

THE DATING OF THE *CIRIS*¹

ONCE we have accepted that the *Ciris* stems from neither Virgil nor Gallus, but was written by a post-Virgilian poetaster,² the obvious task for us is to try and formulate some more specific idea of the date of the poem. I think that it has been sufficiently proved that the *Ciris* is not only post-Virgilian, but post-Ovidian in origin, including as it does unquestionable imitations of that author.³ But this, to date, is really as far as we have got. It is the purpose of this paper to put forward the thesis that the author of the *Ciris* lived late enough to know and be influenced by Statius and other poets of the later first century A.D.

Now of course any theory that the *Ciris* knew and used Statius and other Silver poets is rendered highly unlikely if it can be maintained that Suetonius considered it, with the other *minora*, a genuine Virgilian work. And so we are brought back again to the famous list in the Donatan *Life*:

deinde Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem, cum esset annorum XXVI. cuius materia talis est. pastor fatigatur aestu; cum sub arbore condormisset et serpens ad eum proreperet, e palude culex provolavit atque inter duo tempora aculeum fixit pastori. at ille continuo culicem contrivit et serpentem interemit ac sepulchrum culici statuit et distichon fecit:

parve culex, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti
funeris officium vitae pro munere reddit.

scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur Aetnam.⁴

If this does in truth represent the tradition of the original Suetonian *vita Vergilii*, as is often claimed, then it is practically inconceivable that the author of the *Ciris* lived late enough to echo Statius. I shall therefore briefly reconsider this passage and its origins, in the wider context of the other ancient evidence for the genuineness of the *Ciris* and the rest of the *minora*:⁵ I am of course not questioning the certain spuriousness of almost all the *Appendix*;⁶ I am

¹ A preliminary draft of this paper has been read by Professors Brink and Goodyear, Mr. Kenney, and Professor Skutsch, and I here gratefully acknowledge their advice.

² See especially Leo's articles, 'Vergil und die *Ciris*', *Hermes* xxxvii (1902), 14-55 (*Ausg. kl. Schrift.* ii. 29-70), and 'Nochmals die *Ciris* und Vergil', *Hermes* xlii (1907), 35-77 (*Ausg. kl. Schrift.* ii. 71-112); also F. Munari, 'Studi sulla *Ciris*', *Atti Real. Acad. d'Italia, sci. mor. e stor.*, ser. vii. 4 (1944), 273-314.

³ See most conveniently F. Munari, loc. cit. 315 ff.

⁴ Hardie's text in the O.C.T. *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, sect. 17-19.

⁵ The minor poems are not transmitted in any of the great ancient codices of Virgil, but the Catalogue of the Murbach Monas-

tery (for which see below) and the Graz fragment (possibly copied direct from an ancient codex: see W. Clausen, *CPh* lix [1964], 90 ff. and further bibliography there) suggest that there was a collected edition of the *minora* in late Antiquity. Such an edition may lie behind the Donatan list, but I suggest below that it is unlikely that Donatus himself at least had much first-hand knowledge of the poems.

⁶ Anyone, it seems to me, who claims authenticity for any part of the *Appendix* except for one or two poems of the *Catalepton*, is treading very dubious ground. The works of scholars like Rand, Frank, and Rostagni in this respect are pure eccentricities. Any lingering doubts over the *Culex* should be dispelled by Fraenkel's article on it (*JRS* xlii [1952], 1-9).

interested, rather, in to what extent the Ancients, and primarily the first century, *thought* these poems Virgilian—to what extent indeed they had any knowledge of them at all.

Established opinion now favours—quite rightly I think—the view that the Donatan *Life of Virgil* which we possess is in essence a close reflection of the original Suetonian *vita*.¹ But what surely no one can maintain is that a bare catalogue of works, like the one quoted above, could not be inserted into a tradition, or that an original kernel could not be interpolated or expanded, or indeed contracted. This could happen even in the normal course of manuscript transmission; and we, of course, know that the original Suetonian version has passed through the hands of Donatus, who was fully at liberty to make alterations or additions in the light, as he thought, of his better knowledge. This is an argument from plain common sense, quite divorced from any stylistic pronouncements on our present text or consideration of other available evidence. It will be illustrative to note in passing, I think, what happens to the Donatan tradition of the *minora* in later years and subsequent lists.²

The *vita Servii* basically adopts the Donatan list, but adds the *Copa* and mentions no doubt over the authenticity of the *Aetna*.³ The *vita Probiana* mentions no *minora* at all, the *vita Focae* just the *Culex*.⁴ In the ninth-century catalogue of the Murbach monastery, the list of Virgilian *minora* is as in the Servian *Life*, but plus the *Moretum* and *Maecenas*, and minus the *Epigrammata*.⁵ The 'vulgate life', or *Donatus auctus*,⁶ includes the *Moretum* in addition to those listed in Donatus, but has no mention of the *Catalepton* or the *Ciris*, while not omitting the *Epigrammata*. One could continue, but the lesson is already plain: any catalogue like this is bound to be volatile—prone both to accretion and omission. Let us therefore for the moment leave the muddled scene of the

¹ On the question of the relationship of our '*vita Donati*' to the actual work of Donatus, as well as to the original Suetonian *vita*, the most convenient summary is in K. Büchner's *P. Vergilius Maro* (Stuttgart, 1961), 2-4 (= *RE* viiia, 1, pp. 1022-4). Coincidence of vocabulary and method of expression etc. tie up our Donatan life closely with Suetonius, via Donatus. Not unexpectedly, however, there is not absolute agreement about the details of the affinity, and of course the question of the list of *minora* concerns us acutely. As well as Büchner, cf. e.g. H. Nettleship, *Ancient Lives of Vergil* (Oxford, 1879), G. Körte, *In Suetonii de viris illustribus libros inquisitionum capita tria* (Diss. phil. Halenses xiv, 1898-1901, pars 3, 189-284), F. Leo, *Die griechische-römische Biographie* (Leipzig, 1901), 11-13, H. Naumann, 'Suetons Vergilvita', *RhM* lxxxvii (1938), 334-76.

² I am assuming for the moment that the list of minor works in our version of the *vita Donati* represents the list as it was in the original Donatan *Life*. For a plausible *stemma vitarum* see p. xxvii of Hardie's edition (based on H. R. Upson).

³ Unless the phrase *septem sive octo libros*

hos is indicative of doubt over *Aetna*.

⁴ Texts of both these *Lives* are in Hardie's O.C.T. I cannot help wondering, in view of the conclusions I come to with regard to Suetonius and the list of *minora*, whether this might not be an indication that these particular *Lives* had access to a purer, pre-Donatan tradition.

⁵ The *Epigrammata* remain rather mysterious, nothing surviving under that name. But quite possibly the title originally designated part or all of a collection containing what we now know as the *Catalepton* and *Priapea*; cf. Büchner, op. cit. 44 = *RE* viiia, 1, p. 1064. In our MSS, both these are in fact transmitted under the heading *Catalepton*, but the Priapean poems do closely cohere as a distinct group (cf. Büchner, op. cit. 48 = *RE* viiia, 1, 1068). It is to be noted that Quint. (*Inst.* 8. 3. 29) implicitly, and Marius Victorinus (*Gramm. Lat.* Keil, 6. 137. 24) explicitly, refer to a poem of our *Catalepton* collection as an *epigramma*.

⁶ Text in Diehl, *Die Vitae Vergilianae* (Bonn, 1911, kleine Texte 72), 26-37. For this life, see also Büchner, op. cit. 4 = *RE* viiia, 1, p. 1024.

Donatan and post-Donatan lists and see what other specific ancient evidence there is for the acceptance of the minor poems as genuine, looking in particular for any *testimonia* in the period preceding the writing of Suetonius' *de viris illustribus*.¹

There are no references at all to *Priapea*, *Epigrammata*, *Dirae*, *Ciris*, and *Aetna* during the whole pre-Suetonian and Suetonian period; for the enigmatic *Epigrammata* and for the *Dirae*, in fact, there are no citations during the whole of antiquity, except in the Donatan and post-Donatan *vitae*.² For the *Priapea*, unless they are being thought of by Pliny at *Epist.* 5. 3 (for which see below), the only other possible reference is in Diomedes, *Gramm. Lat.* Keil, 1. 512. 27.³ Servius refers to an *Aetna Vergilii* at *Aen.* 3. 571, though this does no more than confirm the statement of the Servian *vita*; interestingly enough, too, a perusal of Servius' complete note here suggests that he has no sure, first-hand knowledge of the poem.⁴ And for the *Ciris* there is nothing apart from one vague reference, this time in Servius *auctus* on *Ecl.* 6. 3, *alii Scyllam eum* (sc. *Vergilium*) *scribere coepisse dicunt* . . . , in which the writer again reveals by his account of the subject-matter that he could scarcely have known the actual poem.

For the *Catalepton* and the *Culex*, however, the situation is somewhat different, especially for the *Culex*. Both are known, to some extent at least, in the pre-Suetonian period. Quintilian (*Inst.* 8. 3. 27-8) actually quotes as Virgilian the second poem of the *Catalepton* collection. But then, apart from the probability that Pliny has poems of the *Catalepton* in mind at *Epist.* 5. 3,⁵ the only other

¹ My intention is to counter the impression that Vollmer, for example, tries to create in 'Die kleineren Gedichte Vergils', *Sitz. der philos.-philol. u. der hist. Klasse der K.B. Akad. der Wiss. zu München* (1907), 335-74, that these poems are well attested as Virgilian in antiquity. I shall only deal with the ones that appear in the Donatan list (for *Copa* and *Moretum*, see Vollmer, *op. cit.* 349 ff.). In fact Munari (*loc. cit.* 246-72) gives quite a good review of most of the ancient *testimonia* to them, and makes some important points. Indeed it was only through prejudging the issue of the linguistic parallels between the *Ciris* and the Silver epicists that he missed the full significance of some of these points, as regards the date of the *Ciris*.

I shall not here consider in detail the indications concerning acceptance of these poems that can be gleaned from apparent verbal echoes in later poets—which do not in any case build up a very clear picture. e.g. I have noticed several probable echoes of the *Ciris* in Claudian, and a case can be made (with varying degrees of success) for echoes of other poems in the *Appendix* by Claudian and Ausonius (cf. R. B. Steele, *TAPhA* lxi (1930), 203 ff.) and other poets.

