in progress on a *tabula terebinthina* when he enters the *triclinium* (*Sat.* 33.1–3).[7] Trimalchio apparently gambles with his own slaves (*Sat.* 70.13).

Although the parallel between Petronius *Satyricon* 76.9 and Suetonius *Divus Augustus* 71.3 has gone unnoticed to the best of my knowledge, some translators of Petronius have seen Trimalchio's meaning: Haseltine translates *manum de tabula* as "I threw up the game"; Arrowsmith translates the phrase as "I picked up my winnings and pulled out." Perhaps the best translation would be "I cashed in my chips."[8]

D. THOMAS BENEDIKTSON
The University of Tulsa

7. Catalano, "Petronio e il dialetto," 92.

8. M. Haseltine, *Petronius* (1913; rev. ed., Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1930), 153. William Arrowsmith, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius* (Ann Arbor, 1959), 77. Cf. A. E. Ernout, *Pétrone, le "satyricon"*[4] (Paris, 1958), 78. Lewis-Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, s.v. 1. *manus* II.E, *TLL* 8.3 (1971): 358.70–72 s.v. *manus* I.B.4.B and *OLD* s.v. *manus* 26 (1976 fascicle) cite only *Aug.* 71.3 for "stakes."

MACROBIUS, CORNUTUS, AND THE CUTTING OF DIDO'S LOCK

Macrobius' *Saturnalia* offers many valuable observations on Virgil. The one that has perhaps exerted the strongest influence on later scholarship is his discussion of the cutting of Dido's lock, which appears in Book 5 of his dialogue (5.19.1–5). Here Macrobius rejects the view of Lucius Annaeus Cornutus, who claimed that Virgil invented the notion that Dido was unable to die because Proserpina had not yet cut a lock of her hair. Macrobius (through the mouth of the philosopher, Eustathius) counters that Cornutus is mistaken, and he argues that the cutting of Dido's lock is in fact an imitation of Euripides' *Alcestis*, where, in accordance with common belief, the heroine goes to her death only after Thanatos cuts a lock of her hair (*Eur. Alc.* 73–76).

Modern scholars have generally regarded Macrobius' argument as proving that Virgil's portrayal of Proserpina is conventional. But before accepting Macrobius' remarks at face value it is necessary to recognize that Macrobius is here not really speaking as an "objective" scholar who is interested only in correcting a factual error that he has found in Cornutus. He is instead engaging in what is in essence an ideological dispute over the proper interpretation of Virgil's poetry and over the role that Virgil's poetry plays in his society. In this paper I will attempt to analyze the ways in which Macrobius' ideology shapes his discussion of the cutting of Dido's lock. By looking at a few representative examples, I hope to show that the readings that Macrobius' characters present in the course of their dialogue are typically constructed with the aim of confirming Macrobius' own view of how Virgil as the ideal poet must have composed.

At the heart of Macrobius' disagreement with Cornutus is a differing evaluation of poetic invention. Cornutus, in line with critical opinion reaching back to Aristotle, holds that poets have the right to invent and to present fictions in their works. Macrobius' conception of Virgil, however, allows no place for such license. He consistently regards invention as abhorrent, and is unwilling to admit its presence in Virgil's text.

The reasons for this attitude lie in the values that Macrobius seeks to promote in the *Saturnalia.* As Robert Kaster has shown, Macrobius' reading of Virgil is informed by a vision of what Macrobius, as an educator, holds to be an ideal society.[1] Key to Macrobius' vision are the virtues of *verecundia* and *diligentia,* which express themselves in the intellectual sphere as a sense of humility toward the past and as a scholarly diligence that is devoted to preserving one's cultural inheritance.

These virtues are displayed by the participants of Macrobius' dialogue, both in their deportment toward one another and in their academic interests, and find their exemplary expression in the character of Servius, whom Macrobius presents as a young man, "iuxta doctrina mirabilis et amabilis verecundia" (*Sat.* 1.2.15). These very same terms are used to describe Virgil himself[2] and reflect the profound way in which Macrobius has projected his own scholarly interests and ideals onto the poet, who is the subject of his characters' most earnest discussions. Just as Servius is portrayed as revering Virgil, so too Virgil himself is imagined as revering his predecessors and as exercising a like-minded scholarly diligence that fills his work with a profound learning (*doctrina*), thus preserving the past and ensuring the continuity of the cultural tradition. The job of a poet, in Macrobius' view, is to convey culture, not to invent it. Any assertion of a poet's creativity in effect breaks the link between the past and the present that is so important to Macrobius by introducing the poet's own idiosyncratic inventions in place of the traditional material that should rightly be the common cultural possession of all members of society. The transmission of this cultural inheritance is what gives Virgil's poetry its chief value, and according to Macrobius, the prime task of explicators is to show this process at work.[3]

