

SOME PASSAGES IN VIRGIL'S *ECLOGUES**

3.7-9

D. Parcius ista uiris tamen obicienda memento.
nouimus et qui te transuersa tuentibus hircis
et quo (sed faciles Nymphae risere) sacello.

Cf. Theocr. 5.39-42 ΛΑ. καὶ πόκ' ἐγὼν παρὰ τεύς τι μαθὼν καλὸν ἦ καὶ ἀκούσας / μέμναμ' . . . ; ΚΟ. ἀνὴκ' ἐπύγξόν τυ, τὸ δ' ἄλγεες· αἱ δὲ χίμαιραι/αἶδε κατεβλη-
χῶντο, καὶ ὁ τράγος αὐτὰς ἐτρύπη. To Menalcas' taunts of dishonesty Damoetas
replies, in effect, 'ego tamen uir sum' (cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 13). Coleman's statement,
which contradicts both Servius and Quintilian (9.3.59), that the ellipse of the
verb in 8 f. (cf. Theocr. 5.41) is 'an instance not of *uerecundia*, but of col-
loquialism', fails to take into account the essential refinement and elegance of
Virgil's lines, which contrast sharply with the earthy realism of Theocr.¹ See
Gow on Theocr. 1.105 for other examples of an 'aposiopesis to avoid an
indelicacy'.² *qui* (8), taken by some as plural (cf. Serv.), is surely singular
(= *quis*; cf. Löfstedt, *Synt.* ii. 86 f.): the detailed description of the scene indicates
a single occasion and on this occasion there is no reason to assume that M. had
a plurality of lovers; indeed, it seems evident that Damoetas is obliquely referring
to himself, following up *uiris* (7), and thus indulging in a boastful taunt like
Comatas in Theocr. 5.41 and 116 and Priapus (?) in *A.P.* 9.317.3 (see below).³

The expression *transuersa tuentibus hircis* has been liable to misunderstanding.
Conington, Sidgwick, and Page offer no comment; Perret is puzzled; Coleman
explains 'either literally "peeping out of the corner of their eyes" or figuratively
"looking askance"; cf. Greek λοῖζά βλέπεω. This was too much even for the lusty
goats . . .'; others, e.g. Holtorf, detect humour in the words. A more realistic
view was taken by some earlier editors (cf. Forbiger), who saw in the sidelong
looks of the goats a sign of envy and desire; cf. H. E. Butler's rendering, 'while
the goats looked goatish'.⁴ This is in keeping with the model (41 f.) and also
with an apparent imitation of the latter (cited by Gow on Theocr. 5.42), not
known, it seems, to Virgilian commentators, *A.P.* 9.317 (Meleagrian group).
3 f. αἰπόλε, τοῦτον ἐγὼ τρίς ἐπύγισα, τοὶ δὲ τραγίσκοι/εἰς ἐμὲ δερκόμενοι τὰς
χμᾶρας ἔβλεπον (ἐβάτευν Salm.).⁵ In Theocr. 1.87 f. we find the reverse situ-
ation: the goatherd, on beholding the amorous achievements of the goats *τάκεται*
ὀφθαλμῶς ὅτι οὐ τράγος αὐτὸς ἔγεντο.

That the sense is as I have indicated is confirmed by an examination, for which

* Editions of Virgil referred to by the editor's name only: (i) *Complete works* (a) *Text* R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969); M. Geymonat (Turin, 1973). (b) *Text with commentary* C. G. Heyne and G. P. E. Wagner, 4th edn. (Leipzig and London, 1830-41); A. Forbiger, 4th edn. (Leipzig, 1872-5); J. Conington and H. Nettleship, vols. ii-iii (London, 1883-4), vol. i, 5th edn. revised by F. Haverfield (London, 1898); A. Sidgwick (Cambridge, 1890); T. E. Page (London, 1894-1900). (ii) *Eclogues only* (a) *Text with commentary* H. Holtorf (Freiburg, 1959); J. Perret

(Paris, 1961); Robert Coleman (Cambridge, 1977). (b) *Text with translation* E. de Saint-Denis, revised edition with a commentary (Budé, 1967).

¹ Cf. Saint-Denis, p. 12.

² A. S. F. Gow (ed.), Theocritus (Cambridge, 1952²).

