

displays in cleverly manipulating the elements of myth. It is of course possible that Statius' copy of Catullus was already corrupt. Nevertheless, I hope I have demonstrated that these passages should not be considered in isolation. Nor would this be the first time the *Achilleid* was called upon to bear witness to the text of Catullus 64. In his 1566 edition of Catullus, Achilles Statius (Aquiles Estaço) supplied *campi* in 64.344 on the basis of Statius' imitation at *Ach.* 1.84–8. The closest readers of Roman poetry were other Roman poets, and this is an example of how the study of allusion can collaborate with textual criticism in contributing evidence towards three *cruces* in three different authors.

University College, Dublin

P. J. HESLIN

### THE POSITION OF GALLUS IN *ECLOGUE* 6\*

|   |    |
|---|----|
| tum canit Hesperidum miratam mala puellam;<br>tum Phaethontiad as musco circumdat amarae<br>corticis atque solo proceras erigit alnos.<br>tum canit, errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum<br>Aonas in montis ut duxerit una sororum,   | 65 |
| utque uiro Phoebe chorus adsurrexerit omnis;<br>ut Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor<br>floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro<br>dixerit: 'hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae,<br>Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat<br>cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.<br>his tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo,<br>ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo.' | 70 |
| Quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi, quam fama secuta est<br>candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstros<br>Dulichias uexasse rates et gurgite in alto,<br>a! timidos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis;<br>aut ut mutatos Terei narrauerit artus,<br>quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,<br>quo cursu deserta petiuerit et quibus ante                                     | 75 |
| infelix sua tecta super uolitaueit aliis?<br>omnia, quae Phoebus quondam meditante beatus<br>audiit Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros,<br>ille canit, pulsae referunt ad sidera ualles,<br>cogere donec ouis stabulis numerumque referre  | 80 |
| iussit et inuito processit Vesper Olympo.   | 85 |

Although modern scholars have expressed in various ways the view that the Gallus passage is unusual in its context,<sup>1</sup> no editor or commentator during the past quarter of a century has questioned the ordering of the lines in which the Gallus passage occurs.<sup>2</sup> Recently, however, E. Courtney has voiced two objections: (1) '[T]he sequence *tum canit* (61), *tum Phaethontiad as circumdat* (62), *tum canit* (64–65) . . .

\* I am grateful to I. M. Le M. DuQuesnay, G. P. Goold, R. G. M. Nisbet, and the editor of *CQ* (S. J. Heyworth) for their comments, but it should not be assumed that they agree with what I say.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. R. Coleman, *Virgil: Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 194 and 205 ('abrupt'); R. D. Williams, *Virgil: the Eclogues and Georgics* (London & New York, 1979), p. 114 ('startling') and p. 117 ('extremely striking'); G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven & London, 1980), pp. 223–4 ('inappropriate and bizarre').

<sup>2</sup> To Coleman and R. D. Williams (above, n. 1) add R. A. B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (corrected edition, Oxford, 1972); M. Geymonat, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin, 1973); and W. Clausen, *A Commentary on Virgil Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994).

troubles me because it looks like an attempt at an anaphora ruined by the interposed middle item, and I have found no parallel in Vergil for this'; (2) 'If 61–63 are metamorphosis, why are they separated from 74–81, which are also metamorphosis, by Gallus?'<sup>3</sup> Courtney therefore suggested transposing 61–3 to follow 73. Now, although Courtney's transposition is one way of meeting the difficulty of the interrupted series of metamorphoses, it does nothing to solve a major problem perceived by B. Otis, for whom Silenus' song 'falls into a quite recognizable chronological pattern' from the creation onwards.<sup>4</sup> In fact Otis went so far as to say that the interruption of this chronology by the Gallus section is 'the only major problem of the eclogue'.<sup>5</sup>

It is true that O. Skutsch in his turn objected to Otis's view that Silenus' song is chronologically arranged;<sup>6</sup> and indeed the dislocated chronology of lines 41–2 ('Hinc lapides Pyrrhae iactos, Saturnia regna, / Causasiasque refert uolucres furtumque Promethei') was noted at least as early as Servius.<sup>7</sup> It could perhaps be argued that the chronological dislocation of 41–2 anticipates, and acts as the cue for, the anachronistic insertion of Gallus at 64–73. Yet there seems all the difference in the world between the localized dislocations of a single couplet and the disruptive insertion of a ten-line paragraph introduced by the words *tum canit*.<sup>8</sup> As Clausen says, at 41–2 'Silenus is offering a history of the world in brief' (p. 192);<sup>9</sup> and even Skutsch admitted that Silenus' song exhibits 'a certain semblance of chronological order' (p. 164). It seems that Otis's point about chronology emerges more or less unscathed from Skutsch's attack; and, if that is the case, the problem of the Gallus section remains.