Macrobius' approach, however, almost ensures that he will encounter difficulties in Virgil's text and that he will involve himself in defenses of Virgil that are far more strained and convoluted than those of Virgil's other apologists. Servius, for example, repeatedly defends Virgil against charges of barbarisms and solecisms in language. But his arguments typically rest on the concept of *figurae,* which historicize Virgil's text and thus remove any conflict between his usage and contemporary speech. The values that are championed by Servius as a teacher still hold, but are recognized as not applicable to Virgil.[4]

Macrobius, however, cannot avail himself of this historicizing argument. Because he projects his own values onto Virgil, any disparity between Macrobius' view of how Virgil must have written and how he actually did write must be resolved by other means. Macrobius accomplishes this by an a priori reconstruction of Virgil's poetry. He argues that those passages that appear to have no models are in fact based on sources that are obscure only to those who do not share Virgil's high level of eru-

1. "Macrobius and Servius: *Verecundia* and the Grammarian's Function," *HSCP* 84 (1980): 219–62.

2. "item poeta doctrina ac verecundia nobilis" (*Sat.* 1.16.44); see Kaster, "*Verecundia,*" 231.

3. Ibid., 234–39.

4. See Robert Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988), 172–76. Here, as in "*Verecundia*" 255–58, Kaster stresses the profound differences in this respect between Macrobius and Servius. When Servius defends Virgil's *historia,* as he does on occasion, his methods are basically ad hoc, appealing variously to historical content (e.g., *Aen.* 1.71), narrative consistency (e.g., *Aen.* 5.493), etymology (e.g., *Aen.* 5.410), and imitation (e.g., *Aen.* 5.517). Servius, however, encounters some passages he cannot explain or defend (e.g., *Aen.* 5.626), which he labels *insolubiles,* observing that if Virgil had lived he would have corrected them. For these and other examples, see Henry Nettleship, "On Some of the Early Criticisms of Virgil's Poetry," in Conington and Nettleship, eds., *The Works of Virgil*[4] (London, 1884; reprint ed., 1963), xl–xlii.

dition. In short, Macrobius takes the rather extreme position of rejecting invention as a critical principle and of attempting to replace it with an idealized picture of Virgil's *doctrina.*[5]

There are few modern scholars who would feel at all uneasy with the image of Virgil as a *doctus poeta,* but Macrobius' formulation of this idea often leads him to readings that make inappropriate use of previous scholarship and that have little or no basis in Virgil's text. A telling example of this is Macrobius' discussion of *Aeneid* 7.689–90, where Virgil describes the Hernici advancing into battle with one foot bare, "vestigia nuda sinistri / instituere pedis, crudus tegit altera pero" (*Sat.* 5.18.13–21). Macrobius has Eustathius (who is the speaker throughout this section) observe that to his knowledge no Italian people ever had the custom of fighting with one foot shod and the other bare. Eustathius, however, notes that Julius Hyginus, in his work on the foundations of Italian cities, reported that the Hernici were descended from Aetolian colonists, and further that Euripides, in his play, the *Meleager,* describes the Aetolians as advancing to the boar hunt with their left foot bare, τὸ λαιὸν ἴχνος ἀνάρβυλοι ποδός (Eur. frag. 530 Nauck). Thus, Eustathius observes, Virgil's description of the Hernici is not an invention, but is modeled on Euripides, a point that he drives home by emphasizing the verbal parallels.[6]

This interpretation, however, presents Eustathius with a problem, for he feels compelled to note that Aristotle, in Book 2 of his dialogue, *De Poetis* (frag. 74 Rose[3]), had caught Euripides in an error; the custom of the Aetolians was not to bare their left foot, but rather their right. The obvious implication is that Virgil was as ignorant of the truth as Euripides. This, however, is something that Eustathius cannot accept. He asserts that a poet so scrupulously learned (*tam anxie doctus*) must have known Aristotle's criticism (*Sat.* 5.18.21):

> nam ut haec ignoraverit vir tam anxie doctus minime crediderim. iure autem praetulit Euripiden: est enim ingens ei cum Graecarum tragoediarum scriptoribus familiaritas.