³ Cf. A. Barigazzi, *AC* 44 (1975), 71.

⁴ In his translation (Loeb, 1921) of Quintilian, who quotes *Ecl.* 3.8 f. in 9.3.59.

⁵ A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), i. 212, ii. 586.

⁹ 'te . . . canet' cannot mean 'sing of you', as generally translated, for the *myrica* and *nemus* do nothing of the kind. Varus is the essence of their song through its being dedicated to him (12). (He subsequently appears only in 9.26 f.)

tastes of the love-oriented reader,¹⁰ and such a sense receives no support from the immediate context. An interesting, but commonly ignored, witness to the sense of 6.9 f. is Jerome, who, in the preface to his *Quaest. hebr. in Genes.* (Migne xxiii), writes (col. 984) 'lectorem obsecro, si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis captus amore leget, ut in libris *Hebr. quaest.* . . . non quaerat eloquentiam, non oratorum leporem' (*amore = harum rerum a.*).

6.35-8 tum durare solum et discludere Nerea ponto
coeperit et rerum paulatim sumere formas;
iamque nouum terrae stupeant lucescere solem,
altius atque cadant summotis nubibus imbres.

35 f. sc. '[canebat Silenus ut] tum [mundi orbis] . . . coeperit'. It has been controversial whether *altius* (38) is to be taken with the preceding or the following words. Among the more recent editors, Mynors prints a comma after *solem*, likewise Geymonat (yet indicating Wagner's pointing after *altius*); Perret and Coleman join *lucescere altius*. The obvious and natural interpretation, in my view, can alone be right, viz. to regard 37 as a complete clause, expressing the amazement of the earth, hitherto in darkness, at the spectacle of the light of the new born sun: cf. Serv. ' . . . stupeant terrae solis ortum', Ambros. *Epist.* 18.23 'exutae humentibus tenebris nouum terrae stupore solem'; in such a clause *altius* has no place. In Lucretius' account (5.471 ff.) the sun originated before the separation of land from water, and we must assume, as we reasonably may, that V. has differed from Lucr. (cf. Coleman's remarks on 31 ff.). Those who join *lucescere altius* explain, e.g. Conington: 'The force of *altius* will then be "higher than before", when the elements of the sun and moon were not yet disengaged from those of the earth; or the comparative may indicate the gradual elevation of the sun into its place'; much to this effect, Perret and Coleman. But there were more exciting and more poetic aspects of the sun's behaviour to amaze the earth and charm the reader than mere adjustments to its height.

Taken with the following clause (38), *altius* is not only appropriate, but necessary. The adverb consorts naturally indeed with *cadant* (see *TLL s. alte* 1784.30 ff.): cf. Varro *Men.* 272.3 'alte maesti in terram cecidimus', 557.1 'imber alto nubilo cadens'; but with *summotis* it is positively needed. The latter is generally interpreted as = (*sub*)*leuatis* (cf. Serv. 'nubibus in altum leuatis'), but, though in theory *submoueo* may bear this sense, no other instance appears to be recorded nor is there evidence that it occurs here;¹¹ cf. Luc. 3.401 'alte summotis solibus [i.e. *solis radiis*]' (of a dark grove), a passage unnoticed by commentators. *summotis* must bear its common sense of *remotis*, *separatis*, sc. *a terra*, and is further defined by *altius*.¹² But, occupying its prominent position

¹⁰ Cf. 'Love is prominent throughout the Eclogue', Coleman, p. 204. This idea, rejected by A. Cartault, *Étude sur les Bucoliques de V.* (Paris, 1897), p. 269, has been developed more recently: cf. Brooks Otis, *Virgil, A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 125 ff., C. Segal, *TAPA* 100 (1969), 407 ff.; for a different approach, see R. D. Williams, *Virgil, G. & R. New Surveys in the Classics*, No. 1 (Oxford, 1967), pp. 12 f., Saint-Denis, p. 70, K.

Büchner, *RE* viiiA (1955), 1219, 'Sicher ist die 6. Ekloge ein Lied auf die Macht und die Kurzweiligkeit des Gesanges'.

¹¹ V. uses *submoueo* three times elsewhere: *Aen.* 6.316 'alios longe summotos arcet harena', 7.225 f. 'si quem tellus extrema refuso/summouet Oceano' ('separates from us'), 8.193 'spelunca . . . uasto summoti recessu'.

