

how the levy for the hunt was made in many cities, πολλέων ἐκ πολλῶν θηρήτορας ἀνδρας ἀγείρας (*Il.* 9. 544); and Bacchylides calls the participants Ἑλλάνων ἄριστοι (*Epin.* 5. 111). So it would not be unnatural for Stesichorus to employ an elevated style to describe the deployment of the hunters.

This note does not profess to prove that column ii belongs to the Συνοθῆραι; it simply

attempts to show that it is possible to make sense of the activities described in it within the context of the Calydonian boar hunt and that, on the basis of content alone, the two columns do not need to be separated.

ANTHONY A. BARRETT

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

MARCUS AGRIPPA'S SON-IN-LAW P. QUINCTILIUS VARUS

For about thirty-five years, P. Quinctilius Varus, the ill-fated commander of the legions destroyed by Arminius in the Teutoburg Forest in A.D. 9, enjoyed high favor in the entourage of Augustus. Though his father was on the proscription lists of the Triumvirs and committed suicide in 42 B.C., in the early years of the Principate the fortunes of Varus were already tied to Augustus' through marriage connections close to the imperial house. He was, for example, related by marriage (probably through his sister Quinctilia), to Sex. Appuleius, nephew of Augustus, consul in 29 B.C. and proconsul of Asia in about 23–21.¹ In 21–19, when he was between twenty-five and thirty years of age, Varus was closely attached to Augustus, serving as adjutant to the *princeps* during his tour of the East.² Subsequently he held the consulship, together with Tiberius, in the memorable year 13 B.C.—an honor indicative of the signal favor of the emperor.³ A few years later he married Claudia Pulchra, grandniece of Augustus.⁴

That Varus had been married previously has been generally accepted: the evidence is Josephus' reference to a son of Varus who served on his staff when he was governor of

Syria in 6–4 B.C. Varus' son was old enough to command troops in 4 B.C., when Varus intervened in Judea to suppress disorders there after the death of Herod.⁵ Accordingly, the *terminus ante quem* for an earlier marriage of Varus is about 25 B.C.⁶ Did this earlier marriage already bring Varus within the intimate circle of the imperial family and its growing network of matrimonial alliances?

In this connection, new light has been shed on the career of Varus by a tantalizingly brief papyrus fragment just published by L. Koenen. It contains a contemporary Greek translation, probably from Oxyrhynchus, of the *laudatio funebris* delivered by Augustus in honor of his great colleague and son-in-law Marcus Agrippa.⁷ This document is of interest to historians of the Augustan Age because it deals with the powers of Agrippa, particularly his much-disputed *maius imperium*. From it we learn incidentally the startling fact that at the time of Agrippa's death, in 12 B.C., Varus was, like Tiberius, Agrippa's son-in-law.⁸ What daughter of the prolific Agrippa did Varus marry? In his masterful commentary Koenen concludes that Varus was Agrippa's son-in-law by virtue of a first marriage to a

1. See U. Weidmann, "Drei Inschriften aus Kyme," *AA*, LXXX (1965), 446–66.

2. W. John, s.v. *P. Quinctilius Varus*, *RE*, XXIV (1963), 908–9.

3. His portrait has been identified on the Ara Pacis Augustae. See, e.g., J. M. C. Toynbee, "The Ara Pacis Reconsidered and Historical Art in Roman Italy," *PBA*, XXXIX (1953), 82.

4. John, *op. cit.* (n. 2), col. 964.

5. Joseph. *AJ* 17. 288; cf. *BJ* 2. 68, where, however, Varus' son is not mentioned in this connection. On Varus' previous wife and son, see von Rohden-Dessau, *PIR*, III (Berlin, 1898), 119.

6. A marriage of Varus before his union with Claudia Pulchra was rejected without adequate grounds by W. John,

"Zu den Familienverhältnissen des P. Quinctilius Varus," *Hermes*, LXXXVI (1958), 251–55; cf. *idem*, *loc. cit.* (n. 4). He thinks the text of Joseph. *AJ* 17. 288, in which a son of Varus is mentioned, is corrupt, and would emend the text to remove reference to a son of Varus. He considers it likely that Varus enjoyed Augustus' favor in 21–19 because he was already engaged to Claudia Pulchra, long before she was *nubilis*.

7. "Die 'Laudatio Funebris' des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus" (= P. Colon. inv. no. 4701), *ZPE*, V (1970), 217–83. I am indebted to Professor G. W. Bowersock for calling my attention to this papyrus, and to Professor Koenen for his kindness in sending me a transcript of the papyrus in advance of publication.