Eustathius' explanation of how Virgil could know the "truth" and yet fail to follow it is based on the argument that Virgil had a "great familiarity" with the tragedians, and that therefore, as a poet, he was justified in preferring the authority of Euripides over that of Aristotle (*iure autem praetulit Euripiden*). There is, of course, no evidence that Virgil was ever aware of Aristotle's *De Poetis* or that he was compelled to make the choice that Eustathius has outlined for him. This interpretation is entirely a product of the values that Macrobius seeks to express through Eustathius' discussion of Virgil's *doctrina,* values that in this case are in open conflict with the "facts" of Virgil's text. Macrobius' attempt to resolve this conflict produces a rather convoluted reading in which Virgil's description of the Hernici is allowed to be neither an invention nor simply the imitation of a model, but is instead asserted to be a tacit dismissal of Aristotle's criticism of Euripides.

5. Eustathius' remarks introducing this section stake out the territory: "ad illa venio quae de Graecarum litterarum penetralibus eruta nullis cognita sunt, nisi qui Graecam doctrinam diligenter hauserunt. fuit enim hic poeta ut scrupulose et anxie, ita dissimulanter et quasi clanculo doctus, ut multa transtulerit quae unde translata sint difficile sit cognitu" (*Sat.* 5.18.1).

6. "animadvertitis diligentissime verba Euripidis a Marone servata? ait enim ille: τὸ λαιὸν ἴχνος ἀνάρβυλοι ποδός et eundem pedem nudum Vergilius quoque dixit: vestigia nuda sinistri/ instituere pedis" (*Sat.* 5.18.18).

A rather more subtle example of the way Macrobius can impose his own values on Virgil's text is offered by his discussion of the story of Pan and Luna that appears at *Georgics* 3.391–93. According to Eustathius, Valerius Probus claimed to know of no source for this story (*Sat.* 5.22.9–10):

> Valerius Probus, vir perfectissimus, notat nescire se hanc historiam sive fabulam quo referat auctore. quod tantum virum fugisse miror. nam Nicander huius auctor historiae, poeta quem Didymus, grammaticorum omnium quique sint quique fuerint instructissimus, fabulosum vocat. quod sciens Vergilius adiecit, *si credere dignum est;* adeo se fabuloso usum fatetur auctore.

Eustathius here marvels at an inexplicable lapse on the part of a great scholar (*quod tantum virum fugisse miror*), and corrects it by noting that Virgil has taken this story from Nicander. The point of Probus' observation, however, might not be as simple as Eustathius assumes, for from his own remarks it is not clear that Probus actually charged Virgil with invention. It is quite possible that Probus knew Virgil was following a source and that he was concerned instead with the question of attribution (*quo referat auctore*) and with what appears to have been a related question of whether the story of Pan and Luna was a *fabula* or *historia.* Macrobius, however, is not open to these possibilities. His immediate concern is to refute the charge of invention that he sees implied by Probus' remark, and he accordingly has Eustathius cite Didymus' statement that Nicander was the author of *fabulae* ("fabulosus") in order to argue that the phrase *si credere dignum est* proves not only that Virgil did not invent, but also that Nicander was Virgil's source.

There is, perhaps, a certain appeal in Macrobius' interpretation of *si credere dignum est* and the clever way he makes it a gloss on Nicander; this is just the sort of thing Virgil might do, and it is lent support by the Servian commentary, which confirms that Nicander was in fact Virgil's source.[7] But it should be pointed out that Macrobius' detection of an allusion to Nicander is not supported by the sources he cites. As in the case of the Hernici, the sole basis for Macrobius' reading lies in his high estimation of Virgil's *doctrina.* Virgil knew what Didymus knew (*quod sciens*), not because he had read Didymus' work on Nicander, which is unlikely,[8] but rather because Virgil was Didymus' equal in learning. This parity between Virgil and the greatest scholar of his or any generation ("grammaticorum omnium quique sint quique fuerint instructissimus") enables Macrobius to replace the picture of the poet as inventor of fictions with that of the poet as ideal *grammaticus,* who here is envisioned engaging in a sort of scholarly conversation with Didymus. Macrobius, however, fails to perform what should be the simple job of citing Nicander to support his point, nor does he present any other evidence that Nicander was in fact Virgil's source, even though this must have been readily available to him in the commentators.[9] The material that Macrobius does cite from his sources might have been rele-

7. Cf. T. C. W. Stinton, "*Si credere dignum est:* Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others," *PCPS* 22 (1976): 60–89, esp., 66, who emphasizes the variety of interpretations that are possible for *G.*3.391, and who shows that such statements are generally made for emphasis and are not to be taken as literal expressions of disbelief.

8. There is apparently no reference to Didymus in Latin literature before Seneca (*Ep.* 88.32), and it is doubtful that his work, as familiar as it was to later grammarians, was known to Virgil.