¹² Cf. F. Klingner, *Virgil, Bucolica, Georg., Aeneis* (Zürich and Stuttgart,

in the line, the adverb must be regarded as pertaining, not singly either to *cadant* or to *summotis*, but to the sentence as a whole: i.e. 'and from the higher eminences to which the clouds have withdrawn the rains fall down'.

What has dissuaded some from attributing to Virgil's words their natural sense is that the postponement of *atque*¹³ occurs nowhere else in V. (cf. Conington, Page, Perret). Elsewhere in poetry instances of postponed *atque* occur here and there (e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 17.4, Ov. *A.A.* 3.282, etc.),¹⁴ and the postponement by V. of other conjunctions, e.g. *et*, *nam*, *at*, *sed*, etc., is far from rare;¹⁵ a remarkable postponement, unexampled in V. and rare elsewhere, is that of *namque* to sixth word in *Ecl.* 1.14. *aut* is postponed once only in Lucretius (6.105),¹⁶ and *nam* once only in Propertius (4.8.23, with Beroaldus' generally accepted reading).¹⁷ The objection has indeed no validity. On the same principle we might condemn the attachment of *que* to the preposition *a* (rare elsewhere) in *G.* 4.347 'aque Chao', as being alien to V.'s usage; cf. too *atque-atque* (= *et-et*) in *Ecl.* 5.23 (Sil. 1.93 f.); likewise, the solitary instance of the combination *que-et* (not infrequent in poetry) in Martial (7.54.5; cf. Hofm.-Szant. 515).

6.78-81 [quid loquar] ut mutatos Terei narrauerit artus,
 quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,
 quo cursu deserta petiuerit et quibus ante
 infelix sua tecta super uolitaueit alis?

According to Ovid (*Met.* 6.424-674), who gives the most detailed form of the legend,¹⁸ Tereus, king of Thrace, married to Procne, daughter of Pandion, king of Athens, violated her sister Philomela and cut out her tongue. Procne in revenge, assisted by Philomela, killed her son Itys and served his flesh for Tereus to eat; after the meal, Philomela hurled his head into his father's face. Pursued by Tereus, the sisters were transformed into birds, one seeking refuge in the woods, the other beneath the roof; Tereus became a hoopoe. Of the legend's variations a conspicuous feature concerns the sisters' transformation: in general, Greek authors make Procne and Philomela respectively a nightingale and a swallow, the Romans a swallow and a nightingale. Some critics, on the strength of a few passages, which include the present, have assumed that Philomela is at times represented as the wife of Tereus,¹⁹ but the evidence for this

1967), who translates 38: 'und die Wolken sich aufwärts entfernen u. daraus Regen niederfällt'.

¹³ Editors in general seem agreed that *atque* P, not *utque* R, is the true reading; Ribbeck, however, reads *solem*, *altius utque*.

¹⁴ See *TLL* s. *atque* 1049.69 ff. (some dubious instances included), *OLD* s. *atque* (init.), Hofm.-Szant. 506.

¹⁵ See E. Norden (ed.), Virgil, *Aeneid* 6 (Leipzig, 1927³), pp. 402-4, on the inversion of particles (*atque* p. 402 n. 3). Cf. M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 93-6.

¹⁶ For this reason Lachmann conjectured and read *ab* in its place.

¹⁷ Viz. *serica nam taceo*. Norden, op. cit., p. 403, regards this apparent instance

of postponed *nam*, owing to its being conjectural, as uncertain. Cf., however, the manuscript evidence: V has *Sirica nam tacto*, the other mss. *Si riganam tacto* or the like.

¹⁸ For treatment of the legend, see F. Bömer's commentary on Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (Heidelberg, 1969 -), on 6.412-674 and 669; R. J. Tarrant (ed.), Seneca, *Agamemnon* (Cambridge, 1976), on 670 ff.; also S. G. Owen (ed.), Ovid, *Tristia* 2 (Oxford, 1924), on 2.389. A tragedy *Tereus* is known to have been written by Sophocles and Philocles, also by Livius Andronicus and Accius.

