

forward to the charging bulls of *Arg.* 3.1293–5.<sup>19</sup> Vergil's technique of allusion here is familiar enough, although a thorough investigation of how he used the Hellenistic epic remains a major desideratum.<sup>20</sup>

Other parallels between the two passages have less significance, but two further points may be mentioned. The shadow-boxing of *Georg.* 3.233–4 has its parallel in *Arg.* 2.45–7, where Polydeuces prepares for the fight. In both poems careful preparation is to pay off against an arrogant and careless opponent. Secondly, there is the phrase *irasci in cornua* (line 232). With more or less confidence, editors see here a borrowing from the only earlier instance of the phrase in extant literature, Eur. *Bacch.* 743, ταῦροι δ' ὑβρίζονται κὰς κέρασ θυμούμενοι (of animals attacked by the bacchants). If this is correct – and caution in such matters is always necessary – then it is noteworthy that Malcolm Campbell has argued<sup>21</sup> that Apollonius' description of the contest of Amycus and Polydeuces is indebted to the Euripidean confrontation of Pentheus and Dionysus: the calm, beautiful young man confronts the brutish, 'earthborn' tyrant.<sup>22</sup> Campbell also argued that οἰνωπός of Polydeuces at Theocr. 22.34 showed that Theocritus had picked up the resonance of Apollonius' account. Does *Georg.* 3.233–4 show that these allusions were not lost on Vergil? Opinions will differ, but no one will want to underestimate his appreciation of detail and nuance in the *Argonautica*.<sup>23</sup>

Pembroke College, Cambridge

RICHARD HUNTER

<sup>19</sup> Apollonius' account of Jason's struggle with the bulls very likely contains echoes of Callimachus' *Hecale*. This lends colour to the suggestion (cf. Thomas ad loc.) that *Georg.* 3.232–4 is indebted to Call. fr. 732 Pf., πολλὰ μάτην κεράεσσιν ἐς ἥερα θυμήναντα, a verse of uncertain authorship which has been ascribed, with some probability, to the *Hecale*.

<sup>20</sup> For Apollonius' influence on the *Georgics*, cf. the brief survey of W. W. Briggs in H. Temporini and W. Haase (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 31.2 (Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 955–8.

<sup>21</sup> 'Three Notes on Alexandrine Poetry', *Hermes* 102 (1974), 38–46, at 38–41.

<sup>22</sup> H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich, 1968), p. 157, had cited Eur. *Bacch.* 543–4 in this connection, but he did not pursue the parallel.

<sup>23</sup> I am grateful to Michael Reeve for his comments on an earlier version of this note.

#### THE NEW GALLUS AND THE *ALTERNAE VOCES* OF PROPERTIUS 1.10.10

In *CQ* 34 (1984), 167–74, Janet Fairweather makes the interesting suggestion that the elegiacs by Gallus on the Qaṣr Ibrīm papyrus should be understood as 'a fragment of an amoebaeon song-contest'. This hypothesis, as she notes, might explain why the papyrus' quatrains are set apart by spaces and by an odd type of symbol, and treat 'separate, indeed discrepant, topics', yet show 'unmistakable verbal and thematic connections'.<sup>1</sup> Fairweather's discussion is thorough, but overlooks one small piece of evidence for Gallan amoebaeon verse.

Propertius 1.10 describes Propertius' delight at having witnessed the lovemaking of someone named Gallus and his mistress. As F. Skutsch in 1906 and others more

<sup>1</sup> Fairweather, 167. L. Koenen, in L. Koenen and D. B. Thompson, 'Gallus as Triptolemos on the Tazza Farnese', *BASP* 21 (1984), 142–50, argues still for separate epigrams, principally because of the use of both a paragraphus-type symbol and space between quatrains, but he does not really confront Fairweather's suggestion. J. Blänsdorf, 'Der Gallus-Papyrus – Eine Fälschung?' *ZPE* 67 (1987), 49 n. 28, refers to Fairweather's hypothesis as 'interessante, aber unbeweisbar'.

recently have suggested, that poem can be seen as referring to or at least as playing with the idea of referring to not a night of voyeurism ('Durchs Schlüsselloch?' asks Skutsch), but Propertius' reading of Cornelius Gallus' love-poetry.<sup>2</sup> A. S. Benjamin noted the ambiguity of 1.10.9–10:

non tamen a vestro potui secedere lusu:  
tantus in alternis vocibus ardor erat.

The use of the word *lusu* resembles that of the verb *ludere* in Catullus 50 (*hesterno, Licini, die otiosi/ multum lusimus...*), where amatory language is used of poetry writing. The phrase *in alternis vocibus* in line 10, while referring on the literal level to the love talk of Gallus and the girl, also 'suggests amoebaeon verse'.<sup>3</sup> Some may still resist the idea of linking Cornelius Gallus the poet to the addressee of Propertius 1.5, 10, 13, and 20, but recent arguments have explained the principal barrier to this line of interpretation, the reference to Gallus' *nobilitas* at Prop. 1.5.23–4.<sup>4</sup> The finding of possibly amoebaeon verses by Gallus further argues for such a link, and the phrase at Prop. 1.10.10 supports Fairweather's suggestion that the elegiacs from Qaṣr Ibrīm are amoebaeon verse.

Wesleyan University,  
Middletown, Connecticut

JAMES J. O'HARA

<sup>2</sup> cf. Franz Skutsch, *Gallus und Vergil* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1906), pp. 144–6, A. S. Benjamin, 'A Note on Propertius 1.10: *O iucunda quies*', *CP* 60 (1965), 178, David O. Ross, Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry. Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 83–4, and F. Cairns, 'Propertius 1.4 and 1.5 and the "Gallus" of the Monobiblos', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, Fourth Volume (Liverpool, 1984), p. 101 n. 73.

<sup>3</sup> Benjamin (previous note), 178.

<sup>4</sup> *nec tibi nobilitas poterit succurrere amanti: / nescit Amor priscis cedere imaginibus*. See Ross (above n. 2, pp. 83–4, and especially Cairns (above n. 2), pp. 61–103, with full references. Line 24 does not have to mean that the Gallus has *priscae imagines*, especially since the line is probably adapted from a line from Cornelius Gallus' own work. Cairns shows that use of the words *nobilitas* or *nobilis* is not always so precise as to exclude the word *nobilitas* from being used of Gallus.

#### OVID, *METAMORPHOSES* 8.476

incipit esse tamen melior germana parente,  
et, consanguineas ut sanguine leniat umbras,  
impietate pia est.

*Met.* 8.475–7

In these lines Ovid introduces Althaea's debate whether or not to kill her son Meleager by burning the brand which was his life, because he had killed her two brothers during the Calydonian boar hunt. A. S. Hollis (Oxford, 1970) says of line 476 that it contains 'a forced and almost pointless word-play'. If *sanguis* is taken in its primary meaning, 'blood', this condemnation is quite justified. However, if one takes into account a secondary sense, the word-play acquires more strength. This sense is that of 'offspring' or 'descendant'. Examples of this usage (see Lewis and Short s.v. B1b and *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s.v. 10) include Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.835 '*sanguis meus*' (Julius Caesar), Horace, *Carmen Saeculare* 50 '*clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis*' (Aeneas), *Odes* 3.27.65 '*regius sanguis*' (Europa), and, in the *Metamorphoses* itself (5.514–15) '*pro ... meo veni supplex tibi, Iuppiter, ... sanguine*'. It may well be that Ovid was intending implications of both meanings in his choice of the word.

Worcester College, Oxford

KATIE E. GILCHRIST