9. Servius Danielis (ad *G.*3.391) had the information: "fabula sic est: Pan cum Lunae amore flagraret, ut illi formosus videretur, niveis velleribus se circumdedit atque ita eam ad rem veneriam illexit. huius opinionis auctor est Nicander." Servius, however, alternatively suggests that Virgil has changed the traditional

vant to Probus' original remark on the distinction between *fabula* and *historia,* but it is tangential at best to the question of invention. In short, Macrobius has attempted to refute a charge of invention (one that perhaps had never been made) by in effect misapplying the information he has found in his sources.

A very similar process is at work in Macrobius' discussion of Dido's lock. Macrobius has Eustathius begin by quoting Virgil's presentation of Proserpina at *Aeneid* 4.698–99:

> In libro quarto in describenda Elissae morte ait quod ei crinis abscisus esset his versibus:
>
> nondum illi flavum Proserpina vertice crinem
> abstulerat Stygioque caput damnaverat Orco.
>
> deinde Iris a Iunone missa abscidit ei crinem et ad Orcum refert. [*Sat.* 5.19.1]

Eustathius then quotes Cornutus, who in his commentary on these lines observed that the notion that a lock of hair had to be cut before death was a Virgilian invention, like the golden bough (*Sat.* 5.19.2):

> hanc Vergilius non de nihilo fabulam fingit, sicut vir alias doctissimus Cornutus existimat, qui adnotationem eius modi adposuit his versibus: *unde haec historia ut crinis auferendus sit morientibus ignoratur: sed adsuevit poetico more aliqua fingere ut de aureo ramo.*

Cornutus' remarks present a fundamental challenge to Macrobius' entire interpretative enterprise, for not only does Cornutus confront Macrobius with what is explicitly claimed to be an invention, he also makes the more far-reaching claim that invention is part of the poet's art (*poetico more*). Macrobius, however, never addresses this challenge directly. Instead he redefines the issue as one of ignorance versus learning, and he attempts to refute Cornutus by adducing a source.

Macrobius has Eustathius deny that Virgil invented the necessity of the cutting of the lock "out of nothing" and, as we have seen him do in the case of Probus, he calls Cornutus' competence into question, expressing amazement that a scholar of Cornutus' stature was ignorant of Virgil's source, especially one as well-known as Euripides' *Alcestis* (*Sat.* 5.19.2–5):

> haec Cornutus. sed me pudet quod tantus vir, Graecarum etiam doctissimus litterarum, ignoravit Euripidis nobilissimam fabulam Alcestim. in hac enim fabula in scaenam Orcus inducitur gladium gestans quo crinem abscidat Alcestidis et sic loquitur:
>
> ἡ δ' οὖν γυνὴ κάτεισιν εἰς Ἅιδου δόμους.
> στείχω δ' ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὡς κατάρξωμαι ξίφει·
> ἱερὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῷ κατὰ χθονὸς θεῷ
> ὅτῳ τόδ' ἔγχος κρατὸς ἁγνίσῃ τρίχα.
>
> proditum est ut opinor quem secutus Vergilius fabulam abscidendi crinis induxerit, ἁγνίσαι autem Graeci dicunt dis consecrare unde poeta vester ait ex Iridis persona,
>
> hunc ego Diti
> sacrum iussa fero teque isto corpore solvo.

---

version of the Luna story ("mutat fabulam") by making her lover Pan instead of Endymion, that is to say, that Virgil has indulged in invention!

In Euripides' play, Thanatos consecrates Alcestis to the gods of the underworld by cutting her lock and, as Eustathius points out, this is exactly what Iris does when she cuts Dido's lock at *Aeneid* 4.702–3.

The cutting of Dido's lock would thus seem to be given an unimpeachable authority, and on the basis of what Macrobius says here it has become generally accepted that the cutting of Dido's lock is conventional, and that the necessity of Proserpina's cutting a lock at death reflects a widely-held belief.[10] Given the nature of such a claim, one would expect to find abundant references to this belief scattered throughout ancient literature. However, this is simply not the case. There is, in fact, no evidence whatsoever for such a belief concerning Proserpina—or indeed any god—before the *Aeneid.* All other examples are post-Virgilian.[11] The sole exception would seem to be Horace *Carmen* 1.28.19–20 "Mixta senum ac iuvenum densentur funera;/ nullum saeva caput Proserpina fugit." However were it not for the influence of the *Aeneid* itself—as reinforced by Macrobius[12]—it is hard to see how these lines would ever be understood to mean that Proserpina cut a lock of hair at death. There is nothing implied by *caput* here; it means simply "a person's life" (just as it does at *Aen.* 4.699), and Horace is quite simply saying that death spares no one.[13]

