "From Tomb to Womb: Tibullus 1.1 and the Discourse of Masculinity in Post-Civil War Rome", *Scholia* N.S. 20, 52-71.
- Nisbet R. G. M. and Hubbard M., (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*, Oxford.
- (1978), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 2*, Oxford.
- Ogden D., (2001), *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, Princeton.
- Oliensis E., (1991), "Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's Epodes", *Arethusa* 24.1, 107-135.
- (1998), *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge.
- O'Neil E., (1958), "Cynthia and the Moon", *Classical Philology* 53.1, 1-8.

- O'Neill K., (1998), "Symbolism and Sympathetic Magic in Propertius 4.5", *Classical Journal* 94.1, 49-88.
- Papanghelis T. D., (1987), *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death*, Cambridge.
- Parca M., (1988), "*Tardus Amor* and *Tardus Apollo* in Propertius' Monobiblos", *Latomus* 41.3: 584-588.
- Pasoli E., (1977), "Poesia d'amore e 'metapoesia': aspetti della modernità di Properzio", in Bigaroni M. and Santucci F. (eds.), *Colloquium Propertianum Assisi, 26-28 marzo 1976: Atti*, Assisi, 101-121.
- Postgate J. P. (ed.), (1903), *Selections from Tibullus and Others*, London.
- Prince M. D., (2002), "Magic Love and the Limits of Power: The Figure of Medea in Latin Love Elegy", PhD Diss., Duke University, North Carolina.
- (2003), "Medea and the Inefficacy of Love Magic: Propertius 1.1 and Tibullus 1.2", *The Classical Bulletin* 79.2, 205-218.
- Putnam M. C. J., (1972), "Horace and Tibullus", *Classical Philology* 67.2, 81-88.
- (1973), *Tibullus: A Commentary*, Oklahoma.
- Quinn K., (1982), "The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.30.1, 75-180.
- Richardson Jr. L. (ed.), (1977), *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*, Norman.
- Richlin A., (1983), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, New Haven.
- (1984), "Invective Against Women in Roman Satire", *Arethusa* 17.1, 67-80.
- Rimell V., (2005), "Facing Facts: Ovid's *Medicamina* through the Looking Glass", in Ancona R. and Greene E. (eds.), *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*, Baltimore, 177-205.
- Rives J. B., (1995), "Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians", *Journal of Roman Studies* 85, 65-85.
- Ross Jr. D. O., (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Rothstein M. (ed.), (1966), *Propertius Sextus Elegien Erster Teil: Erstes und zweites Buch*, Dublin and Zürich.
- Sandbach F. H., (1962), "Some Problems in Propertius", *Classical Quarterly* 12.2, 263-276.
- Schlegel C., (2005), *Satire and the Threat of Speech in Horace's Satires*, Book 1, Madison.
- Schmidt E. A., (1990), *Notwehrdichtung: Moderne Jambik von Chénier bis Borchardt (mit einer Skizze zur antiken Jambik)*, München.
- Scibilia A., (2002), "Supernatural Assistance in the Greek Magical Papyri: The Figure of the *Parhedros*", in Bremmer J. N. and Veenstra J. R. (eds.), *The*

- Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, Leuven, 71-86.
- Shackleton Bailey D. R., (1949), "Propertiana", *Classical Quarterly* 43.1/2, 22-29.
(1967), *Propertiana*, Amsterdam.
- Sharrock A., (1994), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria II*, Oxford.
(1995), "The Drooping Rose: Elegiac Failure in *Amores* 3.7", *Ramus* 24.1, 152-180.
(2013), "The Poeta-Amator, *Nequitia* and *Recusatio*", in Thorsen T. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge, 151-165.
- Skinner M. B., (2018), "Lesbia as Procuress in Horace *Epode* 12", *EuGeStA* 8, 131-144.
- Smyth W. R., (1949), "Interpretationes Propertianae", *Classical Quarterly* 43.3/4, 118-125.
- Solmsen F., (1975), "'Catullus' Artistry in c. 68: A pre-Augustan 'subjective' Love-Elegy", in Lefèvre E. (ed.), *Monumentum Chiloniense: Studien zur augusteischen Zeit: Kieler Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 70. Geburtstag*, Amsterdam, 260-276.
- Spina L., (1993), "Orazio nell'Ade (Lettura dell'epodo XVII)", *Lexis* 11, 163-188.
- Stahl H.-P., (1985), *Propertius: "Love" and "War". Individual and State Under Augustus*, Berkeley.
- Stratton K. B., (2007), *Naming the Witch: Magic, Ideology, and Stereotype in the Ancient World*, New York.
- Stroh W., (1971), *Die Römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*, Amsterdam.
- Suits T. A., (1976), "The Iambic Character of Propertius 1.4", *Philologus* 120.1, 86-91.
- Syme R., (1978), *History in Ovid*, Oxford.
- Syndikus H. P., (1972), *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden. Band 1: Erstes und zweites Buch*, Darmstadt.
- Tupet A.-M., (1976), *La Magie Dans La Poésie Latine. Vol. I: Des origines à la fin du règne d'Auguste*, Paris.
- Ullman B. L., (1912), "Horace and Tibullus", *The American Journal of Philology* 33.2, 149-167.
- Veyne P., (1988), *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*, Chicago.
- Voutiras E., (1998), ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΥΑΜΟΙ: *Marital Life and Magic in Fourth Century Pella*, Amsterdam.
- Wallis J., (2018), *Introspection and Engagement in Propertius: A Study of Book 3*, Cambridge.
- Watson L. C., (2003), *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford.
- White P., (1993), *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.
- Wimmel W., (1968), *Der frühe Tibull*, München.

- (1987), "Zur Rolle magischer Themen in Tibulls Elegie 1.5", *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, 231-248.
- Winkler J. J., (1991), "The Constraints of Eros", in Faraone C. A. and Obbink D. (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford, 214-243.
- Wyke M., (1987), "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*", *Journal of Roman Studies* 77, 47-61.
- (1989a), "Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy", *Helios* 16.1, 25-47.
- (1989b), "Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3.1", in Cameron A. (ed.), *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, London, 113-143.
- Zetzel J. E. G., (1996), "Poetic Baldness and Its Cure", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 36, 73-100.