

GALLUS AND THE *CULEX**

The *Culex* remains the most bewildering of poems. The consensus of modern opinion holds that it is a deliberate forgery, post-Ovidian in date, purporting to be a work of the youthful Virgil and thus serving to fill the large biographical vacuum in the career of the poet before the publication of the *Eclogues*.¹ If this is the case, it must be asked why the forger chose to fill that gap with a poem thematically and stylistically so idiosyncratic which nevertheless managed to gain ready acceptance as Virgilian by the end of the first century A.D.² This is a very large question, but in postulating the close dependence of parts of the poem on Cornelius Gallus (I), particularly on his symbolism of poetic inspiration (II–V), I hope to go some of the way towards providing an answer (VI). If this article is directed primarily at the problem of the *Culex*, I would like to think it makes a contribution also to the much more important study of Gallus, whose reputation has suffered somewhat since the publication of those wretched lines from Qaşr İbrîm.³ Yet, if not a single line of his work had survived, the one thing we could say of his poetry with confidence is that it inspired. Anyone trying to make an assessment of Gallus' poetic achievement should first make a close study of Virgil's Sixth and Tenth *Eclogues* and then ask whether fragments have ever formed a firm basis for the evaluation of an author's work. Rehabilitation should not be necessary.

I

The narrative of the *Culex* opens at dawn with a herdsman leading his goats to the hills (42 ff.). Their feeding is described at length in picturesque terms (48–57):

iam silvis dumisque vagae, iam vallibus abdunt
 corpora, iamque omni celeres e parte vagantes
 Tondebant Tenero viridantia gramina morsu. 50
 scrupea desertas haerebant ad cava rupes,
 Pendula Proiectis carpuntur et arbuta ramis,
 densaque virgultis avide labrusca petuntur.
 haec suspensa rapit Carpentē CaCumina morsu
 vel salicis lentae vel quae Nova Nascitur alNus, 55
 haec teneras fruticum sentes rimatur, at illa
 imminet† in rivi praestantis imaginis undam.

Descriptions of animals feeding are fairly frequent in Roman poetry, forming as they do the conventional backdrop to pastoral scenes. The pleasure of watching such a scene is remarked upon at Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 75 f., and for Alfius it is one of the blessings of country

* I gratefully acknowledge the advice and encouragement given at various stages in the evolution of this paper by Prof. E. J. Kenney, Dr J. G. W. Henderson and Dr R. O. A. M. Lyne.

¹ Stated authoritatively by E. Fraenkel, 'The *Culex*', *JRS* 42 (1952), 1–9 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* II (Rome, 1964), pp. 181–97, and argued for in greater detail by D. Güntzschel, *Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex* (Münster, 1972). The conclusions of the latter are conveniently summarized in the review of E. Courtney, *Gnomon* 46 (1974), 810–12. A dissenting voice: A. A. Barrett, 'The Authorship of the *Culex*: an Evaluation of the Evidence', *Latomus* 29 (1970), 348–62.

² cf. Suet. *Vita Lucani* (ed. Reifferscheid, p. 50), *Stat. Silv.* 1 *praef.*, 2. 7. 73 f., *Mart.* 8. 56. 19 f., 14. 185.

³ cf. R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons and R. G. M. Nisbet, 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr İbrîm', *JRS* 69 (1979), 125–55.

life (Hor. *Epod.* 2. 11 f.). It is thus quite likely that this scene was intended by the poet to provide one source of motivation for the sudden introduction of the lengthy digression in praise of the *bona pastoris* that follows immediately (58–97). Following the digression our attention is at once focused on the herdsman who is watching the scene (98–100):

talibus in studiis baculo dum nixu apricas
pastor agit curas et dum non arte canora
compacta solitum modulatur harundine carmen...

100

The passage describing the feeding of the goats is notable mainly for its striving after preciousity, both in the scenes it portrays and the terms it uses to portray them. The most prominent of the complicated patterns of assonance⁴ have been indicated by italics, the strongest alliterations by capital letters. Four of the ten lines (three in successive lines (50–2) and seven of the sixteen in 42–57) are formed by two balancing nouns and epithets (abBA or abAB), a configuration especially favoured by the neoterics.⁵ Remarkable verbal and stylistic peculiarities abound: the extraordinary hyperbaton in 51, notable not only for its greatly dislocated word-order,⁶ but also for its daring, even paradoxical apposition – deserted crags are equated with stony hollows; line 52 contains the longest postponement of *et* in hexameter poetry;⁷ *labrusca* in 53 is a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον in classical Latin;⁸ *scrupea* in 51 is a very rare and conspicuous archaism,⁹ as is *proiectis* in 52 in the sense ‘jutting out’,¹⁰ while the use of *at illa* at the end of 56 may be a neoteric affectation.¹¹ In short, it would be difficult to point to another ten lines in the *Culex* which aimed at such elevation in a particular style (neoteric), and which contained so many extreme examples of conscious stylistic peculiarity.

What prompted the poet to indulge this extravagant style at this point? In trying to answer this we must take into consideration three very close parallels:

(i) Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 75 ff.:

non ego vos posthac viridi *proiectus* in antro (cf. *Culex* 52)
dumosa pendere procul de *rupe* videbo: (Culex 48, 51)
carmina nulla canam; non me pascente, capellae,
florentem cytisum et *salices carpetis* amarae. (Culex 55, 52, 54)

(ii) Ov. *Rem.* 175 ff.:¹²

aspice curvatos pomorum pondere ramos, (Culex 52, 54)

⁴ A feature of high neoteric style, cf. D. O. Ross Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975; hereafter: Ross, *Backgrounds*), pp. 54 f. on Catul. 64 and Prop. 1. 3, and L. C. Curran, ‘Greek Words and Myth in Propertius 1. 20’, *GRBS* 5 (1964), 281 ff.

⁵ cf. D. O. Ross Jr., *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969; hereafter: Ross, *Style*), pp. 132 ff. The percentage for the *Culex* as a whole is 10.6, which should be compared with the following (the figures are taken from E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI⁸* (Berlin, 1926), p. 394): Lucr. (1 + 6), 0.7; Cic. *Arat.*, 7.7; Catul. 64, 14.2; Verg. *Ecl.*, 4.7; G. (1 + 4), 6.1 (in G. 4. 281–558, this rises to 11.9); A. (1 + 6), 2.3.

⁶ The only true parallel (noted by F. Bücheler, ‘Coniectanea’, *RhM* 45 (1890), 326) is Luc. 3. 295 ‘usque Paraetionias Eoa ad litora Syrtis’; cf. Housman ad loc.

⁷ cf. *Thes. L. L.* v. 2. 898. 2.

⁸ cf. *Thes. L. L.* vii. 2. 814. 6 ff.

⁹ cf. Enn. sc. 113, with Jocelyn’s note ad loc.

¹⁰ cf. Macrobian. *Sat.* 6. 4. 14 f., and R. D. Williams on Verg. *A.* 3. 699.

¹¹ No fewer than four of the seven instances of this phrase in Virgil occur in the *Aristaeus* epyllion (G. 4. 360, 416, 446, 513), suggesting that it may have been characteristically neoteric.

¹² F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 125 n., was the first to draw attention to the similarities between Ov. *Rem.* 178–81 and the *Culex*; they are, however, more widespread than he realized.

- (iii) Ov. *Pont.* 1. 8. 51 f.:¹⁴

¹⁹ Ross, *Backgrounds*, pp. 86 f., has stated the case well for taking Servius' famous comment on *Ecl.* 10, 46 ff. ('hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus') to refer to more than just these lines, and for seeing the Tenth *Eclogue* as a reworking of themes already composed by Gallus. For Servius' use of *transferre* in this sense cf. J.-P. Boucher, *Caius Cornélius Gallus* (Paris, 1966), p. 80 n. 43. The Tenth *Eclogue* is, I think, a sincere though not, as many

he also briefly mentions herding sheep (68), another diversion that fails to relieve his 'labores' (64).²⁰ This is a scant reference, but there must have been a fairly prominent rural element in the elegies of Gallus, otherwise there would not have been sufficient linking themes and motifs (surely necessary to explain the inspiration of *Eclogue* 10) between his elegies and the pastoral world of the *Eclogues*. *Ecl.* 10. 50 f. 'ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita versu/carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena', though in the future in the dramatic setting of the *Eclogue*, should refer to something Gallus had already done in his poetry, namely to introduce strictly pastoral themes or *color* into the generalized rural setting implied by 42 f., 52 ff., 55 ff. This strictly pastoral element need not have been very large; Virgil for his own ends could have exploited a minor theme. The brief reference to shepherding (*Ecl.* 10. 68) as a remedy for his *labores* suggests that this was one way, at any rate, that Gallus introduced pastoral material into his elegies.²¹ Such a scene would have provided Virgil with a suitable point of departure for his poem, and I suggest that it could also have been the ultimate source for both Ovid's remedy and some of the motifs and phrasing in *Culex* 48–57 and 98–100.²²

This is as much as can be said on the evidence presented so far. It might be tempting immediately to attribute the 'clinging goats' motif, the phrase *modulatur harundine carmen* or other details to Gallus, but we have no licence to do so. All we can say at this stage is that the possibility exists that certain details found in our extant texts may not be original to them. The application of Axelson's principles²³ may arouse suspicion in the case of a particular phrase, but is no certain guide, because the presence of incongruity in it does not necessarily connect it with the postulated main source. Where this is not extant it is impossible to measure the level of conflation in and between our extant texts. The phrase *tondere gramen*, for instance, appears in *Lucr.* 2. 660, and might quite naturally have occurred independently to Ovid and the poet of the *Culex* in a context where there was a reference to grazing. Furthermore, we know little about the date of composition of Gallus' poetry beyond the fact that part of his *oeuvre* must have appeared before Virgil's Sixth and Tenth *Eclogues*. If he did use the 'clinging goats' motif, the possibility that he took it from Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 76, rather than *vice versa*, cannot be excluded. Likewise we should not deny originality

critics take it, solemn tribute to Gallus' recently appeared elegies (cf. 73 f. 'cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas/quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus' with 54 'crescent illae (sc. arbores), crescetis amores'; for the significance of this motif cf. section II below), and as such a reflection of them. Allusion to Gallus' poetry, as I hope will emerge in this paper, pervades the whole poem.

²⁰ 55–70 seem to be a rhapsody on the general theme of Gallus' attempts to forget his amatory troubles, perhaps combining allusions to a number of Gallan elegies, as seems to be the case earlier in the poem; thus his wistful invitation to his beloved to share life in the country (42–3) may reflect a poem like *Tib.* 1. 1, while his pleas to Lycoris in 44–9 may derive from a propemptic poem like *Prop.* 1. 8, cf. F. Skutsch, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

²¹ *Ecl.* 10. 68 contains echoes of Theocr. 7. 111–14, as F. Skutsch, *op. cit.*, p. 16 noted. Perhaps Virgil is echoing Gallus, who is drawing on Theocritus (cf. *Ecl.* 10. 50 f., and F. Skutsch, *op. cit.*, p. 21), rather than Virgil drawing directly on Theocritus to give the *Eclogue* more pastoral colouring.

²² All four passages treated (and cf. *Hor. Epod.* 2. 11 f. and *Ov. Tr.* 4. 1. 11 f.) stress the pleasure or consolation to be derived from watching herds graze. This might well have been influenced by the context of a remedy for love.

²³ B. Axelson, 'Lygdamus und Ovid: zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung', *Eranos* 58 (1960), 110: 'eine vernünftige Methode operiert nicht ohne weiteres mit den Kriterien "besser" und "schlechter", sie fragt in erster Linie, um nun die Sache so kurz – und so streng – wie möglich auszudrücken, ob die verdächtige Fassung in ihrem organischen Zusammenhang (wenn sie überhaupt einen hat!) ohne die parallele Fassung genetisch denkbar ist oder nicht'.

in phrasing to Ovid. The number, scope and context of the similarities noted above were sufficient merely to point us in the direction of Gallus. As to the attribution of specific details to him, it is necessary to look for corroborative evidence elsewhere, and, in the absence of manuscript evidence for the passage concerned, even this cannot guarantee certainty.

This much having been said, the concentration of hyper-neoteric features and conspicuous archaisms in *Culex* 48–57 in numbers that are not representative of the poem as a whole suggests that if Gallus was the primary source for this pastoral description, then his work may be more clearly reflected in the *Culex* than in Ovid.²⁴ Some details can be attributed to his influence with greater confidence than others, and, to conclude this section, I shall examine a variety of possible instances.

First, phraseology. *baculo...nexus* occurs in both *Culex* 98 and Ov. *Pont.* 1. 8. 52. It depicts, of course, a characteristic pastoral pose,²⁵ so it is rather surprising that the exact phrase *baculo niti* is nowhere else paralleled in poetry.²⁶ It would be wrong to jump to the conclusion that the phrase must have appeared in this or any other form in Gallus, for we find ‘*baculo...innexus*’ in Ov. *Met.* 2. 218 and ‘*innitens baculo*’ in 14. 655. *baculum* is, however, rare before Ovid, with whom it becomes frequent (16 times in all), occurring first in prose in Cic. *Ver.* 5. 142 and in poetry in Prop. 4. 2. 39. The external evidence is not very helpful here, and the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the possibility that the phrase is Gallan has not been excluded.

Perhaps the most striking verbal similarity to be found in the passages under discussion is the occurrence in both Ov. *Rem.* 181 and *Culex* 100 of the weighty phrase *modulatur harundine carmen*. It is found elsewhere in Ov. *Met.* 11. 154 ‘*et leve cerata modulatur* (sc. Pan) *harundine carmen*’, and, with a slight alteration, in Sil. 14. 471 ‘*septena modulatus harundine carmen*’, of a Sicilian named Daphnis who dies in a sea-battle against the Carthaginians. Latin pastoral poets must have felt the lack of a simple equivalent to *συρίξεν*.²⁷ The phrase *carmen modulari harundine/avena*²⁸ formed a useful, if cumbersome, substitute, and it is perhaps surprising that Virgil does not use it²⁹ until his last *Eclogue*, and then in a remarkable context (10. 50 f.): ‘*ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita versu/carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena*’. As remarked above, the future tense here is valid only in the dramatic situation of the *Eclogue*, and Virgil must be referring to something Gallus either did or said he was going to do in his poetry, and it is tempting to think that Virgil might be alluding to the words Gallus himself used. The circumstantial evidence that Gallus used the phrase is strong, but we cannot talk in terms of absolute proof. If he did, we have no assurance that he used the exact form *modulatur harundine carmen*. Silius (loc. cit.) illustrates how it can be adapted without changing its metrical value.

Caution must also be exercised when dealing with possible instances of stylistic influence. *et* in *Culex* 52 represents the longest postponement of this conjunction in hexameter poetry. Postponement of conjunctions was a device employed in Hellenistic poetry³⁰ for metrical reasons, and also to remove a neutral word from a prominent

²⁴ For the likelihood, based on independent evidence, that archaism was a prominent feature of the style of Gallus, cf. Ross, *Backgrounds*, p. 79.

²⁵ cf. elsewhere Verg. *Ecl.* 8. 16, Prop. 4. 2. 39, Ov. *Met.* 2. 218, 8. 218, 14. 655, *Tr.* 4. 1. 11.

²⁶ cf. *Thes. L. L.* II. 1670. 75 ff.

²⁷ cf. P. L. Smith, ‘Virgil’s *avena* and the Pipes of Pastoral Poetry’, *TAPA* 101 (1970), 506.

²⁸ For which cf. also Tib. 2. 1. 53 f., [Verg.] *A.* 1. 1 a–b, Calp. *Ecl.* 4. 63, V. Fl. 4. 386, Nemes. *Ecl.* 1. 71 (*Thes. L. L.* VIII. 1247. 7 ff.).

²⁹ cf. however the similar use of *meditari* in *Ecl.* 1. 2 and 6. 8; *modulari* is found in the sense ‘play’ in *Ecl.* 5. 14 ‘*modulans alterna notavi*’.

³⁰ cf. Gow on Theocr. 2. 142 and 8. 23.

position in the verse. It was a practice adopted by the Roman neoterics.³¹ Catullus has no fewer than 15 postponements,³² 12 in the long poems, 3 in the polymetrics, but none in the stylistically more conservative elegiacs. He has no example involving *et*; presumably he thought it too radical a step to postpone this most common of conjunctions. There is, in fact, no certain example of the postponement of *et* before Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 34. The postponement of *et* always seemed more at home in elegy, a sharp contrast, this, with Catullan practice. Of the numerous instances in Ovid, only four are found in the hexameter *Metamorphoses*,³³ and the most extreme cases all occur in elegy, after three words in Tib. 1. 2. 96, Prop. 1. 13. 31, Ov. *Tr.* 5. 7. 24; after four words in Ov. *Pont.* 1. 4. 20. It is not unlikely that the postponement of *et* was introduced into Latin poetry by a neoteric elegist, in which case the name of Gallus comes immediately to mind. Again we find strong circumstantial evidence pointing to the influence of Gallus (whether it be of a particular passage or a notorious stylistic predilection) on the *Culex*.

The same is true of the extravagant appositional hyperbaton in *Culex* 51. The neoterics sometimes took great liberties with the word-order of appositional phrases,³⁴ and Otto Skutsch, noting the similarity of Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 57 'rauca, tua cura, palumbes', Prop. 3. 3. 31 'volucres, mea turba, columbae' and Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 22 'tua cura Lycoris', has, with a high degree of probability, attributed a distinctive type to Gallus, even calling it the *schema Cornelianum*.³⁵ The combination in *Culex* 51 of an extreme form of appositional hyperbaton with the motif of clinging goats leads one strongly to suspect that imitation (or perhaps better, emulation) of Gallus is taking place.

While it is very likely that Gallus does lie behind the four details examined, in the absence of a text of his poetry, strong suspicion based on circumstantial evidence cannot be turned into absolute proof. I make no claim to have discovered new fragments of Gallus, only to have drawn attention to and brought into sharper focus probable elements of his subject-matter and style. I have subjected these four cases to close individual examination to emphasize the need for such cautious scrutiny. This is to forestall the very dangerous and all too tempting inclination to attribute unexplained details to Gallus by analogy. Line 53 of the *Culex* provides a good example of the potential pitfalls. On the basis of the evidence adduced above in the cases of stylistic peculiarities, and in the absence of any other evidence, we might be tempted to attribute the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον *labrusca* to the influence of Gallus. But we would be over-hasty to do so. Nonius (p. 311–12L) cites the word, and his source is not Gallus (whose works admittedly he may not have known), but the *Culex*, as chance would have it, the only citation of the poem by an ancient grammarian. Thus reasonable caution must be the guiding principle of studies of this kind. Recent events have shown that the arsenals of divine vengeance reside no more in the Bodleian, but in the rubbish heaps of Qaṣr Ibrīm.

³¹ The classic treatment of the subject in Latin poetry is still that of M. Haupt, *Opuscula* 1 (Leipzig, 1875), pp. 115 ff.; cf. too E. Norden, *Aeneis* *VF*⁸ (Berlin, 1926), p. 402, Ross, *Style*, pp. 67 ff. and J. B. A. Hofmann in *Thes. L. L.* v. 2. 897. 52 ff.

³² The conjunctions involved being *nam*, *namque*, *atque*, *nec/neque*, *at* and *sed*, cf. Ross, *Style*, loc. cit. ³³ cf. *Thes. L. L.* v. 2. 897. 74 f.

³⁴ Again probably influenced by Hellenistic practice, cf. Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 6.

³⁵ 'Zu Vergils Eklogen', *RhM* 99 (1956), 198 f. The new Gallus fragment (*JRS* 69 (1979), 140) does not contain an instance, but does at least (lines 4–5) indicate Gallus' freedom in altering accepted word-order. I would draw particular attention to the example of the *schema* in Ov. *Rem.* 182, particularly the use of *turba*, comparing Prop. 3. 3. 31, cited above.

II

The rhetorical praise of the blessings of the herdsman's life reaches its climax in an abrupt and obscure exclamation (*Culex* 94–7):

o pecudes, o Panes et o gratissima tempe
†fontis† Hamadryadum, quarum non divite cultu 95
aemulus Ascræo pastor sibi quisque poetae
securam placido traducit pectore vitam.

The difficulties of these lines are exacerbated by textual corruption, consideration of which I shall postpone until the end of this section. The key to their resolution lies in the identity of the Hamadryads. They do not figure frequently in Latin poetry, only ten times in all up to the time of Statius.³⁶ They are simply wood nymphs in Catul. 61. 23, Ov. *Met.* 1. 690, 14. 624, *Fast.* 2. 155 and Stat. *Silv.* 1. 3. 63. In the remaining five passages their function cannot be explained away so easily. In fact, they seem to play a distinctive role which has not hitherto been recognized.

Much the most important, and the key to the identity of the Hamadryads, is Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 62 f. 'iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis/ipsa placent'. Critics, following Servius' note ad loc.,³⁷ seem content to identify the Hamadryads here with the nymphs with whom Gallus hunts on Maenalus (55), which leaves 62 f. rather flat. David Ross is prepared to go a little further.³⁸ On the basis of an elaborate argument he suggests that 'the Hamadryads and "songs" may stand for scientific or abstract mythological poetry'. Ross is correct in connecting them with poetry, but not with 'scientific or abstract mythological poetry'. Their function can be inferred with some confidence from *Eclogue* 10 itself. One of the most prominent elegiac motifs that Virgil uses in this poem is the fiction that Gallus wandered in wild places and carved his *amores* on trees (52 ff.):

certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere *amores*
arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis *amores*.

Propertius uses this same motif (which goes back to Call. *Aet.* fr. 73 Pf.) of himself as the elegiac lover in 1. 18. 1 ff., 19 f. Much here depends on the ambiguity of *amores*, stressed by its repetition at the end of both 53 and 54, which immediately suggests the name of his lover, but connotes his love poems.³⁹ The basis for the ambiguity lies in the convention we meet in pastoral poetry that poems could be carved on trees.⁴⁰ Now, there is an obvious point in wishing that as the tree grows so should his actual love, but what about the other side of the ambiguity? Clearly his love poems should grow in stature, a pleasant conceit. Yet, there is something missing in the literary side of the ambiguity, an inner motivation. Why should trees guarantee the stature of poetry? I believe the Hamadryads supply that inner motivation. The etymology of their name provides the vital clue, cf. Schol. to Apoll. Rh. 2. 476 (ed. Wendel): 'Αμαδρυάδας νύμφας Μνησίμαχος φησι διὰ τὸ ἅμα ταῖς δρυσὶ γεννᾶσθαι ἢ ἐπεὶ

³⁶ cf. *Thes. L. L.* vi. 3. 2520. 73 ff.

³⁷ 'hoc autem ad superiora pertinet, quia dixerat "mixtis lustrabo Maenala nymphis"'.
³⁸ *Backgrounds*, p. 95 n. 4.

³⁹ cf. *OLD* s.v. 5 and Serv. on *Ecl.* 10. 1 'amorum suorum de Cytheride libros quattuor'; perhaps the title of his elegies, cf. Boucher, op. cit., p. 72 n. 10. The ambiguity was first noted by F. Skutsch, op. cit., p. 23.

⁴⁰ cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 5. 13 f., Ov. *Ep.* 5. 27 ff., Nemes. *Ecl.* 1. 28 f.; Calpurnius quotes a poem of some 56 lines allegedly written on a tree (*Ecl.* 1. 33–88).

δοκοῦσιν ἄμα ταῖς δρυσὶ φθείρεσθαι, νύμφαι Ἀμαδρυάδες λέγονται.⁴¹ The Hamadryad was a nymph intimately connected with the tree she was born in, grew up in and perished with. Unlike Dryads, tree spirits who could wander free, the Hamadryad was confined to her own particular tree and shared its fate.⁴² The closeness of this idea to that of the fate of Gallus' *amores* being bound up with the tree on which they are carved is no coincidence: if *amores* are carved on her tree, their future will necessarily be linked to that of the Hamadryad. The Hamadryads thus seem to act here as surrogate Muses. This is supported by Virgil's address to his Muses after the end of Gallus' lament (*Ecl.* 10. 72 ff.): 'vos (sc. Pierides) haec facietis *maxima* Gallo/... cuius *amor* tantum mihi *crescit* (cf. 54) in horas/quantum vere novo viridis se subicit *alnus*'. It is a reasonable, indeed necessary, assumption that the basis for these ideas was laid by Gallus, not Virgil, whose treatment of them is very allusive.

The other references to Hamadryads are all bedevilled by unresolved textual and interpretative problems, but I believe that my hypothesis, based on *Eclogue* 10, that the Hamadryads are surrogate Gallan Muses, can go a very long way towards providing solutions. Three of the four remaining occurrences are found significantly in Gallus' successor, Propertius.

In lines 59 ff. of what is transmitted to us as poem 34 of Book 2, Propertius surveys the tradition of love poetry with which he wants to be associated. He gives a couplet each to Varro (85 f.), Catullus (87 f.), Calvus (89 f.) and finally Gallus (91 f.), but what is remarkable about this catalogue is that it is prefaced by twenty-four lines devoted to Virgil (61–84), and their tone is by no means adulatory, as though Propertius were trying to settle in his mind his estimation of Virgil. Six lines are given to the *Aeneid*, then in the process of composition (61–6), and four to the *Georgics* (77–80). Ten lines are devoted to the *Eclogues*, and clearly he regarded them alone as possibly qualifying for inclusion in the tradition he himself worked in, but the length at which he treats them indicates the uncertainty he feels about their status. The incidents he lists (not all of which actually occur in the *Eclogues*) all concern the love aspects of the *Eclogues*, and they are introduced in a slightly condescending manner: can these incidents *really* be the stuff of love poetry? The closing couplet of the discussion concerns us (75–6):

quamvis ille sua lassus requiescat avena,
laudatur facilis inter Hamadryadas.

'facilis... Hamadryadas' can hardly mean 'the easy-going girls of Rome', as Butler-Barber, Enk and Camps take it in their commentaries, nor even 'the public which likes love poetry', the interpretation of Boucher;⁴³ there must be more to it than that. The crucial clue to their identity lies in the epithet *facilis*. Why should they be 'indulgent'? Because the *Eclogues* are not really *love* poetry, as Propertius sees it. If the Hamadryads are here the rural Muses of Gallus who watch over *amores*, love poems, the couplet has considerable point in spite of its compressed expression.⁴⁴ I see Propertius' sequence of thought this way: 'Virgil has now given up pastoral poetry and moved on to more grandiose themes; but the *Eclogues* did contain some elements

⁴¹ cf. too Serv. on *Ecl.* 10. 62 'nymphae quae cum arboribus et nascuntur et pereunt'; similarly Probus on *G.* 1. 11.

⁴² For descriptions of the deaths of nymphs whose trees are cut down, cf. *Hom. Hym. Aphr.* 257 ff., *Call. Hym.* 4. 82 f., *Apoll. Rh.* 2. 476 ff., *Ov. Met.* 8. 761 ff.; also *Fast.* 4. 231 ff.

⁴³ J.-P. Boucher, *Etudes sur Properce* (Paris, 1965), p. 285.

⁴⁴ Although Virgil does not use the Hamadryads in the *Eclogues* independently of Gallus, we shall see in due course (section IV below) how closely Gallus' symbolism of poetic inspiration is linked to Virgil's in the *Eclogues*. Hence the ease with which Propertius can invoke Gallan symbolism to pass a critical judgement on the *Eclogues* as love poems.

of love, and, if one stretches a point, he can be included as a member of the amatory tradition'. His attitude to the *Eclogues* is summed up in 81–2:

non *tamen haec* ulli venient ingrata *legenti*
sive in *amore* rudis sive peritus erit.

I.e. 'in spite of my reservations (*tamen*), these poems will be most acceptable to devotees of love poetry'.⁴⁵

In 2. 32. 21 ff. Propertius is talking about the evil rumours going around Rome about Cynthia's reputation, and he defends her by citing the behaviour of some famous mythological and historical figures: (i) Helen (31 f.) (ii) Venus (33 f.) (iii) Paris and Oenone⁴⁶ (35 ff.) (iv) Lesbia (45). What is striking about the first, second and fourth of these is their literary quality, as though Propertius were trying to defend the reputation of his love poetry as much as that of his mistress against moralistic attacks.⁴⁷ In this company, the affair of Paris and Oenone seems a bit out of place:

quamvis Ida Parim pastorem dicat amasse
atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam,
hoc et Hamadryadum spectavit turba sororum
Silenique senes et pater ipse chori;
cum quibus Idaeo legisti poma sub antro,
supposita excipiens, Nai, caduca manu.

35
40

There are several obscurities in this passage. The satyrs seem to have played some part in the story of Oenone (cf. Ov. *Ep.* 5. 135 f.), and suffering the importunate advances of these creatures was an occupational hazard of being a nymph, as Oenone was. However, why are the satyrs referred to as *Sileni*...*senes*, and why are they (as well as the Hamadryads) said to 'look on and find no fault with'⁴⁸ the affair? They had poor credentials to set themselves up as judges of the morals of others. Silenus seems to have had something to do with poetic inspiration,⁴⁹ and he may have been used in this connection by Gallus.⁵⁰ I should like to put forward the suggestion that the story of Paris and Oenone was told in some form by Gallus, and that Propertius is drawing upon another famous literary precedent to reject moral criticisms of his 'Cynthia'.⁵¹ The Hamadryads, as Gallus' Muses with special responsibility

⁴⁵ I follow D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), p. 134, in taking 'haec' to refer to the *Eclogues*, against Butler and Barber, Camps (notes ad loc.), D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'Nescio quid maius', *PVS* 9 (1969/70), 67, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, 'The Neoteric Poets', *CQ* n.s. 28 (1978), 177, who understand it to refer to Propertius' own elegies. Propertius' claim to merit and prospective fame does not come until his survey of his predecessors is complete, that is, not until the last two lines of the poem (thus Enk, note ad loc.). That 'haec' refers to the *Eclogues* is surely clinched by the obvious echoes of Virgil's own hesitant claim for the *Eclogues* to be regarded as love poetry (6. 9 f.): 'si quis *tamen haec* quoque, si quis/captus amore *leget*'.

⁴⁶ Not Venus and Anchises, cf. the judicious note of Camps ad loc.

⁴⁷ Propertius often seems to use 'Cynthia' to represent not only his mistress but his love poetry as well; cf. the demonstration of this for 2. 30 by F. Cairns, *CQ* n.s. 21 (1971), 204–13, and the remarks of Ross, *Backgrounds*, pp. 58 f.

⁴⁸ cf. Camps' note to line 37.

⁴⁹ cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6 *passim*, Prop. 3. 3. 29 and also Verg. *G.* 2. 494 'Silvanumque *senem*', a passage dealing with the sources of Virgil's inspiration. For the assimilation of Silvanus and Silenus cf. Coleman's note to Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 24.

⁵⁰ cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 64 ff.

⁵¹ The story of Oenone was one of the tales of tragic love (no. 4) collected by Parthenius for Gallus. It seems to have been a subject rarely treated in Latin poetry; for full details cf. H. Jacobson, *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton, 1974), pp. 176 ff., who comments: 'It is surprising, indeed unaccountable, to me that Oenone is hardly mentioned in Latin poetry, not even in comedy or elegy'. One reason for Ovid's choice of the story for treatment in the *Heroides* may have been that it was already known in a famous literary version. Of particular interest is Ovid's introduction of the theme of carving the name of one's beloved on trees (*Ep.* 5. 21 ff.): 'incisae

for the 'stature' of his poems, are quite prepared to condone the story of Oenone.⁵²

The final Propertian instance is quite the most difficult (1. 20. 32):

a dolor! ibat Hylas ibat Hamadryasin.

The Hamadryads would appear to be merely water nymphs here, which is strange, but not wholly unparalleled.⁵³ In Apollonius of Rhodes, the spring of Pegē where the rape of Hylas took place is said to be under the charge of water nymphs (1. 1229), but not, I would stress, Hamadryads. In poetry of an allusive nature, changes of this kind usually betoken something of significance, but Propertius' reason for using Hamadryads in this context remains a puzzle. The entire poem, in fact, is very difficult, not least in its addressee and purpose (1. 20. 1): 'hoc pro continuo te, Galle, monemus amore'. The hyper-neoteric style of the poem is quite different from Propertius' elsewhere, and Ross has made out a very good case for taking it as a pastiche of Gallus.⁵⁴ The use of 'amore' in the first line should awaken us to the ambiguity of this word, and 'monemus' could be taken on the level of *poetic* criticism of the *poet* Gallus, presented in a form that preserves the persona of the *elegiac lover* Gallus, in other words, a poem on the same imaginative level as Virgil's Tenth *Eclogue*. If this is the case, line 32 may conceal much beneath the surface, bearing in mind what has already been conjectured about the poetic role of the Hamadryads. It is quite likely that Propertius is offering some sort of literary comment in this line,⁵⁵ but what it is must be a matter of speculation.⁵⁶

The evidence is necessarily somewhat scanty, but there is a good case for seeing the Hamadryads as surrogate Muses and for associating them in this role with the name of Gallus. Clearly they are suitable as surrogate Muses only if the setting of the poetry whose reputation they represent is rural. Their connection with amatory poetry which emerges from our extant sources may not lie at the heart of their conception (which is the pastoral motif of carving poems, not necessarily amatory, on trees), but may be a distortion resulting either from the very limited data, or from the fact that the

servant a te mea nomina fagi/et legor Oenone falce notata tua/... (25) et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt'. A short poem is inscribed on the bark in 29 f.; cf. 25 and Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 54; also *Ep.* 5. 13 'saepe greges inter requievimus arbore tecti' with Prop. 2. 32. 36 'atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam'.

⁵² Again we shall see in due course (section IV below) that satyrs are an integral part of Gallus' symbolism of poetic inspiration.

⁵³ cf. *Anth. Pal.* 6. 189. 1 *νύμφαι ἀμαδρυάδες, ποταμοῦ κόραι*, with Gow-Page's note ad loc.

⁵⁴ *Backgrounds*, pp. 74–81. Whatever about the Gallus of Prop. 1. 5, 10 and 13, it is almost universally agreed that the addressee of 1. 20 is the poet. Almost, but not quite: cf. R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 99 ff. But the application of strict historical reasoning to a poetic persona is not always appropriate.

⁵⁵ As he appears to be doing also in 1. 20. 45 f., cf. n. 89 below.

⁵⁶ The subject-matter of Prop. 1. 20 immediately brings to mind the introduction of homosexual themes into love poetry. Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 37 f. 'certe sive mihi Phyllis sive esset Amyntas/seu quicumque furor...' would seem to indicate a homosexual element in Gallus' poetry. It has long been seen that Prop. 1. 20. 32 is similar to a line of Alexander of Aetolus preserved in Parthenius *Erot.* 14 *αὐτὸς* (viz. a bucket) *δ' ἐς Νύμφας ᾤχετ' Ἐφνδριάδας*. The context of the line concerns a boy, Antheus, who crawls down a well to retrieve a golden bucket, a striking coincidence with the scene described in Propertius. We know from Aulus Gellius (13. 27) that Virgil once translated a line from Parthenius (viz. *G.* 1. 437). Gallus may have done the same sometimes with his Greek sources – especially those singled out for his special consideration. If so, he will have written *Ephydriasin* (as conjectured by E. Baehrens for Prop. 1. 20. 32, cf. Ross, *Backgrounds*, p. 80). Propertius will then have been parodying the line, and by introducing Gallus' own Hamadryads, will have been making a pointed literary remark, perhaps about the effect of Gallus' choice of subject-matter on his literary reputation.

subject-matter of Gallus's rural poetry happened to be exclusively or predominantly amatory.

A link with poetry seems clear in the remaining instance also, *Culex* 95. Each and every herdsman who strives to emulate the poet Hesiod ('Ascraeo . . . poetae', 96) would not venerate the Hamadryads in his own modest way ('non divite cultu', 95) unless they represented for him in some way the spirits of poetry – hardly amatory, but certainly rural. *Culex* 95–6 thus deal with the poetic aspirations of the herdsman, and the parallel of the exclamation in Verg. *G.* 2. 485–9, in a passage in his praise of country life where Virgil is dealing with the sources of his inspiration,⁵⁷ suggests that the exclamations in *Culex* 94 may also refer to sources of inspiration, in this case for the herdsman.⁵⁸

Thus *Culex* 94–6 concern the poetic inspiration and aspirations of the herdsman. While the idea of introducing such a motif into his praise of country life may have been suggested to the poet by the corresponding section in Virgil (*G.* 2. 475 ff.), there can be little doubt that he has used as his main source for these lines not Virgil but Gallus. The Hamadryads are closely linked with his name, and it is likely that the reference to 'the poet of Ascra' was also inspired by Gallus. 'Each and every herdsman vying with the poet of Ascra' (96) is odd after the herdsman's poetic efforts have just been described as modest (95), and the words 'aemulus Ascraeo . . . poetae' may be a verbal *furtum*. When considering who might have been described in Latin as a rival to Hesiod, one thinks immediately of Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 69 ff. "'hos tibi (sc. Galle) dant calamos (en accipe) Musae, / Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat / cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos"', which may reflect a scene in Gallus. The phrase *Ascraeus poeta* occurs elsewhere only in Prop. 2. 34. 76 'tu canis Ascraei veteris praecepta poetae',⁵⁹ the line which introduces Propertius' discussion of the *Georgics* directly after his enigmatic reference to the Hamadryads. Perhaps both *Culex* 95 f. and Prop. 2. 34. 75 f. look back to a single literary-critical passage of Gallus.⁶⁰

To conclude this section, I append a consideration of the textual problems of *Culex* 95 in the light of what we have now discovered. The transmitted text cannot and should not be defended, as Housman observed.⁶¹ The problem has previously been attacked on three fronts:

(i) Housman (loc. cit. n. 61) expected a noun in apposition to *tempe* meaning 'abode' or 'resort'. Leo⁶² had proposed *hortus*, but Housman compared what he believed to be the model for these lines, Verg. *G.* 2. 469 'frigida tempe', and conjectured *frigus* (i.e. *sedes frigida*), comparing Mart. 4. 64. 14 'quodcumque iacet sub urbe frigus'. S. Allen⁶³ proposed *saltus*, comparing Verg. *G.* 3. 40 'interea Dryadum silvas saltusque sequamur'.

(ii) J. Sillig⁶⁴ felt that *gratissima* was unduly isolated and conjectured *Hamadryasin*,

⁵⁷ 'rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes, / flumina amem silvasque inglorius. o ubi campi / Spercheosque et virginibus bacchata Lacaenis / Taygeta! o qui me gelidis convallibus Haemi / sistat, et ingenti ramorum protegat umbra!'

⁵⁸ cf. *Culex* 76 ff., where we are told that the herdsman finds pleasing 'rorantes lacte capellae' (cf. 'pecudes', 94), 'fecunda Pales' (cf. 'Panēs', rural deities) and 'vallibus intus / semper opaca novis manantia fontibus antra' (cf. 'gratissima tempe').

⁵⁹ cf. *Thes. L. L.* II. 772. 40 f. ⁶⁰ Propertius' other allusive references to Hesiod in programmatic passages (2. 10. 25, 2. 13. 4) may have their origins in Gallan poetics, cf. Ross, *Backgrounds*, pp. 32, 119 f.

⁶¹ A. E. Housman, 'Remarks on the *Culex*', *CR* 16 (1902), 340 = *Classical Papers* II (ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear, Cambridge, 1972), p. 565.

⁶² F. Leo, *Culex: carmen Vergilio adscriptum* (Berlin, 1891), p. 46.

⁶³ 'On *Culex* 93, 94 (sic)', *CR* 16 (1902), 416.

⁶⁴ *Publii Virgilii Maronis quae vulgo feruntur carmina Culex Ciris Copa Moretum recensuit et Heynii suasque observationes addidit Julius Sillig* (Leipzig/London, 1832), ad loc.; supported by R. Helm, 'Beiträge zum *Culex*', *Hermes* 81 (1953), 59.

comparing Verg. *A.* 3. 73 'gratissima tellus Nereidum matri et Neptuno Aegaeo'; wood nymphs appear as water nymphs in *Anth. Pal.* 6. 189. 1 (cited above, n. 53). However, this leaves *fontis* unqualified and unexplained.

(iii) S. Sudhaus⁶⁵ felt another vocative was needed and proposed *fons* <et>.

Further to the difficulties isolated by these critics, the sentence as it stands is awkwardly unbalanced, with the exclamation in 94 an insufficient counterpoise to the heavy dependent relative clause in 95–7. This is clearly the emotional climax of the digression, and the thrice repeated *o* (94) leads us to expect something more satisfying than we have. None of the solutions proposed seems compelling, the less so now that the poet's source is apparently different from those hitherto supposed.

The Hamadryads, as we have seen, appear as tutelary deities of rural poetry. Thus it is not impossible that *fontis*, which the tradition unanimously preserves, may approximate to or actually be what the poet wrote, since springs were frequently associated with poetic inspiration.⁶⁶ It is clear, however, that the text cannot be correct as it stands. Since the exclamation in 94 deals with the objects of poetic inspiration for the herdsman, *gratissima* should refer to the pleasure felt by the herdsman. This is strongly suggested by Virgil's corresponding treatment of the sources of his inspiration in the Second *Georgic*, cf. 'mihi...placeant' (485) and 'amem' (486), but the point is not made explicit here, as we might expect it to be. Furthermore, there is no connection made between the objects of inspiration (94) and the creatures who symbolize the poetry produced under that inspiration, the Hamadryads (95). I suspect there is a lacuna between lines 94 and 95. Had we a text of Gallus to hand, so close is our poet's apparent dependence it might be possible to conjecture what was contained within it. However, our knowledge of the motifs used is too scanty to justify further speculation. The lacuna itself may be of more than one line. Within the praise of the *bona pastoris* (58–97), there are strong indications of numerically balanced composition.⁶⁷ 58–78 form a self-contained section: the cares of the avaricious take up 10½ lines (58–68) and the *otium* of the herdsman also 10½ (68–78). The digression as a whole falls into two thematically balanced sections, 58–78 and 79–97, i.e. 21 and 19 lines respectively. Perhaps it was the poet's intention that the sections should balance numerically too. Certainly a lacuna of two lines would have given the poet the opportunity to develop a satisfying period with which to round off his digression.

III

In *Culex* 18–19, the poet leaves off his formal hymnic invocation of Apollo (11–17) and turns to the Naiads, asking them to honour Apollo with a choral dance:

quare, Pierii laticis decus, ite, sorores
Naides, et celebrate deum ludente chorea.

He introduces the exhortation with the inferential *quare*, but the logical connection with what precedes is far from clear. The Naiads are described as 'Pierii laticis decus', and are obviously meant to be identified directly with the Muses.⁶⁸ Apollo was traditionally the Musagetes, the leader of the Muses in their dance.⁶⁹ Thus an

⁶⁵ 'Ciris v. 48', *RhM* 68 (1913), 457; cf. M. Schmidt, 'Textkritisches zum *Culex*', *Philologus* 99 (1955), 317, who proposed *fana* <et>.

⁶⁶ cf. Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1. 26. 6.

⁶⁷ cf. O. Skutsch, 'Culex 59', *HSPH* 72 (1967), 309 f.

⁶⁸ Who were originally water nymphs, cf. *RE* (s.v. Musai) xvi. 692. 11 ff.

⁶⁹ cf. W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griech. u. röm. Mythologie* II (Leipzig/Berlin, 1884–1937) (s.v. Musagetes) 3233. 57 ff.

exhortation to them to honour Apollo with a dance is quite in keeping with their usual role. What is lacking, however, is something in 11–17 to justify why (cf. *quare*) they should honour him in this particular context. Had Phoebus, for instance, in some way indicated his agreement to be the *fautor* (cf. 13) of this poem in accordance with the poet's request, his exhortation to the Naiad/Muses would follow quite naturally. As things stand, the exhortation has not been properly prepared for, and we must bear in mind the possibility that the poet has incorporated the motif from some source without due consideration for the sequence of thought. One might add that the reference to the 'Pierian spring' (18) coming so soon after the description of Castalia is rather inelegant.

There are two parallels to our poet's exhortation which demand consideration. First, Lygdamus 1. 15 ff.:⁷⁰

per vos (sc. Pierides), <i>auctores huius mihi carminis</i> , oro	(cf. <i>Culex</i> 12)
<i>Castaliamque umbram Pieriosque lacus,</i>	(<i>Culex</i> 17, 18)
<i>ite domum...</i>	(<i>Culex</i> 18)

H. Wagenvoort⁷¹ was the first to point out the extent of the similarities between these two passages, which are both exhortations of Muse-like figures. Attempts since to determine priority have proved inconclusive,⁷² and the most recent discussion argues for independence.⁷³ However, the number, scope and context of the similarities makes some kind of connection likely, and the most significant correspondence has not before been noted, as I shall show presently. While a connection is likely, it must be stressed that the sequence of thought in the *Culex* leading up to the exhortation in no way presupposes that in Lygdamus, which we might expect were this a case of direct dependence.

The second parallel is *Aetna* 4 ff.:

dexter venias mihi <i>carminis auctor</i> ,	(cf. <i>Culex</i> 12)
<i>seu te Cynthos habet, seu Delo gratior Hyla,</i>	(<i>Culex</i> 13 ff.)
<i>seu tibi Dodone potior, tecumque faventes</i>	(<i>Culex</i> 13)
<i>in nova Pierio properent a fonte sorores</i>	(<i>Culex</i> 18)
<i>vota: per insolitum Phoebos duce tutius itur.</i>	(<i>Culex</i> 36)

The resemblances between this passage and the *Culex* are, if anything, more striking than those between the *Culex* and Lygdamus. Discussions of priority have again been inconclusive.⁷⁴ Again we find an exhortation of the Muses (*Aetna* 7 f.), but here combined, as in the *Culex*, with a formal hymn to Apollo, though the *Aetna* passage, while it contains a smooth transition between the invocation of Apollo and the exhortation of the Muses, cannot explain why *quare* is used in the *Culex*.

Nothing mentioned thus far gives any firm clue to priority. One similarity that links all three passages has not before been noted: all contain an oblique reference to the spring sacred to the Muses in Pieria, Pimpleia.⁷⁵ There are only a couple of other

⁷⁰ The date of Lygdamus is a vexing problem; there is even now no *communis opinio*. Some (most prominently A. G. Lee, 'The Date of Lygdamus, and his Relationship to Ovid', *PCPhS* n.s. 5 (1958/9), 15–22, and B. Axelson, 'Lygdamus und Ovid: zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung', *Eranos* 58 (1960), 92–111) put the date of his birth as late as A.D. 69. More recently there has been a reaction to this view, and his apparent claim (5. 17 f.) to be a contemporary of Ovid has been given wider credence, cf. K. Büchner, 'Die Elegien des Lygdamus', *Hermes* 93 (1965), 65–112 and W. Erath, *Die Dichtung des Lygdamus* (diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1971), pp. 297–9. However, the problem is relevant here only if there is a direct connection between him and the *Culex*.

⁷¹ 'De Lygdamo poeta deque eius sodalicio', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1917), 104, 111 f.

⁷² To the bibliography cited by Güntzschel, op. cit., p. 66 n. 30, add Erath, op. cit., p. 37.

⁷³ Erath, loc. cit.

⁷⁴ For bibliography cf. Güntzschel, op. cit., p. 66 n. 30.

⁷⁵ cf. Call. *Hym.* 4. 7, Lycophr. 275.

allusions to the place in Latin literature (Catul. 105. 1 'Pipleium... montem' and Stat. *Silv.* 2. 2. 37 'superet Piplea sitim') and three to the Muses as *Pi(m)pleides* (Var. *L.* 7. 20, Hor. *Carm.* 1. 26. 9, Mart. 11. 3. 1), and our three passages are unique before Statius in referring to the spring, all by a variety of circumlocutions. In view of the similarities already noted, this is a strong argument for the close connection with one another of all three passages. The problem of priority is a very tangled one, and trying to solve it is perhaps a futile exercise. In the *Culex* alone does the reference to Pimpleia play an organic role by identifying the Naiads as the Muses. The natural inference would be that the *Aetna* and *Lygdamus* derive the elements they both share with the *Culex* from the *Culex*. It might be possible to build up some evidence to support this position (e.g. *Aetna* and *Lygdamus* have no element in common which does not appear in the *Culex*), but it would not be sufficient to outweigh the fact that the exhortation of the Naiad/Muses in the *Culex* itself shows signs of being derivative. Once again, the hypothesis of a lost common source would provide the most economical solution, and would at a stroke cut the Gordian knot of possible interrelationships between the three passages and make them draw independently on a common model. That model must have been an exhortation of the Muses incorporating a reference to Pimpleia in some form or other.

As to what that model was, the distinctive Naiads of *Culex* 18 f. provide the firmest clue. Only once elsewhere in Roman poetry are the Naiads so clearly equated with the Muses,⁷⁶ Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 9 ff.:

quae nemora aut qui vos saltus habuere, puellae
 Naides, indigno cum Gallus amore peribat?
 nam neque Parnasi vobis iuga, nam neque Pindi
 ulla moram fecere, neque Aonie Aganippe.

'Parnasi...iuga' and 'Aonie Aganippe' are significantly different from Virgil's Theocritean model (*Id.* 1. 66 f.), have clear connotations of poetry and must have a point in a poem dealing with the 'sollicitos Galli... amores' (10. 6) and addressed to 'divine poeta' (10. 17).⁷⁷ Even Pindus, besides performing the obvious function of pointing out the dependence of these lines on Theocritus, may also have some connection with poetic inspiration.⁷⁸ Consistency demands that the Naiads (who are primarily inspired by the *Νύμφαι* of Theocr. *Id.* 1. 66) be identified with the nymphs who inhabit those poetic haunts, the Muses.⁷⁹

The resemblance of *Culex* 18 f. to Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 9 ff. is striking not only in the use of the Naiads, but by their identification with the Muses by the same method, association with their well-known geographical haunts. However, Virgil was probably not the poet's model. We have already seen the likelihood that *Culex* 18-19 derive their form from a lost exhortation of the Muses. The reference to the spring of Pimpleia (which serves to identify the Naiads with the Muses in the *Culex*) shared by the *Culex*, *Aetna* and *Lygdamus* and unexampled elsewhere before Statius, can only come from this model, and probably served an identificatory function similar to that in the *Culex*. Thus Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 9 ff., for all its similarity to *Culex* 18 f., did not serve as its model, but can indicate what that model may have been. The natural inference from Virgil's

⁷⁶ Naiads are also invoked in Grat. 17 f. and Stat. *Silv.* 1. 5. 6.

⁷⁷ cf. Ross, *Backgrounds*, pp. 87 ff., 97.

⁷⁸ cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1. 12. 6, with Nisbet-Hubbard's note ad loc., and A. D. Fitton Brown, 'Muses on Pindos', *G&R* n.s. 8 (1961), 22-6.

⁷⁹ The identification gains corroboration from the fact that Virgil, drawing on Hellenistic precedents (e.g. Lycophr. 274), can elsewhere call the Muses 'Nymphae' (*Ecl.* 7. 21, with Coleman's note ad loc.).

substitution of Naiads rather than simply Muses for Theocritus' *Nύμφαι* is that Gallus on occasion called his Muses Naiads, and that Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 10 has a previously undetected piquancy: Gallus has been deserted in his hour of need even by his personal Muses. 'sorores/Naiades' (*Culex* 18 f., note the enjambement) may even be a direct echo of Gallus, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 9 f. 'puellae/Naiades' and 6. 65 'Aonas in montis ut duxerit (sc. Gallum) una sororum'; also *Aetna* 7 f. 'in nova Pierio properent a fonte sorores/vota'.⁸⁰

IV

As the time reaches midday (*Culex* 101–3), the herdsman leads his goats down from the hills and drives them into a grove sacred to Diana (109 f.), whose trees (11 species in all) the poet later proceeds to describe at length (123–45).⁸¹ Before that we are told something of the surprising history of the grove. In times gone by, it served as both a refuge for Agave (110–14) and a setting for the revels of an assortment of minor rural deities, who held Diana as spellbound with their dancing as Orpheus the Hebrus and the woods by his singing, a comparison the poet has some difficulty in expressing (115–22):

hic etiam viridi ludentes Panes in herba	115
et Satyri Dryadesque chorus egere puellae	
Naiadum in coetu. non tantum Oeagrius Hebrum	
restantem tenuit ripis silvasque canendo	
quantum te, pernix, remorantem, diva, chorea	
multa tuo laetae fundentes gaudia vultu,	120
ipsa loci natura domum resonante susurro	
quis dabat et dulci fessas refovebat in umbra.	

The syntax of 119–22 is very difficult, but the terms of the comparison give us the guidance we need to see how the sentence holds together.⁸² Diana is held as still by the dancing of the deities as the Hebrus was by the singing of Orpheus. 'chorea' (119) is thus parallel to 'canendo' (118) and must be ablative, and 'remorantem' (119, Diana) corresponds to 'restantem' (118, the Hebrus). 'tenuerunt' should be understood from 'tenuit' (118) as the verb, the subject of which is to be supplied from 'quis' (122).⁸³ There is a harsh case of zeugma with 'tenuit' in 118: Orpheus stays the flow of the Hebrus ('restantem tenuit') and also holds the trees rapt with his singing. This makes fair sense until we remember that in the second limb of the zeugma, Orpheus is said to do exactly the opposite of what he is so famous for not only in other writers⁸⁴ but also later on in this poem (279 f.). The poet's abilities seem just not to have been equal to the task of expressing this comparison. His sole purpose was to compare the effect of the dancing of the nymphs and satyrs on Diana with that of the singing of Orpheus on the Hebrus. The linking term of the comparison is stillness, and thus he was

⁸⁰ cf. too Ov. *Met.* 3. 505 f., Sil. 6. 288 f.

⁸¹ The ecphrasis of a grove was one of the most common themes throughout the history of Roman poetry (cf. Hor. *Ars* 16, Persius 1. 70 f.), cf. the rudimentary examples at Verg. *A.* 1. 441 ff., 3. 679 ff., 8. 597 ff., Prop. 4. 4. 3 ff., Ov. *Met.* 3. 155 f., Luc. 3. 399 ff., Sil. 6. 146 ff. Such ecphrases could be very elaborate, cf. Enn. *Ann.* 187–91 V², Var. *Men.* 389 ff., Verg. *A.* 6. 179 ff., 11. 135 ff., Ov. *Met.* 10. 90 ff. (27 species), Luc. 3. 440 ff., Sen. *Oed.* 530 ff. (8 species), [Sen.] *Her. O.* 1618 ff., Sil. 10. 529 ff., Stat. *Theb.* 6. 98 ff. (13 species), Claud. *de Rapt. Pros.* 2. 107 ff. (9 species).

⁸² cf. W. V. Clausen, 'The Textual Tradition of the *Culex*', *HSPH* 68 (1964), 129.

⁸³ cf. *Culex* 151 f. 'hac querulae referunt voces quis nantia limo/corpora lymph a fovet'.

⁸⁴ cf. especially Verg. *G.* 4. 510 'agentem carmine quercus', *Ecl.* 3. 46 and Ov. *Met.* 10. 88 ff.

concerned above all to emphasize *tenuit*. Once he had done this, he was faced with padding out the remainder of the hexameter, and, in so doing, he must have overlooked the fact that the resulting sentence was inconsistent with Orpheus' known powers. How did this inconsistency arise? I suspect because the phrase *silvasque canendo* (or something very similar) was used in one of his sources for the Orpheus motif. Much the closest parallel is Ov. *Tr.* 4. 1. 7 f. 'cum traheret *silvas* Orpheus et dura *canendo/saxa*'; the choice of the main verb makes all the difference. This could have served as the poet's source, but my findings below suggest to me that there may once have existed a yet closer parallel.

The Orpheus comparison is undeniably awkward. What prompted its use? There is a remarkable parallel in Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 26 ff.:

simul incipit ipse (sc. Silenus).
tum vero in numerum Faunosque ferasque videres
ludere, tum rigidas motare cacumina quercus;
nec tantum Phoebo gaudet Parnasia rupes,
nec tantum Rhodope miratur et Ismarus Orpheia.

The Fauns and wild beasts dance ('in numerum... ludere', 27 f., cf. *Culex* 115 'ludentes') in response to Silenus' *song*. Nature, as it were, dances with them (*Ecl.* 6. 28), more animatedly even ('nec tantum', 29, 30, cf. *Culex* 117 'non tantum') than it does in response to Orpheus. There is a subtle but significant difference between this and *Culex* 115 ff., a difference which makes the comparison in Virgil successful and that in the *Culex* largely unsuccessful. In *Ecl.* 6. 26 ff., the minor deities with their *dance* and the trees with their *motion* respond to the *singing* of Silenus even more than Rhodope and Ismarus to Orpheus the *singer*, an effective and homogeneous comparison which reflects well on Silenus, as Orpheus was traditionally renowned as the one who could *move* nature by the beauty of his singing. In the *Culex*, the rural deities hold Diana as *still* with their *dancing* as Orpheus the Hebrus and (inappropriately) the woods with his *singing*. This important Virgilian parallel perhaps explains the introduction of the comparison into the *Culex*, though, as we have seen, it is clear from his botching of the comparison that the poet has drawn on another source for his phrasing. What the Virgilian parallel will not explain is the reason for the sudden and, following the gruesome story of Agave, incongruous introduction of the rural deities into his grove scene. There is an explanation for this, and the facts that they are dancing, and that the effect of their dancing is compared with that of a great singer's music, provide the vital clues.

The dancing of minor rural deities is a not uncommon motif, but it seems to be put to special use in some contexts, for example, in the invocation in Verg. *G.* 1. 10 ff.:

et vos, agrestum praesentia numina, Fauni
(ferte simul Fauniquē pedem Dryadesque puellae:
munera vestra cano).⁸⁵

The deities are requested to dance *in response* to Virgil's song. Why? Apart from being the tutelary deities of agriculture, they seem in some way to represent rural poetry, cf. (in contexts where poetry is being discussed) Verg. *G.* 2. 493 f. 'fortunatus et ille deos qui novit agrestes/*Panaque Silvanumque senem Nymphasque sorores*' and Prop. 3. 3. 29 f. 'orgia Musarum et *Sileni* patris imago/fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaeae,⁸⁶ tui'. Their dancing implies the success of the song of the poet who is singing within their

⁸⁵ Pan (17) and Silvanus (20) are also invoked.

⁸⁶ cf. Verg. *G.* 1. 17 f. 'Pan.../...o Tegeaeae'.

sphere of influence. The motivation for the idea comes from Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 26 ff., where Silenus, the successful singer, has an Orphic effect on nature (Fauns and wild beasts dance in time to his song) and is explicitly compared to Orpheus. The motif is programmatic: the successful 'rural' poet will be like Orpheus.⁸⁷ This complex of ideas lies behind our poet's combination in his grove scene of dancing deities and the figure of Orpheus.

I suspect the poet of the *Culex* was not primarily influenced by Virgil. We discovered above (section II) that the Hamadryads of *Culex* 95 could be linked to Gallus and provided the inner motivation for the idea of the growth of his *amores* that had been carved on trees. The Naiads too (*Culex* 19, cf. 117) seem to have been connected with Gallus, and to have acted as patron deities of poetry.⁸⁸ I am thus led to believe that there was a large group of rural deities in Gallus (larger even than in Virgil) who were used to represent metaphorically the poet's attitude to and estimate of his poetic inspiration and production.⁸⁹ It may not merely be pastoral colouring when Virgil makes Pan and Silvanus (who appears *only* here in the *Eclogues*, and elsewhere in Virgil only in *G.* 1. 20 and 2. 494, both discussed above) address Gallus in *Ecl.* 10. 23–30; they must have formed an integral part of his symbolism of poetic inspiration. This would again explain Virgil's divergence from his Theocritean model (*Id.* 1. 77 ff.), where Hermes, Priapus and Aphrodite visit the dying Daphnis.⁹⁰

We have now discovered why these characters in the *Culex* are depicted as dancing, and also where the poet found them: a passage or passages of Gallus concerning poetic inspiration and the Orphic effect the successful poet has on nature.⁹¹ However, we have still not explained why the poet thought fit to introduce them into his grove. We shall postpone consideration of this question until we have examined the remaining, very mysterious, figure of poetic inspiration in the poem.

⁸⁷ Compare Calpurnius' estimate of Virgil (*Ecl.* 4. 64 ff.) 'magna petis, Corydon, si Tityrus esse laboras, ille fuit vates sacer et qui posset avena/praesonuisse chelyn, blandae cui saepe canenti/allusere ferae, cui substitit advena quercus'; also *Ecl.* 2. 12 ff. (the spectators at the singing match of Idas and Astacus) 'convenit umbrosa quicumque sub ilice lentas/pascit oves, Faunusque pater Satyrique bicornes;/adfuerunt sicco Dryades pede, Naides udo,/et tenuere suos properantia flumina cursus'. Cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 5. 73 'saltantis Satyros imitabitur Alpheisiboeus' and Hor. *Carm.* 1. 1. 30 ff. 'me gelidum nemus/nympharumque leves cum satyris chori/secernunt'.

⁸⁸ Note that they are requested to honour Apollo 'ludent chorea' (19).

⁸⁹ It is possible to be more specific about a number of details. The plural form *Panes* (*Culex* 115, cf. 94, another passage influenced by Gallus) may be Gallan. It never occurs in Virgil and is found elsewhere in Latin poetry only in Ov. *Ep.* 4. 171 (see below), *Met.* 14. 638, *Fast.* 1. 397, *Luc.* 3. 399 (cf. note 100 below), Sen. *Phaed.* 784 (in the company of Naiads and Dryads), Stat. *Silv.* 2. 2. 106 and Col. 10. 427. 'Dryadesque...puellae' (*Culex* 116) may also reflect Gallus, cf. the only other occurrences of this phrase (*Thes. L. L. Onom.* iii. 260. 54), Verg. *Ecl.* 5. 58 f. 'ergo alacris silvas et cetera rura voluptas/Panaque pastoresque tenet Dryadasque puellas', *G.* 1. 11 (cited above), Prop. 1. 20. 45 f. 'cuius ut accensae Dryades candore puellae/miratae solitos destituere choros'. This, together with the importance of the dance of the nymphs for Gallus, adds some weight to the argument that sees Prop. 1. 20 as a critique of certain aspects of Gallus' poetry. Bearing in mind Gallus' conjectured partiality for appositional hyperbaton and his use of minor rural deities, the following lines of Ovid would appear to look back to Gallan prototypes: *Ep.* 4. 171 'sic faveant Satyri montanaque numina Panes', *Met.* 1. 192 f. 'rustica numina Nymphae/Faunisque Satyrique et monticolae Silvani' and 6. 392 f. 'ruricolae, silvarum numina, Fauni/et Satyri fratres'. Cf. too Verg. *G.* 1. 10.

⁹⁰ And influenced in turn by Moschus 3. 26–9, where Satyrs, Pans and Priapi mourn for the poet Bion. It is from sources such as this that Gallus will have developed his symbolism.

⁹¹ Orpheus must have played a prominent role in the poetry of Gallus, not only as a singer, but also as a lover whose sorrow was reflected by his wild surroundings: compare Verg. *G.* 4.

V

Immediately following his invocation of the Naiad/Muses, the poet of the *Culex* turns, very surprisingly, to appeal to Pales (20–3):

et tu, sancta Pales, ad quam ventura recurrit
agrestum bona fetura – sit cura tenentis
aerios nemorum cultus silvasque virentes:
te cultrice vagus saltus feror inter et antra.

In extant Latin poetry she is invoked only thrice elsewhere, once in Ov. *Fast.* 4. 723, where Ovid makes an appeal to her to help him sing of her festival ('alma Pales, faveas pastoria sacra canenti'), and twice in Virgil's Third *Georgic*. In the opening lines her name is linked with that of Apollo Nomios, and she is invoked on her own (as 'veneranda Pales', cf. 'sancta Pales', *Culex* 20) in line 294, where Virgil turns to deal with sheep-farming. Virgil chose Pales because she was the goddess of animal fertility,⁹² and an appeal to the divinity into whose province the subject-matter of the poem falls was regular in didactic poetry.⁹³ However, this is true only of didactic poetry, not of (mock-) epic (as the *Culex* purports to be, cf. 4–5), where only an appeal to Apollo and the Muses, as in 11–19, would be regular. To add to the difficulty, Pales seems to have usurped one of the chief functions of the Muses.⁹⁴ The poet wandering in the groves of the Muses was a common metaphor for poetic composition in Hellenistic and Roman poetry.⁹⁵ The poet of the *Culex* says he is wandering among the glades and bowers of Pales (23). Though the Third *Georgic* may have been at the back of his mind, it cannot explain the massive extension of Pales' functions that we find here.

The other occurrences of her name in poetry give us no immediate enlightenment. She appears only once in Virgil's *Eclogues* (5. 35, again in a fertility role in the company of Apollo), which is surprising in view of the frequency of references to her in later pastoral,⁹⁶ though the appearance of her statue dripping with milk as a symbol of rustic piety twice in Tibullus⁹⁷ will have helped to establish her.

All these fail to explain the appearance in *Culex* 20–3 of Pales as a figure of poetic inspiration. However, she has one prominent characteristic not yet touched upon: she is described as a wood-dweller (22–3), which is found elsewhere only twice, Ov. *Fast.* 4. 746 'silvicolam...Palem' and Stat. *Theb.* 6. 111. The latter instance is crucial. Of all the extended grove scenes catalogued above (n. 81), rural deities are found in only one, Stat. *Theb.* 6. 90 ff. Its inhabitants include 'Nymphas' (95) and 507 ff. with *Ecl.* 10. 14 and 65, and the remarks of Ross, *Backgrounds*, pp. 23 ff. and I. M. LeM. DuQuesnay in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (ed. D. A. West and A. J. Woodman, Cambridge, 1979), p. 61 n. 210. The river Hebrus (cf. *Culex* 117) occurs first in Latin in Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 65, in the mouth of Gallus. It is associated with Orpheus in Verg. *G.* 4. 463, 524 and Stat. *Silv.* 5. 3. 15 ff. The connection of the Hebrus with both Orpheus and Gallus suggests that the distinctive hexameter clausulae in *Culex* 117 ('Oeagrius [ex corr.] Hebrum') and Verg. *G.* 4. 524 ('Oeagrius Hebrus') may share a common source in Gallus.

⁹² cf. *Culex* 20 f., 77 'fecunda Pales' (= Calp. *Ecl.* 7. 22) and *RE* (s.v. Pales) xviii. 3. 89–97. The ancients connected the name of the festival of Pales, the Parilia, etymologically with *parere*, cf. Paul. *Fest.* 248L.

⁹³ cf. the useful collection of material in G. Engel, *De antiquorum epicorum didacticorum historicorum prooemiis* (diss. Marburg, 1910).

⁹⁴ cf. W. A. Baehrens, 'Zum Prooemium des *Culex*', *Philologus* 81 (1926), 371.

⁹⁵ cf. Nisbet–Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1. 1. 30.

⁹⁶ Calp. *Ecl.* 2. 36, 4. 106, 5. 25, 7. 22, Nemes. *Ecl.* 1. 68, 2. 52, 55.

⁹⁷ 1. 1. 36, 2. 5. 28 and cf. K. F. Smith's note on Tib. 1. 2. 48.

'Faunorum... greges' (96). The grove is felled for a funeral pyre, and it is then revealed that there are some much more significant inhabitants (110 ff.):

linquunt flentes dilecta locorum
otia cana Pales Silvanusque arbiter umbrae
semideumque pecus, migrantibus adgemit illis
silva, nec amplexae dimittunt robora nymphae.⁹⁸

It comes as something of a surprise to find the Italian deities Pales and Silvanus in a Greek wood. There is too much here to be attributed to mere coincidence. Pales, like the Hamadryads, the Pans, Silvanus, the Dryads and the Naiads, must have been a Gallan figure of poetic inspiration. They congregated in groves as being both their natural haunts and the resorts of poets when inspired,⁹⁹ and their traditional dance became a symbol of the success of the poet's song. The hypothesis that Gallus developed a number of these ideas in a protracted grove/inspiration scene would best explain their appearance in the grove of Diana in the *Culex*.¹⁰⁰ His poem on the Grynean grove¹⁰¹ immediately springs to mind as a possible source, especially as Virgil alludes to it in the context of Gallus' sources of inspiration, but the motifs discussed cannot be linked to it with certainty.

VI

So, to the list of literary influences on the *Culex* must be added another name, and one of the most important, that of Gallus. His influence is thematic, stylistic and verbal and, at times, the *Culex* seems to take on the character of a pastiche of his work. Indeed, the poet seems to have given special prominence to features (e.g. the Hamadryads) which would have served to direct the reader's mind to Gallus. If the poem is the imposture it has been conjectured to be, then the poet's reasons for recalling Gallus are not hard to find. The youthful 'Virgil' had to be equipped with an appropriate style. The poems of Gallus were the most notable poetic event of the period before and during the composition of the *Eclogues*, and Virgil allied himself closely to the poetic stance they represented. This was the one certain fact about Virgil's poetic development, known to all because freely acknowledged by the master himself. Readers would find perfectly natural, even expect, a close proximity to Gallan poetic ideas and style in a poem purporting to come from the pen of Virgil in the years before he wrote the *Eclogues*.

University of Liverpool

DUNCAN F. KENNEDY

⁹⁸ i.e. Hamadryads.

⁹⁹ cf. *Culex* 23 'te cultrice vagus saltus feror inter et antra'. *errare* is found a few times elsewhere to suggest a state of poetic inspiration, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 64 'errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum', Hor. *Carm.* 3. 4. 6 f. 'videor pios/errare per lucos', and perhaps also Nemes. *Cyn.* 53 f. 'nos flumineas errare per umbras/malumus'. In view of Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 64 and the influence of Gallus on the invocation of Pales in *Culex* 20 ff., it is likely that he lies behind the use of *vagus* in *Culex* 23. Norden (on Verg. *A.* 6. 10) notes that *antrum*, a loan-word from Greek, is found first in Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 75, and suggests that it was introduced into Latin by the neoterics. The possibility of Gallan influence on Verg. *Ecl.* 1. 75 (cf. section I) and on the invocation of Pales in *Culex* 20 ff. would tend to confirm the conjecture of Ross (*Backgrounds*, p. 63) that its introduction was the work of Gallus.

¹⁰⁰ Luc. 3. 399 f. may conceal a polemical overtone: 'hunc (sc. lucum) non ruricolae Panes nemorumque potentes/Silvani Nymphaeque tenent'.

¹⁰¹ cf. Serv. on *Ecl.* 6. 72; for reservations about Servius' knowledge of the poem, cf. Lyne, op. cit. (n. 45 above), 186 n. 68.