

vigorous people, an already engaged citizen for whom political non-involvement is not an option, however challenging the situation. In the *ARD*, finally, the question of whether the wise man should enter politics has been reformulated into the more general problem of the intellectual's relationship to the real (read: less than ideal) circumstances in which he finds himself. To the horror of Augustine, Varro has no interest in founding the City of God, nor does he wash his hands of his "old people" the way the Plato of the fifth letter does. All the while acknowledging that there is such a thing as a "formula of nature," Varro without any apparent regret settles for Roman *consuetudo*.⁹

New York

Katharina Volk

CIRIS 524: AN EMENDATION

After Scylla has been transformed into the *ciris*, Jupiter takes pity on her father Nisus and gives him life back in the form of a sea eagle (520–528):

*nec tamen hoc ipsum poena sine: namque deum rex,
omnia qui imperio terrarum milia uersat,
commotus talem ad superos uolitare puellam,
cum pater extinctus caeca sub nocte lateret,
illi pro pietate sua (nam saepe fuidemusf
sanguine taurorum supplex resperserat aras,
saepe deum largo decorarat munere sedes)
reddidit optatam mutato corpore uitam
fecitque in terris haliaetos ales ut esset.*

There is no doubt that line 524 requires emendation, nor that the corruption can be located in *uidemus*: a verb in present, first person, is obviously out of place here. Lyne conveniently sums up earlier attempts to solve the problem: "One line of correction supplies us with an epithet for *aras*, the other with an epithet for *taurorum*".¹ The latter approach is represented by *nitentum* (ed. Ascens. 1500), *bidentum* (Scaliger), and *nigentum* (Ellis); the former, by *rubentis*, tentatively conjectured by Housman.² There is also a third line of correction not mentioned by Lyne, namely to introduce an epithet for *sanguine*, which is represented by *tepentis* (ed. Ald. 1517).³ It will hardly be an exaggeration to say that all these conjectures, including

9) Varro's attitude here is in keeping with his realistic stance throughout his oeuvre; see now K. Volk, *Varro and the Disorder of Things*, HSPh 110 (forthcoming).

1) R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*, Cambridge 1978, 316.

2) A. E. Housman, *Remarks on the Ciris*, CR 17, 1903, 303–311, at 303 n. 1.

3) See e. g. the *apparatus* in D. Knecht, *Ciris: Authenticité, histoire du texte, édition et commentaire critiques*, Brugge 1970, 38.

nitentum printed by the majority of modern editors,⁴ mainly perform the function of a metrical filler. Lyne offers a plausible *ratio corruptionis*: “Corruption was, I suggest, at least helped on its way by scribal familiarity with a common line-ending: cf. Lucr. 4.61 *nam saepe uidemus*, 2.768 *quod saepe uidemus*, 4.598, etc., Verg. *Georg.* 1.451 *nam saepe uidemus*; we should not therefore necessarily expect a correction closely following the *ductus*”.⁵ I am ready to concede to Lyne his first point, but, as we shall see, there is in fact a possible correction that only inflicts minimal changes on the transmitted text.

The *Ciris* passage has an important intertext in Lucretius, noted, for example, by Salvatore,⁶ but nowhere, to the best of my knowledge, properly discussed (5.1198–1210):

*nec pietas ullast uelatum saepe uideri
uertit ad lapidem atque omnis accedere ad aras
nec procumbere humi prostratum et pandere palmas
ante deum delubra nec aras sanguine multo
spargere quadrupedum nec uotis nectere uota,
sed mage placata posse omnia mente tueri.
nam cum suspicimus magni caelestia mundi
templa super stellisque micantibus aethera fixum,
et uenit in mentem solis lunaeque uiarum,
tunc aliis oppressa malis in pectora cura
illa quoque expergefactum caput erigere inquit,
nequae forte deum nobis immensa potestas
sit, vario motu quae candida sidera uerset.*

Although literary implications of this intertext for the *Ciris* would better be discussed more thoroughly elsewhere, in connection with other Lucretian allusions, a few remarks will not be superfluous. To begin with, we may observe that Lucretius’ abstract *deum immensa potestas (quae candida sidera uerset)* is in the *Ciris* replaced by the traditional figure of *deum rex (qui imperio terrarum milia uersat)*. This is a clear case of ‘remythologisation’, an allusive technique generally associated with Virgil.⁷ The next set of Lucretian echoes in our *Ciris* passage has an even more poignant effect. Whilst, on the surface, praising Nisus for his piety (*pro pietate sua*) manifested in regular sacrifices to the gods (*saepe fuidemus? / sanguine taurorum supplex respererat aras*), on a deeper level, the *Ciris* unmistakably alludes to Lucretius’ emphatic refutation (*nec pietas ullast uelatum saepe uideri . . .*) of precisely this traditional view of piety as the meticulous following of religious prescriptions, instead of which he asserts the Epicurean ideal of ἀταραξία (*sed mage placata posse omnia mente tueri*). This is indeed a striking case of ‘subversion by intertextuality’,⁸

4) To mention only a few: Knecht (above, n.3) 38; Lyne (above, n.1) 91; A. Salvatore (et al.), Appendix Vergiliana, Rome 1997, 241; G. P. Goold / H. R. Fairclough, Virgil: Aeneid VII–XII, Appendix Vergiliana, Cambridge, Mass. 2000, 482.

5) Lyne (above, n.1) 316.

6) Salvatore (above, n.4) 242.

7) See e.g. M. R. Gale, Virgil on the Nature of Things: The *Georgics*, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition, Cambridge 2000, 116–123.

8) A term introduced by R. O. A. M. Lyne, Virgil’s *Aeneid*: subversion by intertextuality (Catullus 66.39–40 and other examples), G&R 41, 1994, 187–204.

which is further elaborated by an allusion to a similarly subversive Catullan intertext. The main sentence of the *Ciris* passage *illi pro pietate sua . . . reddidit* clearly evokes the concluding line of poem 76 (26 o di, reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea) in which Catullus presents a view of piety (3–4 *nec sanctam uiolasse fidem, nec foedere in ullo / diuum ad fallendos numine abusum homines*), if not as radically innovative as Lucretius', but still distinctly different from that exemplified by Nisus. It is against the background of these pointed intertextual references that the corrupted *saepe fuidemust* can be linked with Lucretius' *saepe uideri*, which leaves little doubt that what we need to restore is some form of *uidere*. From the palaeographical point of view, the most economical solution is obviously to write *uidendus*.

However, from the semantic perspective, this gerundive is admittedly not as obvious, and its precise function and meaning may require further discussion. It seems clear that *uidendus* cannot here express necessity or obligation, which is the standard grammatical force of the gerundive when used predicatively. What other modality can it denote? Perhaps the most straightforward course of interpretation would be to understand *uidendus* as having a potential force, that is as roughly equivalent with *uisibilis*. Although this function of the gerundive does not seem to be properly codified,⁹ there are several examples showing that it is no fiction. To quote a few from Ovid: Met. 7.723 *ineo non cognoscendus Athenas* ('I enter, unrecognisable, Athens'), 15.844 *constitit alma Venus nulli cernenda* ('Venus stood invisible to all'), F. 6.720 *continua Delphin nocte uidendus erit* ('on the following night the Dolphin will be visible').¹⁰ There is also a good one in Martial: 10.6.6 *totaque Flaminia Roma uidenda uia* ('all of Rome to be seen on the Via Flaminia'). Yet perhaps the clearest example is provided by pseudo-Quintilian (describing a night apparition): Decl. mai. 10.6 *non ille, ut pridie, procul et tantum uidendus, sed audacius et propius et ad matris manus tamquam corpus accedens* ('he was not the same as last night, only to be glimpsed and that from a distance, but he boldly came so close that his mother could touch him with her hands like a real body'). The implication of such a potential use of *uidendus* would apparently be that there were many witnesses of Nisus' piety: Nisus offered sacrifices to the gods not only regularly (*saepe*), but also in public (*uidendus*).¹¹

I would, however, tentatively suggest that *uidendus* may have here a somewhat different, more pointed, emphasis. As is well known, there is a specific class of gerundives, mainly formed from verbs of affect, expressing evaluation, like *admirandus*. Most often, and this is the recognised use, such gerundives possess, so to speak, an objective modality: 'one that [objectively] can, or should, be admired' (to stay with *admirandus*). But sometimes, it would appear, they have a hint of subjective modality, as they seem to convey the attitude, not of the speaker, but of the

9) As F. Bömer, P. Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphosen*: Buch VI–VII, Heidelberg 1976, 378, complains commenting on the potential gerundive at Met. 7.723, "die großen Grammatiken geben keine genauere Auskunft".

10) Cf. further F. 3.712, 3.794, 5.111, 6.712.

11) A conceivable alternative would be to take *uidendus* as 'visible' not to people but to Jupiter. This reading could be supported with Cat. 64.387–389 *saepe pater diuum templo in fulgente residens / ... / conspexit terra centum procumbere tauros* (note *conspexit*). Yet I believe the Lucretian intertext is more important: Lucretius' *uideri* (5.1198) clearly refers to being seen not by the gods (who do not care!) but by the people around.

agent: ‘one that [subjectively] wants to be admired’. This pregnant use of the gerundive can perhaps be observed best in the three occurrences of *conspiciendus* in the Tibullan corpus. At 1.2.71–72 Tibullus speaks of his rival: *totus et argento contectus, totus et auro, / insideat celeri conspicendus equo* (‘let him, completely covered with silver and gold, sit on his swift horse, catching everyone’s eye’). Here *conspiciendus* may, of course, express a disinterested external judgement, namely that the man on the horse is worth looking at, but as is remarked by Maltby, it seems “pejorative in tone, suggesting one who ‘parades’ in his wealth, cf. 2.3.52 of Nemesis parading T[ibullus]’s luxurious gifts”.¹² In other words, the implication of *conspiciendus* appears rather to be that the man on the horse wants to attract attention. The same is true of 2.3.51–52 *ut mea luxuria Nemesis fluat utque per urbem / incedat donis conspicienda meis* (‘my Nemesis would flow in luxury and go through the city parading my gifts’): *conspicienda* may be an appraisal by an objective external observer, but it is one sought for by both Tibullus and Nemesis. Perhaps in the clearest possible way these subjective connotations come out in the third context, 3.12.3–4, where Sulpicia speaks of herself: *lota tibi est hodie, tibi se laetissima composuit, / staret ut ante tuos conspicienda focus* (‘for you [Juno] she bathed today, for you she gaily adorned herself, so that she would stand before your altar attracting everyone’s attention’). It is obvious that *conspicienda* here is not merely an objective consequence of Sulpicia’s bathing and dressing, but very much her own subjective goal. Whether such modal connotations are part of the morphological semantics of the gerundive, or they arise from the predicative syntactic function allotted to the gerundive in the above examples, I think that these three parallels, and especially the last one, can help us grasp the meaning of the *Ciris* context: just as Sulpicia wants to be *conspicienda* as she stands before Juno’s altar, so, I would suggest, Nisus wanted to be *uidendus* as he worshipped at the altars of the gods.

Why should Nisus be concerned specifically about being seen worshipping the gods? The Lucretian intertext provides the answer. Although at first sight Lucretius’ *uideri uertier* (etc.) may seem merely an awkward and unnecessary periphrasis for *uertier* (etc.), *uideri* is in fact deeply meaningful. It is no coincidence that the passive *uideri* is pointedly contrasted with the active *tuere*, likewise placed at a verse-end. The traditional conception of piety, characterised by *uideri*, is thus presented as, in a sense, a passive position, dependent on, and aimed at, society’s approval;¹³ what Lucretius offers instead is, on the contrary, the ideal of an active internal life, encapsulated in *tuere*. Bailey catches well the tone of *uideri*: “‘to be seen’ with ostentatious piety, like that of the Publican”¹⁴ (meaning the Pharisee, of course). Nisus, who *saepe uidendus / sanguine taurorum supplex resperserat aras*, is thus portrayed, I suggest, as precisely this sort of person.

Trondheim

Boris Kayachev

12) R. Maltby, *Tibullus, Elegies: Text, Introduction, and Commentary*, Cambridge 2002, 174.

13) Cf. Epicurus, Ep. Men. 123: ἀσεβῆς δὲ οὐχ ὁ τοῦς τῶν πολλῶν θεοῦς ἀναίρων, ἀλλ’ ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας θεοῖς προσάπτων.

14) C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex*, Oxford 1947, 3.1515.