Concerns such as these, however, never arose to shake Macrobius' confidence, for he was not interested in considering issues that lay beyond his immediate purpose of defending Virgil against the charge of invention made by Cornutus. As we have seen in the examples reviewed above, Macrobius sets out with the premise that Virgil did not fabricate his material, and drawing on the arsenal of commentary that was available to him, he applies his material in a way that confirms his values. In this case, however, the ideals that give coherence to Macrobius' vision of Virgil effectively blind him to what Cornutus actually said, and lead him to mount a defense that is based on a distorted reading of the *Alcestis.*

Cornutus was the mentor of the poets Lucan and Persius, a friend of Silius Italicus, and the author of numerous scholarly works in addition to his Virgil commentary, among them a *Theologica Graeca.*[14] As Eustathius remarks, it is indeed difficult to believe that such a man was ignorant of the *Alcestis.* But there is no evidence that he was. The reason Cornutus failed to mention the *Alcestis* was due to the simple fact

10. E.g., R. G. Austin: "[W]hen men die at the appointed time, Proserpina herself cuts off a lock of hair as like a first-fruit . . . but she could not do this for the untimely dead" (*P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* [Oxford, 1966] on *Aen.* 4.698). See also Conington and Nettleship on *Aen.* 4.698 and 699; T. E. Page, *The Aeneid of Virgil,* vol. 1 (London, 1962), on *Aen.* 4.698, and R. D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil Books 1–6* (New York, 1972) on *Aen.* 4.698–99. This belief concerning Proserpina is also duly cited in works on ancient mythology and religion, e.g., W. H. Roscher, "Kora u. Demeter (Unterweltgöttin)," *Ausführliches Lexicon,* vol. 2 (1890–97): 1336, and Cyril Bailey, *Religion in Virgil,* (Oxford, 1935), 246.

11. E.g., Mart. 3.43.3–4 "scit te Proserpina canum: / personam capiti detrahet illa tuo"; Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.147 "iam complexa manu crinem tenet infera Iuno"; *Gesta Apollonii* 257 (= *Poet. Aevi Carol.* 2.492) "signavit rapto mortem Proserpina cirro." See Arthur Stanley Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Harvard, 1935), 533 (on *Aen.* 4.698 *vertice crinem*), who offers these and other parallels, including Demades 12 ἀπείκερε γὰρ τὴν ἀκμὴν τῆς Σπάρτης ὁ Θηβαῖος; Demades, however, is speaking in metaphorical terms about the destruction of Sparta, rather than making reference to any belief about the dying (see *LSJ,* s.v. ἀποκείρω, III).

12. His influence is pronounced; see, e.g., Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace "Odes" Book I* (Oxford, 1970), 330–31, ad loc.

13. "Proserpina tritt hier . . . einfach an Stelle des Styx oder Orcus. . . . An die ganz singuläre Tradition bei Virgil aen. IV 698, wonach Proserpina die Sterbenden durch Abschneiden einer Locke dem Tode weiht, is hier nicht zu denken," Kiessling-Heinze, *Oden und Epoden*[14] (Berlin, 1984), 144–45, ad loc.

14. Ed. Karl Lang (Leipzig, 1881). The only comprehensive study of Cornutus remains that of Rudolphus Reppe, *De L. Annaeo Cornuto* (Lipsiae, 1906). Also useful is the article by D. Nock, "Kornutos," *RE,* supp. 5 (1931): 995–1005.

that it was irrelevant to the point he was trying to make, for Cornutus was not commenting on Iris' actual cutting of the lock in lines 702–3, where a parallel with *Alcestis* might reasonably be argued, but rather on lines 698–99, as Macrobius himself unwittingly admits ("adnotationem . . . adposuit his versibus"), where Virgil implies that Proserpina normally cut a lock of hair from those who died ("haec historia ut crinis auferendus sit morientibus"), an idea that Cornutus correctly noted was a Virgilian invention.[15]

Macrobius, however, ignores the significance of this line reference. As a result, he makes the unwarranted assumption that Cornutus must have been ignorant of the *Alcestis,* and consequently he attempts to use Euripides' play as a basis for defending Virgil's presentation of Proserpina. Macrobius' argument, however, is fundamentally flawed, for the *Alcestis* might provide a parallel for Iris' cutting of Dido's lock, but it does no more than that. The play offers no evidence that the necessity of cutting a lock at death reflects traditional belief. If anything, it proves the opposite. The whole point of Alcestis' story is that her death is not an ordinary one, for it is not her time to die, nor is it really her own death that she is dying. It is these highly unusual circumstances that require Thanatos to cut a lock of her hair (Eur. *Alc.* 74–76):