Otis's problem, like each of those raised by Courtney,<sup>10</sup> is solved by the suggestion of Scaliger and Heyne, who transposed 64–73 to follow 81:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| tum canit Hesperidum miratam mala puellam;         | 61 |
| tum Phaethontiadās musco circumdat amarae          |    |
| corticis atque solo proceras erigit alnos.         | 63 |
| quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi, quam fama secuta est | 74 |
| candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris    | 75 |
| Dulichias uexasse rates et gurgite in alto,        |    |
| a! timidos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis;       |    |
| aut ut mutatos Terei narrauerit artus,             |    |

<sup>3</sup> E. Courtney, 'Vergil's Sixth *Eclogue*', *QUUC* 34 (1990), 99–112, at pp. 102–3 and p. 111.

<sup>4</sup> B. Otis, *Virgil: a Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964), p. 138 (cf. p. 407 'the obviously temporal structure of the Silenus song as a whole').

<sup>5</sup> Otis, p. 407, who was obliged to describe the Gallus passage as an 'interlude'.

<sup>6</sup> O. Skutsch, 'Symmetry and sense in the *Eclogues*', *HSCP* 73 (1969), 153–69, at p. 164, endorsed by N. Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 138.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Clausen, p. 192.

<sup>8</sup> Of lines 41–2 Clausen correctly says: 'brief, allusive references in the Alexandrian manner to well-known stories'. It might be thought that a parallel to the Gallus passage is provided by the introduction to *Ecl.* 8, where eight lines (6–13) addressed to an unnamed contemporary (surely not Octavian) intervene between two sections on Damon and Alpheisiboeus (1–5 and 14–16). But the parallel is false: 8.6–13 is to be read as a parenthesis, in which a grander type of poetry (8 *tua dicere facta*) is mentioned as a complimentary alternative to the proposed pastoral (1–5 *Pastorum Musam... dicemus*), whereas in *Ecl.* 6 Gallus is simply one of a number of subjects listed on an equal footing with one another (as *tum canit* at 64 makes clear).

<sup>9</sup> Coleman, p. 187, says of line 42 that 'The mention of the crime after the punishment indicates that the sequence in the preceding line need not be chronologically significant'.

<sup>10</sup> Dr Heyworth, quoting *G.* 2.4–7 (*huc, pater o Lenaeae; tuis hic...; huc, pater o Lenaeae*), questions the validity of Courtney's first objection.

|  |    |
|--|----|
| quas illi Philomela dapes, quae dona pararit,      |    |
| quo cursu deserta petierit et quibus ante          | 80 |
| infelix sua tecta super uolitauerit alis?          | 81 |
| Tum canit errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum      | 64 |
| Aonas in montis ut duxerit una sororum             | 65 |
| utque uiro Phoebe chorus adsurrexerit omnis;       |    |
| ut Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor           |    |
| floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro           |    |
| dixerit: 'hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae, |    |
| Asraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat         | 70 |
| cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.          |    |
| his tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo,             |    |
| ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo.'      | 73 |
| Omnia quae Phoebo quondam meditante beatus         | 82 |
| audii Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros            |    |
| ille canit, pulsae referunt ad sidera ualles,      |    |
| cogere donec ouis stabulis numerumque referre      | 85 |
| iussit et inuito processit Vesper Olympos.         |    |

On this ordering of the lines, each of the last three sections of the poem is introduced by the early placing of *canit* (61, 64, 84). But Courtney has objected that the transposition 'will not work: first, because *quid loquar* 74 looks as if it marks a coda: second, Vergil seems deliberately to have avoided placing Gallus last because in that position, coming directly before the concluding reminder (82–86, foreshadowed by *narrauerit* 78) that all this has been the song of Silenus, the incongruity of his appearance in Silenus' mouth would be too obvious' (111).