¹⁹ So Conington; Page; P. Brandt (ed.), Ovid, *Amores* (Leipzig, 1911), on 2.6.7; S. G. Owen on *Trist.* 2.389; J. B. Evenhuis, *De Vergilii ecloga sexta commentatio* (Diss.

assumption is dubious. Among his summaries of the subjects of Silenus' song, Virgil assigns the above lines to the Tereus legend. The last two (80 f.) bristle with difficulties of which I have seen no satisfactory exposition, still less, a solution.

On considering the general structure of 79-81, we find four parallel and carefully balanced clauses, each introduced by an interrogative pronoun; the expressed subject of the first clause is *Philomela* and the remaining clauses show no indication of a change of subject. Yet some scholars have been in doubt as to the subject of the last two clauses: 'There is nothing to determine with certainty' writes B. H. Kennedy (edition of Virgil, London, 1876), 'whether these two lines [80 f.] have for their subject Tereus or Philomela'; Conginton, too, feels unable to decide; F. Klingner (op. cit., translation) evidently takes Tereus as the subject in both 80 and 81; others, e.g. Coleman, find a change of subject (to T.) in 81 only. Such reasoning appears to me to violate all Latin convention: in the absence of any hint, either from the language or from the context, I do not see what justification there can be for postulating a change of subject and appointing a new one. Making Tereus the subject, whether of the two verbs or of the one, saddles this master artist with the language of a novice. The subject of all four clauses can only be *Philomela*.

The next point concerns the time relationship between the verbs *petiuerit* and *uolitauerit*, and here the function of *ante* must be considered. Some take *ante* with the whole clause as indicating that the action of *uolitauerit* is prior to that of *petiuerit*: so Wagner, Forbiger, and Page seeing in 'deserta petiuerit' an allusion to Philomela's transformation into a nightingale, Coleman. The step backwards in time here involved is unbelievably lame and leaves the last clause, a third of the whole summary in length, void of all legendary relevance. And are we to suppose that any small bird would pause to flit about over the house-tops when pursued by an incensed and heavily armed hoopoe?²⁰ For *petiuerit*, like *petit* in Ov. *Met.* 6.668 (quoted below), 'suggests flight from a pursuer' (Coleman). Those, again, who make Tereus the subject of *uolitauerit* should explain why, instead of hotly pursuing as in Ovid, he perversely elects first to perform aerial turns above his own roof-tops.²¹ Others take *ante* closely with *sua* and hold that the action of *uolitauerit*, so far from being prior, is subsequent to that of *petiuerit*: so Heyne (cf. Perret), believing that the clause 'quo c. deserta petiuerit' refers to the flight from Tereus and that Philomela, transformed into a swallow (as in the Greek version) and visited by nostalgia, subsequently flew above her former home. This involves an unusual order in 'ante infelix sua', but, as Conington suggests, *infelix* may be regarded as parenthetical, and the interpretation of *ante* is supported by Ov. *Met.* 2.490 '[Callisto]

Groningen, 1955), pp. 16-27; cf. Holtorf and Perret. The chief passages invoked in support of their view, in addition to *Ecl.* 6.78-81, are *Georg.* 4.511-15, Ov. *Am.* 2.6.7-10, neither of which convinces, and lines of the late versifier Pentadius, who in *Anth. Lat.* 234.3 f. makes Procne the mother of Itys, but in 235.7 f. Philomela. The evidence of Eustathius, Hom. *Od.* 1875, who makes Philomela the wife of Tereus, appears confused and self-contradictory.

²⁰ Cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.666 'nunc sequitur nudo genitas Pandione ferro', 671-3 'ille dolore suo poenaeque cupidine uelox/ uertitur in uolucrum, cui stant in uertice cristae, /prominet inmodicum pro longa cuspidis rostrum'.

²¹ For the epithet *infelix*, which Coleman states 'suits the victim Tereus more than either of the avengers', cf. Hor. *Od.* 4. 12. 5 ff. 'nidum ponit Ityn flebiliter gemens /infelix auis et Cecropiae domus/aeternum opprobrium . . .'.

ante domum *quondamque suis errauit in agris*. *deserta*, however, is not accounted for: why should Philomela, whether girl or swallow, seek uninhabited places in particular, thereby giving the powerful Tereus obvious scope for catching her?