8. Lines 6–7: γαμβρῶν τῶν σὺν.

daughter of Agrippa and Claudia Marcella *maior* (daughter of Octavia), whom Agrippa married *ca.* 29/28 B.C.⁹ He had several children by her, but their identities are not known.¹⁰ But if Varus married a daughter of Agrippa issuing from this marriage, we should then have to conclude that Varus' son, whom Josephus mentions and who must have been at least twenty years old in 4 B.C., was a child of an even earlier, third marriage of Varus to an unknown woman.¹¹

Still another possibility is that Varus married a daughter of Agrippa by his first wife, Atticus' beloved daughter, Caecilia Attica.¹² We know certainly of only one child from this union—Vipsania Agrippina (born no later than 33 B.C.), the first wife of Tiberius, to whom she was betrothed when she was scarcely a year old.¹³ It would be perverse to conclude (*ex silentio*) that Agrippa and Attica had no other children; and their marriage may indeed have lasted, as we shall see, for as long as about fifteen years.

Here the authority of Drumann-Groebe, who determined 51 B.C. as the date of Attica's birth,¹⁴ long followed by most historians on the matter, has induced a chain reaction of errors. But Tyrrell and Purser¹⁵ were more perceptive and are more credible in their conclusion that there is no evidence that Attica was born in 51. The first references to Attica are in two letters of Cicero to Atticus, dated Sept. 51 and Feb. 50,¹⁶ in which Cicero mentions that he has never seen her—hardly evidence for a conclusion that she had just been born. It is more likely that the reason

Cicero had not yet seen her was that in the latter half of the 50's Atticus' family was living on his estate in Epirus.¹⁷ Perhaps Attica was born there.

Yet the authority of the traditional date for Attica's birth is so great that even the most recent learned commentator on Cicero's letters, Shackleton Bailey, asserts that, since Cicero had not yet seen her in 51, Attica was probably born shortly before Cicero's departure for his province of Cilicia in 51.¹⁸ Hence Shackleton Bailey is led to conclude that, when Atticus referred in a letter of Feb. 50 to Attica's talking and even sending greetings to Cicero, this was mere "persiflage" with regard to a baby less than a year old.¹⁹ What are we then to make of Cicero's inquiry of Atticus in Nov. 46, "quid [Attica] scribat ad te?"²⁰ Unless we insist that Attica as a girl of about five was extraordinarily precocious, or dictated to an amanuensis a child's letter to her father, it is more reasonable to follow Tyrrell and Purser's sense that Attica was about eight or nine in 46 and only four or five when Cicero first shared Atticus' delight, in 51, in his friend's little daughter whom he knew only through their correspondence.²¹ Similar conclusions as to an earlier year of birth for Attica were independently arrived at by R. Verdière,²² who argued that Attica was born in 56, and by E. F. Leon, who conjectured 55.²³ A careful perusal of Cicero's many other references to Attica in the years 46/45, when she was seriously ill, reveal a tone hardly appropriate to a girl of about five.²⁴

If then Attica was born at the end of 56 or

9. Koenen, *op. cit.* (n. 7), pp. 257–68.

10. Cf. M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa: A Biography* (Geneva, N.Y., 1933), pp. 70–71.

11. Koenen, *op. cit.*, p. 267, n. 103, follows John (see n. 6 above) in rejecting the manuscript tradition in Josephus for a son of Varus.

12. Koenen, *op. cit.*, p. 267, n. 105, raises the theoretical possibility of another daughter of Agrippa by Caecilia Attica but rejects the likelihood of such an earlier marriage for Varus.

13. Reinhold, *op. cit.*, p. 37. Since Vipsania Agrippina is not likely to have been engaged to Tiberius until Octavian married Livia, in 38 B.C., it is not probable that she was born before 39 B.C. We do not know the year the marriage took place. Conjectures put it in 20 or 19: G. P. Baker, *Tiberius Caesar* (London, 1929), pp. 18–19; G. Marañón, *Tiberius* (London, 1956), pp. 36–37.

14. W. Drumann and P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*², V

(Leipzig, 1919), 90–92. Cf. Reinhold, *op. cit.*, p. 37. R. Hanslik, *s.v.* (? *Pomponia*) *Caecilia Attica*, *RE*, XXI (1952), 2350–51, places her birth between June and September of 51.

15. R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, IV (Dublin and London, 1894), 381.

16. *Att.* 5. 19. 2; 6. 1. 22.

17. Cf. A. H. Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus* (Bryn Mawr, 1920), pp. 68–73; R. Feger, *s.v.* *T. Pomponius Atticus*, *RE*, Supp. VIII (1956), 510.

18. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, III (Cambridge, 1968), 233 (on *Att.* 5. 19. 2).

19. *Ibid.*, p. 252 (on *Att.* 6. 1. 22).