The first of these objections, which earlier had occurred also to Wagner, cannot be sustained. *quid loquar* no more marks a coda at Ov. *A. A.* 3.169 or *Tr.* 3.10.25 than does *quid . . . dicam* at Virg. *G.* 1.311: there is thus no necessity for it to do so in the eclogue. The second objection, echoing a point made by O. Skutsch,<sup>11</sup> seems misguided. On any ordering of the lines Silenus sang of Gallus, and it is no more incongruous that he should be made to do so at the end of his song than earlier. Indeed *tum canit* (64) suggests that Virgil had no wish to disguise any potential incongruity; but in fact there is no incongruity at all, since Silenus was by tradition a 'prophetic character',<sup>12</sup> as implied at the start by *carmina* (25, to which the subsequent examples of *canere* look back).

The transposition of Scaliger and Heyne is not mentioned by Mynors, Geymonat, Coleman, R. D. Williams, or Clausen;<sup>13</sup> yet it has the principal advantage of removing the chronological problem articulated by Otis. Silenus' song now describes a general movement from creation through to contemporary times and anticipates precisely the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, whose indebtedness to the eclogue is so clear.<sup>14</sup> The error will

<sup>11</sup> Skutsch, p. 163, 'the incongruity of that story [sc. of Gallus] in the mouth of Silenus would have been too obvious'.

<sup>12</sup> Coleman, p. 203; so also e.g. Clausen, p. 175, D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 20, 28.

<sup>13</sup> Nor by R. Sabbadini in his edition (Rome, 1937) nor by F. della Corte in his commentary (Milan, 1939). Indeed the only recent scholar apart from Courtney to mention the transposition is E. Coleiro in his apparatus criticus to the poem (*An Introduction to Vergil's Bucolics with a Critical Edition of the Text* [Amsterdam, 1979], p. 332); but his discussion of the eclogue's structure presupposes that the transposition, to which he makes no further reference, is mistaken (pp. 63, 211, 214–15).

<sup>14</sup> See e.g. P. E. Knox, *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 10–14, M. Helzle, 'Ovid's Cosmogony', *PLLS* 7 (1993), 123–34, at pp. 123–4.

perhaps have arisen originally because a copyist wished to foist upon Virgil precisely that 'attempt at an anaphora' of which Courtney complained.<sup>15</sup> It is no real objection to the transposition that errors of this type are rarely found in the text of Virgil: as Courtney himself has argued elsewhere, transpositions in Virgil's text may be more frequent than has been commonly thought.<sup>16</sup>

The Scaliger–Heyne transposition also has subsidiary advantages, of which the first is that a central paragraph of myth (41–81, omitting 64–73) is now framed by two other paragraphs of ten lines each (31–40 and 64–73). The first of these two paragraphs is packed with allusions to Lucretius and constitutes an implicit tribute to a recently dead poet;<sup>17</sup> the other paragraph constitutes an explicit tribute to a still living poet. The resulting correspondence of line-numbers, position and literary compliment seems wholly in the manner of the *Eclogues*.

The second advantage is that the transposition helps to determine the function of the last five lines of the poem (82–6). As Clausen observes (207), these lines have been understood in two different ways:

- (i) the song of Silenus is not his own composition but a song composed and sung by Apollo; or
- (ii) the song of Apollo is the last of the themes in the song composed and sung by Silenus.

If we accept the Scaliger–Heyne transposition, whose primary *raison d'être* is the restoration of chronological order, it follows that the contemporary Gallus cannot be succeeded by any (further) mythological theme but must itself constitute the finale of the song. Thus the function of 82–6 is to sum up the whole of Silenus' song:

Omnia quae Phoebus quondam meditante beatus  
audii Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros  
ille canit . . .

These lines look back to 27–30, as indeed the correspondence between *beatus* here and *gaudet* at 29 suggests ('Phoebus gaudet Parnasia rupes'), and both passages together form an outer frame for Silenus' song. It is of course true that on this interpretation, which is the more usual,<sup>18</sup> it is revealed that everything which Silenus has been singing was originally sung by Apollo to the delighted river Eurotas. Clausen follows F. Skutsch in regarding this as a fatal objection, on the grounds that 'Apollo's song could not conceivably include Gallus' initiation on Helicon';<sup>19</sup> yet these grounds seem misconceived. Apollo is divine and the god of prophecy: if

<sup>15</sup> Alternatively, as Dr Heyworth has suggested, the scribe's eye leapt from *erigit alnos* (63) to *uolitaerit alis* (81). It may perhaps be added that *Atthis* for *ante* (80) has been suggested by E. J. Boneschanscher, *CQ* 32 (1982), 148–51.