² To be more accurate, no *collection* with the title *Epigrammata* is mentioned: cf. p. 234 n. 5 above.

³ Talking of metres, Diomedes says: *Priapeum quo Vergilius in prolusionibus suis usus*

fuit, tale est . . . , and he quotes a verse, the metre of which is certainly used in the third poem of our collection of *Priapea*, but which itself does not appear there.

⁴ See Goodyear's *ed. maior* of the *Aetna*, p. 56 note 2. The only other sign of recognition of the *Aetna* that Vollmer can muster is that line 320 is adduced s.v. *suffocat* by the *Exempla Vaticana* (Keil).

⁵ Pliny, while defending his own *versiculos severos parum* (5. 3. 2)—apparently the *hendecasyllabos* . . . *quibus* . . . *iocamur ludimus amamus dolemus querimur*, etc. of 4. 14. 2 f.—appeals to the example of (among others) *P. Vergilius* (5. 3. 6). So apparently he knows of Virgilian occasional verses, probably some of them erotic or risqué, as this seems to be a main concern in *Epist.* 5. 3. Bearing in mind Quintilian's evidence, we are probably right to imagine he is thinking of some of the *Catalepton*; this certainly seems more likely than that he could have had in mind the three *Priapea*, at least exclusively—but it is not impossible that the *Priapea* were from the start in one collection with some or all of our *Catalepton*.

Pliny's invocation of Virgil should be contrasted with Ovid's reaction in a similar situation; if Ovid had known any of the erotic or risqué *Catalepton* as Virgilian, we might expect them to figure in his list of Roman predecessors in the sphere of amorous poetry at *Trist.* 2. 422 ff. *et Romanus habet*

testimonia to be adduced for this collection are Aus. 12. 14. 5 ff. (Peiper, 167) who talks of the '*Catalepta Maronis*', referring again in particular to the second poem, and Marius Victorinus (*Gramm. Lat.* Keil, 6. 137. 24) who refers to the twelfth poem;¹ the latter person incidentally is known to have drawn a lot of material from Caesius Bassus, a contemporary of Nero.² The *Culex* is best attested, and was apparently fairly widely accepted as Virgilian in the latter part of the first century.³ According to the Suetonian *vita Lucani* and the anecdote recorded therein, Lucan thought of it as genuine.⁴ Statius, too, is by implication of the same opinion in the introduction to *Silv.* 1: *sed et Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus* etc.; and he explicitly refers to the Virgilian authorship at *Silv.* 2. 7. 74; and this is the unquestioned assumption of Martial at 8. 56. 20 and 14. 185. 1. In later centuries we find the *Culex* cited by Nonius Marcellus (vol. 1, p. 312 Lindsay). There are no other specific references.⁵ The *Culex* and the *Catalepton* thus in fact, in spite of their life in the first century, fared scarcely better than the other *minora* in later ages.

There is thus positive evidence that the *Culex* and at least one of the *Catalepton* were regarded as Virgilian prior to the writing of Suetonius' *de viris illustribus*. There is absolutely no evidence that any of the other *minora* were equally honoured. Now if we remember the number of citations from, and references to, the major works, as well as the recognition accorded to the *Culex* and *Catalepton* in this period, I think we begin to see the significance of this in its true perspective:⁶ if works with the titles *Priapea*, *Epigrammata* (distinct from the *Catalepton*), *Dirae*, *Ciris*, and *Aetna* were known at all in the pre-Suetonian period, it never crossed anybody's mind that they might be Virgilian. This is

multa iocosa liber . . . Their absence (as that of the *Ciris*) at *Trist.* 2. 533 ff. is even more noticeable. This ties in with the universal lack of recognition of any of the *minora* during Virgil's lifetime or immediately after it: cf. especially also *Ov. Am.* 1. 15. 25-6, *Prop.* 2. 34. 67 ff., and note of course *Virg. Georg.* 4. 565-6. (On all this see Munari, loc. cit. 252 ff.)

¹ *facit praeterea versum iambicum trimetrum tam 'Simonides' quam 'negotio' repetitum ter, haud alias, quam ut aiunt fecisse Vergilium nostrum iambico epigrammate, thalassio thalassio thalassio* (= *Catal.* 12. 9).

² See Westendorp Boerma's commentary on *Catalepton* i, p. xlii. For further possible indications of knowledge of this collection, see Westendorp Boerma, i, p. xliii.

³ I assume that the text of the *Culex* that we possess is the one accepted by 1st-century literary figures as a genuine Virgilian poem. This of course is where echoes in other authors become very important: cf. e.g. J. W. Spaeth, *TAPhA* lxi (1930), 24. Some scholars (see e.g. C. Plesent, *Le Culex: Étude sur l'Alexandrinisme latin* [Paris, 1910], ch. 1), puzzled by the existence on the one hand of superficially good external evidence for a Virgilian *Culex*, but on the other of overwhelming internal evidence against our present poem's authenticity, have sought a

compromise solution in the theory that a genuine Virgilian *Culex* has been lost (an unlikely occurrence, surely), to be replaced by the present poem. They see some support for this idea in the fact that Donatus' summary of the *Culex* (quoted above) does not exactly fit our present text: a main point is the omission in Donatus of the long *Hades* digression—a reasonable economy for a summarizer, we might feel. I shall be returning to the summary in the Donatan *Life* below (it is, I think, almost certainly later than Suetonius), but it does seem to me that it is very probably not based on a recent reading, or perhaps any first-hand knowledge of the poem at all. In this it is interestingly similar to the Servian references to the *Aetna* and the *Ciris* (see above).

⁴ . . . *ut praefatione quadam aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere 'et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem'.*

⁵ Vollmer's other purported signs of recognition (op. cit. 349) are not cogent.

⁶ Vollmer's plea that the *minora* did not form part of the school edition just is not sufficient. If these works existed and were thought of as Virgilian juvenilia, they would surely have been a bountiful source of interest and remark in the post-Virgilian period, whether they were read in schools or not.

of course an *argumentum ex silentio*, but the silence, in the circumstances, is surely deafening.

Now, I find it very hard to believe that Suetonius' views on this question would have differed radically from those, explicit and implicit, of the first century. I think thus that Suetonius could very possibly have included some part of the *Catalepton*, and the *Culex*, among the works of Virgil as surviving examples of his youthful efforts, but I feel that it is highly improbable to say the least that he could have accepted the other titles mentioned in the catalogue of the *vita Donati*; on these grounds then I do not think that the *vita Donati* can at this point be accurately reflecting the Suetonian *Life*.¹ Whether or not these works existed when Suetonius wrote is a question to be asked in the examination of each individual poem.² At the moment I am merely contending that the *Ciris* at least was written late enough to echo Statius.

These then are the conclusions from common sense and an examination of the available evidence of *testimonia* and citations, without recourse to a detailed examination of the Donatan *Life* as we have it, but there are two or three pieces of internal evidence from the *vita* which support the conclusions made so far. Munari³ makes one very important point, but misses the significance of it. The Donatan *Life* as we have it makes no use of the abundant 'biographical' material offered by the minor poems; the *Ciris* especially, perhaps, might be expected to have provided details, indeed problems, interesting to the biographer. Munari offers no answer to this surprising anomaly. But the solution is now clear: granted that the main text of the *vita* is basically and substantially Suetonian, most of the list of *minora* is revealed as a palpably later, non-Suetonian addition.⁴ Suetonius did not use the evidence of the 'biographical'

¹ We will remember, too, how Suetonius rejected on stylistic grounds forged Horatian *elegi* and a letter of self-commendation purportedly from the poet to Maecenas: see the *vita Horati* (in Klingner's Teubner text of Horace, p. 3, lines 20 ff.). If Suetonius was capable of doing this, can we really imagine him accepting the *Ciris* or the *Dirae* as Virgilian? Even the *Culex*, we might think, would give him pause. Donatus' apparent blanket-approval is puzzling enough, but in the light of the rarity of contemporary *testimonia* and the possible indications of sketchiness in his knowledge of the *Culex*, I have my doubts whether he actually knew many of his list of *minora* at first hand. Cf. above, p. 236 n. 3.

² In the case of the *Aetna* at least, a fairly convincing *terminus ante quem* of composition is the year A.D. 79. See Goodyear's *ed. maior*, p. 59.

³ Loc. cit. 258.

⁴ The *Culex*, which Suetonius probably did include, offers no distinctive biographical detail; nor do *Catal.* 2 and 12, the only poems of that collection for which we have specific ancient *testimonia*. As for *Catal.* 5 and 8, which have generally been considered genuine Virgilian, I think the association with Siro alluded to therein, and other biographical details which are completely

missing from the Donatan *Life*, indicate one of two things: either the poems are post-Suetonian and thus presumably intentional forgeries (like the more obvious *Catal.* 14, for which see Westendorp Boerma ad loc.), or, if they are pre-Suetonian, even Virgilian, Suetonius did not know them: otherwise the biographical material they contain would feature in the *Life* that basically emanates from him. I think too that if these poems were known as Virgilian in the first century, the absence of specific citations from them, especially the attractive *Catal.* 5, becomes very surprising.

Virgil (*Georg.* 4. 563 f.) himself mentions that he wrote the *Georgics* at Naples, and Donatus refers to a 'Campanian retreat': *habuitque domum Romae . . . quamquam secessu Campaniae Siciliaeque plurimum uleretur* (sect. 13); cf. sect. 11 . . . *ut Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellatus sit*. The Servian *Life* says he studied at Naples (Hardie, line 6). Poems, thus, which are apparently Virgilian and imply a close connection between that poet, in whose earlier works a strong dash of Epicureanism is discernible, and Siro, the well-known contemporary Epicurean philosopher and teacher, who functioned at Naples (see Westendorp Boerma, op. cit. i. 99 f.; T. Frank, *Virgil* [Blackwell, Oxford,

minor poems because he did not include them among the Virgilian works, and probably did not even know them.