20. *Att.* 12. 1. 1.

21. Tyrrell and Purser, *loc. cit.* (n. 15).

22. "Les Amours de Tityre," *Latomus*, IX (1950), 276–77.

23. "Note on Caecilia Attica," *CB*, XXXVIII (1962), 35–36.

24. See especially *Att.* 12. 11; 12. 33. 2; 13. 19. 1; 13. 44. 2.

in 55 (within about a year of Atticus' marriage to Pilia), then the date of Agrippa's marriage to Attica needs to be reconsidered. My own earlier reasons for proposing that the marriage took place in 37 B.C.²⁵ are, I am now convinced, not valid, since they were largely based upon the erroneous 51 B.C. date of birth for Attica. The two controlling elements are the age of Attica and the fact that Marcus Antonius was *harum rerum conciliator*. Attica was legally *nubilis* (at age twelve²⁶) in 43, and it was indeed in that year that Cicero inquired about matches (*condiciones*) for Attica.²⁷ Accordingly, the marriage of Agrippa and Caecilia Attica may have taken place as early as 43/42, at some time when relations between Octavian and Antony were cordial. This marriage lasted certainly until 32, the death of Atticus, and may have endured until it was dissolved to enable Agrippa to marry Claudia Marcella in 29/28.

We must admit the possibility that there were other children of this marriage besides Vipsania Agrippina. If there was another

daughter, she would have been old enough to have married Quintilius Varus before 25 B.C., and to have had a son old enough in 4 B.C. to serve on his father's staff when he was governor of Syria. Such a marriage and the status of Agrippa's son-in-law as early as about 25 B.C. would account for Varus' favored position in the imperial family circle at such an early date. If Varus was not Agrippa's son-in-law by virtue of a union with a granddaughter of Atticus, then he acquired this status about a decade later when he married a daughter of Agrippa by Claudia Marcella. But in that case Varus had a son by a third, earlier marriage.

The new data on P. Quintilius Varus' family connections afford further evidence that "the schemes devised by Augustus in the ramification of family alliances were formidable and fantastic. He neglected no relative, however obscure, however distant, no tie whatever of marriage . . ."²⁸

MEYER REINHOLD

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

25. Reinhold, *op. cit.*, pp. 36–37. Leon, *loc. cit.* (n. 23), accepting 37 B.C. as the date of the marriage of the sickly Attica, commented: "She was about eighteen, a little older than the average Roman bride."

26. See M. K. Hopkins, "The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage," *Population Studies*, XVIII (1965), 309–27.

27. *Ad Brut.* 25, 7 (= 1. 17. 7).

28. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), p. 378.

THE CONTEST IN VERGIL'S SEVENTH *ECLOGUE*

Vergil's seventh *Eclogue*, like the third, has as its focal point a poetic contest between two herdsmen; unlike the third *Eclogue*, the seventh ends with a clear decision in favor of one of these herdsmen. Many reasons for the judgment at the end of the poem have been advanced, ranging from supposed metrical lapses in the loser's verses to Vergil's preference for the person presumed to be hidden under the winner's mask.¹ The *Eclogue* also has been viewed as a paradigm of pastoral poetry in which the poetic approach of the contestants determines the winner.²

Another approach, developed particularly

by J. Perret and V. Pöschl, depends on the differences of Corydon and Thyrsis as they are presented in their verses. Perret sees their personalities as markedly dissimilar on a moral level: "Thyrsis est dénigrant, jaloux, vulgaire, toujours occupé de soi; Corydon est capable d'admiration et de spontanéité."³ Pöschl develops the contrasts presented in each pair of opposing quatrains similarly, writing of Corydon's "frommer Demut" and Thyrsis' "ehrfurchtsloser Anmassung."⁴ One facet of the temperaments of the two herdsmen depicted by Vergil calls for particular attention: their attitudes toward love in its widest sense are

1. V. Pöschl includes among many reasons the former explanation on pp. 110, 111, etc., of *Die Hirtendichtung Vergils* (Heidelberg, 1964). John J. H. Savage discusses the latter one extensively in "The Art of the Seventh *Eclogue* of Vergil," *TAPA*, XCIV (1963), 248–67.

2. Michael C. J. Putnam, *Vergil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues* (Princeton, 1970), esp. pp. 251–54, and John B.

Van Sickle, "The Unity of the *Eclogues*: Arcadian Forest, Theocritean Trees," *TAPA*, XCVIII (1967), 491–508, esp. 501–2.

3. J. Perret, ed., *Virgile: Les Bucoliques* (Paris, 1961), p. 83. I should like to thank Charles Henderson of Smith College for bringing this book to my attention.

4. Pöschl, *op. cit.*, p. 108, on verses 21–28.