<sup>16</sup> E. Courtney, 'The formation of the text of Vergil', *BICS* 28 (1981), 13–29, at pp. 16–20.

<sup>17</sup> The Lucretian element is minimized by Ross, p. 25, but see L. Ramorino Martini, 'Influssi lucreziani nelle Bucoliche di Virgilio', *Civiltà classica e cristiana* 7 (1986), 297–331, at pp. 324–6, and note also A. J. Woodman, *LCM* 16 (1991), 92. The tribute to Lucretius should not, of course, obscure Virgil's allusions to Apollonius (on which see e.g. Ross, pp. 25–6, Knox, pp. 11–12, Clausen, p. 176).

<sup>18</sup> See esp. R. B. Rutherford, 'Virgil's poetic ambitions in *Eclogue* 6', *G&R* 36 (1989), 42–50, at p. 45.

<sup>19</sup> Clausen, p. 207, who states that the alternative interpretation 'must be right'. Yet, if Clausen is correct, what would Silenus' final theme be? Apollo's tragic love for Hyacinthus, which is the usual answer to the question, scarcely suits the adjective *beatus* (82). Hence P. E. Knox ('Inpursuit of Daphne', *TAPA* 120 [1990], 183–202) has suggested an allusion to the story of Daphne; but it is not quite clear from Clausen's note (pp. 207–8) whether he accepts Knox's suggestion. For the appropriateness and importance of Apollo as a closural figure in the eclogue see G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 248–9.

Silenus could sing prophetically of Gallus, as (on any view of the eclogue) he does, *a fortiori* Apollo could too.

Nor is there anything surprising in the late revelation of Apollo's role. In line 67 we have been told that Linus likewise sings Apolline song (*diuino carmine*), and the final advantage of the Scaliger–Heyne transposition is that it brings into juxtaposition the divine nature of the singing of these two comparable figures,<sup>20</sup> a juxtaposition to which the repetition of the god's names in successive lines is no objection (see e.g. Callim. *Hymns* 2.31–2, 4.8–9).

University of Durham

A. J. WOODMAN

<sup>20</sup> For the tradition linking Linus and Silenus see Ross, chapter 2.

### A NOTE ON PROPERTIUS 1.10.3: *IUCUNDA VOLUPTAS*

O iucunda quies, primo cum testis amori  
affueram uestris conscius in lacrimis!  
O noctem meminisse mihi *iucunda uoluptas*,  
o quotiens uotis illa uocanda meis,  
cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella  
uidimus et longa ducere uerba mora!

Propertius 1.10.1–6

Commentators have generally been content to cite parallels for the phrase *iucunda uoluptas* at Propertius 1.10.3 without drawing attention to an interesting resonance which it may evoke.

The somewhat tautological combination of the noun *uoluptas* and the adjective *iucundus* in grammatical agreement is in fact rare in extant Latin literature. It is used by Cicero to describe the most delightful pleasure which a reader can derive from reading accounts of the lives of great men;<sup>1</sup> it is employed in the pseudo-Virgilian *Aetna* to refer to the consequences of a man's knowledge of the workings of the universe;<sup>2</sup> but the most striking parallel occurs at the start of Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* book 2 (1–4):

Suave, mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis,  
e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem;  
non quia vexari quemquamst *iucunda voluptas*,  
sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere suave est.

A comparison is surely invited by the fact that the same unusual phrase is employed in the same, highly emphatic position at the end of the hexameter; indeed, in the third line in each case. Lucretius states that it is not that any man's troubles are in themselves an *iucunda uoluptas*, but that it is pleasant to observe (*spectare, cernere*)

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.5: 'Etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet quasi enumeratione fastorum; at viri saepe excellentis ancipites varique casus habent admirationem expectationem, laetitiam molestiam, spem timorem; si vero exitu notabili concluduntur, expletur animus iucundissima lectionis voluptate.'

<sup>2</sup> *Aetna* 247–51:

... et quaecumque iacent tanto miracula mundo  
non congesta pati nec aceruo condita rerum,  
sed manifesta notis certa disponere sede  
singula, diuina est animi et iucunda uoluptas.