The poet could rely upon the Roman reader's intuitive recognition of this legal form of repudiation, just as he expected the *flagitatio* of 42 to make its point (v. E. Fraenkel, *JRS* 51 [1961], 49ff. = *Kl. Btrg.* 2 [1964], 120–5).

Birkbeck College, London ROLAND MAYER

AN ACROSTIC IN VERGIL (*AENEID* 7. 601–4)?

In any competition for monuments of wasted labour the collection of accidental acrostics in Latin poets published by I. Hilberg[1] would stand a good chance of a prize. But amongst his examples of 'neckische Spiele des Zufalls' (269) is one I am gullible enough to believe may be more significant. In *Aeneid* 7. 601–15 Vergil describes the custom of opening the gates of war in a long anacoluthic sentence, the first four lines of which run:

> Mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes
> Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum
> Roma colit, cum prima movent in proelia *Martem*,
> Sive Getis inferre manu lacrimabile bellum...

This may be pure chance; but the consonance with the subject matter is remarkable, and certainly stronger than the parallels Hilberg adduces. Given the impeccable Hellenistic precedents,[2] is it inconceivable that Vergil should have used an acrostic in this way? I await the men in white coats.

Jesus College, Oxford D. P. FOWLER

[1] 'Ist die Ilias Latina von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?' *WS* 21 (1899), 264–305; 22 (1900), 317–8.

[2] Pease on Cic. *de div.* 2. 111, E. Vogt, 'Das Akrostichon in der griechischen Literatur', *AA* 13 (1966), 80–97 and the literature cited p. 80 n. 1.

THE CIVIL STATUS OF CORYDON

There is a suspicion in the minds of a number of Virgil's modern commentators that Corydon, the lover-shepherd of the second *Eclogue*, is himself a slave, and that the *dominus* of his beloved Alexis (who may be the Iollas of line 57) is his master too.[1] It is the purpose of this note to show that the suspicion is baseless.

None of the ancient commentators appears to know of such an interpretation. This should be significant in that they probably shared the poet's assumptions about literary *decorum*. We can gather how Virgil viewed the function of slaves in poetry of an exalted genre by looking at the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics*. The essential considerations were set out by W. E. Heitland in *Agricola* (1921), pp. 218–41. Virgil

[1] These commentators, with or without diffidence, take Corydon to be a slave: Conington (ed. 5, 1898), Perret (1961), Coleman (1977), Williams (1979); Forbiger (ed. 4, 1872) asserted that he is free. The list can be lengthened in favour of servitude: H. J. Rose, *The Eclogues of Vergil* (1942), p. 34; E. W. Leach, *AJP* 87 (1966), 441; M. C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art* (1970), p. 83; G. Lee, *Greece and Rome* 28 (1981), 10 f.; W. V. Clausen in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* ii (1982), p. 307.

was less ready to introduce slaves into his epic than Homer had been. More startling is the complete silence of the poet in the *Georgics* on the use of slave labour in contemporary farming. Literary *decorum* induces this reticence; slaves are too mean to have a voice or place in epos. How do matters stand with pastoral?

In Theocritus slaves have no prominent place, as Heitland observed (p. 116). Gow says that only in the fifth *Idyll* is the servile status of the rustics plainly visible (*Theocritus* [1951], ii. 92); but Dover maintains that even there the address δῶλε is merely abusive and not a real indication of status (*Theocritus* [1971], pp. 128 f.). There may after all have been a grey area between absolute freedom and servitude, as Sandbach argues in his note to Menander, *Heros* 36. Such an area could be exploited by the malignant for abuse. The general picture is clear, however we regard the fifth *Idyll*. Slaves are marginal in Theocritean bucolic. When we turn to Virgil, while we find in him greater realism, we also find greater *decorum*. A well-known instance is the euphemistic banter which opens the third *Eclogue*; the Theocritean model at 5. 41 ff. is coarse. So in the first *Eclogue* Tityrus is now a freedman. In the ninth Moeris, far from being the tenant of Menalcas, was the owner of the expropriated farm. He refers at the outset to 'nostri...agelli', and Fraenkel, supporting the interpretation of W. Kroll, declared that the use of the first person pronoun is a claim of ownership, not a sympathetic identification with the real owner.[2] (This point is relevant to the status of Corydon, as we shall see.) The second *Eclogue* therefore would prove to be the only one with a servile protagonist, and this might be a break not only with bucolic tradition but with the poet's general practice. Nothing in the language, however, compels an eccentric reading, and one linguistic point tends to be misunderstood. To that we turn now.

