

REVIEW ARTICLE

GALLUS, ELEGY, AND ROSS*

The late geographical dictionary of Vibius Sequester quotes five words of verse, one pentameter, from Cornelius Gallus; that is all that can without hesitation be accepted as a genuine remnant of his work. "Uno tellures diuidit amne duas," Gallus wrote of the river Hypanis. It is an elegant and allusive line: one number at the beginning, the other at the end; the adjective and noun pairs in interlocking order, separated by the verb in the middle; and the whole referring to an exotic eastern river. It is a verse that any Latin poet would be proud to claim as his own, and the quality of the line is surely one reason that modern scholars—Franz Skutsch above all, but also Norden and others—have hunted for more remains. The well-known excesses of Skutsch's attempt have deterred many from the search. In any case, anyone who tries to reconstruct works of which only fragments remain ought to be warned by Housman's verdict on Marx's edition of Lucilius: "No editor . . . has such cause to wish that the earth may lie heavy on Herculanum and that no roll of Lucilius may ever emerge into the light of day."¹

The quest for Gallus is more perilous than that for Lucilius, and, while we should not think of the object as another Holy Grail or philosopher's stone, it is of considerable significance for the history of Latin poetry. Gallus is generally mentioned as the first elegist, and anyone seeking to answer the vexed question of the origins of Latin elegy must deal with him. Parthenius dedicated his *Erotica pathemata* to him. Virgil praised him and valued his poetry, and the man who earned that acclaim deserves our time and study. Above all, his is the most important literary name in the dark period between the death of Catullus and the completion of the *Eclogues*, nearly twenty years in which something ought to have happened to account for the startling brilliance of Latin poetry in the succeeding decades. What does lie behind the poetry of Virgil, Horace, Propertius, and Tibullus?²

David Ross, following the course suggested by his *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), has attempted to bridge that gap with *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry*. It is a fascinating book of great erudition, complexity, and brilliance, of more importance than any similar work of recent years, a book that all students of Latin poetry will have to read closely, even if—and I suspect it will be true of many—they disagree strongly with its arguments and conclusions. It is in many ways a paradoxical book: Ross's greatest strength is his ability to apply the methods of Axelson and Tränkle, to use apparently small points of philological detail, particularly the use of proper names and Callimachean vocabulary, and

* *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. By DAVID O. ROSS, JR. London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975. Pp. viii + 176. \$19.50.

1. A. E. Housman, "Luciliana," *CQ* 1 (1907): 74, reprinted in *Classical Papers* (Cambridge, 1972), 2: 684. I am grateful to Michael Putnam for many improvements of a draft of this review, and to Wendell Clausen and Ross himself for discussing it with me; they do not necessarily agree with my views.

2. I accept with some hesitation Bowersock and Clausen's redating of the *Eclogues* from 38 to 35, as does Ross. It should be mentioned that Gallus is unlikely to have written very much before 40 himself: he was probably only a year younger than Virgil.

draw out their wider literary implications. He is superbly sensitive to nuances of tone and style. His technique is also, however, his greatest weakness: by concentrating on single words or lines, Ross tends to lose sight of larger contexts. Propertius in Ross's interpretation suffers badly from this limited focus: he is largely humorless (except in Ross's discussion of 1. 11 and 20 [pp. 74 ff.]). For Ross, the Catullan elements in 1. 3 are stylistic alone, without any bearing on the larger aims of the poem;³ in 3. 1-3 Ross seems to think that Propertius is accepting Horatian poetics without demur; 3. 9 is taken as a prelude to the Roman themes of Book 4 without any recognition of the irony of that poem. In many of these respects, and in others, I find Commager's Propertius (and even, occasionally, Sullivan's) more satisfactory than Ross's or Margaret Hubbard's.⁴ Ross is only entirely successful in his final chapter, in discussing the Roman Odes and Horace's relationship to the Callimachean tradition; but the insights of that analysis show the finest use to which these methods have ever been put, and more than compensate for any weaknesses of the preceding argument.

To do justice to *Backgrounds* would take a review at least as long as the book itself, and I will deal here only with what I find most difficult and misleading in it, the figure of Gallus himself, who occupies a large part of the book. In the usual view, Gallus is at the end of one tradition and the beginning of another: he was the last great writer to use the epyllion form, and the first to write love elegy. Ross questions this picture: his Gallus wrote only elegy. While this appears to be a small point, it is not. If Gallus wrote only elegy, then his poem on the Grynean grove must have been a part of his *Amores*. And if that is so, then his elegies were not the simple erotic poems about his own experience that are frequently postulated as the background to Propertius' *Monobiblos*, but included more elaborate, learned, and Alexandrian poems than anyone had thought. The *Monobiblos*, then, may be not a further elaboration of Gallan elegy, but a break from it, and the developments of Books 3 and 4 of Propertius more a return to Gallus than a departure. The whole history of elegy is turned on its head.