Secondly, the treatment given to the works in this list is, so far as we can judge, uncharacteristic of Suetonius.¹ In all the other Suetonian lives, mention of the works of an author is accompanied by some remarks pertaining to their occasion or destination, or by some relevant anecdote; in short, the bare catalogue, in these circumstances, is not Suetonius' technique, whereas, incidentally, we do find it employed fairly baldly in the longer non-Suetonian life of Lucan, and Porphyry's *vita Horatii*. Added to which, R. M. Geer² makes the point that when Suetonius *does* for some reason have a series like *Catalepton et Priapea* . . . it is more in his style to omit connectives: Geer compares Suet. Aug. 21. 1. Thus stylistic considerations join ranks with the indications from external evidence to proclaim this catalogue of *minora* un-Suetonian in all respects.³

There is thus no real reason to think that Suetonius believed in the Virgilian authorship of the *Ciris* and in fact all the evidence is against it: the first, and only sure independent, *testimonium* is given in the *vita Donati*. We thus approach the question of the dating of the poem without the approximate *terminus ante quem* normally assumed.

The work of several scholars, has, as I mentioned at the beginning, already established that the author of the *Ciris* closely imitates not only Virgil, but Ovid as well. And the same is true as regards other Augustan poets. It has also been noticed that there are some parallels of expression with the Silver epic poets Lucan, Valerius, Statius, and Silius.⁴ I have been able to add to the list several

1922], 48), are not implausible. And certainly *Catal.* 5 at least would be the work of a very inventive and imaginative forger, who would be creating a motif apparently without authority. It is not impossible, however, to see *Catal.* 8 as a forgery based on knowledge of *Catal.* 5 and other elements of the biographical tradition, and perhaps with echoes of Horace's Sabine farm. *Catal.* 5 then, at least, appears to be either genuine Virgilian, or at least contemporary with him, but it disappeared, only to re-emerge much later.

As well as being missing from the Donatan *Life*, Siro is also unmentioned in the *vita Servii*, the *vita Probiana* (though cf. lines 10 f. (Hardie) *liberali in otio secutus Epicuri sectam*), and the *excerpta* of Jerome. He emerges in the commentaries (Serv. *Ecl.* 6. 13, *Aen.* 6. 264, Schol. Veron. *Ecl.* 6. 10), and in the *vita Focae* (63) and the vulgate *Donatus auctus*. Presumably these latter references are based on knowledge of *Catal.* 5 and/or 8.

¹ Cf. Munari, loc. cit. 257.

² 'Passages in the life of Vergil', *TAPhA* lvii (1926), 111.

³ Geer in fact (op. cit. 110-12) thinks that the whole section from *deinde Catalepton* . . . to the end of the quotation from the *Culex* is un-Suetonian in style, and thus that the

summary must be an addition. I have shown above that it is possible that Suetonius would have included the *Culex* as a Virgilian work, so we may give this a moment's more thought.

Stylistic arguments are less valuable in this sort of case than when considering a specific feature like the list of titles: we could easily imagine Donatus altering the phraseology of a summary—say, if he wanted to abbreviate it. But I still think it highly unlikely that Suetonius would have ever had such a thing: for (a) there is nothing comparable elsewhere in Suetonius, (b) the *Culex* seems to have been sufficiently well known in Suetonius' time to make a summary otiose anyway. It seems to me to belong much more naturally to a later period when knowledge of all the *minora*, including the *Culex* and *Catalepton*, was very sparse. Thus if information was available for one of these rather mysterious poems, it would be natural to work it in. I do not actually think the summary is based on first-hand knowledge of the poem: cf. above, p. 236 n. 3. It ought to be mentioned that Munari, loc. cit. 257, in the face of the un-Suetonian character of the style, sees at least one un-Donatan feature.

⁴ Cf. Munari's list, loc. cit. 248; these are scarcely significant on their own, but since

more such parallels, and these too of greater significance; and it is my contention that if the methods employed by Leo and Munari so successfully in their work are applied to these cases, we can say with some certainty that the author of the *Ciris* knew and was influenced by the work of Statius and probably also of several other later poets.¹

Let us first, though, consider the *Ciris* in relation to the *Culex*: for if as I believe the *Ciris* imitates this poem, it is surely a fair assumption that the author regarded it as a genuine Virgilian work; in which case it is straight away hard to see how we could put the *Ciris* much earlier than Lucan's time, given the certain post-Ovidian dating of the *Culex*.² Of course in each individual case that I discuss there exists (to a greater or lesser degree) the possibility that both poems are independently drawing on a common source now lost. This is true for all the parallels adduced in this paper; it must be remembered each time, and I shall not bother to repeat it. But as the number of parallels mounts up, the continual postulation of this theory begins to wear a bit thin. I think I adduce enough evidence to make it very unlikely that *all* the parallels can be explained this way.

At lines 52, 281, and 382, the author of the *Ciris* applies the epithet *purpureus* to describe the fabulous purple lock that is the guarantee of Nisus' inviolability; and in fact *purpureus* is the most natural and regular word to describe the hair—cf. Ovid, *Met.* 8. 93, Hyg. *Fab.* 198 (*purpureus crinis*); Tib. 1. 4. 63, Prop. 3. 19. 22 (*p. coma*); Virg. *Georg.* 1. 405, Ovid, *Ars* 1. 331 (*p. capillus*); cf. also Apollod. 3. 15. 8 (*πορφυρέαν . . . τρίχα*), etc. Obviously, though, because of the number of times the poet was called upon to mention the purple hair in the *Ciris*, he found it desirable to introduce some variation in its description, to avoid a monotonous repeat of *purpureus crinis*, *coma*, or *capillus*. Two such variations are found at 387 and 319 f., where the circumlocutions involved are really no more than periphrases for *purpureus*; neither of these excites attention. But at 122 the poet describes the colour of Nisus' famous hair with the single adjective *roseus*: *et roseus medio surgebat vertice crinis*. Now it may be maintained that *roseus* can naturally convey the deep red colour probably imagined for the *purpureus crinis*,³ but it does seem to me that the use of *roseus* here, in what turns out to be an almost unparalleled collocation for the word, would have seemed startling and bold to a Roman reader. I know in fact of only one other place in Latin literature where *roseus* is applied to *crinis*, or indeed to 'hair' at all, and that is at *Culex* 44: *crinibus et roseis tenebras Aurora fugarat*, where the author is employing a striking but understandable and logical image. In graphic art, the Sun's rays are often represented as hair, and similar images occurred in Greek literature.⁴ The poet of the *Culex* not only talks of Aurora's

they are largely different from the ones I discuss, they provide a further useful indication of the extent of the connection.

¹ From common sense alone it is hard to see how the relationship could be the other way round. The only conceivable reason why the Silver epic poets should be influenced by the *Ciris* is that they regarded it as a genuine Virgilian work—which from the evidence set out above seems scarcely possible. (Contrast e.g. R. B. Steele (*AJP* li (1930), 173) who argues thus: *because* Statius

imitated the *Ciris*—premiss unquestioned—he must have considered it a genuine Virgilian work).

² Cf. Fraenkel, *JRS* xlii (1952), 8.

³ Cf. André, *Les Termes de couleur dans la langue latine* (Paris, 1949), 111 f.

⁴ See Cahen's note on Call. *Hymn* 4. 302 f. In Latin literature the image is not common: cf. Avienus, *Arat.* 1628, *Octavia* 3, and a few more times; but note too the use of *crinis* (as *κόμη*) to denote the flaming trail of comets or shooting stars.

'hair', but qualifies it with the traditional epithet of dawn.¹ His finished expression is colourful and quite poetic, but we can understand the reasons for the choice of words. But I do not think we can plausibly explain why the author of the *Ciris* chose the epithet *roseus* to describe Nisus' purple hair,² without realizing that he has remembered what he clearly thought was a striking Virgilian line and used a portion of it, in a different context, to provide a desired variation.

At lines 496 ff. the author of the *Ciris* is describing Scylla's metamorphosis:

oris honos primum et multis optata labella
et patulae frontis species con crescere in unum
coepere . . .

R. Fairclough renders: 'First, the lovely face and those lips yearned for by many, and the broad brow's charm, began to grow together.' His translation of *patulae frontis*, which is completely accurate, immediately jars. *Patulus* means basically 'broad, wide, spreading' and is used as little more than a poetical variant for *latus*. Now Scylla was supposed to be a beauty, but a *patula* or *lata frons* seems oddly incompatible with ancient ideas of attractive feminine foreheads, which envisaged something altogether more delicate:³ cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1. 33. 5 *insignem tenui fronte Lycorida* (Porph. ad. loc.: *frons autem minor pulchriorem facit mulierem*), and Petr. 126. 15 *frons minima*; Martial's ideal boy, too, has a *frons brevis* (4. 42. 9). A high brow could apparently be praised in a woman: cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1. 2. 113, *celsae procul aspice frontis honores*; but the indications are that a broad brow would be a matter for reticence not praise. It is particularly some animals which have broad foreheads: cf. Varro, *Rust.* 1. 20. 1, Colum. 6. 1. 3, Plin. *Nat.* 8. 221, etc.; among men we find the unlovely Caligula also credited with a *lata frons* (Suet. *Cal.* 50. 1). Our knowledge of the poet's sometimes heavy-handed plagiarism makes us suspect that it was the novelty of the phrase *patula frons* and the desire to include it in his poem that involved him in this odd description; and the clue to the solution of this problem lies in the variation *patulus* for *latus*. I see only one other place cited in *TLL* (*frons*) where the actual collocation *patula frons* occurs, and that is at *Culex* 16 *qua Parnasia rupes / hinc atque hinc patula praepandit cornua fronte*, where twin-peaked Parnassus is visualized as a horned animal. Something about this passage seems to have attracted the author of the *Ciris*, either the image itself or perhaps just the substitution of *patulus* for the more obvious *latus*; anyway the phrase stuck in his mind, to re-emerge out of context rather unhappily applied to his beautiful heroine.⁴

¹ Hypallage involving *roseus* in contexts of dawn is common: cf. Lucr. 5. 976 *dum rosea face sol inferret lumina caelo*, Tib. 1. 3. 93 f., Virg. *Aen.* 6. 535, etc.

² Commentators sometimes quote Catull. 64. 309 *at roseae niveo residebant vertice vittae* as a possible influence behind the choice of adjective. I doubt there being any direct or conscious connection, but Professor Skutsch does point out to me that since the author of the *Ciris* was fond of the 'golden line' which here could not be attained simply with *purpureus* (because of the necessity for *et*), the

Catullan 'golden' line may have suggested to him a way round the difficulty.

³ Clearly lines 496-7 refer to specific features of the pre-metamorphosis Scylla, which then *con crescere in unum coepere*; thus the inclusion of the present example of *frons* in the *TLL* under the heading *bestiarum* is misleading and erroneous (vi. 1359. 53).