At line 21 Corydon says 'mille meae Siculis errant in montibus agnae'. He claims to own the lambs, and the claim is as strong as Moeris' to have owned the farm from which he is driven. Property precludes servitude. It is to the credit of Heyne, who may have been among the first to regard Corydon as a slave, that he renounced his error when he came to appreciate the force of *meae* (his *argumentum* to the second *Eclogue*, as well as the note to line 19, should be consulted in the 1830 edition). This is the crucial point. *Meae* claims ownership, and that in turn rules out servile status. It would have to be maintained that Corydon is as much deluded about owning the numberless lambs as he is, at times, about the character of Alexis. (Since modern Virgilian studies tend to the impressionistic, this view will doubtless find adherents.)

A few other points are worth considering. However fanciful some of Corydon's utterances, no-one doubts that Virgil takes his erotic passion seriously in the main. The shepherd suffers, his love is tender and romantic. Outside comedy, to which we shall return, how likely is it that the love of slave for slave could be handled in this way? The Romans were snobs. We should be forced to maintain that Virgil once set his face against the fashion, to no obvious gain in sensibility. If he chose to do so, why is not more made of Corydon's status? Why must it be inferred so artfully? If Corydon were a slave, he could be in no doubt which way a fellow-slave would jump. Tacitus tells an ugly story at *Ann.* 14. 42 of a slave's love blighted by a master and its consequence. But Corydon does not see his status as a bar to successful wooing of the boy; his question 'qui sim?' implies something else. No, the chief defect is his poverty, compared to Iollas. The opposition that blights his passion is also that between town

[2] E. Fraenkel, *JRS* 51 (1961), 47 = *Kl. Btrg.* 2 (1964), 116 f.; W. Kroll, *RM* 64 (1909), 50–5.

and country, not between slave and free suitor. Alexis is a pampered darling, like the *concubinus* of Catullus' friend Torquatus. Grandees took their pet slave to the country (cf. Mart. 3. 58. 30–2), but the boys found the country a bore. 'Sordebant tibi uilicae' says Catullus to the *concubinus* at 61. 136. So Alexis finds the countryside *sordida* (28) and rustic presents do not suit him (44). That is why Corydon is *despectus*, not because he is also a slave.

Only one instance of a slave's love given serious treatment is known to me (and it is not Toxilus in Plautus's *Persa*). Daos in Menander's *Heros* loves a sort of bondswoman, Plango; that in itself provokes the raillery of his friend, Geta. Still, his love is honourable and he wants to live with the girl in *contubernium*. He even claims to be the father of her child. But in the end his claim will be set aside. At a pinch, then, Menander's Daos might be the spiritual ancestor of a servile Corydon. But it is unlikely that Daos' plight was seen to be pathetic; certainly Geta did not find it so. Comedy was meant to amuse. Corydon's love is no joke.

To sum up. The linguistic evidence is the most telling: *meae* emancipates Corydon. We have also to keep an eye on the principle of literary *decorum*, especially in Virgil, who tends to be stricter than his models. If he does without slaves in the *Georgics*, what need of a servile protagonist in one and only one *Eclogue*?

Birkbeck College, London ROLAND MAYER

'OMNIBUS UNUS' (*AENEID* 3. 716)

At the end of the third book of the *Aeneid*, after Aeneas has finished his story of the fall of Troy and the wanderings in the Mediterranean, Virgil concludes with these lines (716–18):

> Sic pater Aeneas intentis omnibus unus
> fata renarrabat diuum cursusque docebat.
> conticuit tandem factoque hic fine quieuit.[1]

Commentators have always felt that the juxtaposition of 'omnibus' and 'unus' has presented an awkward contrast.[2] But the figure is more complicated and more artistically satisfying.

Aeneas, throughout the third book, has related how he and his father directed the search for a new home. The command seems to have been shared. Usually Anchises gave orders, sometimes Aeneas; but as *paterfamilias* Anchises performed the religious duties. Aeneas concludes his story in Book Three with eight moving lines describing the death of Anchises in Sicily (lines 708–15). It is immediately after this speech that Virgil describes Aeneas as 'unus' and the adjective should be read in the context of Aeneas' concluding words.[3] 'Unus' emphasizes (1) that Aeneas is the 'one', the 'only' leader of the Trojans (as opposed to the two before the death of Anchises), the new

[1] *Opera*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969).

[2] R. D. Williams, in his edition of Book Three (Oxford, 1962), p. 212, says the contrast is 'not especially effective', and then quotes Servius' remark ('non interpellante regina interrogationibus').

[3] Aeneas has described the death of his father in a curiously brief passage of only eight lines. This abrupt conclusion may be intended to show Aeneas as still emotionally bound to his father and reluctant to describe in detail such recent grief. If this is the case, the use of 'unus' creates in Virgil, the narrator, a sympathy for the grieving hero, a good example of the 'subjective style' of Virgil; cf. Brooks Otis, *Virgil, A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 41–96.