In order to prove his general argument, Ross finds it necessary to try to prove that Gallus did not write epyllia; the argument is insecure, and in some points wrong. The testimonia about Gallus are not decisive. Ross rightly shows the ambiguity of Servius on *Eclogue* 10. 1 and Parthenius' preface. His handling of what he considers to be the most important passage, however, is questionable. Diomedes (484. 17K) speaks of elegy: "quod genus carminis praecipue scripserunt apud Romanos Propertius et Tibullus et Gallus imitati Graecos Callimachum et Euphoriona." Ross (p. 44) believes that *praecipue* here suggests that these three are listed because they alone wrote only elegy. But scarcely a page later, Diomedes says of iambus (485. 15): "cuius carminis praecipui scriptores apud Graecos Archilochus et Hipponax, apud Romanos Lucilius et Catullus et Horatius et Bibaculus." Of neither the Greek nor the Latin authors listed can it be said that they wrote exclusively iambus; Ross's conclusion about Gallus is not supported by Diomedes.

The evidence of Diomedes also seems to contradict Ross's second main argument, based

3. For this poem, Leo Curran's discussion in *YCIS* 19 (1966): 189-207, is extremely useful.

4. S. Commager, *A Prolegomenon to Propertius*, Semple Lectures (Cincinnati, 1974); M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (London, 1974); J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, 1976). As this is not a review of these works, I will only make occasional reference to them; but I note in passing that, taken together with Ross's book, they well illustrate in a new way Phillimore's *quot editores tot Propertii*.

on *Eclogue* 10. 50 f.: "ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita uersu / carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor auena." *Chalcidico uersu* is a critical problem: does it mean elegy, or hexameter, or does it simply refer to the style of Euphorion? Ross concludes that the last is true, and that Euphorion wrote only in hexameters.⁵ But if that is true, why does Diomedes suggest that he is an elegist? Ross cannot have it both ways; the evidence simply does not suggest that Gallus wrote only elegy. The reason that he turns up in the lists of elegists is obvious: he was the first poet to compose any quantity of elegiac poetry, and perhaps the first to write it in books, in the manner of Callimachus.⁶

The most difficult piece of information that we have about Gallus' poetry comes from the Sixth *Eclogue* (64 f.): "tum canit errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum / Aonas in montes ut duxerit una sororum." Does the geography tell us anything about the poetry? Are Permessus and the Aonian mountains to be seen as closely related parts of the same poetic landscape? Ross is surely right to say that Permessus does not mean simply "subjective love-elegy," and that the Aonian mountains do not mean epic or epyllion. It is less satisfactory to say (p. 33) that "Permessus and Helicon are topographically and poetically identical whenever they occur together in Greek poetry" and that therefore they are the same in Latin poetry. For Ross, this implies that Gallus, both before and after his initiation, writes in the Alexandrian vein. I remain somewhat skeptical: the way the scene is described makes it clear that, for Virgil at least, the poem on the Grynean grove was special, not just one poem in a book of elegies; and while it is obvious that a programmatic statement such as the Grynean grove *could* be a part of a larger book (like the Sixth *Eclogue* itself), the fact that there is no such overtly poetic statement in the *Monobiblos* seems to suggest the contrary.⁷

What is needed is a closer examination of this poetic geography in its poetic context in the three most important passages, *Eclogue* 6. 64 f., Propertius 2. 10. 25 f.,⁸ and Propertius 2. 13. 3 ff. Ross is right that 2. 10. 25 f. does not imply that Permessus is not a part of Helicon, but he is wrong in his further deductions. There are a number of geographical terms in these passages: the river Permessus, the springs of Ascra, the grove of Ascra, Helicon, and the Aonian mountains must all be distinguished, and they do not all necessarily refer to Alexandrian or "Gallan" poetry. Whatever Helicon meant in Greek, at Rome it was the mountain of all poets, not just of Callimacheans. In the second century B.C., Ennius may have been there;⁹ Propertius put him there (3. 3. 6), drinking appropriately from *magni fontes*. And to take only one later example of the general poetic nature of Helicon, there is

5. In order to have Euphorion write only hexameters, Ross must deny the evidence of pseudo-Probus, who calls him an *elegiarum scriptor*. The scholiast may have inferred this from Euphorion's known influence on Gallus, but pseudo-Probus is a tricky source, who knows some strange things. On *Ecl.* 6. 82, for instance, he cites Callimachus (699 Pf.) in a way that contains both error and a correct translation from Callimachus himself. He cannot be dismissed out of hand.

6. If we had to rely on Quintilian (10. 1. 96) and Diomedes (cited p. 250), we would not know that Catullus wrote hexameters or elegiacs; in the list-tradition, he is an iambographer.

7. Ross's analysis of some of the implicit statements about poetry (e.g., 1. 1 and 1. 2) is excellent; so, in a more readable fashion, is Commager's.