⁴ Professor Skutsch points out to me that the author, in order to emphasize the change that Scylla's face underwent in the metamorphosis, may be meaning to stress the relative broadness of her original form

At *Cir.* 225, Carme uses the phrase *viridis pallor* to describe one symptom of Scylla's malaise which she shows later she knows is love (see lines 241 ff.). At *Culex* 144 the same phrase is used more literally in connection with ivy: *pinguntque* (sc. *hederae*) *aureolos viridi pallore corymbos*. I know of no other occurrence, at least in the poets I have examined.¹

The use in the *Ciris* is quite plausible, considering the Alexandrian neoteric aspirations of the poet. The lover's *pallor* is of course formulaic—cf. e.g. Ovid, *Ars* 1. 729 *palleat omnis amans, hic est color aptus amanti*, Hor. *Carm.* 3. 10. 14; and *viridis* could well have been the author's, or some neoteric's, translation of the Greek *χλωρός*—cf. Sappho 2. 14 f. (Diehl) *χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας / ἔμμι*. Thus the collocation *viridis pallor* could not improbably have been coined by the poet of the *Ciris* or a predecessor, to fit the present context of a wan lover,² and could thus be quite independent of the *Culex*. But though I am sure some process of thought like that suggested above was behind the adoption of the phrase by the author of the *Ciris*, further factors seem to me to point to the conclusion that the poet is here, as in the previous two lines discussed, taking his cue from the *Culex*.

Firstly, of course, two probable cases of direct influence by the *Culex* on the *Ciris* make a similar conclusion very likely in a third case where a phrase occurs in these two poems and in no other obviously traceable place; secondly, moreover, I think it possible to show how the author of the *Culex* himself arrived at the phrase *viridis pallor* for his own context, following a recoverable process of thought; and thus, unless we are to posit a second independent invention of this striking phrase for an amatory context by the author of the *Ciris* or a lost neoteric, the direct connection of the *Culex* and the *Ciris* (with the *Culex* having priority) seems almost certain.

The origin of *Cul.* 144 *pinguntque aureolos viridi pallore corymbos* seems to me to be primarily Lucr. 4. 336 *quae* (sc. *luroris semina*) *contage sua palloribus omnia pingunt*: the author of the *Culex* has transferred the image *pingere*³ *pallore* from its Lucretian context of jaundiced vision to his description of ivy, thus using the noun *pallor* in the same context as Virgil uses *pallens*; it may be that he is in fact actually remembering here Virg. *Ecl.* 3. 39 *vitis / diffusos hedera vestit pallente corymbos* (it appears to be echoed anyway at *Culex* 405). He fills out the resultant expression with the adjective *viridis*, which in his context was a fairly obvious thought, even if it did produce an apparently unique collocation. The author of the *Ciris*, in his search for material, noticed this striking phrase and realized the neoteric possibilities of it in an amatory context: he accordingly borrows and uses it in an entirely different sense. The reader may be meant to recognize the 'Virgilian' source and to applaud the ingenuity involved in its novel re-use: certainly it is no mere heavy-handed plagiarism, such as sometimes occur in the poem.⁴

compared with her beaked bird's face. Thus *patulae* may be intended to contrast with *conscrescere in unum*. I think this helps to explain the choice of phrase, though I still believe one has to be charitable to forgive the bald *patulae frontis species*. There is at least, I think, enough awkwardness in it to suggest the priority of the *Culex*.

¹ For convenience's sake I have chosen the following authors to provide a reasonable survey: Enn., Lucr., Catull., Virgil and Vergili-

ana, Hor., *Corp. Tib.*, Prop., Ovid, Sen. *Trag.*, Luc., Sil., Val. Flacc., Stat., Mart., and Juv.

² Cf. Ovid, *Met.* 4. 267 *luridus pallor*, of a deathly pallor resulting from love-induced starvation.

³ Cf. also Virg. *Ecl.* 2. 49 f. *tum casia atque aliis intexens suavis herbis / mollia luteola pingit vaccinia caltha*, and other comparable uses of *pingo*.

⁴ The appearance of *aureolus* in *Culex* 144, in the light of the likelihood that the *Ciris* is

There are other indications of the influence of the *Culex* on the *Ciris*; e.g. *Cir.* 482 *miseros mutavit virginis artus* may be dependent on *Culex* 128 *quibus . . . ambustus Phaethon luctu mutaverat artus*.¹ But I will leave the *Culex* now and turn to the question of the relationship between the *Ciris* and the poets of the Silver Age.

It is well to bear in mind that we should not expect echoes of the latter to be as obvious as those of Virgil, even the *Culex*. Virgil clearly occupied an almost uniquely honoured position in the poet's eyes, and often he plainly intended his borrowings to be recognized. It is my contention that he had read and knew some of the Silver authors, and that consequently their work affected and influenced him, often probably unconsciously.

I shall first go through the *Ciris* mentioning in the order of occurrence some of the similarities of verbal and phraseological usage that can be fixed upon between that poem and Statius, and which may be the result of the direct influence of the latter; some of these, indeed, not only indicate a direct connection between the two, but independently point to Statius' priority. I do not stress each individual instance—indeed one or two of the examples would not really be worth mentioning if they occurred in isolation—but I would argue that in sum they create a large probability.

Cir. 24 *tarda . . . redeunt quinquennia*: *quinquennium* means of course basically a period of five years, cf. Cic. *Leg.* 3. 7, etc. Here, however, the poet denotes by the word the great Panathenaea, i.e. the *festival* that comes every fifth year: thus he is using *quinquennia* for *quinquennalia*, 'quinquennial' games, festival. I know of no parallel for this in prose or verse before Statius, who seems to use it thus no less than four times.²

Two of these examples clearly designate the quinquennial games of the Augustalia at Naples: see *Silv.* 3. 5. 92 *Capitolinis quinquennia proxima lustris* ('the Augustalia that rival the Capitoline games'), and *Silv.* 5. 3. 113 *cum stata laudato caneret quinquennia versu*; and at *Silv.* 2. 2. 6 *quinquennia* is found in a more difficult phrase, but one which clearly presumes the same sort of use of *quinquennium*, and again refers to the Augustalia: *patrii* (i.e. *Neapolitani*) . . . *quinquennia lustris*. *lustrum* has also extended its meaning to signify a five-yearly event (see below), and the phrase is, I think, to be translated 'the quinquennial games of our native festival', i.e. *quinquennium* is a more general term than *lustrum*: the force of the phrase is illustrated by *Silv.* 5. 3. 134 *protinus ad patrii raperis certamina lustris*.

At *Silv.* 4. 2. 62 *saepe coronatis iteres quinquennia lustris*, *quinquennium* and *lustrum* are again juxtaposed in a rather difficult expression. *quinquennium*, however, does seem to have the same sort of sense as above, though this time it is apparently referring, directly or indirectly, to the Capitoline Games, which were instituted by Domitian. I think actually that, as at *Silv.* 2. 2. 6, *quinquennia*

indebted to this line for *viridis pallor*, makes Housman's conjecture of *aureolam* at *Cir.* 151 even more likely: the author may well have been stimulated to its use hence as well as by the occurrence of the word in Catullus.

¹ Cf. also *Cir.* 198 *vosque, adeo, humanos mutatae corporis artus* and Virg. *Ecl.* 6. 78 *aut ut mutatos Terei narrauerit artus*. The identical metrical pattern of the conclusions of *Culex* 128 and *Ecl.* 6. 78 suggest to me that the

author of the *Culex* had the latter line in mind when he wrote his line 128, whilst the closer similarity of grammatical form points to a direct connection between *Culex* 128 and *Cir.* 482.

² We might, however, compare how *πεντετηρίς* means both a five-year period and a festival celebrated every fifth year (see LSJ s.v.).

here is the more general, *lustrum* the particular, reference to the festival in question. That the phrase *coronatis . . . lustris* should apply *directly* to the Capitoline games is perhaps indicated by Suet. *Dom.* 4. 4 *instituit et quinquennale certamen Capitolino Iovi . . . aliquanto plurium quam nunc est coronatorum*: Statius seems to be calling the festival 'garlanded' because it was a characteristic of it that there were many more than the usual number of contests to win *coronae* in (hence an abundance of *coronati* at the end).¹ I therefore would translate: 'often may you repeat quinquennial festivals/games-every-five-years, by means of/in the form of/with the Capitoline Games'.

Now Vollmer, in his note on *Silv.* 2. 2. 6 says that Statius is using *quinquennia* thus (instead of *quinquennalia*) for metrical convenience, and this may be at least partly right. But Statius' use of *lustrum*, which we noticed above, to refer to actual festivals should be compared (originally of course it meant 'purificatory sacrifice', then 'period of five years'). Forcellini (*lustrum* sect. 14) says this sense of *lustrum* developed particularly for (and confined itself to) Domitian's Capitoline Games; and thus indeed it is definitely used by Statius at *Silv.* 3. 5. 92 and probably, as we have seen, at 4. 2. 62. Two points, however, must be noted: (a) the use of *lustrum* to denote a particular festival is rare outside Statius, and (b), as we saw from *Silv.* 2. 2. 6, Statius' own use of it is not confined to the Capitoline Games alone; cf. too *Theb.* 1. 421, *Silv.* 3. 1. 45, 5. 3. 134.²

Thus *lustrum* seems to extend its meaning in a way that interestingly parallels the extension in meaning of *quinquennium*, and the use of both in this way may well be a particularly Statian idiom. It looks thus as if the *Ciris*' isolated comparable use of *quinquennium* in 24 is directly due to the influence of the Flavian poet. Statius uses *quinquennium* twice more, but both times in the conventional sense of a 'period of five years': see *Silv.* 5. 3. 253, *Theb.* 5. 466. His fondness for the word should be contrasted with its rarity otherwise in the poets I have examined;³ cf. only Ovid, *Met.* 4. 292, 12. 584, *Mart.* 4. 45. 3. And the similarity of the clausula in three of the Statian examples above to that in *Cir.* 24 should be noted (thus too in *Mart.* 4. 45. 3).

