

not need line 402 to complete it. But a son's premature cessation of mourning (400), although perhaps repugnant, does not by itself stand on the same level of monstrosity as the other crimes enumerated in 399–404. If, however, line 402 is appended as an explanation of this circumstance, the son's act is certainly as nefarious as the rest.

The sequence of crimes listed in 399–404 is also improved by this arrangement. The fraternal slaughter of line 399 exemplifies rivalry within a generation, even as the father's wish for his son's death in the transposed 401 illustrates jealousy between generations. This same tension is carried into line 400; yet 400 together with 402 implies an illicit union of the generations. The son's culpable pursuit of his stepmother in 400 and 402 is reversed in 403–4 by a mother's incestuous exploitation of her unknowing son. The first two crimes involve forbidden conflict between family members of the same sex, while the last two involve forbidden union between family members of the opposite sex. This carefully wrought symmetry may have been obscured by the manuscripts' confusion.

Of course, certainty is impossible here. But no one can doubt the existence of misplaced or transposed lines in the Catullan corpus.<sup>12</sup> Considering the end-stopped self-containment and parallel grammatical structure of lines 399–401, and especially the paleographical similarities of 400 and 401,<sup>13</sup> it is not difficult to see how a copyist might confound their order by misreading 400 as 401, and then reinsert 401 after looking back at his exemplar and discovering the omission.

THOMAS K. HUBBARD  
*Skidmore College*

12. Among the indisputable cases of misplaced lines are 50. 16–17 (which the MSS repeat after 54. 1), 67. 21 (which is repeated after 64. 386), and 68. 16 (which the MSS give after 68. 49). Most editors since Muretus transpose 58b. 2 and 3 (which is probably the most apt parallel for the present transposition); indeed, the whole of 58b may be a segment of 55 (as some of the *recentiores* conjecture). See also the crux of 68. 157–58, which some recent critics have wanted to place after 68. 154 (i.e., a transposition of one couplet); cf. G. Pennisi, "Il carme 68 di Catullo," *Emerita* 27 (1959): 225–28. On transpositions in the Catullan MSS, see the general account of F. della Corte, *Due Studi Catulliani* (Genova, 1951), pp. 91–100.

13. The first word of each line ends in *-it*. The *-tor* and *-tos* of the second word look similar in most minuscule hands. The *lUGERe* of line 400 resembles the *fUnERa* of 401. And, of course, the *nati* of 401 is repeated by the *natus* of 400. A. E. Housman, *Lucanus* (Oxford, 1926), pp. xix–xx, calls this phenomenon "homoeomeson," and identifies it as a frequent paleographical cause of omitted or transposed lines.

## SERVIVS AND TRIUMVIRAL HISTORY IN THE *ECLOGUES*

In his recent discussion of the date of *Eclogue* 8, G. W. Bowersock rightly castigated those who accept as true the historical fictions of the ancient commentators on Virgil.<sup>1</sup> As he showed, the chronology of the *Eclogues* found in Servius and others is based on the weakest of historical foundations, and the story that Virgil's farm was returned by a land commission consisting of Pollio, Varus, and Gallus is a totally unwarranted inference from the fact that these are the

1. "A Date in the Eighth Eclogue," *HSCP* 75 (1971): 73–80.

three men to whom various *Eclogues* are addressed. In the context of Virgilian criticism, this demonstration is very welcome, and long overdue; on the other hand, it lends itself to a dismissal of Servius as a mere purveyor of worthless fiction. But although in interpreting Virgil it may be necessary to treat Servius as an unreliable witness, his interpretations offer evidence of a different sort: they allow us some insight into the aims and methods of the fifth-century grammarian himself. The purpose of this note is not to defend the correctness of Servius' views of the historical background of the *Eclogues*, but rather to consider the problem of why he held them.

Aside from the question of the land commission, which Bowersock has already considered, there is one important historical problem in Servius' interpretation of the *Eclogues*, and that is the identity of the unnamed person addressed in the opening lines of *Eclogue* 8.<sup>2</sup> Bowersock, on historical grounds, identified him as Augustus. So did Servius; but his argumentation is not as easily followed. There are two passages in his commentary that are significant in this regard. The first is his note on *Eclogue* 8. 6:

TV MIHI SEV MAGNI S. I. S. T. ubi ubi es, o Auguste, siue Venetiae flumina transcendis—nam Timaeus fluius est Venetiae—, siue per Illyricum nauigas mare, id est per Dalmatiam, putas, umquam erit tempus, quo mihi liceat tua facta describere?

The second follows four lines later, on *Eclogue* 8. 10:

SOLA SOPHOCLEO TVA C. D. C. ac si diceret: quamquam impar sit ingenium meum laudibus tuis; nam tuae laudes merentur exprimi Sophocleo tantum cothurno. Sophocles autem tragoediographus fuit altisonus.

To this note we find an addition in DS:<sup>3</sup>

alii ideo hoc de Pollione dictum uolunt, quod et ipse utriusque linguae tragoediarum scriptor fuit.

The first of these notes shows that Servius believed the unnamed person addressed in this poem to be Augustus; but, given Servius' normal methods of composition, it is also extremely likely that he knew, and suppressed, the alternate identification with Pollio recorded by DS.<sup>4</sup> That is not a little peculiar: given that Servius knew that Pollio was a tragedian and had campaigned in Dalmatia,<sup>5</sup> and that he ap-

2. The discussions of the identity of the addressee of *Eclogue* 8 since Bowersock's original article are those of E. A. Schmidt, *Zur Chronologie der "Eklogen" Vergils* (Heidelberg, 1974); R. J. Tarrant, "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue," *HSCP* 82 (1978): 197–99; G. W. Bowersock, "The Addressee of the Eighth Eclogue: A Response," *HSCP* 82 (1978): 201–2; J. van Sickle, "Commentaria in Maronem Commenticia: A Case History of *Bucolics* Misread," *Arethusa* 14 (1981): 17–34; R. Mayer, "Missing Persons in the *Eclogues*," *BICS* 30 (1983): 17–30.

3. On the relationship between the vulgate Servius and the longer version (here referred to as DS), see J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York, 1981), pp. 81–82, with references.

4. For a clear discussion, with examples, of Servius' relationship to his sources and their relationship to the DS additions, see G. P. Goold, "Servius and the Helen Episode," *HSCP* 74 (1970): 101–68, particularly at pp. 102–17.

5. For Servius' knowledge of Pollio's activities, see his notes on 3. 84 and 4. 1.

parently knew nothing either of Augustus' abortive *Ajax* or of the Illyrian campaign which Bowersock associates with Virgil's dedication, it would seem far more logical for him to have believed that Pollio, not Augustus, was the person addressed. What is more, in order to connect the dedication with Augustus, Servius was led to adopt the extremely dubious interpretation of *tua carmina* as meaning *carmina de te*.<sup>6</sup> Even if Servius' exegesis is often marked by ignorance and misinterpretation, it is not normally as perverse as that.

In order to understand Servius' explanation of this passage, it is necessary to examine it not in accordance with modern knowledge of the details of triumviral history but in the light of Servius' often faulty understanding of that period. Servius believed that the *Eclogues* were begun when Virgil was twenty-eight years old, in 42 B.C., and took three years to write.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, in explaining historical allusions in the poems, he constantly ignores his own chronology, in both directions. At *Eclogue* 6. 11, for instance, he gives us a fascinating but almost entirely fictional anecdote:

Dicitur autem [sc. haec ecloga] ingenti fauore a Vergilio esse recitata, adeo ut, cum eam postea Cytheris cantasset in theatro, quam in fine Lycoridem uocat, stupefactus Cicero, cuius esset, requireret. et cum eum tandem aliquando uidisset, dixisse dicitur et ad suam et ad illius laudem 'magnae spes altera Romae' [*Aen.* 12. 168]: quod iste postea ad Ascanium transtulit, sicut commentatores loquuntur.

The idea of Cicero listening to Cytheris (whom he had, of course, met) reciting the *Eclogues* and then complimenting the poet in words which the latter turned to his own use more than a decade later is extremely appealing—but Cicero was dead by the end of 43, and we may doubt whether he ever met Virgil, much less listened to Cytheris reciting the *Eclogues*.

