

Francesco Cabras

Pedagogical University of Cracow

francesco.cabras@up.krakow.pl

The Elegiac Qualities of Jan Kochanowski's amorous foricoenia: Ovidian Models Part 2: Translations from Greek, Dives amator, Ovid and Catullus, Foloe

Abstract

Jan Kochanowski's Amorous *Foricoenia*: Ovidian Models

The purpose of this article is to find Classical references in Jan Kochanowski's amorous *foricoenia*, as yet not systematically studied. Scholars have focused on the meaning of the title *Foricoenia* (Szatyńska-Siemion) or on the ancient references (e.g. the presence of Terence in some epigrams or the translations from Greek, studied by Głombiowska), but have not studied the amorous epigrams as a whole.

At the beginning the author indicates some *topoi* that are common to elegiac poetry (*recusatio* or the heroes treated like elegiac lovers). Firstly, the author shows that Kochanowski uses elegiac material and *topoi* in his epigrams, presenting to the reader a little epigrammatic *Ars Amatoria*, based on Ovid's model. Secondly, he argues that even when Kochanowski translates epigrams from Greek, he chooses those that are more appropriate to his literary project, i.e. the "elegization" of the epigrams. Conclusions: Kochanowski "elegizes" his epigrams, first of all presenting a small *Ars Amatoria*, and then writing his texts according to the elegiac tradition, both in terms of *topoi* and textual imitations.

After singling them out, I propose an interpretation of Kochanowski's choices: I argue that he engages in a longdistance dialogue with Ovid's *Ars amatoria* and more in general with the whole ancient amouroelegiac tradition, which he some-

times denies. I bring forward a few examples, starting from a comparison between Kochanowski's epigram XVI and Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* 501–502 and *Ars amatoria* I 45–48 (i.e. the hunter caught in his own nets). Epigram V, *In paellas venetas*, introduces a special Ulysses, described as amorous, a lover rather than an epic hero, exactly as Ovid taught for this character. Furthermore, writing epigram LXIX to his friend Torquato, Kochanowski assures him he can make people fall ill with love, as well as cure his friend of such a “disease;” similarly, Ovid teaches how to make people fall in love (*Ars amatoria*) and how to recover from love (*Remedia amoris*).

Key words: Polish NeoLatin poetry, Renaissance poetry, Jan Kochanowski, *Foricoenia*, Ovid, elegy, love poetry, epigrams

1. Translations from Greek¹

A significant intervention in Krinagoras' epigram (*AP* VI 244) imitated in the Latin epigram XXI *Ad Lucinam* shows what Kochanowski thought of a specific literary project, to which he subdued the choice of texts for translation—also with regard to the translation of Greek epigrams.

Ἥρη, Ἐλεθυῶν μήτηρ, Ἥρη δὲ τελείη καὶ Ζεῦ, γινομένοις ξυνὸς ἅπασι
πάτερ, ὠδῖνας νέυσαιτ' Ἀντωνίη ἴλασι ἐλθεῖν πρηείας μαλακαῖς χερσὶ σὺν
Ἥπιόνης ὄφρα κε γεθήσειε πόσις μήτηρ θ' ἔκυρή τε· ἡ νηδὺς οἴκων αἶμα
φέρει μεγάλων.

[Hera, the mother of Eileithyia, Hera the matron

an you, Zeus, the father of all that were born, make Antonia's labour light
with the delicate hands of Epione,

for the husband, mother and mother-in-law to rejoice,

because her foetus is from the blood of two major families.]

¹ The Polish version of the paper: F. Cabras, *Elegijność Foricoeniów miłosnych Jana Kochanowskiego – wzorce Owidiańskie*, „Terminus” 16 (2014), 1 (30), pp. 53–69.

XXI. *Ad Lucinam*

Iuno Lucina aut, si mavis, Illithyia,
Quae gravidis uterum solvere, diva, soles,
Haec tibi sarta Acmon patula sospendit ab orno,
Praesens nitenti tu, dea, sis Crocali.
Illa quidem, lepores dum captat credulus Acmon,
E Zephyri non est flamine facta parens,
Sed tu, diva, tamen non omnia nosse labore,
Nam si infans non est hic meus, illa mea est.

[XXI. *To Lucina*

Juno Lucina, or if you prefer—Ilithyia,
the goddess helping the pregnant to break free from the burden, for you did
Akmon hang these garlands on the patulous ash tree, so that you, devine,
were at the side of Krokalis giving birth.
Although she did not become pregnant with the gust of Zephyr, when naive
Akmon was hunting hares,
but you, oh devine, do not try to know everything:
because despite the fact that this child is not mine, she is!]