8. I accept, as does Ross (and Hubbard, *Propertius*, pp. 41 ff., and, more cautiously, Sullivan, *Propertius: A Critical Introduction*, p. 7), Lachmann's hypothesis that 2. 10 was the first poem in Propertius' third book, and that the statements in 2. 10 and 2. 13 are designed to reflect a new development in his poetry. On the book divisions, see now O. Skutsch, "The Second Book of Propertius," *HSCP* 79 (1975): 229-33.

9. Cf. Lucretius 1. 118 and O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968), p. 127.

Manilius 2. 50 f.: "omnis ad accessus Heliconos semita trita est / et iam confusi manant de fontibus amnes." Even though Manilius gives only a hackneyed rehash of Callimachean motifs, he serves to draw attention to the significant contrast within Helicon, that of size and purity of water.

The adjective *Ascraeus* probably need not refer to Callimachean poetry either: it all depends on the noun it modifies. Propertius proclaims in 2. 10 that his poetry has not yet known the Ascraean springs, but in 2. 13 he is living in the Ascraean *nemus*. As Ross sees, the two passages are not contradictory, but his explanation is not clear or convincing. The crucial passage is 2. 13. 4 ff.:

[Amor] iussit et Ascraeum sic habitare nemus
non ut Pieriae quercus mea uerba sequantur,
aut possim Ismaria ducere ualle feras,
sed magis ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia uersu:
tunc ego sim Inachio notior arte Lino.

Sic . . . non ut . . . sed magis ut . . . is very clear: Propertius is living in the grove in one way, but others are possible. The grove of Ascra, I suggest, is the same as Helicon itself: all poets are welcome there. They may drink from different fountains and rivers, and be higher or lower on the mountain, but they are still poets. That is all that Propertius means here. The spring of 2. 10. 25 f., however, is quite different: "nondum etiam Ascraeos norunt mea carmina fontis / sed modo Permessi flumine lauit Amor." The contrast is not between *Ascraeos* and *Permessi* alone, but between *fontis* and *flumine*, and perhaps between *norunt* and *lauit*. The source of Permessus was Aonian Aganippe, the fountain alluded to here and in Virgil's reference to the Aonian mountains.¹⁰ In 2. 10 Propertius is saying that his poetry is still not very good, and it is the reference to the river and the spring that shows that he is speaking in Alexandrian terms.

What then of Gallus in the Sixth Eclogue? It is not the name of Permessus that is important, but the fact that it is a river, and that Gallus is wandering (like the bull Pasiphae is following in 6. 58). He is then taken up to the Aonian mountains (the source of Permessus) and given the pipes and his subject. If these lines mean anything at all, Virgil is suggesting that Gallus' poem on the Grynean grove represented a great advance in his poetic technique, that he was approaching true Callimacheanism. It does not have to mean a change from love poetry to epyllion, although it could mean that. It could mean that all of Gallus' previous poetry was nugatory, and that he had finally found a worthwhile subject. In fact, it could mean that he had not written anything at all before this. What in all probability it does not mean is the one thing Ross wants, namely, that the poem on the Grynean grove was simply one poem, albeit an important one, in a book of the *Amores*.

Ross's argument about the nature of Gallus' *Amores* is based on his belief (which is extremely dubious to me) that they were Gallus' sole literary production. Such an argument, however, is unnecessary, because the dedication of Parthenius' book in fact provides all the evidence that is needed to show that the *Amores* were Alexandrian in inspiration. Ross says, correctly, that the fact that Parthenius says that Gallus may use his book for both hexameter and elegy does not tell us any-

10. The two are at least related; it may be only that the nymph Aganippe was the daughter of the river Permessus. The testimonia are confused; see R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1953), p. 103 (addenda to frag. 1a), and Ross, p. 33.

thing at all about what Gallus actually wrote: it is prescriptive rather than descriptive. But it does show that Parthenius thought that *either* type of poem would include such erudite material, and Parthenius should have known. Whether or not Gallus wrote epyllia—and I am still inclined to think that he did—his elegies must have been equally learned.

One further reason to believe in the sophistication of Gallus' elegy is Ross's analysis of his style, as inferred from Propertius and Virgil. Here, I believe, Ross is on solid ground, and offers a good explanation for Quintilian's description of Gallus as *durior*. Ross has taken the discussions of Skutsch, Norden, and Tränkle on such words as *antrum* and *medicina* a considerable stage further. That is one of the most valuable aspects of the book, but it is so detailed that I can merely refer the reader to it. Our knowledge of the style not only of Gallus but of Propertius as well is greatly increased. But when it comes to the identification of subjects, rather than words, as Gallan, the argument is much less convincing.