στείχω δ' ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὡς κατάρξωμαι ξίφει·
ἱερὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῷ κατὰ χθονὸς θεῷ
ὅτῳ τόδ' ἔγχος κρατὸς ἁγνίσῃ τρίχα

This act renders Alcestis' unnatural death acceptable by treating it on analogy with a sacrifice in which a cutting of the victim's hair is thrown in the fire.[16] Individuals might cut their hair in mourning, as the chorus remark at *Alcestis* lines 102–4—and as Electra, for example, does at the tomb of Agamemnon (Soph. *El.* 52–53, 448–51, 900–901), or they may cut their hair as part of a special vow—Achilles' aborted dedication of his hair to the river Spercheios would be an example of this (Hom. *Il.* 23.140–53), but the idea that a god cut a person's hair in order for that person to die is unique to the Alcestis story.[17]

Macrobius' misreading of Cornutus and his subsequent misapplication of the *Alcestis* parallel are all the more striking when his discussion is compared with that of Servius. In his note on *Aeneid* 3.46 Servius lists three passages in which Virgil's liberty in invention has exposed him to criticism: the transformation of Aeneas' ships into nymphs, the golden bough, and the cutting of Dido's lock:

> vituperabile enim est, poetam aliquid fingere, quod penitus a veritate discedat. denique obicitur Vergilio de mutatione navium in nymphas; et quod dicit per aureum ramum ad inferos esse descensum; tertium, cur Iris Didoni comam secuerit.

15. Disquiet with the implications of lines 698–99 pointed out by Cornutus might also be reflected in the variant reading, *necdum,* for *nondum* at line 698, which is found in Codex *P* and which perhaps represents another attempt to rescue Virgil from the charge of invention, this time though emendation. Reading *necdum* (with a comma after line 699) would make Proserpina's failure to cut Dido's lock parallel with the fact that her death was voluntary and before her time. The causal clause beginning at line 696 would then explain why Iris cut the lock, not why Proserpina failed to act, and hence there would be no implication, as there is with *nondum,* that Proserpina normally cut a lock at the time of death. (I owe the above observation to one of the anonymous readers for *CP.*)

16. E.g., Hom. *Il.* 3.273, 19.254; Verg. *Aen.* 6.245–46, and see Pease, *Aeneidos Liber Quartus,* 533 (on *Aen.* 4.698 *vertice crinem*).

17. As A. M. Dale remarks, *Euripides "Alcestis"* (Oxford, 1954), 57–58, "Death's explanation 75–76 is circumstantial enough to suggest that the idea was not immediately familiar to his hearers."

Servius notes, however, that the case of Dido's lock is "purged" of criticism by the parallel of Euripides' *Alcestis:*

> sed hoc purgatur Euripidis exemplo, qui de Alcesti hoc dixit, cum subiret fatum mariti.

This parallel with the *Alcestis* is duly invoked again by Servius Danielis at *Aeneid* 4.703 when he comes to the cutting of the lock:

> Euripidis Alcestin Diti sacratum habuisse crinem dicit, quod poeta transtulit ad Didonem.

Servius, like Macrobius, cites the *Alcestis* in the context of defending Virgil against the charge of invention. When viewed on this level it might appear that Servius is echoing Macrobius and that both are drawing upon material derived from a common source.[18] There are, however, important differences.

First, Servius, unlike Macrobius, makes no attempt to deny that the cutting of Dido's lock is an invention. His remarks at *Aeneid* 3.46 show that, like Cornutus, he accepts that poets will introduce inventions, and he is critical only of those cases that depart too far from the "truth" of traditional accounts (*quod penitus a veritate discedat*). This is essentially the Aristotelian view, common among scholiasts, which holds that poets have freedom to invent and that part of the critic's task is to judge the success or failure of these innovations.[19] Servius' criticism in this case is thus based on a version of the well-established standard of probability,[20] and he accordingly accepts the invention of the cutting of Dido's lock as defensible on the grounds that it has a parallel in the case of Alcestis.