The novelty of Kochanowski's retouch is impressive right from the first verse. *Poeta doctus* speaks directly with the goddess, winking meaningfully to her and to the reader: "Juno Lucina, or if you prefer—Ilithyia," may be paraphrased in the following way: "Please, Juno, choose yourself how I shall call you because for me this matter is trivial: I am perfectly fluent both in Latin and Greek." Thus the poet exhibits his *doctrina*. In the first verse of Kochanowski's version, Juno/Hera's husband—Jove/Zeus—disappears; the characters include Krokalis and Akmon, and not Antonia and the "groom" or "mother-in-law". There is also no mention of οἶκος μέγας (the major family) or the midwife-goddess Epione.

The *Ilithyia* epithet is a translation of Ἐλεθυῶν μήτηρ. Here, Akmon is not directly identified as Krokalis' husband: he spends his time hunting hares and his part in the procreation is limited only to hanging votive garlands on a beech tree. And the poet comes forward to the foreground

—*dramatis persona*—and speaks with irony: “Let the fool go safely hunt his hares! A gust of Zephyr will not suffice to conceive a child.”²

The last distich confirms the poet’s playful game: “You, goddess, do not try to know everything; even if the child is not mine (the poet’s, *dramatis persona*), at least she is—she does not belong to Akmon alone.”

What formed the family context in the Greek epigram, in the Latin one becomes “adultery” (which is typical of elegy and consistent with Ovid’s provisions). What is more, the poet consents to share the girl with other lovers.³

It seems that Akmon follows the rules stipulated in *Am.* II 19, 1—4 in such a way so as for the girl to stay faithful to him:

Si tibi non opus est servata, stulte, puella,
At mihi fac serves, quo magis ipse velim.
Quod licet, ingratum est; quod non licet, acrius urit:
Ferreus est, siquis, quod sinit alter, amat.
[Fool, if you do not want to guard her for yourself as it should be,
At least guard the girl for me, so that I will love her even more honestly!
The admissible is displeasing, but the prohibition alone bethralls;
A loving man is made of steel when someone gives him a consent⁴.]

We should not forget that the Ovidian argumentation is to some extent dialectic, which means that any conduct is allowed: if a hus-

² In her commentary *ad locum*, Z. Głombiowska justly recalls the episode with mares impregnated by Zephyr in Vergil’s *Georg.* III 272—279. See. J. Kochanowski, *Carmina Latina*....

³ Cf. *Am.* II 10, where the poet loves two girls; in *Am.* III 14, 1—2 the poet accepts the fact that his lover has another admirer: „Non ego, ne pecces, cum sis formosa, recuso,/ Sed ne sit misero scire necesse mihi”. We should also read verses 15—16 of the same elegy: „Quae facis, haec facito; tantum fecisse negato/ Nec pudeat coram verba modesta loqui”.

⁴ *Rzymska elegia miłosna (wybór)*, trans. A. Świderkówna, opr. G. Przychodzki, W. Strzelecki, Wrocław 1955.

band is too jealous, a lover will take his wife away⁵—after all, a forbidden fruit tastes best; but the same may also happen if the husband is not vigilant enough. A woman will be attractive to her lover if she stays faithful to him; but even otherwise he shall not object her making love to others. Nothing is subject to fixed rules because everything is allowed.

I have just quoted this elegy of Ovid because in it (27—30) we can find mythical *exempla* of “guarded” girls (Danae and Io) who nonetheless became Jove’s captures.⁶ And Danae is one of the mythical examples⁷ used in the Latin epigram XXII *Ad Corinnam*, which is a translation of Bassus’ epigram (AP V 125):⁸

Ὅν μέλλω ρεύσειν χρυσός ποτε· βούς δὲ γένοιτο ἄλλος χῶ μελίθρους
κύκνος ἐπηόνιος.

Ζηῆ φυλασσέσθω τάδε παίγνια· τῆ δὲ Κορίννη Τοὺς ὀβολοὺς δώσω τοὺς
δύο, κοῦ πέπταμαι.

⁵ Cf. eg. *Am.* II 2, 11—14: „Vir quoque non sapiens: quid enim servare laboret/ Unde nihil, quamvis non tueare, perit?/ Sed gerat ille suo morem furiosus amoris/ Et castum, multis quod placet, esse putet”. A husband too jealous of his wife guards her too much, by nevertheless—or maybe precisely because of that—she becomes an easily conquest for a lover.

⁶ Let us compare verses 28—29 of the same elegy “Si numquam Danaen habuisset aenea turris,/ Non esset Danae de Iove facta parens” with verse 6 of the Latin epigram XXI: „E Zephyri non est flamine facta Arens”.

⁷ The two other are Europe and Leda.

⁸ In his monographic study of Kochanowski’s output in the European context, a German scholar, Jörg Schulte, discussed penetratingly traversed the translations of Greek epigrams in *Foricoenia*, including the text discussed here (J. Schulte,

Jan Kochanowski i renesans europejski. Osiem studiów, trans. by K. Wierzbicka-Trwoga, ed. M. Rowińska-Szczepaniak, K. Wierzbicka-Trwoga, Warszawa 2012, pp. 137—138). He demonstrates that Kochanowski, translating from Greek, verified the heretofore existing translations, competing with them and striving to improve and perfect them. According to Schulte, in this case Kochanowski was probably familiar with Ottmar Lascinus’ version, reprinted by Cornarius: *Selecta epigrammata Graeca Latine versa, ex septem epigrammatum Graecorum libris [...]* recens versa, ab A. Alciato, O. Luscino, J. Cornario, Basileae 1529.

[I do not wish to be golden rain. May another one transform into a bull or a signing swan on a shore. Let Zeus play in such a manner. And I shall give to obols to Corina and will not need to fly.]

XXII Ad Corinnam

Aureus imber ego latitantem nolo puellam

Fallere nec sim bos, nec fluvialis olor,

Haec ludicra Iovi sint curae, ego bina Corinnae

Aera dabo nec erit, cur volitare velim. [*To Corina*

I do not wish to deceive in the form of golden rain

a girl in hiding, or to be a bull or a river swan—

may Jove enjoy such playthings. I will give two copper coins to Corina and will not have to go after her].

The Latin translation is quite accurate. When it comes to the swan, Kochanowski chooses the latter of the two epithets: μελιθρους and ἐπηόνιος. *Volitare* is well rendered into Greek as πέπταμαι and it is not precluded that the Polish poet chose this verb also due to its metaphorical meaning, that is “cocking one’s nose, riding a high horse”, which is not present in the Greek original.

This epigram and the previously discussed one form a diptych, being a kind of dialogue with Ovid, an author who influenced the composition of the epigram on Krokalis and Akmon: in the Latin epigram XXI, the poet jauntily accepts the fact that the girl sleeps with another man; here, in turn, he renounces metamorphoses as a method of seduction, settling for a simpler and more trivial means: money. This confirms the “dialectic” of which I wrote with reference to Ovid.

2. Dives amator

A reflection on the dependence between love and money appears mostly in epigrams VIII *Ad Callistratum* and XXXI *De Lyco*. The poet does not miss the opportunity to use another topos very common in elegies: the topos of a contention with a wealthy rival (*dives amator*⁹):

Ἡράσθης πλουτῶν, Σωσίκρατης, ἀλλὰ πένης ὦν οὐκέτ' ἐρᾶς· λιμὸς
φάρμακον οἶον ἔχει.

δὲ πάρος σε καλεῦσα μύρον καὶ τερπνὸν Ἄδωνιν Μηνοφίλα νῦν σου
τοῦνομα πυνθάνεται· «Τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; Πόθι τοι πτόλις;» Ἡ μόλις
ἔγνωσ

[You have loved, Sosicrates, as a Dives. Now, you have grown poor and love
no more: hunger is a effective cure!

And Menofile, who not long ago called you sweet and gracious Adonis, now
asks your name:

“From which family are you? Where is your city?” Only now do you know
that they speak the truth: the one who has nothing, has no friends either.]

VIII *Ad Callistratum*

Dives amasti olim, sed inops, Callistrate, factus Non item amas: habet haec
pharmaca pauperies Quae te blanda suum nuper vocitabat Adonim, Meno-
phile, nomen nunc rogat illa tuum:

„Tu quis es? Quid vis tibi?” Num satis illud Nostri tritum: “Inopi nullus
amicus erit?”

[VIII *To Callistratus*

You have once loved as a Dives, Callistratus, but since you grew poor, you do
not love the same: this is the poison of poverty.

Menofile, the one who until recently called you tenderly her Adonis, today
asks your name:

“Who are you? Where did you come from? What do you want?” Don't you
know this phrase well enough, that a poor fellow shall not find any friend?]

⁹ Tib. I 5, 47—48: „Haec nocuere mihi. Quod adest huic dives amator,/ venit in
exitium callida lena meum”.

Here, Kochanowski uses the Greek epigram of Marcus Argentarius (*AP* V 113) as his model. As we may notice at once, the first verse changes the addressee of the text from Sosicratus to Callistratos¹⁰. But the most interesting places in this translation are in the last two distiches. The fragment “[...] σε καλεῦσα μύρον καὶ τερνὸν Ἄδωνιν/ Μηνοφίλα νῦν σου τοῦνομα πυνθάνεται” is rendered as “te blanda suum nuper vocitabat Adonim/ Menophile, nomen nunc rogat ille tuum.” The word τέρνος, which in the Greek original refers to Adonis, means ‘pleasant’, while in the Latin translation it concerns Menophile and is replaced with the word *blanda*, which may mean ‘pleasant’, but more often—as here—it describes someone’s seductive character.

In the fifth verse, we may observe another change done by Kochanowski: in the Greek text, Menophile asks, “Τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; Πόθι τοι πόλις;”¹¹, while in the same place in the Latin text, there is the question “Tu quis es? Unde venis? Quid vis tibi?” Let us take a look at two other differences: the Greek μόλις, literally ‘with difficulty’, was changed into the Latin *satis*—‘sufficiently’; secondly, the Latin epigram, contrary to the Greek one, ends with a mocking rhetorical question asked to the interlocutor: “did you understand well enough that a poor fellow has not friends?” Kochanowski enriches his epigram with meanings, enforcing it: “gracious” Adonis becomes “seductive”; the questions that Menophile asks Callistrat in

¹⁰ This name appears only in Martial’s V 13, IX 95/95b, XII 35, 42, 80. What is more, epigram V 13 is the only one, in which the character is characterised by his wealth contrasted with the poverty of the poet, whom, nonetheless, his art gives fame, which is enjoyed by few: „Hoc ego tuque sumus: sed quod sum non potes esse; tu quod es, e populo quilibet esse potest”. In other epigrams, apart from the problematic IX 95/95b, Callistratus is presented in a less than complimentary or encouraging way: in XII 35 and 42, he is a sodomite; in XII 80, a hypocrite, who for the sake of a peaceful life praises everyone, regardless of whether they deserve it or not: „Ne laudet dignos, laudat Callistratus omnes./ Cui malus est nemo, qui bonus esse potest?”.

¹¹ An epic phrase, e.g. *Od.* X 325: „Τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἤδε τοκήες; [...]”.

verse 5, as compared to the Greek original, are more dynamic and casual, as if the girl wanted to quickly get rid of a blighter. This epic construct, in this love context itself hyperbolic, becomes matter-of-fact (and faster): *Tu quis es*. The word πτόλις disappears replaced with a more general *unde venis*, but the most casually sounding *Quid vis tibi?* does not appear in the original at all. The last question, easy to overlook, is in fact a smart move of the poor lover-poet, who—asking his unfortunate rival this scoffing question (in the Greek text there is only a simple statement of facts)—pays back for the past humiliations with sarcasm.

The character of the next epigram, XXXI, is Lycos, desperate to such an extent that he is satisfied with Chione's urine:

XXXI *De Lyco*

Formosam Chionem, denos nisi solveret aureos, Infelix cum non posset habere Lycus,

Hoc unum precibus multis contendit ab illa, Ut saltem in pelvim meieret ipsa suam.

Quod cum impetrasset, remo salsa aequora verrens, „Ius ede, nam cara est” – inquit – „amice, caro”.

[XXXI *On Lyco*

As unfortunate Lyco was able to possess beautiful Chione only for ten dinars,

what he obtained by insistent begging was only that she passed water to a bowl.

Having achieved this, working his paddle in the sea, he said: “Eat, my brother, a soup because meat is too expensive!”]

Contrary to Callistratos, Lycos is not a rich man who fell from grace but a poor enamoured man who does not have the ten coins... This epigram is a reference to the Latin epigram XXII *Ad Corinnam*, where the poet said: “[...] ego bina Corinna/ Aera dabo nec erit, cur velitare velim” (3–4).

I would like to stop at the last two verses. Let us begin with their content: the metaphor of “bitter waters” shall be clear in the context of verse 6: Lycos will eat an unenviable meal... But this is not

all: the metaphor of sailing frequently appears in the context of love, while in *Ars amatoria* it symbolizes an accomplished love act.¹² Thus the “salty sea” (*salsa aequora*) assumes this particular meaning, if we take into account the topoi used beforehand. Lycos’ sailing did not succeed. With regard to style, verse 6 with its alliterations (“cara amice caro”) reminds of the references to Catullus, who often used similar playthings (Catull. XXXVI and XCIV). This device appears later in Martial’s epigram III 78, which Kochanowski could have had in mind, despite the different tone and situation:

Minxisti currente semel, Pauline, carina. Meiere vis iterum? Iam Palinurus eris. [You have pissed once, Paulinus, from a sailing ship. Do you wish to piss again? You will become Palinur.]

3. Ovid and Catullus

There is still one more poem to discuss before I shall close the section of erotic epigrams—epigram XXV:

XXV *In Cypassim*
Solam invitavi, tu hircis comitata duobus
Venisti ad cenam, fusca Cypassi, meam.
Quid vestem obtendis, caecas quid comprimit alas,
Improba? Sentit eos nasus adesse meus.

¹² Cf. G. Baldo, *op. cit.*, p. 273, a commentary *ad loc.* reminds the relation between sailing and love, referring to *Ars.* II 9–10 („Sed non, quo dederas a litore carbasa, vento/ utendum, medio cum potiere freto”); he later adds *Ars.* II 725–26 and 731, which speak of an unsuccessful love relationship; he also recalls the fact that the metaphor could as well mean poetical creation (in *Ars amatoria* it was related to successful love, let us bear in mind the didactic aspect of the poem). On the metaphorical association between sailing and poetic creation, see Curtius E.R., *Literatura europejska i lacińskie sredniowiecze*, trans. and ed. by A. Borowski, Kraków 2005², pp. 136–139.

[XXV *On Cypassim*

I have invited only you, and you came to me for a dinner accompanied by two goats, dusky Cypassim.

Why do you cover yourself with a dress? Why do you squeeze your concealed armpits, you despicable? Why my nose smells their presence!]

Thanks to Ovid, *Am.* II 8, where an identical adjective describing Cypassim appears in verses 21—25, we know the literary identity of this character. It is a bondmaid of Corinna, seduced by her mistress' lover:

Pro quibus officis pretium mihi dulce repende

Concubitus hodie, fusca Cypassi, tuos.

Quid renuis fingisque novos, ingrata, timores?

Unus est a dominis emeruisse satis.

[So, Cypassis, you black girl, your blissful hugs shall pay me for the moments of affright!

Why do you resist, oh ungracious, and fear in vain?

You have sneered your mistress and now you wish to sneer me?]

I have quoted these two distiches because apart from the character's name and the adjective describing her, the conversation develops according to the same schemes as in Kochanowski's poem, beginning with rhetorical questions. Let us also notice the same asking adverb in the same position, the place of the *ingrata* and *improba* adjectives is also the same—at the beginning of the last verse, and the last word of the question divided into two verses.

While Ovid's poem provides an interpretative key for this epigram, Catullus supplies the motif of a bad smell emitted by a women neglecting personal hygiene. The motif of a "goat" in the armpits appears in Catull. LXIX (*caper* v. 6) and LXXI (*hircus* v. 1). Kochanowski, however, reverses the situation: it is not the lovers who stink as a "goat", but the girl so desired by the poet. Nonetheless, the situation does not end here as Kochanowski also refers to the advices of *magister amoris*, Ovid, who in *Ars.* I 522 admonished his disciple to take care of his hygiene. Girls will not fall for a lover that stinks. Ovid

gives similar advices to girls in *Ars*. III 193: „Quam paene admonui ne trux caper iret in alas”.

4. Foloe. Παρακλαυσίθυρον

The other group of poems begins with a diptych (L and LX), a real gem, the most beautiful in the whole collection due to its delicacy and the aptness of the evoked images. They tell a story of a night tryst divided into two poems. The rendezvous does not take effect and the structure of the story resembles the motif of paraclausithyron known e.g. from the Roman theatre and elegies. Let us begin with epigram L:

L. *Ad Pholoen*

Ad vitam revocata Venus Titane perempto
Cum fuerit, mihi te sistere pollicita es.
Nec nostras, Pholoe, fallas, oculissima, speres,
Nam sine te magna sum miser in rutuba.

[L. *To Foloe*

You have promised that you will come to me
as soon as Venus returns to life after Titan's death.
Do not fear, Foloe, the apple of my eye, I shall not lie because without you
I am miserable and live in torments!]

There is a number of sophisticated lexical forms here that are worthy of more attention. Let us take a look at *oculissima*: adjective *oculissimus* may only be found¹³ in Plautus' *Curculio* (*Cur.* 15 and 121), and later in Paul the Deacon's *De verborum significatu* and Fla-

¹³ Thesaurus linguae latinae online ([http://refworks.referenceglobal.com/Xaver/start.xav?SID=unipadova305380183233&startbk=deGruyter_TLL&bk=deGruyter_TLL&start=/*\[@attr_id=%27N0x17b40a0.0xc013488%27\]&startSkin=german](http://refworks.referenceglobal.com/Xaver/start.xav?SID=unipadova305380183233&startbk=deGruyter_TLL&bk=deGruyter_TLL&start=/*[@attr_id=%27N0x17b40a0.0xc013488%27]&startSkin=german); accessed on: 14 May 2011).

vius Sosipater Charisius' *Artis gramaticae libri V*, but the latter two authors cite Plautus. When it comes to the word *miser* in reference to love, we come across it for the first time also in a Plautus' work,¹⁴ namely in *Asinaria* (*Asinaria* 617): "Miser est homo qui amat,"¹⁵ while the only trace of the word *rutuba* meaning a "torment" is to be found in fragment 488 of Varro's *Menippean Satires*.¹⁶ The most meaningful words here are *oculissima* and *rutuba*. They are evidence of the erudition, attention to detail and curiosity of the poet, who might be described by d'Annunzio's self-definition: "a master of the art of words, a hunter of antiques" ("spulciatore di vetumi").

We should take a closer look at the word *oculissima*, which will enable us to present not only the topos of paraklausithyron, but also Kochanowski's method of *imitatio* and his considerable consciousness in his choice of hypotextual references.¹⁷ Zofia Głombiowska¹⁸ notes the references to Plautus. What seems most interesting in the light of epigram LX is the fact that verse 15 of *Curculio* include words used by Phaedromus when he addresses the door of his beloved one: "huic proximum illud ostiumst oculissimum." In verse 121, on the other hand, the maiden named Planesium uses the same word when she addresses Phaedromus: „Salve, oculissime homo”.