At line 45 *in quibus aevi / prima rudimenta et iuvenes exegimus annos*, the author of the *Ciris* is probably indebted to Ovid for the phrase *iuvenes anni* (cf. *Met.* 7. 295, 14. 139),³ and the first half of the line bears a strong resemblance to Virg. *Aen.* 11. 157 *dura rudimenta et . . .* among others. But the line as a whole is very similar in rhythm and wording to Stat. *Ach.* 1. 478 *cuius adortus / cruda rudimenta et teneros formaverit annos / Centaurus*: there is, for example, no other such coupling of *rudimentum* and *annus* in the poets I have examined.⁴ It is interesting to note in passing that at line 43 the author of the *Ciris* couples the adjective *tener* with *nervus*, a collocation for which I have seen no exact parallel (*teneros firmamus robore nervos*). I suspect that he started off with Stat. *Ach.* 1. 478 as his model for 45, and then, rejecting *teneros* in favour of the more interesting *iuvenes* to qualify *annos*,⁵

¹ Steph., however, reads *coronarum* for *coronatorum*.

² At *Mart.* 4. 1. 7 *ingenti . . . lustris* is directly designating, I think, the *ludi saeculares*, and thus the use of *lustrum* parallels the one we have noticed in Statius; and it should be noticed that neither here, nor at Stat. *Silv.* 3. 1. 45, is the festival in question even five-yearly.

³ See above, p. 241 n. 1.

⁴ But cf. also Stat. *Silv.* 4. 4. 45; *TLL* (*annus*) adduces only *Cir.* 45 and Ovid, *Met.* 7. 295. Cf. too *anni iuvenales*, Ovid, *Met.* 8. 632, Stat. *Theb.* 1. 486, etc.

⁵ *Teneri anni* is quite a common phrase and thus (it might be felt) not particularly desirable.

used the former to fill up as an epithet for *nervos* in 43. The process of course may well have been largely unconscious, but a similar painstakingly economic use of borrowed material is directly paralleled elsewhere in the poem.

At *Cir.* 178 *non arguta sonant tenui psalteria chorda*, the phrase *tenui . . . chorda* is noteworthy; *chorda* (which is nearly always used in the plural by the poets—though never at all by Virgil) is usually qualified by an epithet conveying sound, e.g. *Lucr.* 4. 981 *loquentes*, *Tib.* 2. 5. 3 *vocales*, *Manil.* 5. 329 *sonantis*, *Sen. Tro.* 833 *tinnulas*. The only parallel I can find for *tenuis chorda* is *Stattius Silv.* 4. 4. 53 *tenuis ignavo pollice chordas / pulso*;¹ here however the choice of the epithet *tenuis* is explained by the context: the sycophantic *Stattius* is contrasting his feeble literary existence with the virile active prospects of his addressee *Vitorius Marcellus* (cf. 56 ff. *at tu . . . forsitan Ausonias ibis frenare cohortes*, etc.) and thus *tenuis* like *ignavo* in the same line is practically a hypallage. If the author of the *Ciris* did have this passage in mind, his use of *tenuis* purely as an epitheton ornans suggests that *Stattius* here has the priority; moreover the complete phrase *tenui chorda* gives the impression of being tacked on in the *Ciris*, a mere ornament to fill out the line.

At *Cir.* 184 *fertur et horribili praeceps impellitur oestro* the poet is almost certainly borrowing in part or as a whole a line from *Calvus' Io*.² The Greek word *oestrus* for a gadfly in fact first appears in surviving Latin at *Virg. Georg.* 3. 147 (and is otherwise rare), but assuming that *Calvus* did have the gadfly version of the *Io* wanderings³ it is most probable that he, a neoteric, would use the Graecism in preference to the unromantic native words *tabanus* or *asilus*.⁴ The author of the *Ciris*, of course, applies *oestrus* in a metaphorical sense; this is not paralleled in surviving Latin before *Stattius*, who has it twice thus (his only uses of the word), at *Theb.* 1. 32 and *Silv.* 2. 7. 3 (in both of which it refers to the spur or inspiration of the Muses).⁵ *οἶστρος* was of course used in Greek metaphorically, cf. *Soph. Ant.* 1002, *Eur. Hipp.* 1300, etc., but I doubt that our poet ever adopts Greek usages direct, beyond specific items of vocabulary.⁶ His intention seems clear. The imitation of *Calvus' Io* stands out so obviously in the new context (even indeed to modern readers who no longer possess the original), that we must surely conclude that it was meant to be recognized, and the ingenuity involved in adapting it to the new situation applauded; and this was done of course via the metaphorical application of *oestrus*, a usage that in Latin is otherwise first found in *Stattius*.

Cir. 205 reads *et qua / candida concessos ascendat ciris honores*; for *concessos honores* we might compare phrases like *concessus amor* (*Cir.* 244, *Cic. Tusc.* 4. 70, *Epic. Drusi* 305), *concessa Venus* (*Hor. Serm.* 1. 4. 113), etc., also a line like *Ovid, Met.* 2. 590 *facta volucris / . . . Nyctimene nostro successit honori*. But the closest parallel I can find is *Stat. Theb.* 5. 277 *infandum natae concessit honorem*. Two lines

¹ Cf., however, *Ilias Lat.* 882 *lyrae graciles extenso pollice chordas / percurrit*; and also *Seneca Ag.* 338 *licet et chorda graviore sonet* and *Stat. Silv.* 1. 4. 36 *nec . . . sperne coli tenuiore lyra*, in both of which the epithet is explained by the context and a hypallage similar to that at *Silv.* 4. 4. 53 is operating.

² See S. Sudhaus, *Hermes* xlii (1907), 482.

³ This is not absolutely certain. *Ovid* for example in his *Io* (*Met.* 1. 583 ff.) tells the wanderings of the heroine very elliptically

and has her goaded by a terrifying apparition, thus line 725 *horriferam . . . Erinyem*, 726 *stimulos . . . caecos*. But it is *Ovid's* habit to introduce changes, and he would naturally vary the *Calvan* account.

⁴ See Sudhaus, loc. cit.

⁵ Cf. also *Juv.* 4. 123, *Nemesian. Cyn.* 3.

⁶ And even the apparently original Graecisms of diction in the *Ciris* could easily be taken from neoteric sources now lost.

later in the *Ciris*, at 207 f. *vigilumque procul custodia primis / excubias foribus studio iactabat inani*, the poet is obviously mainly concerned with the imitation of Virg. *Ecl.* 2. 5; for *primis . . . foribus*, however, though we might compare phrases like Ovid, *Her.* 12. 150 *ad geminae limina prima foris*, the only actual parallel I have seen (before one in Pallad.) is Stat. *Theb.* 7. 47 f. *primis salit Impetus amens / e foribus*, which occurs in the attractive description of the domain of Mars.

Cir. 215 *caeruleas sua furta prius testatur ad umbras*: M. Kreunen¹ suggests that the collocation *caeruleas . . . umbras* is formed in imitation of the use of the Greek *κυάνεος*; the idea behind the use of *caeruleus* may be originally based on Greek precedents (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1. 6. 85 also), but the existence of the actual phrase at Stat. *Theb.* 2. 528 *nox et caeruleam terris infuderat umbram*, the only other exact parallel adducible from *TLL* (*caeruleus*), may suggest to us a more immediate source. Now there seem to be at least two other parallels with this part of the *Thebaid*—see the discussion below on *Cir.* 467 and 486; if these are all justified, it becomes very interesting, since the poet would then be displaying the same technique that is discernible in his imitation of Virgil (see Munari, loc. cit. 356), whereby echoes periodically crop up from certain particular sections of the source-works which he obviously knew especially well.

For *Cir.* 396 *Leucothea parvusque dea cum matre Palaemon*, we might compare Ovid, *Met.* 4. 542 *Leucotheaque deum cum matre Palaemona dixit*, and *Met.* 9. 482 *Venus et tenera volucer cum matre Cupido*, etc., but it is perhaps no accident that the second half of the line is paralleled almost identically at Stat. *Silv.* 3. 2. 39 *tu tamen ante omnes, diva cum matre Palaemon / annue . . .* (cf. *Silv.* 2. 1. 180).

The adjective *abruptus* is largely confined to Silver Latin; for its main sense 'sheer', 'steep', represented at *Cir.* 465, the only pre-Silver example quoted by *TLL* s.v. is Catull. 68. 108 *aestus in abruptum detulerat barathrum*, where, however, the word is applied, contrary to usual practice, in a context of depth.² Then cf. Sen. *Dial.* 12. 6. 5, Sen. *Herc. F.* 1209, Luc. 2. 450, etc. The closest parallel, however, is Stat. *Theb.* 1. 114 *abrupta qua plurimus arce Cithaeron / occurrit caelo* which like *Cir.* 465 uses *arx* of a natural peak.

At line 467, the author of the *Ciris* describes the cliff which the Sphinx haunted in these words: *multoque cruentas hospite cautes*. I know of only one other instance where *cruentus* directly qualifies rocks or cliffs or the like and that is in a Statian reference to the Sphinx story: at *Theb.* 2. 516 ff. Statius describes the Sphinx's final fall: *donec de rupe cruenta / . . . / tristic inexpleram scopulis affligeret alvum*. The cliff of course is bloody from the Sphinx's victims, as the author of the *Ciris* feels bound to make clear. Now just as this section of the *Thebaid* seemed to be being echoed at *Cir.* 215 (see above), so too is the same piece apparently in our poet's mind at *Cir.* 486. At *Theb.* 2. 519 ff. Statius tells how creatures still shun the haunt of the Sphinx: *horrent vicina iuvenci / gramina, damnatis avidum pecus abstinet herbis*. The phrase *avidum pecus* which Statius applies literally is used at *Ciris* 486 in the same metrical position to describe the inhabitants of the ocean (though here *avidum* is grammatically complementary): *nimum³ est avidum pecus Amphitrites*. The only other actual collocation of *avidus* and *pecus* cited by *TLL* s.v. *avidus* is Sen. *Q. Nat.* 6. 27. 4. Now if we are right in assuming a direct connection between the two passages, the *Ciris*' metaphorical

¹ *Prolegomena in Cirin* (Diss. Utrecht, 1882), 48.

at *Aen.* 3. 422, 12. 687.

² Cf. Virgil's use of substantival *abruptum*

³ For *nimum . . . avidum* cf. Lucr. 4. 594 *humanum genus est avidum nimis auricularum*.

application of the phrase would tend to suggest, I think, Statius' priority; our poet could have been prompted to use Statius' phrase in this way by lines like Lucr. 2. 343 *squamigerum pecudes* (cf. also Plaut. *Pseud.* 834); and for *avidus* applied to fish cf. Mart. 4. 56. 5, 5. 18. 8, Ovid, *Rem.* 209. The point of the expression in the *Ciris* is presumably that Amphitrite felt there was a danger Scylla would get eaten by the other fish; but *nimum est avidum pecus* scarcely conveys this clearly. The poet sacrifices clarity to use a vivid, borrowed, phrase.

At Cir. 489 *ciris Amyclaeo formosior ansere Leda*, the author is clearly referring to the swan-incarnation of Jupiter, though the use of *anser* is very strange.¹ *TLL* adduces only one other place, Stat. *Silv.* 1. 2. 142, where *Amyclaeus* is used directly as an epithet of swans: talking of Venus, Statius says *Amyclaeos ad frena citavit olores*; cf. also Mart. 14. 161. 1 *Amyclaea . . . pluma (cygni)*. Now Amyclae was a town on the bank of the Eurotas, the valley of which was famous for its swans. Thus one cannot grumble at *Amyclaeus* as an *epitheton ornans* for swans or their feathers. But there is an awkwardness about its application to the Jupiter-swan of the Leda story: for in that story, the town Amyclae actually plays a part, and thus the epithet can scarcely any more happily be *ornans*. Its associations are inevitably recalled, and herein lies the difficulty. It was not Jupiter but Leda who had connections with Amyclae, and this too only after, and because of, her association with the god—she gave birth to Castor and Pollux there.² Very possibly, I think, our poet chose the unhappy epithet in imitation of the Statian line quoted. It is worth while noting that the adjective *Amyclaeus*, which is used twice in the short space of the *Ciris*, is especially popular in Statius, occurring nine times—much oftener than in other poets.

At Cir. 511 *purpureas flavo retinentem vertice vittas* the author as at 170 seems to have had Catull. 64. 63 in mind, *non flavo retinens subtilem vertice mitram*, but he has varied *subtilem mitram* by *purpureas vittas*; for this we might compare Catull. 64. 309 *roseae . . . vittae* or Prop. 4. 9. 27 *puniceae . . . vittae*, but the actual collocation occurs no less than three times in Statius, at *Theb.* 2. 738, *Ach.* 1. 611, and at *Silv.* 2. 7. 9, all in the plural as here in the *Ciris*. The only other occurrences that I can find are two in the singular: Sen. *Thy.* 686 and Sil. 13. 779 f.

To complete this examination of parallels between the *Ciris* and Statius, I will examine a passage of the former which not only points, I think, to a more substantial imitation of Statius by the poet, but also gives a perhaps firmer indication of Statius' priority. At Cir. 478–80 the poet describes Scylla, as she is dragged behind Minos' ship, tied to its stern, thus:

¹ In spite of the gloss CGL iii. 17. 36 *κύκνος anser olor*, *anser* and *olor* always seem to refer to different species, and to be distinguished—cf. e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 9. 36 (*videor*) *argutos inter strepere anser olores*; *anser* in fact means goose, not swan. Professor Goodyear points out to me how similar this reference to the divine swan as a goose is to the kind of comic depreciation of poetic-mythological figures which we find in satire, especially Juvenal: cf. 1. 54 *fabrumque volantem* (Daedalus), 10. 257 *Ithacum . . . natantem* (Odysseus), Pers. *Prologus* 1 *fonte . . . caballino*, etc.

² Heinsius in fact proposed to read *Amyclaeae* at Cir. 489. But it seems to me that

the fact that Leda happened to give birth to her sons at this town is a very good reason for calling them 'Amyclaeans' (cf. Virg. *Georg.* 3. 89 *Amyclaei . . . Pollucis*, Stat. *Theb.* 7. 413) or for calling Amyclae 'Ledaean' (cf. Sil. 2. 434), but not really sufficient to warrant Leda herself being called Amyclaeans. (At Stat. *Silv.* 2. 1. 111 *Amyclaea mater* is probably meant to mean any Spartan mother—cf. Vollmer ad. loc.—though the use of the word *mater* does make the Leda-identification possible.) Thus at Cir. 489 the poet did indeed write *Amyclaeo*, and I believe very probably under the influence of Stat. *Silv.* 1. 2. 142.

fertur et incertis iactatur ad omnia ventis
 cumba velut magnas sequitur cum parvula classis,
 Afer et hiberno bacchatur in aequore turbo

'She is carried on, and buffeted in all directions by uncertain winds, just as a tiny dinghy when it follows *magnas classis*,¹ and an African hurricane raves over the wintry sea . . .'

First of all, quite simply, what is the situation being described in the simile? What is the picture intended by *cumba velut magnas sequitur cum parvula classis*? One view, adopted e.g. by Haury, is that the poet is describing a small boat being tossed about in the wake of large vessels during a storm: Haury translates 'elle roule . . . telle une chaloupe minuscule dans le sillage des hauts bords, l'hiver, quand . . .'; I think we can discount this. The main picture that the poet has in mind, to illustrate the effect of wind and wave on the suspended maiden, is that of a tiny vessel tossed in a storm (see 480): to conflate with this the additional picture of the effect of the wake of large ships on this same small vessel would be extremely clumsy and otiose; and since there is no suggestion of 'wake' in *sequitur*, it seems unfair, to say the least, to foist this intention on the poet. Added to which, this interpretation still does not answer the main question raised by the passage.

Why in fact is the small dinghy said to be *following magnas classis*? The poet's broad intention seems to have been to convey that the *parvula cumba* is out in mid ocean, in the domain of large ocean-going vessels, where the effects of rude weather are more fearsome and dangerous. I think he must have had in mind that most obvious occasion when small boats 'follow' large ones, i.e. when they are towed by them as dinghies, a common ancient practice.² Hence he presumably means 'ships' or rather 'ship' by *classis*,³ but we must admit that the choice of this word as well as the vague *sequitur* greatly impedes a quick appreciation of the picture intended in the simile.⁴ (For another example of *sequor* in this context, see Stat. *Silv.* 3. 2. 31.)

Anyway, since the poet decided to adopt an expanded simile like this, with one item of it, the *cumba*, clearly paralleling Scylla, we might reasonably look to see if there is any further detailed correspondence between the simile and the main narrative. And we would naturally and immediately conclude that there was: thus the dinghy towed behind a large ship seems to parallel Scylla suspended from the stern⁵ of Minos' vessel.⁶ But the whole conception seems

¹ The meaning of *classis* here is discussed below.

² See C. Torr, *Ancient Ships* (Cambridge, 1895), 103.

³ *Classis* in the singular does occasionally seem to be used where we would more naturally expect *navis* (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3. 11. 48), and more frequently *classes* seems to occur where 'ships' makes the best sense: see *TLL* 3. 1283. 60 ff., though by no means all the examples cited there ought to be. In our present line *classis* not only seems to be used for *naves*, but the plural is most conveniently taken as 'poetic'. It could be, though, that *cumba* is due to the poet's thinking of a specific, *classis* a general, occasion.

⁴ It appears additionally awkward when we remember that Minos' fleet was called a *classis* in the main narrative at 459, and when we reflect that the *classis* in the simile turns out to be representing Minos' *particular* ship!—see below.

⁵ The reference to the actual suspension of Scylla (389) is so elliptical that it is in fact only from the present simile that we infer that the poet is adopting the version of the story in which the girl was hung from the stern, rather than from the prow (for which see Tzetz. ad Lycophr. *Alex.* 650).

⁶ The use of *classis* to denote 'ship' in 479 (see above) was indeed rather obscure; but we should note how Minos' own vessel, the item in the main narrative to which it

grotesque, and it is hard to believe that the simile could have been actually composed specifically to illustrate this scene. We will note in this connection the awkwardness of line 478: the tossing of the unfortunate Scylla is described in terms far more suitable to the buffeted dinghy of the subsequent simile, and it seems that this was forced upon the poet through the difficulty in effecting a transition from his main narrative to the *cumba* image. In short, the simile, unclearly expressed in itself, appears to be an alien unit in the narrative.

I know of just one other comparable extended image in Latin: cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1. 4. 120 ff.

immensae veluti conexa carinae
cumba minor, cum saevit hiems, pro parte furentis
parva receptat aquas et eodem volvitur austro.¹

Here the scene pictured in the simile is clearly expressed and the point of the comparison obvious. In his thanksgiving for the recovery of Rutilius Gallicus, Statius enlarges upon how worried he himself had been during the latter's illness, but emphasizes what a small part his own worry was amidst the universal concern of the senate and people. *quis mihi tot coetus inter populi que patrumque | sit curae votique locus?* he says (115 f.); 'but', he goes on, 'I worried day and night (116 ff.), and just as a small skiff joined to (towed by) a mighty vessel bears its small share of the storm, so I, in conjunction with the mighty senate and people of Rome, bore my small share of the worry and anxious prayers for your safety'. Statius' use of the simile is as apt and logical (if artificial!) as the one in the *Ciris* was forced and inept.²

This then, I think, was the source for the simile in the *Ciris*, and the problems voiced above explain themselves quite simply as being due to the unskilful plagiarism of our poet. He seems to have taken some trouble to disguise the borrowing (contrast his habit with Virgilian imitation), but twice at least the choice of replacement vocabulary can only be described as unfortunate: *sequitur* for *conexa*³ and *classis* for *carinae* merely obscure the picture intended. *cumba minor* he varies by the introduction of the diminutive form *parvula*—note *parva* in *Silvae* 1. 4. 122; but cf. too Prop. 1. 11. 10 *parvula . . . cumba*. Finally, as well as varying the order of the whole, he expands the simple Statian *cum saevit hiems* into the more florid *Afer et hiberno bacchatur in aequore turbo*.

I think this is sufficient to show that the author of the *Ciris* knew the works of Statius and was influenced by them in the composition of his poem. The evidence for a similar knowledge of the other Silver authors is more modest, but still I think it likely that he was acquainted with, and to a certain extent influenced by, at least some of the other poets of the period. I shall now therefore consider some of the parallels between the *Ciris* on the one hand and Lucan, Valerius, and Silius on the other. Once again some of the instances

apparently corresponds, is also in the 'poetic' plural: see line 389 *de navibus altis*.

¹ Cf. the unextended simile at Catull. 25. 12 f.

² To mention one detail, Statius' use of the small/big contrast (*immensae . . . minor*) in the simile plays an integral role in his scheme, whilst the emphatic juxtaposition of *parvula* and *magnas* in the *Ciris*' simile has little point as regards the main narrative.

³ I am a little surprised that the poet

abandoned *conexa* or a close equivalent in favour of the vague *sequitur*—one would have thought he might have enjoyed drawing the exact parallel between Scylla fastened to the stern of a ship, and the dinghy likewise fastened. But this does of course highlight the grotesqueness of the comparison being made or at least implied, and we must assume that the poet appreciated this, and chose to take refuge in a vaguer substitute.

cited might not be considered worth much in isolation, but they gain in significance in the company of other possible parallels.

First of all, Lucan—*Cir.* 43: *firamus robore nervos*: Lucan uses *firmare robore* three times in all, twice in military contexts where *robur* is used with its specific military sense almost equal to 'troops', cf. 1. 280 *dum trepidant nullo firmatae robore partes / tolle moras*, 2. 527 *arma parabat / Magnus ut immixto firmaret robore partes*;¹ cf. too Sil. 8. 446 *sed non ruricolae firmarunt robore castra / deteriore . . . Umbri*, but I have scarcely seen any other example of the phrase outside Lucan.² Lucan also, moreover, uses *robur* and *nervi* joined together in contexts of physical strength or weakness, like that presumed by the author of the *Ciris* to illustrate metaphorically his idea of philosophical maturity:³ cf. 3. 625 *defectis robore nervis* (see Housman, ad loc.), 4. 372 *mox robora nervis / et vires rediere viris*. The author of the *Ciris* appears to have combined this use of *robur* and *nervus* with the phrase *robore firmare*; and Lucan's third use of the latter phrase occurs in a context of mental resolution,⁴ which is quite similar to the context of philosophical maturity at *Cir.* 43: see 2. 245 *tu (sc. O Cato) mente labantem / derige me dubium, certo tu robore firma*. It will not have escaped notice that in the first two examples mentioned in Lucan (and at Sil. 8. 446) the phrase occupies the same metrical position as here; likewise Luc. 3. 625 and 4. 372 have the same clausula as *Cir.* 43. It seems hard to me to avoid concluding that the *Ciris* is here influenced by Lucan; an additional indication of the *Ciris*' posteriority and dependence is the poet's much weaker use of *robore*—it is really otiose. In all Lucan's examples (and in the Silian example) *robore* was entirely integral.

Cir. 171 *multum illi incerto trepidant vestigia cursu*. TLL cites five other examples of *incertus* qualifying *cursus*: Cic. *Att.* 8. 3. 5, Liv. 37. 41. 10, Sen. *Suas.* 3. 1, and twice in verse: see Sen. *Herc. F.* 144 *errat cursu levis incerto / . . . haedus*, and Luc. 10. 460, in which, interestingly enough, the phrase occurs in the same position in the hexameter as in the *Ciris*: *spem vitae in limine clauso / ponit et incerto lustrat vagus atria cursu*.

Cir. 211 *et pressis tenuem singultibus aera captat*. Leo, by explaining the nautical phenomenon of detecting wind with the ears, convincingly refuted the claim that Virg. *Aen.* 3. 514 (*Palinurus*) *auribus aera captat* must presuppose the present line of the *Ciris*.⁵ But is there necessarily any direct connection between the two lines? A better parallel for *Cir.* 211 *aera captat* is Ovid, *Met.* 7. 557 *auraeque graves captantur hiatu* where the sense is more similar and the wording still close, but the closest parallel in sense and phraseology is Luc. 4. 329 *nociturnumque (ita Dorvillius, nocturnumque MSS.) aera captant*.

For *Cir.* 232 *tempore quo fessas mortalia pectora curas / . . . requiescunt*, we might compare Ovid, *Met.* 8. 83 f. *quies . . . qua curis fessa diurnis / pectora somnus habet*, and judge that *fessas curas* is conflated hence, but in fact the phrase is paralleled exactly at Luc. 5. 504 *solverat armorum fessas nox languida curas* (cf. *pectora* line 505), and no other examples are cited by TLL s.v. *fessus* or *cura*.

Cir. 419 *quae sic patriam carosque penates / . . . addixi: for patriam carosque penates*, cf. Lucr. 3. 85 *iam saepe homines patriam carosque parentis / prodiderunt*, Virg. *Georg.*

¹ *firmo* with an acc. and abl. in this kind etc.
of sense is common.

² Cf. note 4 below.

³ Cf. also Cic. *Fam.* 6. 1. 3 *quantum in cuiusque animo roboris est atque nervorum*, Hor. *Ars* 26 f. (in a context similar to that of the *Ciris*) *sectantem levia nervi / deficiunt animique*,

⁴ Cf. Drac. *Laud. Dei* 2. 739 *tenuis adiecto robore firmas*. For *firmo* alone in such contexts, cf. Ovid, *Pont.* 1. 3. 27 *bene firmarunt animum praecepta iacentem*.

⁵ 'Nochmals . . .', *Hermes* xlii (1907), 44 f. = *Ausg. Kl. Schrift.* ii. 79–81.

2. 514 *patriam parvosque penates*, Ov. *Met.* 8. 91 *Scylla tibi trado patriaeque meosque penates*, but it is exactly paralleled at Luc. 7. 346 *quisquis patriam carosque penates* / . . . *quaerit*; and apart from another time in Lucan (8. 132) *TLL* (*carus*) cites only Val. Flacc. 7. 145 as a parallel for the collocation *cari penates*.

For Valerius, we may look first at *Cir.* 180: though the first half of the line bears strong resemblance to various Ovidian lines like *Am.* 2. 11. 28 *quam tibi sit toto nullus in ore color*, 3. 3. 6 *niveo lucet in ore rubor*, *Her.* 20. 120 *quique subest niveo lenis in ore rubor*, and *Trist.* 4. 3. 50 *et subit ora rubor*, it is perhaps significant that *nullus in ore rubor* occurs verbatim, if in another sense and context, at Val. Flacc. 2. 57.¹ Another parallel with the *Ciris* from this part of Valerius (see below) adds to the chances of a direct connection.

At *Cir.* 292 *Carme* apostrophizes *Minos*, crying *o bis iam exitium crudele meorum: exitium crudele* is paralleled at Val. Flacc. 3. 302 where it occurs in exactly the same metrical position, even to the extent of having an elision before it: *patriae exitium crudele senectae*² / *et tot acerba canens*. Otherwise *TLL* (*crudelis*) cites only Cic. *Sull.* 33 *crudelissimum et luctuosissimum exitium patriae comparasset*, and I have seen no more. In fact *exitium* does not often have an epithet, especially a strong one, at all, before a late period; and I think the use of this very powerful expression in an apostrophe might have sounded striking to say the least—we have here perhaps an independent indication of Valerius' priority.

At *Cir.* 448 the qualification of *vires* by *fessae* reminds us of the equally rare application of that adjective to *curae* at 232 (see above), and we might compare Virg. *Aen.* 5. 396 *frigentque effetae in corpore vires*, but I think it is more than coincidence that Valerius has the same expression at 2. 69 f. *Cereris tum munere fessas* / *restituunt vires* (note *nullus in ore rubor* at 2. 57—see above). The only other examples quoted by *TLL* (*fessus*) are Apul. *Met.* 7. 28, Amm. 27. 2. 8, and S.H.A. 24 (*Tyr. Trig.*) 15. 1 *fessis Romanae rei publicae viribus*. Langen on Val. Flacc. 2. 70 adduces Coripp. *Ioh.* 3. 411.

The evidence for a relationship between the *Ciris* and Silius appears to be weaker, but I will put forward one or two points here. The bold phrase *venis sitientibus* at *Cir.* 163 in an erotic context is readily comprehensible and appreciable when we remember the use of *venae* exhibited at Virg. *Aen.* 4. 2 *vulnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni* and Hor. *Serm.* 1. 2. 33 *nam simul ac venas inflavit taetra libido*, and the erotic sense of *sitis*, which is particularly Ovidian.³ But it is very interesting that the phrase occurs again exactly at Sil. 3. 251 though in a very different, if equally bold, application: *Barce sitientibus arida venis* ('Barce, a dry land of thirsting springs').⁴ I have seen no other example. While in this vicinity of Silius we might notice the expression in the previous line (3. 250) *tereti dextras in pugnam armata dolone*, which, applied to the town Barce, is again a striking phrase. But the feature to be noticed here is the accusative of respect construction: cf. also Sil. 2. 666 *fulgenti dextram mucrone armata mariti*; this is paralleled at *Cir.* 213 *egreditur ferroque manus armata bidenti* whilst the only example I have seen before Silius is Sen. *Oed.* 404 *armati brachia thyrsis*.

Two more parallels: for *Cir.* 176 *crebris . . . flammis* we could compare the

¹ For Val. Flacc. 2. 57, see Langen, ad loc., and cf. Virg. *Georg.* 1. 430 f.

² *senectae* occurs at the end of a line twice in the *Ciris*—at 287 and 314.

³ e.g. *Rem.* 247.

⁴ If the *Ciris* is imitating Silius here, we might compare how *nullus in ore rubor* was perhaps borrowed from a completely different context: see above.

phrase *crebri ignes* (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11. 209, etc.), but there is an exact parallel at Sil. 15. 26 f. (though *alio sensu*) *lascivaeque crebras / . . . iaciebant lumina flammæ*. No other is cited by *TLL* (*creber*). For *Cir.* 526 *saepe deum largo decorarat munere sedes*, the only parallel in *TLL* (*decorare*) for *sedes decorare* is Sil. 2. 698 *castas sedes decorate piorum* (cf. perhaps *Cir.* 94 *castas . . . postes*). And besides these the *Ciris* has numerous clausulae identical with or very similar to ones in Silius.

I will conclude this examination of the relationship between the *Ciris* and Silver authors by looking at a few passages where either (a) the connection seems less certain, or (b) the parallel is with a Silver author other than those mentioned, or (c) where a usage, though probably of this late date in origin, is difficult to tie down to one specific source.

For *trucem . . . pontum* at *Cir.* 76 we may compare Hor. *Carm.* 1. 3. 10 f. *truci . . . pelago*, Catull. 4. 9 *trucemve Ponticum sinum*, etc., but the poet could be directly echoing either *Catal.* 9. 47¹ or Val. Flacc. 8. 180 in both of which the expression occurs exactly. There is no other exact example in the poets I have examined.²

coccum (*Cir.* 31) occurs at Hor. *Serm.* 2. 6. 102,³ though not again until the Silver Age; but for the adj. *coccinus*, which is restored without doubt correctly by Baehrens to *Cir.* 169 (*coccina . . . Sicyonia*) the earliest examples cited by *TLL* are Petron. 28, Martial 2. 29. 8 (*coccina aluta* of a shoe), 4. 28. 2, Juv. 3. 283. It is rare otherwise. The derivatives of *coccum* (itself occurring thrice in Martial) in general seem especially and peculiarly popular in Martial—thus substantival *coccinum* (i.e. *vestis coccinea*) occurs according to *TLL* first in him; see 2. 16. 2, 2. 39. 1, 2. 43. 8, 14. 131. 1; but it is not used by any of the other main writers of the earlier Silver Age. *coccinatus* occurs at Mart. 1. 96. 6, 5. 35. 2, Suet. *Dom.* 4, but not before and scarcely ever afterwards, according to *TLL*. It seems to me that we might have here a case of Martial influencing the diction of our poem: and in this connection it is interesting to note his use of *sophia*. I know of no other author before, or contemporary with, Martial who uses *sophia* naturally as an alternative for *sapientia* as he does: see 1. 111. 1, 7. 74. 9.⁴ Cic. *Off.* 1. 153 and Sen. *Epist.* 89. 7 refer to it in Greek, and it is used by Ennius *Ann.* 218V. and Afran. *com.* 299 Ribbeck (apud Gell. 13. 8. 3), but in both cases as a self-conscious Graecism, a translation of *sapientia*. And apart from the examples in Martial it is extremely rare: cf. Lact. *Inst.* 3. 16. 10, Prud. *c. Symm.* 1. 34. At lines 4 and 40 the author of the *Ciris* uses *sophia* similarly, even though it is probably personified there.

At 204 the author of the *Ciris* probably means little more than 'sky' by *superum sedes*, though the high-flown language of 204-5 makes it sound almost as if Scylla and Nisus are joining the ranks of the divine, or becoming constellations. *superum sedes* sounds like a conflation of two fairly common phrases, *superæ sedes* (cf. Cic. *Arat.* 282-3, Virg. *Aen.* 11. 532, Ovid, *Fast.* 3. 324) and *sedes deorum* (cf. *Cir.* 526, Tib. 1. 2. 83, Lucr. 5. 146 f., 5. 1188) both of which are used with varying shades of meaning. But there may be a direct stimulus from one of two other passages (I have seen no other as close in the poets I

¹ The poet could have thought some or all of the *Catalepton* collection genuine: *testimonia* exist for certain of the poems as early as the first century B.C.: see above, pp. 235 f. There are in fact other parallels between the *Ciris* and poems of the *Catalepton* indicative of possible direct connection.

² See above, p. 241 n. 1.

³ Lachmann implausibly wished to restore it also to Prop. 2. 1. 5.

⁴ Cf. Martial's use of *sophos* and *sophōs*, and what Friedländer has to say about it (at 7. 32. 4 and 1. 3. 7).

examine):¹ Lucan at 10. 15 uses *superum sedes* in the same metrical position, but to mean 'temples'; Silius at 3. 602 uses *superum sedem*² to mean 'heaven, the realm of the gods' in a passage which bears further similarity to *Cir.* 204 f.: *nec Stygis ille lacus viduataque lumine regna | sed superum sedem nostrosque tenebit honores.*

Cir. 341 contains two collocations which seem characteristically Silver. For *blanda . . . spe*, *TLL* (*blandus*) cites Sen. *Epist.* 24. 1 *adquiescas spei blanda*, Stat. *Theb.* 12. 246 *exacti si spes non blanda laboris*, anth. 415. 13 (De Spe) *saepe bono rursusque malo blandissima saepe [est]* (ita Riese, *semp* cod. Voss.), *Itin. Alex.* 26, Auson. p. 157 Peiper, line 2. The only comparable earlier use adduced is Liv. 35. 17. 9 *tamen omni praesenti statu spem cuique novandi res suas blandiorem esse*. For *pectus aegrum* we can adduce from *TLL* (*aeger*), Sen. *Herc. F.* 1320 *pectori hanc* (sc. *manum*) *aegro admovent | pellam dolores*, *Herc. O.* 1643 *ut ingens . . . | aegro reclinis pectore immugit leo*,³ Val. Flacc. 6. 623 *talibus aegra movens nequiquam pectora curis*, Sil. 13. 402 *consultaue pectoris aegri | pandit*, and 15. 135 f.

At *Cir.* 457 the author uses the collocation *casus incertus* which is cited by *TLL* (*casus*) in Cicero (e.g. *Orat.* 98) but in verse only in the Silver Age: see *Culex* 162, Sen. *Tro.* 915 f. etc., Luc. 5. 66, Sil. 10. 544 etc.

I shall conclude this list of miscellaneous examples by pointing to one possible parallel with Germanicus' *Aratus* and one with Manilius. *Cir.* 451 reads *aequoreae pristis*,⁴ *immania corpora ponti*. *aequoreae pristis* occurs similarly at the beginning of a verse (though in the genitive case) at German. *Arat.* 371 *nodus cristam super ipsam | aequoreae pristis radiat*. I know of no other parallel for the collocation of the two words and *pristis* (or *pistris*) is otherwise extremely rare in Latin verse—cf. Virg. *Aen.* 10. 211, Val. Flacc. 2. 531; cf. also Ovid, *Met.* 11. 211 f. *monstro . . . aequoreo* etc.

I know of only one exact parallel for the expression *producere mentum* at *Cir.* 498, and that is at Manilius 5. 103 *incipient Haedi tremulum producere mentum*.

This then is the internal evidence which seems to me to indicate that the author of the *Ciris* knew and was influenced by Statius and probably by other Silver poets; and we saw, I think, how this theory of the poem's date, far from conflicting with the picture suggested by the evidence of available ancient *testimonia*, was actually supported by it. We are thus assuming that the *Ciris*, in genre an epyllion, was written at the earliest right at the end of the first century A.D. This, though very interesting to the literary historian, should not surprise him unduly.

Interest in, and practice of, neoteric neo-Alexandrian forms continued right into the Empire. Tiberius was very fond of Euphron, Rhianus, and Parthenius, placing their busts in the public libraries and himself imitating their verses.⁵ Some of Lucan's *iuvenilia* sound distinctly neoteric.⁶ Persius in his first Satire inveighs against weak neo-neoteric literature (symptomatic of the corruption of the age) which was evidently flourishing at the time.⁷ A tradition represented

¹ See p. 241 n. 1.

² Editors with some plausibility have wanted to emend it to *superum sedes*.

³ Not a very happy use of the phrase; the author of the play, who it is generally agreed was not Seneca, has perhaps lifted it from the *Herc. F.*

⁴ *Pristes*, which is obviously correct, was suggested by Barth in 1608 for *pestes* H (also

G) and *pisces* AR, and is in fact presented, presumably by conjecture, by Corsinianus 43 F. 111. 21.

⁵ Suet. *Tib.* 70.

⁶ His hexameter *Orpheus* for instance (of which a few lines survive) may well have been an epyllion. It seems to have been confined to one book, and the style of the fragments is very Alexandrian.

⁷ See especially lines 93 ff.

in the scholion attributed the illustrative quotations adduced by Persius to Nero: this is almost certainly not right, but it is an interesting reflection on the tastes of the emperor. Martial of course in many respects represents a conventionalized Catullus,¹ while the younger Pliny bears witness to an apparently widespread interest in writing short poems in the neoteric manner.² And in the second century we find the *poetae neoterici* or the *novelli poetae*.³ It should be noted, however, that the interest of these last as well as of the poets mentioned by Pliny does seem to have centred on neoteric 'versicles'—epigram, *polymetra*—rather than on a more elaborate composition like the epyllion.

So all in all a second-century epyllion would not be excessively surprising. There is, however, one obvious feature about the *Ciris* which should be briefly reappraised at this point. The language of this neoterically inspired poem contains successions of imitations of Virgil—phrases, whole lines, and even groups of lines. Initially there may seem to be an inherent contradiction here, but when we remember that with the second century we are into the age of Virgilian *centones*, and the *Vergilianus poeta*,⁴ it does not seem impossible that a poem of that period might both reflect the latter-day neotericism current at the time, and plunder Virgil in a manner that would be perhaps not only acceptable but fashionable.

I think thus that the *Ciris* was perhaps written in the second century A.D., and was surely never intended to pass for a Virgilian work, but found its way into his *corpus*, like many of the other *minora*, purely by accident.⁵ The Messalla to whom the poem is dedicated must then be some descendant of the great family alive in the second century,⁶ unless any good reason can be suggested why a poet of that period should purport to dedicate his work to a great man of a previous age.

Churchill College, Cambridge

R. O. A. M. LYNE

¹ Cf., e.g., how at 4. 14 he compares himself and his work to Catullus, whilst associating Silius with Virgil. And, interestingly, he inveighs against some of the turgid contemporary epic writing: see J. W. Spaeth, 'Martial and Vergil', *TAPhA* lxi (1930), 21. His views are, however, not easily compartmentalized; there is some interesting information on this in K. Preston, 'Martial and Former Literary Criticism', *CPh* xv (1920), 340–52.

² Cf. *Epist.* 1. 16, 4. 27.

³ See Schanz–Hosius iii. 21 ff.

⁴ See Schanz–Hosius iii. 45. A *cento* in fact is only a linguistic *Spielerei* on the level of the metrical games of the *poetae novelli*.

⁵ People have speculated how this might happen: it is not an unparalleled phenomenon for anonymous works to gather around a great name, and we have, too, to

reckon with very simple possibilities—e.g. that a scribe might fill up spare leaves at the end of a codex with an odd poem or two. The Virgilian lines in a work like the *Ciris* might suggest the association with the great poet. We might compare the Virgilian corpus to the collection of poems in the Tibullan manuscripts, though there is much more reason for their association in a single edition. One thing is certain: odd attributions in our sources should cause us no surprise. The inclusion of the *Eleg. Maec.* as a Virgilian work is far more immediately outrageous than that of the *Ciris*; and we can remember too, e.g., that the *Laus Pis.* was assigned, in a manuscript now lost, to Virgil.

⁶ According to the list in *RE*, the *Valerii Messallae* are fast dying out in the second century A.D.