The comment on 6. 11 may be a mere aberration, and the last clause suggests that Servius himself was not entirely happy with it. It is in his chronological errors in the other direction, in which he is both insistent and consistent, that we may find some understanding of his interpretation of the dedication of *Eclogue* 8. At 3. 74, we find the observation, "dicitur enim Virgilius sequi uoluisse Augustum contra Antonium ad Actiaca bella properantem"; at 3. 96, "id est purgabo omnes apud Caesarem, cum de Actiaco proelio reuersus fuerit"; at 4. 13 Actium is included in the list of wars explaining "sceleris uestigia nostri"; at 9. 11 he notes, "beneuolentiam quidem Augusti etiam fama uulgauit, sed eam belli Actiaci necessitas impediuit"; and at 9. 67, "ipse Augustus, qui Actiacis bellis fuerat occupatus." The conclusion to be drawn from these passages is inescapable: Servius believed that the dramatic date of the *Eclogues* was during the war of Actium, in 31 B.C. For a modern scholar, equipped with detailed and precise histories of

6. Van Sickle, "Commentaria in Maronem Commenticia: A Case History," pp. 21–22, has recently revived this interpretation, but it must be pointed out that it is grammatically difficult—it is almost exclusively abstract nouns referring to emotions that take a possessive adjective in place of an objective genitive—and that it is unlikely to be found in an Augustan poet. Leumann–Hofmann–Szantyr, 2:66, sec. 55 b α, describe this use as "umgangssprachlich," and all the examples from Augustan and pre-Augustan literature collected in Kühner–Stegmann, 1:599, sec. 116 A 5, are from Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Livy. The usage may have been acceptable in Servius' day, but not in Virgil's.

7. For the evidence, see Bowersock, "A Date in the Eighth Eclogue," pp. 74–75.

the triumviral period, such an error would be appalling; but from the perspective of five centuries, an error of a few years in explaining the background of a poem must have seemed trivial. And this error helps us to understand his explanation of the opening of *Eclogue* 8: it was not that Servius had, or his sources had, any knowledge of Augustus' Illyrian campaign of 35, but that he understood the reference to Illyria as a clear allusion to the war of Actium. And given that interpretation, it is obvious that Augustus was the only person whom Virgil could have been addressing.

The explanation proposed here of Servius' comments on the opening of *Eclogue* 8 is not without its difficulties; in particular, we might wish that he had made an explicit reference to Actium in his note on *Eclogue* 8. 6. Even without that confirmation, however, it may serve to show that Servius, even when he is wrong, is not necessarily inconsistent or perverse. Modern scholars tend to turn to ancient commentaries for assistance in interpreting specific passages of the texts on which they commented, and that is probably as it should be. But rather than singling out for ridicule those particular notes that are, in the light of modern scholarly techniques, false or misguided, it is far more profitable to try to understand a commentary like that of Servius in its own context and by its own standards. By doing so, we may not learn more about Virgil, but we will at least learn to understand the methods and character of a late antique scholar.<sup>8</sup>

JAMES E. G. ZETZEL  
*Princeton University*

8. I am grateful to the anonymous referees and the Editor of *CP* for their improvements of an earlier draft of this article. I am particularly grateful to Professor Kaster for his assistance in matters Servian, both in his letters and in his published articles, to which I owe much.

### THREE TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN MARTIANUS CAPELLA

The text of the late fifth-century<sup>1</sup> Carthaginian encyclopedist Martianus Capella is riddled with textual problems. Many of these cannot be solved purely by recourse to the manuscripts, but are best elucidated by identifying what this intentionally obfuscatory author is talking about and altering the text accordingly. In this article I will discuss three textual problems from the notoriously difficult second book of the *De nuptiis*.

#### "CHALDAEA MIRACULA"

Tunc Philologia ex aromate praeparato acerraque propria Athanasiae primitus supplicavit matrique eius gratiam multa litatione persolvit, quod nec Vedium cum uxore conspexerit, sicut suadebat Etruria,—nec Eumenidas ut Chaldaea miracula formidavit [codd.: -*darit* Kopp],—nec igne usserit, nec lymphæ subluerit, nec animae simulacrum

1. See D. R. Shanzer, review of *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*: vols. 1 and 2 (New York, 1971 and 1977) by W. H. Stahl and R. Johnson with E. L. Burge, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 104 (1982): 111.