Second, both notes in the Servian commentary are directed to the action of Iris at lines 702–3, and the point behind citing the *Alcestis* is the limited one of noting

18. Reppe, *De Cornuto,* 44, argues that Servius' note on *Aen.* 3.46 is based on Cornutus, who, as Macrobius testifies, also mentioned the golden bough, and who therefore may have cited all three of these passages as examples of inventions. Cornutus' comments probably came to Servius through the commentary of Aelius Donatus, and it is usually assumed that Donatus is also the source for most of Macrobius' comments on Virgil (see Robert Lloyd, "Republican Authors in Servius and the Scholia Danielis," *HSCP* 65 [1966]: 292, with bibliography). It should be noted, however, that the situation is complex and rendered problematical by the considerable distance between Servius and Macrobius. First, if Servius' note does reflect an original comment by Cornutus, it is necessary to assume that Cornutus' remark suffered considerable distortion in the process of abridgment from the Donatan commentary, for, as shown above, Cornutus was not at all critical of Virgil's inventions (although Servius' remark at *Aen.* 3.46 has wrongly been interpreted as implying that he was, e.g., by Reppe, *De Cornuto,* 44), nor does it seem that Cornutus made any reference to Iris, who figures prominently in both notes preserved in the Servian commentary. Second, it would also be reasonable to assume that Cornutus discussed the Polydorus passage that elicits Servius' comments at *Aen.* 3.46, and yet this trio (or quartet) of passages has left no discernible trace in Macrobius, who says nothing about the transformation of Aeneas' ships, and who provides no excuse for (or objection to) the golden bough when he refers to it at *Sat.* 5.14.8. The apparent independence of Servius and Macrobius in this regard is supported by Ribbeck's argument, *Prolegomena Critica ad P. Vergili Maronis Opera Maiora* (Leipzig, 1886), 112–13, that Macrobius' discussion of Virgil's borrowings in *Sat.* 5–6 is drawn from Perellius Faustus and Asconius, and by Thilo, *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii,* vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1881), xxvi–xxvii, who suggested that *Sat.* 5.18–22, along with 3.1–12, is taken from the work of an unnamed grammarian. (I owe these last two references to one of the anonymous readers for *CP.*)

19. For Aristotle's influence, see D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1991), 5–56. Ancient discussions of invention typically assume three narrative levels distinguished by their "truth value": ἱστορία (= *historia*), or events that actually happened; πλάσμα (= *argumentum*), or fictitious events of the sort that might have happened (such as are presented in comedy), and μῦθος (= *fabula*), things that by common consent are held never to have occurred. See also Gianni Puglisi, "πλάσμα: num ψεῦδος an ἀπάτη?" *Philologus* 129 (1985): 39–53.

20. See Richard Heinze, *Virgils Epische Technik*[3] (Leipzig, 1915), p. 246, n. 1, and C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: The "Ars Poetica"* (Cambridge, 1971), 355.

Virgil's *imitatio.* No general observation is made concerning the necessity of cutting a person's hair at death. The parallel is strictly between Thanatos and Iris (again, as Macrobius himself unwittingly observes),[21] not between Thanatos and Proserpina. The Servian commentary, remarkably, has nothing whatsoever to say about the supposedly widespread belief concerning Proserpina. Servius Danielis, in fact, is at a loss to explain the necessity of cutting Dido's lock, and speculates that perhaps she had prayed for an easy death, or had pledged a cutting of her hair.[22]

Macrobius relies on the same material that was available to Servius, but he tries to use it to explain what Servius plainly cannot explain, namely the problem of the action—or, rather, inaction—of Proserpina, and in the process he creates the mistaken impression that Cornutus' observation is at odds with the evidence of Euripides' play. This same tendency to misapply sources was apparent in Macrobius' discussions of the Hernici and of Pan and Luna. In the case of Dido's lock, we can see even more clearly the profound way in which Macrobius' convictions influence what he sees in the text and how he applies his sources. Macrobius finds it quite literally impossible to believe that what Cornutus says is true, and so, perhaps without even realizing that he is doing so, he misreads Cornutus and concludes that this earlier commentator, operating with a different conception of Virgil's poetry, was simply mistaken. Macrobius no doubt felt confirmed in this when he turned to the commentators and found there a reference to the *Alcestis,* which he then misapplied without regard to its context in Euripides' play or to the real point behind the original citation.

Macrobius' reading, surprisingly, has stood virtually unchallenged.[23] The reasons for this are no doubt various. In part it may result from a feeling that Macrobius has a special authority, since he was closer to many sources that are now lost to us. In part it may simply be due to the power of Macrobius' rhetoric and to the effective way in which he makes it appear that Cornutus was ignorant. In part, too, it may result from the way Macrobius' vision of Virgil's erudition dovetails with modern views of Virgil as a *doctus poeta* in the Callimachean tradition. But as I hope to have shown, Macrobius brought his own values to Virgil, even as modern scholars no doubt have brought theirs to Macrobius. We should not assume, however, that Macrobius' values are necessarily the same as our own, nor confuse his idealization of scholarship with scholarly objectivity. We should instead be prepared to find Macrobius' own particular beliefs about Virgil's poetry influencing his reading at every turn. A failure to approach Macrobius with this historical sense of his "otherness" has resulted in an over-hasty and uncritical dismissal of Cornutus' remarks,[24] and

21. "ἁγνίσαι autem Graeci dicunt dis consecrare unde poeta vester ait ex Iridis persona" (*Sat.* 19.5).

22. "potest accipi 'Stygioque caput damnaverat Orco,' ut Didonem voto liberaret, quod semper omnes optant, ut sine cruciatu moriatur: nam subiunxit 'hunc ego Diti sacrum' et reliqua, id est libero. vel illud ab Orco nondum liberaverat, cum illa devotum crinem adhuc retinens inter reos esset" (Servius Danielis, *Aen.* 4.699).

23. One of the few exceptions is Christian Gottlob Heyne, who in his commentary on *Aen.* 4.698–99, vol. 1 (London, 1821), 531, dismissed Macrobius and stressed instead the parallels between the cutting of Dido's lock and acts of sacrifice. Kiessling-Heinze noted the lack of parallels, while Pease, *Aeneides Liber Quartus,* 534–35 (on *Aen.* 4.698) in his comprehensive survey treats the issue as a *non liquet.*

24. Cornutus' abilities as a Virgilian commentator have generally been held in low regard, as, for example, by Nettleship (who cites Macrobius with approval) in his essay, "The Ancient Commentators on Virgil," in Conington and Nettleship, *Works of Virgil*[4], lvii. However, Nock, "Kornutos," col. 1003, defends Cornutus and his observation on Proserpina by pointing out that it is perfectly in keeping with the Stoic view, also expressed in the *Theologica Graeca,* that poets are the creators of myth. A more balanced, although

has prevented the death of Dido from receiving the serious attention that it deserves. Once we realize that the cutting of Dido's lock was in fact not conventional, entirely new interpretations present themselves, interpretations that have effectively been blocked from consideration due to the unwarranted influence of Macrobius' remarks. We are invited to ask anew why Virgil makes an issue of the cutting of her lock and what significance this has for his portrayal of Dido. The answers to these and other questions, along with the particular meaning that Proserpina herself has for Dido's death, will not necessarily be found by diligently searching for the sources that lie behind Virgil's text, as Macrobius believed. Other ways of reading that depart from the sort of scholarship that Macrobius idealized are needed in order to avoid false interpretations and to approach more closely to a "true" understanding of Virgil's text. From this perspective it is perhaps a rather cruel irony that Macrobius, who so opposed invention and falsehood and who so valued tradition and learning, should, by the very exercise of these values, himself become the inventor of a fiction, and the author of one of the most persistent myths of Virgilian scholarship.[25]

JOHN RAUK
Michigan State University

---

brief, discussion of Cornutus as a textual critic is given by James E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity,* Monographs in Classical Studies (Salem, 1984), 38–41.

25. I would like to thank the Editor and readers of *CP* for their suggestions and for saving me from some errors. Thanks are also due to my colleagues at Michigan State University for their support and suggestions when a version of this paper was read as part of the College of Arts and Letters Medieval Consortium, and to my research assistant, Jennifer Stolen, for her help when this paper was in its final stages.

APOLLO'S OTHER GENRE: PROCLUS ON NOMOΣ AND HIS SOURCE

Apollo had a general interest in music and song, but his family had a special connection with one genre, the paean.[1] This link is attested in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo,* where the Cretan priests whom Apollo presses into service sing the paean (516ff.), and it remains an important genre at Delphi. And it is explicitly stated in one of our earliest eidographic sources, the proem of one of Pindar's *Threnoi* (frag. 128c), where paeans are said to belong to the "children of Leto." Apollo's link with the paean is reflected in the fact that the name "Paian" usually means Apollo, since an amplified address to "Paian" is essentially what a paean is. The wide range of functions with which paeans might be performed, ranging from apotropaic prayer to the celebration of victory, simply reflects the wide range of Apollo's interests and capacities.

The paean's close connection with Apollo can be the point of contrast with other genres linked with their own deities. Thus, at Delphi, sources contrast the paeans performed in honor of Apollo during the spring, summer, and autumn while he was believed to be present there, and the dithyramb performed in honour of Dionysus during the three winter months while Apollo was believed to be absent. This contrast

1. On the paean: Arthur Fairbanks, *A Study of the Greek Paean* (Cornell, 1900); Ludwig Deubner, "Paian," *NJKA* 1919 (22), 385–406 (= *Kleine Schriften zur klassischen Altertumskunde* [Königstein/Ts., 1982], 204–25); Albrecht von Blumenthal, "Paian," *RE* 36, 2340ff.; Lutz Käppel, *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung,* Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Band 37 (Berlin, 1992).