What is especially noteworthy in the four lines is the strangely dominant role of Philomela, who appears, in contradiction to the legend, to be the wife of Tereus, for *sua* in 81 can refer only to the queen (see para. 1). It is Philomela, moreover, not Procne assisted by Philomela, who provides for Tereus both the *dapes*²² and the *dona* (the boy's head). Indispensable a member of the cast, as she normally is, one of the two great child-slayers of antiquity, Procne seems entirely forgotten. Furthermore, though one of the sisters' transformations, either that into a nightingale or else that into a swallow, is apparently unrecorded, some have found to their satisfaction an allusion to the former in 'q. c. *deserta petiuerit*', others to the latter in 'q. . . . *tecta s. uolitauerit a.*'

Here the consideration of some related, but largely neglected, passages, in which a contrast is drawn between the two metamorphosed sisters, seems very relevant, in particular, Ov. *Met.* 6.668 f. 'quarum [Cecropidum] petit altera *siluas*,/altera *tecta* subit', where the two parallel clauses show a remarkable congruity with Virgil's '*deserta petiuerit*' and '*tecta super uolitauerit*'; Sen. *Ag.* 670 ff. '... *ramo cantat tristis aedon*/... *tectis Bistonis ales/residens summis* . . .'; Petron. (poet.) 131.8.6 f. '*testis siluestris aedon/atque urbana Procne*'; *Aetna* 586-8 '*Philomela canoris/euocat in siluis*, at tu, soror, hospita *tectis*/acciperis'; *Anth. Lat.* 199.54 f. 'in *lucis* ut cantet tristis aedon/maestaque sub *tecto* sua murmure acta chelidon'. Note too Plin. *N.H.* 10.70 'Thebarum tecta subire negantur [hirundines] . . . nec Bizyes in Thracia propter scelera Terei'. A corresponding contrast is shown in the fable of the nightingale and the swallow as narrated by Babrius 12: cf. 2. ff. [χελιδών] εὔρεν . . . ἐρήμοις ἐγκαθημένην ὕλαις/ἀηδόν' . . . ἡ δ' ἀπεθρήνει τὸν Ἴτυν . . . 11 ἄλλ' ἔλθ' ἐς ἀγρόν καὶ πρὸς οἶκον ἀνθρώπων', 20 ff. (ἀηδών replies) 'ἔα με πέτραις ἐμμένειν ἀουκῆτοισι,/ . . . μετὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀνδρα καὶ πόλιν φεύγω'.²³ The nightingale seeks solitude, the swallow the society of man. From these passages and other references to the habitats of the two birds²⁴ we may assume that, in a mention of the sisters' transformation, an allusion to woods, trees, or uninhabited places, points to the nightingale, one to roofs, houses, or towns, to the swallow. The similarity between these passages and that of Virgil can surely be no accident. The clause 'quo cursu [= *motu*, i.e. *uolata*]²⁵ *deserta petiuerit*' (cf. Ov. loc. cit. 'petit . . .

²² Cf. Servius on 79: '*Philomela dapes* atqui hoc Procne fecit; sed aut abutitur nomine aut illi inputat, propter quam factum est'; and Philargyrius 'id est quod fecit Progne, hoc dicit Philomelam fecisse'. The late poet Nemesianus, in *Cyneg.* 33 f. 'miratumque rudes se tollere Terea pinnae/post epulas, Philomela, tuas', may well have been influenced by our Virgil passage.

²³ The use of the fable by Ennius, Lucilius, and Horace presupposes a close familiarity with these tales on the part of their readers: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.299, 2.6.79 ff., *Epist.* 1.1.73 ff., 1.3.18 ff., 1.10.34 ff., all of which have counterparts in Phaedrus, Babrius, or Aesop.

²⁴ (a) of nightingale, woods, trees, etc.:

Hom. *Od.* 19.520, Eur. *Hel.* 1107, Soph. *O.C.* 671 ff., [Mel.] *Anth. Pal.* 9.363.18, Catull. 65.13, *Georg.* 4.511, Prop. 2.20.6, Ov. *Pont.* 1.3.39 f., Sen. *H.F.* 146, [Sen.] *H.O.* 193, etc. (b) of swallow, roofs, houses, etc.: Mnasalc. *A.P.* 9.70, Antip. Sid. *A.P.* 10.2.3 f., [Mel.] *A.P.* 9.363.17, *Georg.* 4.14 f., 307, *Aen.* 12.473 ff., Ov. *Fast.* 1.158, *Trist.* 3.12.9 f., Stat. *Theb.* 8.618 f., 12.479, etc. For details of the birds see D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford, 1936²), pp. 16-22, 314-25, R. J. Tarrant, op. cit., p. 298.