Four stories and a poetic genealogy are attributed by Ross to Gallus. The Sixth Eclogue shows that he must have written about the Grynean grove; the others are the story of Milanion in Propertius 1. 1, the story of Acontius and Cydippe related to Propertius 1. 18, the story of Hylas from both the Sixth Eclogue and Propertius 1. 20, and the scene of poetic initiation from the Sixth Eclogue. Of these five topics, only that of the Grynean grove and the connected scene of poetic initiation are unquestionably Gallan; the extent of the indebtedness will be considered shortly. The presence of a story of Hylas is doubtful, as Ross himself admits. That the description of the fountain in Propertius 1. 20, addressed to Gallus,¹¹ is derived from Gallus' description of the Grynean grove is brilliantly demonstrated by Ross; but since a putative Hylas poem is unlikely to have been the same as that on the Grynean grove, I see little necessity for postulating the existence of a Gallan Hylas. The fact that Hylas is one of the first topics in Silenus' song suggests to me that it is not a Gallan topic, rather than the reverse.

As for Milanion and Acontius, the arguments are more complex. To take only the first of these: Milanion in Propertius 1. 1. 11 ff. is wandering on Mt. Parthenius; that mountain occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry only in Gallus' speech in *Eclogue* 10. 57, a passage in which Gallus uses language that a Milanion-figure might have used (Ross, pp. 61 f.). That the archaic language of the Milanion exemplum points to a Gallan model had already been suggested by Tränkle, and the analyses of both Tränkle and Ross seem to me to demonstrate that as conclusively as the nature of the evidence permits. But Ross finds further evidence in Ovid's version of the story (*Ars. am.* 2. 185 ff.), which contains details found in the Tenth Eclogue, but not in Propertius. According to Ross, this implies that there was a common source in Gallus' own poem on the subject.

This argument is unsatisfactory for two reasons. The method of *Quellenforschung* seems to me to be that of Lachmannite textual criticism; it is mechanical, and it ignores the possibility of *contaminatio*. There is no reason that Ovid could not have put the passages together himself—although he too had probably read Gallus. In the same way, Propertius 1. 3 combines allusions to Catullus 64 and to the same poet's epigrams (1. 3. 25 from 76. 9). No postulated pre-Catullan poem combining both is necessary: Augustan poets were

11. The question of the identity of the Galli of 1. 5, 10, 13, 20, and 21 is vexed; the last is almost certainly not the poet, and there is no firm evidence that any of the others is. The addressee of 1. 20 is the most likely candidate, and that of 5, 10, and 13 (who must be one person) may be. Not only Ross, but Commager (*Prolegomenon*, p. 12, n.) identifies the Gallus of 10 and 13 as the poet, and Sullivan (*Propertius: A Critical Introduction*, p. 33, n.) thinks that even the Gallus of 21 is the same man. Hubbard (*Propertius*, p. 25) denies any connection, and it seems to me that the noble ancestry of the addressee of 5 makes identification with the poet difficult.

capable of independent thought. Secondly, Ross's interpretation of the Milanion exemplum seems to me to ignore its humorous elements; I would suggest that Propertius here is not accepting Gallan poetics, but rejecting (or at least modifying) them: elegiac love no longer needs such obscure mythological consolations. Propertius is not copying Gallus, but parodying him.¹²

The four stories that Propertius and Virgil may have taken from Gallus, however, are by no means so important as Ross's attribution to him of the "poetic genealogy" in the middle of the Sixth Eclogue, when Virgil describes the presentation of the pipes to Gallus. Ross shows that much of it appears here in Latin for the first time, and that the presence of Linus and Orpheus is both new and important. It is clear that the role of Linus is an innovation, probably based on Callimachus, and, possibly, on Theocritus 24. Orpheus must be related to the song put into his mouth in Apollonius. The whole intention of the genealogy is to show the unity of all good poetry, the lines of true descent from Apollo and the Muses through Hesiod, Orpheus, and Linus, through the Hellenistic poets, to Gallus and Virgil. It supplies a theoretical basis for the broad developments of Augustan poetry, particularly in Horace and Virgil: true poetry is not based on form or content, but on style. That is the genuine heritage of Callimachus. Ross's observations on this score are excellent and important: it was the recognition of the relationship of all poetry, without regard to genre, that permitted the appearance of so many diverse works in the Augustan age. The question remains, however: was this discovery made for Latin poetry by Gallus, as Ross thinks, or by Virgil himself?

In the first place, it is not at all clear that Orpheus appears in Virgil's version directly, or that he was in Gallus'. Ross is unnecessarily dogmatic about this point in discussing *Eclogue* 6. 69–71:

hos tibi dant calamos, en accipe, Musae
Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.

The strangeness of Hesiod's leading trees from the mountains has long been noted, and Ross attempts to remove the difficulty (p. 23): "The two relative clauses can be taken separately, and *ille* can be understood . . . as indicating a change of subject." *Ille* would then be Orpheus. This is very neat, but it is scarcely Latin. *Ille* does denote a change of subject, but the Muses, not Hesiod, are the subject of the preceding clause, and *ille* refers to the person named in an oblique case in the clause before, Hesiod himself. It is a problem to have Hesiod leading trees, but the mixture of two stories is a typical Alexandrian trait: just as later in the same poem Virgil refers to *Scylla Nisi* when he means the other Scylla, so here he refers to one poet and means the other as well.¹³ It is a double reference, which alters and magnifies both Hesiod and Orpheus. Both represent different types of "scientific" poetry (Ross, p. 28), and by amalgamating them Virgil combines the poet who controls nature (Orpheus) with the poet who describes it (Hesiod): it is thus suggested that description and control are really part of the same process. We can never be sure that Gallus did not perform this oblique synthesis, but it is so typical of Virgil that I rather doubt it. My feeling is that Hesiod, the standard Alexandrian prototype, was invoked by Gallus,

12. In general, I find Commager's discussion of this poem (*Prolegomenon*, pp. 21 ff.) more satisfactory, although he misses the point of some details (e.g., *deducere*, p. 34).

13. Silenus seems to have Orphic powers at *Ecl.* 6. 28, and any good Callimachean could probably do it (cf. Propertius 2. 13. 5 and the priestess of *Aen.* 4. 491).

while Orpheus, a poet whose grip on Virgil's imagination shows again and again, is probably the latter's contribution to the genealogy.

As for Linus, the evidence for his poetic importance in Alexandria is stronger than Ross realized, but his Roman originator is again uncertain. In the first place, Ross does not point out that the story of Linus in Callimachus was in some way concerned with statements about the nature of poetry, in the first person. In fragment 26 Pfeiffer, which is extremely mutilated, one pentameter has *καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ βᾶβδῳ μῦθον ὑφαίνόμενον*, and the next couplet but one begins *ἤνεκ' ἀείδω*. One can only infer that Callimachus himself had used the story of Linus as a vehicle for a statement about his own views of poetry. But whether or not Gallus had used Linus in the same way is unclear. The crucial evidence is Propertius 2. 13. 8, which Ross admits is modeled on the Sixth Eclogue. The important difference is that Propertius gives Linus the epithet *Inachus*, Argive, a feature of the story that is previously attested only in Callimachus, as reported in the *Diegeses* of Conon (*FGrHist* 26 F 1. 19). Ross infers that Gallus had described Linus in this way, and that Propertius had taken it from him. But Propertius was as capable of reading Callimachus as Gallus was, as can be shown in the case of 1. 18 (Ross, pp. 71 f.). Propertius clearly drew on Virgil as well, not only in 2. 13, but also in 3. 3 and 1. 18.¹⁴ And if Callimachus' Linus was an important statement about poetry, it is likely that all of the more literate Roman poets knew it.

Much of the material about Gallus had been suggested long ago by F. Skutsch; Ross has elaborated and strengthened the arguments, but the evidence is still ambiguous. It is the speech that Virgil puts into Gallus' mouth in the Tenth Eclogue that is central, because of Servius' notorious comment on 10. 46: "hi autem omnes uersus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus." No one now, including Ross, takes this literally, but there must be an element of truth in it. Skutsch had seen that portions of Gallus' speech correspond to Propertius 1. 1 and 1. 8, and to other passages of Tibullus and Theocritus; he believed that the whole speech gave a survey of the "elegisch-bukolische Poesie seines verehrten Gallus" (cited by Ross, p. 85). Ross takes it further, and is not very convincing: 10. 50 ff. must derive from an elegy of Gallus on Acontius and Cydippe (pp. 88 f.); lines 55 ff. reflect an elegy in which Gallus used Milanion as an exemplum of *obsequium* (pp. 90 f.); the rejection of this poetry in lines 62 ff. (whose language is analyzed brilliantly by Ross) seems to be a denial of the power of either pastoral or scientific poetry for a lover. "The realization of the absolute failure of either poetic alternative is complete in the face of Love's domination" (p. 96).

What Ross believes is that, on at least one level, Virgil is reflecting in the Sixth and Tenth Eclogues actual developments in Gallus' own poetry: from the scientific-mythological, to the Alexandrian exempla of love, Milanion and Acontius, to a pastoral type, to pure love-poetry of experience, or at least fictional first-person expression. These stages presumably correspond roughly to the four books of Gallus' *Amores*. At the same time, however, Ross recognizes that Virgil must have transformed Gallus completely, that Virgil has used the themes of Gallus' narrative poetry and fashioned them into first-person experience—Gallus, for instance, becomes his own Milanion—and transformed the whole into an expression of his own pessimistic attitudes. Leaving aside the question of pessimism—for I find in the Tenth Eclogue an extremely ironic presentation of Gallus' pessimism that

14. Compare also Propertius 1. 18. 20 and *Ecl.* 1. 1; 1. 18. 31 and *Ecl.* 1. 5, 1. 22. 5 and *Ecl.* 1. 71.

makes it slightly humorous—I think that Ross shows great sensitivity to the aims of Virgilian poetry, and one could wish that he had allowed himself to express his literary judgments more often. He seems, however, to concentrate on turning the biographical fallacy into a new direction (as he himself admits on the first page of the book). He rightly condemns efforts to read the first-person expressions of any poet as autobiographical, and in the process he has disposed (forever, I hope) of the idea that there is any such thing as true “subjective love elegy” in Roman poetry. And yet, at the same time, he has tried to read the Tenth Eclogue as a poetic biography, an exposition of the themes of Gallus’ poetry in order of composition. Even while doing this, however, he remains fully aware of the presence of the overwhelming genius and control of Virgil’s own ideas, and his argument rests uneasily between these two perceptions.

But if the details of Ross’s Gallus are not always convincing, the overall clarity and logic of his argument make it extremely attractive. Propertius makes a great deal more sense if he is following Ross’s Gallus; we learn to see the emphasis on love in the *Monobiblos* as something not automatically to be expected of an elegist, and we learn to recognize the often oblique Alexandrianism of that book. The *Monobiblos* is a departure from Gallus, not a continuation, and the opening poems of Propertius 3, with their confused but emphatic proclamation of Callimachean principles, make more sense after Ross’s interpretation, even though, as I have already suggested, his interpretation of the tone of Propertius 3 leaves much to be desired. His explanation of parallel developments in Horace makes more sense of the Roman Odes than any other discussion that I know. But a Gallus whose development is opposite to that of any Augustan poet seems odd to me: from abstract to personal is not the progression that one expects, and Ross can never explain satisfactorily the contradiction between a Gallus in whose first poems Lycoris is at most a peg to hang Alexandrian elegies on, and the Gallus who, Servius said, wrote four books of *Amores* about her.¹⁵ Ross provides a solution, it is true, but it is not really satisfying. It is more important that he reveals the real difficulty of the question. Gallus, Virgil, and Propertius have become a great deal more complex.

One of the reasons that Ross’s book is so good is that the argument is so powerful, and the marshaling of detail so effective. We are swept along from Catullus to Gallus to Propertius 1 and on to the later books without being able, immediately, to offer an alternative explanation of the poetry that he discusses; we may disagree with an argument now and again, but the conclusions tend to quiet doubts. *Backgrounds* seems to me to be one of those rare books whose arguments are dubious, but whose conclusions are not. In order to offer an alternative view of the development of Augustan poetry, much more thought and space would be necessary; I do wish, however, to look briefly at two areas of the Gallan question that Ross does not examine thoroughly, and that deserve to be mentioned. One is the background to Gallus; the other is the relationship of the *Eclogues* to elegy.

“One can say nothing, of course, about . . . Calvus and Cinna” (Ross, p. 101, n. 2). This is a counsel of despair, and the examples are unfortunate. Fraenkel said

15. Lycoris’ presence is strong not only in references to Gallus’ own poetry (e.g., Propertius 2. 34. 91; Ovid *Am.* 1. 15. 30), but in the Tenth Eclogue itself (10. 2). This makes it hard to think of her as incidental.

a great deal about Calvus,¹⁶ and T. P. Wiseman has now done the same for Cinna.¹⁷ Other names could have been used, about whom we know less: Varius and Pollio, for instance, who are both mentioned in the *Eclogues*. None of these figures can ever be more than shadows to us, but they cannot simply be ignored. The gap between Catullus and the *Eclogues* can be filled with some of them: Wiseman is very helpful in this respect. Cicero's reference to *neoteri* is from 50 B.C.—after Catullus had stopped writing—and that to the *poetae noui* is even later.¹⁸ The twenty years may be ten or less, and there is still the perplexing figure Varro of Atax to put in, even though not a word of his poems to Leucadia survives.¹⁹

The list of missing links is not mere emptiness, because we know that some of these poems were read by Virgil and Propertius. Calvus in particular was important, and it is striking that he appears, at least obliquely, in the Sixth Eclogue. Servius Danielis on 6. 47 reports: "Caluus in Io 'a uirgo infelix, herbis pascereis amaris.' " The reminiscence is in the section of Silenus' song about Pasiphae, and this alone would suggest that we should be wary of assigning any parts of the song, even the Grynean grove, to specific poems: there were many sources. It should also be noted that the poem echoed here is an epyllion, not an elegy, and it is even more important that the same epyllion, along with Catullus 64, is alluded to in elegy, in Propertius 1. 3.²⁰

Moreover, even if 68 is the only one of Catullus' poems that looks forward to the development of elegy, it does not mean that other poets were not experimenting in this genre. In particular, Calvus' elegy (or elegies) on his wife Quintilia involved references to his other loves, and provoked a reply in Catullus 96. Thus "love elegy," in some form, is even earlier than some of Catullus. Indeed, there is an important fragment of Parthenius that is rarely mentioned (perhaps because it was only identified in 1943, and is not in any major collection):²¹ the *Arete* was presumably written before Parthenius was taken to Rome, in the 70s or 60s. It was not a small poem like Catullus 96 or 101, but seems to have been remarkably like Calvus' poem on Quintilia: "The particular character of Parthenios' elegy consists in the fact that the poet himself revealed his own sentiments in this larger poetical form, not compressing them into a few distichs. At least one couple of mythological figures, Iris and her husband Zephyrus, were connected with these personal utterances."²² It was perhaps Parthenius himself who developed the long

16. E. Fraenkel, "Catullus' Trostgedicht für Calvus," *WS* 69 (1956): 277–88 = *Kleine Beiträge* (Rome, 1964), 2: 103–113.

