The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Rejoinder

H. W. Garrod

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / January 1917, pp 48 - 49

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800011988, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800011988

How to cite this article:

H. W. Garrod (1917). Rejoinder. The Classical Quarterly, 11, pp 48-49 doi:10.1017/S0009838800011988

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

am concerned only with the consequences of this identification. This fifth eclogue, in common with the rest, is generally thought to have been published about 39 B.C. Mr Garrod, for reasons which he sets forth on p. 217, assigns it a date 'in or after 35 B.C.' If 'after' means six years after, when Virgil is usually supposed to have finished the *georgics*, I have no remark to make on that. But 'in' perplexes me; because, if Varus was dead, 'extinctus crudeli funere', in the year 35 B.C., I do not see how he could produce the *Thyestes* in the year 29.

Yes, perhaps I do see. Mr Garrod has not given a full and consecutive account of Varus' career, but has left something to the intelligence of his readers. By putting together his scattered utterances, dotting his *i*'s and crossing his *t*'s, I think I have constructed what is surely the most eventful history in the annals of literature: the life, death, and resurrection of Alfenus Varus.

Varus was living when Virgil wrote *buc.* VI and IX, and also when he wrote VIII (pp. 212 sq.), which was in 35 B.C. (p. 217). He was living, in old age and unreverend profligacy (his mother, who according to Virgil *buc.* V 23 survived him, must have been a venerable figure), when Horace wrote *epod.* 5 (p. 214), to which no precise date is assigned. But when Virgil wrote *buc.* V, that is 'in or after 35 B.C.' (p. 217), he was dead (pp. 215 sq.). Then there is silence for a while; and then in the August of 29 B.C. is produced the *Thyestes*, which was no posthumous work, for its author was rewarded with a gift of a million sesterces.

The explanation of this seeming inconsistency will be found in a passage already cited by Mr Garrod, *laud. Pis.* 238 sq.

Maecenas tragico quatientem pulpita gestu
erexit Varum.

Mr Garrod did not translate these words, but I now see how he understands them: 'Maecenas erexit Varum' means that Maecenas raised Varus from the dead. And no public man of the time was more competent to do so. Eques Etrusco de sanguine regum, imbued with the traditions of an ancient and religious folk much given to the worship of infernal deities, he possessed the further and exceptional advantage of a house on the Esquiline. There, from the *turris Maecenatiana*, most likely built for the purpose, he commanded a view of the adjacent graveyard and could observe the nocturnal sorceries of Canidia. If the moon blushed and withdrew, as would sometimes happen, he sent out Horace as a spy. The zeal with which the grateful poet discharged his mission has left its literary record in *serm.* I 8, and his inquisitorial supervision of her rites provoked Canidia to describe him as 'Esquilini pontifex uenefici'. 'crematos excitare mortuos' was one of the accomplishments on which this good lady prided herself, and we may believe that she practised it often; Maecenas was an apt though furtive pupil; and never did the black art subserve a better end than when, no doubt at Virgil's request, he resuscitated Alfenus Varus, enriching the literature of Rome with its loftiest tragedy and the late deceased with more than £10,000.

'It is the moderns,' says Mr Garrod on p. 217, 'who rush into print'. Well, perhaps some of them do.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

REJOINDER.

My paper, written in 1911, was something of a *ballon d'essai*, and I acknowledge frankly one or two mistakes. Thus I did not know that Euripides wrote a *Thyestes*; and again one or two of my references were wrong: in excuse I may perhaps plead

that I have not had access to a Latin book for nearly two years. Apart from this I will now make only two observations :

1. I set aside the evidence of Cod. Paris. Lat. 7530 because I was dealing with evidence of saec. i.-iv. Cod. Paris. Lat. 7530 shows that some persons at the end of saec. viii. ascribed the *Thyestes* to L. Varius Rufus. So did persons in saec. iv. In addition, Cod. Paris. Lat. 7530 gives a date for the *Thyestes*. To Mr. Housman this date is certain ; if it is uncertain a large part of his argument comes to nothing. But who can think it certain ? It comes to us from the end of the eighth century. If it came to us from Jerome's Chronicle we could still not think it certain, though we should know whence Jerome derived it. We do not know whence Cod. Paris. Lat. 7530 derived it. The reference to Actium may have no better source than the wish to connect a great literary and a great political event : and the gossip about the playwright's profits (reckoned by Mr. Housman at some £10,000) seems to me in itself suspicious.

2. The main contention of the early part of my paper was that the evidence of the relevant MSS. as between *Vari* and *Varii*, etc., amounts to nothing either way. I do not think Mr. Housman is prepared seriously to contest this proposition.

H. W. GARROD.

NOTE ON HOMER.

- A 40 ἢ εἰ δὲ ποτέ τοι κατὰ πίονα μηρία ἔκη
ταύρων ἢ δ' αἰγῶν
66 αἶ' κέν πως ἀρνῶν κνίσσης αἰγῶν τε τελείων
ἀντιάσας
315 ἔρδον δ' Ἀπόλλωνι τελέεσσας ἑκατόμβας
ταύρων ἢ δ' αἰγῶν

In no other Homeric passages do we find an allusion to sacrifices of goats, nor is it likely that offerings of animals so little prized would have been thought acceptable to the gods. It is clear, therefore, that in the above passages¹ we must read *δαίων* instead of *αἰγῶν*, changing besides *ἀρνῶν* into *ταύρων*. We shall thus obtain the same combination as in O 373 ἢ βοὸς ἢ οἶος κατὰ πίονα μηρία καίων. Compare also B 550, α 25, λ 131. Sacrifices of bulls or thighs of bulls are further mentioned in Θ 240, Λ 728, 773, Υ 403, Φ 131, X 170, γ 6, ν 181.

The word *ταύρου* must also have disappeared in Σ 481 πέντε δ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ ἔσαν σάκεος πτύχες. The pronoun in this passage seems meaningless, and I suggest that originally the verse commenced with πέντε δὲ ταύρου. Skins of bulls were the choicest material of which shield-plates were made, and it was with such that Ajax's famous σάκος was covered. See H 223.

¹ As also in Ω 34, which is a parallel passage to O 373.

NOTE ON SOPHOCLES.

THE mention of *ταῦρος* brings me to *Trach.* 11, where the word *ἐναργής* in the phrase *φουτῶν ἐναργής ταῦρος* does not yield any satisfactory sense. The correct reading, I believe, is *ἐνόρχης*. The epithet was meant to produce an impression of prowess and strength. It is so used in Arist. *Lys.* 661 *ἐνόρχης ἀνὴρ*.

ALEX. PALLIS.