²⁵ The meaning of 'quo cursu' is, perhaps purposely, ambiguous: it could be *qua celeritate*.

siluas') has all the appearance of an allusion to the nightingale transformation. In the last clause *tecta* at once suggests the cue (cf. Ovid's 'tecta subit'), and the words thus indicate the swallow transformation; 'flitting about over the house-tops' is, of course, highly characteristic of the swallow (cf. *Aen.* 12.473 f.).²⁶ We are accordingly faced with the apparent conclusion that we have here, not one transformation, but two.²⁷ If in the last clause, following Heyne, we take *ante* with *sua* ('previously – ill-fated one! – her own'), then the two perfects *petiuerit* and *uolitauerit*, corresponding to Ovid's 'petit . . . subit', merely indicate the occurrence of the events in past time, and no temporal priority of the one event in relation to the other is implied.

The situation as now revealed is indeed a strange one, and we might well feel tempted to suspect that the tradition is unsound. Yet the lines give the impression of studied workmanship and art: they do not suggest a text that is lacunose or corrupt. I submit, accordingly, for consideration the view that, while Philomela is the grammatical subject of each of the four clauses, she is to be interpreted as a composite figure symbolizing the two sisters, both in the preparation of the *dapes* and of the *dona*, actions which cannot with propriety be ascribed to Philomela alone, and also in the transformation of the one into a nightingale, of the other into a swallow. Herein it is appropriate that the named sister should be the less illustrious of the pair; for Procne an oblique allusion will suffice, viz. 'ante . . . sua tecta (80 f.), which indicates the queen. It is thus Procne who becomes a swallow, and consequently Philomela a nightingale; and this departure from the Greek version is in keeping with *Georg.* 4.15 '[absit a stabulis] manibus Procne pectus signata cruentis' and 511 'populea maerens Philomela sub umbra'. To the uninstructed reader the language is vague and ambiguous and for him such sense as the literal meaning of the words affords is enough. The well schooled Roman would note the cues, *deserta* and *tecta*, and instinctively grasp the underlying sense. 'Catullus' observes C. J. Fordyce,²⁸ 'writes for a sophisticated reader who is equipped to seize on hints and expand allusions'. Virgil writes likewise; it is only by implication and allusive language that he here reveals his purpose. Is it possible that he may be experimenting with a technique based on some lost Greek Alexandrian or other model with which his readers would be familiar?

- 7.29–36 C. Saetosi caput hoc apri tibi, Delia, paruus
et ramosa Micon uiuacis cornua cerui.
si proprium hoc fuerit, leui de marmore tota
puniceo stabis suras euincta coturno.
T. Sinum lactis et haec te liba, Priape, quotannis
expectare sat est: custos es pauperis horti.
nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus; at tu,
si fetura gregem suppleuerit, aureus esto.

The singing-match (21–68) consists of six pairs of amoebean quatrains which

²⁶ For *uolitare* applied to the flight of the *hirundo*, cf. *Georg.* 1.377 'arguta lacus circumuolitaui hirundo' (Arat. *Phaen.* 944 λήμνην περίδηθὰ χελιδόνες αἰσσοῦνται), Plin. *N.H.* 18.363 'hirundo . . . iuxta aquam uolitans'.

²⁷ Significant is Conington's comment (on 80): 'The description of the bird flying

round the house might seem to point to the swallow [V. following the Greek version] . . . but this would not suit *deserta petiuerit*. . . Here the ambiguity is certainly awkward, and looks like a confusion of the habits of the nightingale and swallow'.