17. T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (Leicester, 1974), pp. 44–58.

18. Wiseman, *Cinna*, p. 51, points out what Ross, p. 3, n., omits, that *neoteri* is an Alexandrian term. On its use see also A. Severyns, *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège, 1928), pp. 31–61.

19. Varro Atacinus is a mysterious character, whose fragments I hope to edit shortly. Wendell Clausen has pointed out (in an article to appear in *Illinois Studies*, vol. 2) that Varro frag. 7 Morel is an imitation of Catullus 64. 119; his elegies (if they were elegies) may have been equally influenced by neoteric poetry.

20. Ross, pp. 56 f., is forced by his thesis to deny that these are specific allusions, but I find that argument one of the least convincing of the book; see also n. 3.

21. R. Pfeiffer, "A Fragment of Parthenius' *Arete*," *CQ* 37 (1943): 23–32 = *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Munich, 1960), pp. 133–47; see Wiseman, *Cinna*, p. 50, n. 33, for further bibliography, and Hubbard, *Propertius*, pp. 10 f.

22. Pfeiffer, "Parthenius," p. 32.

elegiac poem on a woman, using mythological exempla; he may have influenced Gallus, Cinna, and Catullus 68 as well as Calvus. It is also perhaps worth noting that the connection between love and death in Catullus 68 is not necessarily a part of his personal pathology, but is essential to the genre from the very beginning. The *Arete* and Calvus' poem on Quintilia both fit into this pattern, and it does much to explain the morbidity of many poems of Propertius and Tibullus.

Gallus, then, is simply not the only name in the void. Virgil did think that he was important, and therefore he may have been better than most, but we can say almost nothing about his poetry. We cannot even be certain that the themes echoed by Propertius came from his *Amores*, since Propertius borrowed from epyllia with equal ease. What has to be asked is not what Gallus did in his elegies to make the emergence of a Propertius possible, but how it is that Propertius finds elegy a suitable place to make use not only of elegy, but of epyllion as well. As Ross so clearly points out, it is the Sixth Eclogue that stressed the unity of all poetry and the obliteration of formal distinctions between genres. Ross thinks that Gallus did this before Virgil; I suspect that it was Virgil himself.

I have already noted that Ross does not pay enough attention to the relationship between the *Eclogues* and elegy; indeed it is a topic that has never been studied closely enough. As far as Gallus is concerned, the nature of the evidence makes the subject extremely difficult: the only way that we can possibly reconstruct Gallus' poetry is from Virgil, and therefore the only allusions in elegy that can firmly be recognized are those that are related to the *Eclogues*. The portrait of Gallus as an erudite poet is hampered by this: we cannot tell if any of the less mythological poems of Propertius are influenced by Gallus, as there is simply no evidence to help us. On the other hand, the pastoral element that both Skutsch and Ross find in Gallus is suspicious. Even if there were not such an emphasis in Gallus, it would have been necessary for Virgil to add it in order to make his own *Eclogues* internally coherent. It is most true of Gallus' famous lines in the Tenth Eclogue (50 f., quoted earlier): "ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita uersu / carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor auena." Given the context of these lines, it is nonsense to conclude that Gallus was concerned with pastoral. Both Tityrus in *Eclogue* 1. 2 and Virgil himself in 6. 1 are players on the pastoral reed, and Virgil's Gallus is here first acknowledging the supremacy of Virgilian pastoral, and later denying its relevance for himself. Whatever pastoral element there was in Gallus was overemphasized by Virgil for his own poetry, and elaborated still further by modern critics.

When Propertius read Gallus, he read him through Virgil's eyes. This emerges clearly from 3. 3, whose most striking lines describe the new grotto of his inspiration (3. 3. 29 f.): "orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago / fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaeae, tui." As Ross notes (p. 137, n.), Silenus is taken from the Sixth Eclogue, Pan from the opening of the *Georgics*. That the Sixth Eclogue is the primary reference is shown by an earlier line (3. 3. 3), "reges, Alba, tuos, et regum facta tuorum," which clearly refers to *Eclogue* 6. 3, "cum canerem reges et proelia," which is in turn a reference to Callimachus. But in the Eclogue, Silenus is not one of the group of Linus, Hesiod, and the other poetic prototypes: he is the singer of the song in which they occur. It is the fact of the Eclogue, the fact of Silenus' singing the song, that

gives him a place in Propertius' version of the genealogy: Silenus stands for Virgil. I do not think that even Ross would make Silenus figure in Gallus' poem.²³

When Ross discusses the importance of the theory of poetic unity in diversity expressed in the Sixth Eclogue, he is absolutely right. That Gallus was its inventor is doubtful. I have suggested a few reasons why the genealogy is largely Virgil's own creation; if Gallus had one, it seems likely to me that the only figures in it were the traditional ones, Hesiod and Callimachus, and perhaps Parthenius as well. But, as it is a basic tenet of Callimachean poetry that the true poet adapts but does not merely repeat, and must find his own new path and spring, I doubt very much that Gallus' poetics were at all as intense and complex as Virgil's. We have in Virgil one of the great poetic minds of all times: the *Eclogues* combine elegy and epyllion, pastoral and politics, poetic theory and love poetry, humor and pathos into a book of such poetic unity and diversity that it influenced the development of all future poetry. "Only connect": that is what Virgil did in all of his works; it needs no demonstration. To attribute the connections to Gallus rather than to Virgil himself seems superfluous and improbable: "ingenia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem."

What, then, is the Gallus that Ross has so brilliantly recovered? Quite simply, he is the Gallus that Virgil created, a semifictional hero-poet, embodying Virgil's own view of poetry. Ross has discovered precisely what Virgil intended his readers to think about "Gallus," but the resemblance of Virgil's Gallus to the real one need not have been very close. Just as Hesiod was created for the Alexandrians by Callimachus, and Callimachus for the Romans by Parthenius, so Gallus was created by Virgil. What Ross has really done is to show us how later poets read the *Eclogues*; if they ever did read the real Gallus, it was only because Virgil had shown them how.

One further point: if Gallus was as brilliant as Ross makes him, why do his works not survive? Chance, of course, plays a large part, and certainly politics did as well; but the latter would affect the *Ars amatoria* just as much as Gallus' *Amores*. I suspect that Gallus was simply superseded by Virgil. His influence lived on through the *Eclogues*, and through one other mysterious figure not mentioned by Ross, Caecilius Epirota. Suetonius (*Gram.* 16) gives us a few facts and some faulty inferences about him. We do know that he was a close friend of Gallus, and that after the fall of Gallus he opened a school, presumably in 27 or shortly thereafter: "primusque [dicitur] Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse." If he began to expound Virgil and possibly Gallus during the former's lifetime, we have good reason to see why Propertius was so influenced by the theories of poetry in the *Eclogues*, and we can give an alternate interpretation of the sudden and uneasy change in his statements of inspiration in 25 B.C. and later.²⁴ I note also the astonishing coincidence between Propertius' interpretation of Virgil's *reges* (*Ecl.* 6. 3) as the kings of Alba in 3. 3. 3, and the comments of the ancient scholia on the same line; the error in interpretation that persists to the present day may have begun

23. Ross's own difficulty in deciding whom Propertius is claiming for his inspiration is instructive. On p. 121, 3. 3 involves "acceptance of the neotericism of *Gallus and Virgil*"; on p. 122, the same poem shows that "he accepts *Gallan* poetics fully" (my italics).

24. The influence of the Sixth Eclogue in particular is much more noticeable in 2. 10 (the beginning of a new book, see n. 8) and later; I think that the change comes in about 25 B.C., although Propertian chronology is difficult.

in Virgil's lifetime. That, however, is pure speculation; but that the *Eclogues* made Gallus rapidly obsolete—perhaps not until after the *Monobiblos*, but at about the same time—seems extremely probable. Just as the *Aeneid* superseded the earlier epic poets, so Gallus was surpassed in his own lifetime. We do not have his poems because the ancients did not need to read them. I suspect that Ross would be sorely disappointed if Gallus' poetry should ever be recovered.

I have concentrated on the weaknesses of Ross's book, and on Gallus in particular, but there are many strengths, and Ross himself not only supplies most of the evidence for questioning his arguments, he even draws attention to the weaker points. If for "Gallus" we read "Virgil's Gallus," then in many cases what he says is not only brilliant, but right. Whatever its failings, this is a very original and important book. Ross begins his preface (p. vii) by saying: "The arguments and conclusions in this book are intended for scholars." I take this to be a translation of "Odi profanum uulgus et arceo." Ross is a thorough Callimachean. His erudition is immense and not always easy to follow. His chapter on the Sixth Eclogue is in fact written in the form of an epyllion: detailed argument about single words and lines take up most of it, and his general interpretation is given only in the last paragraphs. He expects us to know Virgil and Propertius as well as Callimachus expected his readers to know Homer and Hesiod. Consequently, like Callimachus, Ross may expect to have his Telchines. But he has trodden a narrow path, and he has found his own pure spring; and just as very few Romans ever really read and understood Callimachus, I fear that few will really read Ross with the attention he deserves. But they should; in Ross Callimachus and his followers have found a worthy interpreter and successor.

J. E. G. ZETZEL
Princeton University