We have reached the moment when we can read the ending of the story commenced in the Latin epigram L:

¹⁴ Thesaurus linguae latinae online ([http://refworks.referenceglobal.com/Xaver/start.xav?SID=unipadova305380183233&startbk=deGruyter_TLL&bk=deGruyter_TLL&start=/*\[@attr_id=%27N0x20e90a0.0x1cf9bf60%27\]&startSkin=english](http://refworks.referenceglobal.com/Xaver/start.xav?SID=unipadova305380183233&startbk=deGruyter_TLL&bk=deGruyter_TLL&start=/*[@attr_id=%27N0x20e90a0.0x1cf9bf60%27]&startSkin=english); accessed on: 14 May 2011).

¹⁵ I would also like to remind Verg. *Aen.* IV 429, where Dydo speaking with her sister asks: "Qui ruit? Extremum hoc miserae det munus amanti”.

¹⁶ Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina online ([http://refworks.referenceglobal.com/Xaver/start.xav?SID=unipadova305380183233&startbk=deGruyter_BTL&bk=deGruyter_BTL&start=/*\[@node_id=%2777522235%27\]&startSkin=english&anchor=el#xaverTitl eAnchore](http://refworks.referenceglobal.com/Xaver/start.xav?SID=unipadova305380183233&startbk=deGruyter_BTL&bk=deGruyter_BTL&start=/*[@node_id=%2777522235%27]&startSkin=english&anchor=el#xaverTitl eAnchore); accessed on: 14 May 2011).

¹⁷ G. Genette, *op.cit.*, pp. 7–8.

¹⁸ Z. Głombiowska, *Ślady lektury komedii rzymskich w Foricoeniach Jana Kochanowskiego*, „Slavica Wratislaviensia” XXVIII (2008), pp. 101–111.

LX. *In culicem*

Quid mihi, parve culex, immiti saucio amore Tristis ad ingratas occinis auricularas?

Ad Pholoen potius querulos converte susurros

Atque haec oblita blandus in aure cane:

„Janus te, o Pholoe, manet, at tu, ferrea, dormis Et iuvenem lenta conficis usque mora”. Quod si forte tuo surrexerit excita cantu

Atque in complexus venerit illa meos,

Vergiliana, culex, tibi praemia scito parata,

Ut numquam in chartis emoriare meis.

[LX. *On a mosquito*

Why do you, little mosquito, hum sadly to the reluctant ears of a man hurt by a cruel love? Address your mournful whispers rather to Foloe and to her forgetful ear sing insinuatingly:

“John waits for you, Foloe, and you sleep like a stone and endlessly torment the young man with your deferment!”

And if by chance she stands up awakened by your singing and runs straight into my embrace,

know, my mosquito, that a Vergil’s prize awaits you because you will never die on the sheets of my books.]

According to Jadwiga Czerniatowicz¹⁹, the model for this poem was Meleager’s epigram (AP V 152):

Πταίης μοι, χώνωψ, ταχὺς ἄγγελος, οὔασι δ’ ἄκροισ

Ζηνοφίλας ψαύσας προσψιθύριζε τάδε·

«Ἄγρυπνος μίμνει σε· σὺ δ’ ὧ λήφαργε φιλοῦντων,

εὐδεις». Εἶα, πέτευ·ναί, φιλόμουσε πέτεν· ἤσυχα δὲ φθέγγξαι, μὴ καὶ σύγιοιτο ἐγείρας κινήσης ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ ζηλοτύπους ὀδύνας.

”Ἦν δ’ ἀγάγης τὴν παῖδα, δορᾶ στέψω σε λέοντος, κώνωψ, καὶ δώσω χεῖρι φέρειν ῥόπαλον.

¹⁹ Por. J. Czerniatowicz, *Recepcja poezji greckiej w Polsce w XVI–XVII wieku*, Wrocław 1966, p. 60.

[*To a mosquito*

Fly, my swift herald, a mosquito, and having brushed Zenophila's ear, tell her the following words:

"He waits for you awoken. And you sleep? Don't you care about those who love you?"—Fly quickly, kind busker!

Speak to her silently not to awake the one with whom she shares her bed. How he would hate me!

If you bring the girl to me, I will crown your head with a lion's skin and give you a ballow in your hand.^{20]}

Apart from this reference, in his poem Kochanowski makes an allusion to the pseudo-Vergilian *Culex*. I shall, however, confine only to emphasise those aspects of the text that are directly related to this paper.

Unlike the pseudo-Vergilian model, the mosquito does not get killed; it may be very useful for the poet persuading Foloe to come and meet him. The insect will be awarded immortality. We should note the marvellous ambiguity of the phrase "in chartis emoriare meis": here, a sheet with which one can kill the bothersome insect serves its immortalisation. The subject undertaken here is frequently picked up in elegiac poetry: the immortality granted to a woman praised in poems. The insect appears here as a mediator between the enamoured (the role of a servant in a comedy). Comedy also provided the slightly altered scheme of paraklausithyron: what is the mosquito's task if not to persuade the girl to come out of her house?²¹ What is more, the name Ianus is no accident: it comes from the word *ianua* and is related with the name Ioannes (or Polish Jan).

Before we turn to a more detailed analysis of individual distiches, I should signal the possible relation between verse 6 "Et iuvenem lenta conficis usque mora" from Ovid's *Ars*. II 455—456:

²⁰ *Antologia Palatyńska*, wybór, przeł. i oprac. Z. Kubiak, Warszawa 1987, s. 162.

²¹ The lover represented by his legate does not want to enter the girl's house (as it usually happens in a comedy and later in elegies), but he wishes that the girl comes out because presumably someone else sleeps next to her.

Si spatium quaeras, breve sit, quo laesa queratur, ne lenta vires colligat ira mora.

[How long will you allow this miss to mourn? Shortly; so that the anger does not accumulate strength over time.]

After these verses in the Ovid's treatise, there comes *concupitus*, awaited by our Ianus. Foloe does not subdue to the recommendations of *Ars amatoria*. I have quoted this passus mostly due to the close correspondence of the two texts, although the situations described in them are different: Ovid speaks of betrayal, while the poet suggests the man does not linger with him asking for forgiveness. Commenting upon the "strategic disappearance" of the lover²², we may refer to distich 357—358, in which the lexis changes ("tuta mora"), but the concept remains the same: this time, the situation fits perfectly—do not leave your beloved one waiting too long, or else you will be forestalled by another suitor. This is a kind of a reversal of the model since Foloe has Ianus in her hand.

The first four verses, which form the apostrophe to the mosquito, were used to present two different situations in which the lovers found themselves: Ianus, scourged by the "cruel love" (*immitis amor*), is aware that his ears are forced to listen to the song (*occino* meaning 'to praise' is ironic). When Foloe enters the scene (3—4), everything changes: the signing turn to whispering (the weakening of the concept), and a mournful whispering at that (*querulus*), but in verse 4, due to its singing, the mosquito becomes seductive (*blandus*). The poem is not only a simple request to the mosquito, but it also problematises the emotional relationship between the subject and the object—between "I" and the external world. In these verses, the poet seems to say that the nature, the essence of what is beyond us, is conditioned on our perception of the external world; for Ianus tormented by love the buzzing of the mosquito is sad and his ears are reluctant, irritated; for Foloe, on the other hand, the same buzzing

²² G. Baldo, *op.cit.*, p. 319 *ad locum*.

is—if not seductive, as the Janus would wish—at least without significance. It is Janus that interprets Foloe's absence as purposeful and malicious (vv. 4—6: „Janus te, o Pholoe, manet, at tu, ferrea, dormis/ Et iuvenem lenta conficis usque mora?"). But there is no evidence that could support this thesis. In fact, everything happens in the “real time”: the character speaks exposed to his suffering, which makes him incredible as a narrator because he is deprived of the overall “bird's eye” perspective. This whole psychological development is a product of Kochanowski's imagination, as in the Greek text Meleager confines to describing Zehophila forgetting her lover...

Conclusions

The impact of elegiac poets and Ovid on Kochanowski's epigrams seems undeniable. The very manner, in which Ulisses is treated in *In puellas venetas* reveals Ovidian influence. The elegiac design of the poet is also discernible in numerous remakes of the Greek originals selected with regard to certain requirements of the elegiac poetic strategy. Ovid is present not only in the direct references, but also when Kochanowski specifically adapts his “dialectic”²³ *modus operandi*, according to which various behaviours are allowed, even if contradictory to one another: let us recall epigrams XXI and XXII—in the former, the poetic “I” assumes the role of a seducer; in the latter, he seems bored with it and settles the matter with several coins.

²³ I mean the inconsistency of the behaviour of the lover in the Ovidian elegy. Slightly simplifying the matter, one could say that there is only one binding rule: to be aware that in love there are no rules. Cf. e.g. the end of the first book of *Ars amatoria*. Since we are in the context of erotodidactics: *magister amoris* tells his disciple that every woman is different and one should behave in accordance with the character of a specific woman he faces.

Love epigrams are also marked by the presence of Catullus, who often appears in turns with Ovid, as in epigram XXV, with whom Kochanowski sometimes polemises. For example, in the Latin epigram LXV, not discussed in this paper, the poet rejects the Catullus' phenomenology of love and appears to shout in Lesbia's face: "Do not think that I am like the others: the more rejected, the more they love".²⁴

Literature

- Antologia Palatyńska*, wybrał, przeł. i oprac. Z. Kubiak, Warszawa 1987.
- Baldo G., komentarz do drugiej księgi *Sztuki kochania*, [w:] Ovidio, *Ars amatoria*, a cura di E. Pianezzola, Milano 2007.
- Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina online: <http://www.degruyter.com/view/db/btltl>
- Biliński B., *Rifl essi italiani nelle poesie di Jan Kochanowski – Giovanni Cochranovio*, [w:] *Jan Kochanowski //Johannes Cochranovius poeta rinascimentale polacco, 1530– 1584. Nel 450–mo anniversario della morte*, Roma 1980.
- Bronikowski K., *O Foricoeniach Jana Kochanowskiego*, [w:] *Sprawozdanie piąte. Dyrekcji C. K. III Gimnazjum w Krakowie za rok szkolny 1888*, Kraków 1888.
- Curtius E.R., *Literatura europejska i łacińskie średniowiecze*, przeł. i oprac. A. Borowski, Kraków 2005.
- Czerniatowicz J., *Recepcja poezji greckiej w Polsce w XVI–XVII wieku*, Wrocław 1966.
- Genette G., *Palinsesti. La letteratura al secondo grado*, traduzione di R. Novità, Torino 1997.
- Głombiowska Z., *Łacińska i polska muza Jana Kochanowskiego*, Warszawa 1988.
- Głombiowska Z., *Ślady lektury komedii rzymskich w Foricoeniach Jana Kochanowskiego*, „*Slavica Wratislaviensia*” XXVIII (2008).
- Grimal P., *Enciclopedia dei miti*, red. C. Cordié, Milano 1995.
- Kochanowski J., *Carmina Latina/ Poezja łacińska. Pars prior. Imago phototypica – Transcriptio./ Fototypia – Transkrypcja. Edidit, praefatione et apparatu critico instruxit/ wydała i wstępem poprzedziła Z. Głombiowska, Gdańsk 2008.*

²⁴ Cf. Traina A., *La poesia degli affetti*, intro. to: Catullo, *I Canti*, Milano 2002, pp. 7–45. In detail, p. 18–19 and footnote 20.

- Liryka starożytnej Grecji*, oprac. J. Danielewicz, Wrocław 1987. Kochanowski J., *Foricoenia*, przeł. G. Franczak: [http:// neolatina.bj.uj.edu.pl/](http://neolatina.bj.uj.edu.pl/) Kubiak Z., *Medytacje Janicjusza*, Warszawa 1993.
- S. Łempicki, *Foricoenia Jana Kochanowskiego*, „Pamiętnik Literacki” 1 (1930).
- S. Łempicki, *Fraszki łacińskie Jana z Czarnolasu*, [w:] idem, *Renesans i humanizm w Polsce. Materiały do studiów*, Kraków 1952.
- Ovid, *Amores. A commentary on Book two*, by J.C. Mckeown, Liverpool 1989.
- Ovidio, *Ars amatoria*, a cura di E. Pianezzola, Milano 2007.
- Owidiusz, *Lekarstwa na miłość*, przeł. i oprac. A.W. Mikołajczak, Poznań 1993.
- Owidiusz, *Sztuka kochania*, przeł., wstępem i przypisami opatrzyła E. Skwara, Warszawa 2008.
- Pelc J., *Jan Kochanowski. Szczyt renesansu w literaturze polskiej*, Warszawa 2001.
- Peri M., *Malato d'amore. La medicina dei poeti e la poesia dei medici*, Catanzaro 1996.
- Perutelli A., *Ulisse nella cultura romana*, Firenze 2006.
- Pinotti P., *L'eglia latina. Storia di una forma poetica*, Roma 2009.
- Poetae lyrici Graeci*, quartis curis recens. Th. Bergk, pars III *Poetae melici*, Lipsiae 1914. *Rzymska elegia miłosna (wybór)*, przeł. A. Świderkówna, opr. G. Przychodzki, W. Strzelecki, Wrocław 1955.
- Schulte J., *Jan Kochanowski i renesans europejski. Osiem studiów*, trans. by K. Wierzbicka-Trwoga, red. M. Rowińska-Szczepaniak, K. Wierzbicka-Trwoga Warszawa 2012.
- Selecta epigrammata Graeca Latine versa, ex septem epigrammatum Graecorum libris [...] recens versa*, ab A. Alciato, O. Luscinio, J. Cornario, Basileae 1529.
- Stawecka K., *O Foricoeniach Jana Kochanowskiego*, „Roczniki Humanistyczne” XX-VII (1979), z. 3.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae online: <http://www.degruyter.com/view/db/btltll>
- Traina A., *La poesia degli affetti*, wstęp do: Catullo, *I Canti*, Milano 2002.
- Ziembra K., *Clemens Janicius – Johannes Cochranovius: due concerti di elegia*, [w:] *Polonia, Italia e culture slave. Aspetti comparati tra storia e contemporaneità*. Atti del convegno dei Polonisti italiani in memoria di Bronisław Biliński, Accademia Polacca di Roma, 11–12 dicembre 1996, red. L. Marinelli, M. Piacentini, K. Żaboklicki, Varsavia/Roma 1997.