²⁸ Catullus, *A Commentary* (Oxford, 1961), p. 274.

take the form of epigrams on different themes. The first of the above pair is a dedicatory epigram of the type, it may be, fictitious, exemplified in *Anth. Pal.* 6. In it the dedicator is a hunter, Micon, presumably intended to be thought of as some acquaintance of Corydon. The answering quatrain, though closely linked with the first, formally differs in being expressed in the first person (35) and Thyrsis himself is purportedly the dedicator, appearing as both gardener and shepherd. It is obvious that the second quatrain is intended as a burlesque of the first and, perhaps, of such creations in general. 29 f. sc. *dedicat* (as *Aen.* 3.288). *paruus* can hardly indicate Micon's age or size (cf. *Aen.* 2.674 *paruus Iulus*, etc.), as many have held, for the notion of 'little Micon' performing the solemn office of dedication is in itself improbable and seems unsupported by any parallel.²⁹ Serv. Dan. must be right in explaining 'uel humilis uel pauper' and wrong in adding 'uel minor aetate'. The words *Delia*, *paruus* in juxtaposition may well suggest the antithesis *Delia* <magna>, *paruus* *Micon* (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.3.28 'parui . . . et ampli'). *paruus* thus corresponds to *pauperis horti*³⁰ (34; cf. too *pro tempore* 35).

In 31 the common interpretation of 'si proprium hoc fuerit', viz. 'if this (hunting success) proves lasting', is fanciful and makeshift: there is no mention of hunting success to which *hoc* can refer; hunting spoils are but a normal type of dedicatory offering (cf. *A.P.* 6.106.5 f., 253.7 f.). Moreover, the natural dative to be understood with *proprium* is not *mibi*, but *tibi* from 29. Much nearer the mark is Coleman's rendering, 'if it turns out that this properly belongs to you', 'if this is in fact an appropriate offering'. In the context, however, *proprium* must denote rather possession of an absolute and permanent nature (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.134 '[ager] erit nulli proprius', and, in the sphere of giving, *Aen.* 3.85, 6.871 'propria [Romanis] haec si dona [Marcellus] fuissent', 7.331), and the meaning must be 'if this offering proves to have become your own absolutely', i.e. 'to have found full and lasting acceptance with you', with the implication that it secures Diana's favour in the future; cf. Philargyrius, 'si p. id est perpetuum aut acceptum. hoc id est munus'. Compare, in the Greek epigram, the stock request to the deity concerned consisting of some form of the imperative of δέχομαι (with accus. of the offering): e.g. *A.P.* 6.106.5 f. ἀλλὰ τὸ, Πᾶν . . . τὰ μὴ πολλοῖσιν τε δέξαι/δῶρα καὶ εὐαγρὲς τῶδε πέτασσον ὄρος, 243, 253.7 f. ἰλήκοιτε καὶ εὐθήρω δέχεσθε/Σωσάνδρου ταχυνῆς σκῦλ' ἐλαφοσσοῖς; in 351 (Callim.) Heracles replies 'δέχομαι' only after due interrogation. The singular *hoc* is used to denote the collective offering; *haec* would have implied the separate objects. *hoc* cannot look forward to the erection of the statue in the next clause, as thought possible by Coleman, also by Saint-Denis p. 129 (interpreting 'si p. h. f.' as 'si cette offrande est en mon pouvoir') and Perret: it seems clear that the two conditional clauses (31 and 36, the latter = 'if you, Priapus [as god of fertility], see that the ewes replenish my flock')³¹ correspond, both signifying 'if you show me your favour'. The general sense of the quatrains is

²⁹ There is no comfort to be found in Theocr. *Epigr.* 20, where ὁ μικκὸς Μῆδεως is credited with the erection of a tomb for his deceased nurse (in the comparable epigram, Callim. *Ep.* 51, Μίκκος is a proper name). Nor do I find relevance in [Theocr.] *Id.* 8.64, sometimes cited here by critics,

where the boy shepherd appeals to the wolf's better nature, 'ὅτι μικκὸς ἔων πολλαῖσιν ὁμαρτέω'.

³⁰ Cf. *A.P.* 6.36, 42.1 Ἀλκμῆνης ὁ πενιχρὸς ἐπὶ μικρῷ τινι κήπῳ, 98, 238.

³¹ Cf. *A.P.* 6.99.5 f. ἀνθ' ὧν ἐν σηκοῖς διδυμητόκοι αἴγες ἔσσονται/γαστέρα.

illustrated by *A.P.* 6.152.3 f. . . ἔργων ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγην δόσω· ἦν δέ τι μείζον/
δωρήσῃ, τίσει [Μεΐδων] τῶνδε πολυπλάσια, 238.5 f.; cf. too Theocr. *Epiqr.*
4.13 ff., Silius 7.78–85.

Aberystwyth

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS