

OXFORD

A COMMENTARY ON  
**VIRGIL'S  
ECLOGUES**

*Andrea*  
**CUCCHIARELLI**

ULTIMA CVM EI VENIT IAM  
CARMINIS AETAS. MAGNVS  
ABINTEGR O SAECLORVM  
NASCITVR ORDO. IAM RE  
DIT ET VIRGO. REDEVNT  
SATVRNIA REGNA. IAM  
NOVA PROGENIES CÆLO  
DEMITTITVR ALTO



SIBYLLA CVMANA CVIVS MEMINIT VIRGILIUS ECLOG. IV.

# A Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*



A Commentary on  
Virgil's *Eclogues*

ANDREA CUCCHIARELLI

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Andrea Cucchiarelli 2023

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023004729

ISBN 978-0-19-882776-4

Printed and bound in the UK by  
TJ Books Limited

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

# Acknowledgements

I shall only say a few words to accompany this English version, updated and augmented, of my commentary on the *Eclogues* published in 2012 by Carocci. The format of the Italian edition remains in place here, particularly in terms of the annotation style and the way in which bibliographical entries are selected and presented.

I wish to express all my gratitude to Stephen Harrison, who has stimulated and supported the idea of an English edition of my commentary from the very beginning and accompanied it throughout the process. The first English version of my text, including almost all additions and changes, was made with great finesse and understanding by Marco Romani Mistretta: it was my great fortune to have such a competent and attentive translator-philologist to help me. I am also indebted to Biagio Santorelli for a very careful reading of the whole book and for many suggestions on matters of Virgilian philology. To Fiachra Mac Góráin I owe some illuminating remarks on the correct use of philological English. I also had an important source of help, especially when it came to proof-reading and double-checking the indexes, in two young scholars, Martina Farese and Luigi Maria Guerci, as well as in my Sapienza colleagues Giuseppe Lentini and Francesco Ursini.

In the Italian edition, the commentary was paired with an Italian translation by the late Alfonso Traina, whom I remember with gratitude for our many discussions on textual and exegetical issues of the *Eclogues*: the *Sibylla Cumana* of the Cathedral of Siena, which had been chosen by him for the cover of the Italian edition, appears on the cover here, too.

The volume is dedicated to my wife Simona Fortini, whose attentive and intelligent care played a fundamental role in its development, and our two children, Livia and Giulio—my three dear companions along the journey of my life.



# Contents

<i>Foreword: Tityrus and the discovery of the new gods</i>	ix
Introduction	1
1. The <i>Eclogues</i> in their time	3
2. Biographical issue	6
3. The poet, the herdsmen, and <i>mimesis</i>	8
4. Arcadia, Epicureanism, and the 'gods'	12
5. The bucolic book	18
6. Textual transmission	30

## VIRGIL'S *ECLOGUES*

Note on the text	35
------------------	----

## COMMENTARY

Eclogue 1	59
Eclogue 2	111
Eclogue 3	147
Eclogue 4	196
Eclogue 5	242
Eclogue 6	284
Eclogue 7	344
Eclogue 8	380
Eclogue 9	428
Eclogue 10	463
<i>Bibliography</i>	507
<i>Index of Proper Names</i>	551
<i>Index of Latin Words</i>	554
<i>General Index</i>	556



# Foreword

## Tityrus and the discovery of the new gods

### 1

#### *... resonare doces Amaryllida siluas*

Virgil's *silvae* may appear to be a free and open space compared to the self-contained city. Quite the opposite is true: the woods, too, are circled by a strong sense of belonging and protection, besides being replete with sounds.

Readers of Theocritus' pastoral idylls experienced a limited horizon of images, actions, and characters. When Virgil arrived, that world became deeper and more complicated: further repetitions were added to the repetition of names (Daphnis, Menalcas, their contest, the former's sad death). The texts of Theocritus' canon are constantly modified and re-elaborated by Virgil, and sometimes literally translated. The poet then applies that same art of variation to his own inventions.

As a result, every event and detail resounds with echoes. This is the case with Virgil's characters. It is certainly impossible to group together the various occurrences of the same names, such as Tityrus, Daphnis, or Menalcas, as if these figures were mythical heroes like Achilles, Hector, Odysseus, or Aeneas. Yet we cannot merely explain the phenomenon as (accidental?) homonymy, either. The bucolic 'mask' has its own personality: each new and different usage carves a mark, a memory on it. An essential component of the 'pastoral' effect is this musicality, this soft whispering, of suggestions and allusions. There are, however, several moments in which the suggestions are unified: note, for instance, the similarities between the exiled Meliboeus in Virgil's first eclogue and Theocritus' dying Daphnis in *id.* 1.

The evocation of songs and harmonies, freely spreading among springs, pine trees, and bushes, finds its visual counterpart in the concreteness of the book roll, in its very 'unfolding' of words and poems. Virgil often lets the reader catch glimpses of his sources, and especially his own Theocritus, namely the collection of idylls he had before his eyes (and in his mind) while composing his *liber*. The book is a treasure chest of the whole patrimony of bucolic song.

For this reason, the arrangement of the eclogues contributes to a complex network of references among the individual poems: note the special significance assigned to the opening and the closing eclogue; the middle (for which eclogues 5 and 6 compete); the symmetrical correspondences between the two parts of the book; and even the 'syntagmatic' effects caused by one eclogue succeeding another.

## 2

*Vrbem quam dicunt Romam*

When Virgil wrote his *Eclogues*, and even when he published them as a volume, nothing was yet certain of what we consider to be the cornerstones of the Augustan age. To be sure, in the period of instability immediately following the assassination of Julius Caesar, the young *diui filius* played a considerable role; and yet, it was Mark Antony who was bound to appear as the strongest heir of the deceased dictator, by virtue of his age and prestige. Sextus Pompey, meanwhile, controlled the sea, and enjoyed some popularity even at Rome. Thus, the reader ought to look at the *Eclogues* from a ‘defamiliarized’ perspective. The book, an ‘Augustan’ text *par excellence* (indeed, an inaugural text of the new Augustan culture), was conceived and composed before ‘Augustus’ could even be imagined. Rather, Virgil himself contributed to inventing the Augustan age.

In those of his idylls that are aptly called pastoral, Theocritus never mentioned the city of Alexandria by name, or any city, except in the famous *Thalysia*, where the wanderers on Cos are described as leaving the town, on the road leading towards the countryside (*id.* 7). To be sure, Theocritus celebrated the Ptolemies and their great city, but he did so through either a playful mime (*id.* 15) or ad hoc encomiastic poems (*id.* 16 and 17). In both cases, however, he abandoned the shepherds and their world. Now, by contrast, Virgil places Rome at the outset of his pastoral book, presenting the city’s greatness through the naive eyes not of two Syracusan women but of a Mantuan herdsman who had been in danger of losing all his property as a result of the expropriations.

Thus, the first eclogue immediately sets off a mythopoetic process, centred around the city of Rome, which was to become crucial to Virgil’s own work and to Augustan culture as a whole, as it played a key role in Octavian’s political programme from the early 30s BCE. In a typically Virgilian way, however, this mythologizing is full of chiaroscuro. While Rome appears as a beacon of redemption, it is nevertheless part of a mechanism, which produced injustice and oppression.

## 3

*Deus, deus ille Menalca!*

Not only does Tityrus proclaim Rome’s unlimited greatness, but he also reveals the city’s unique privilege: it is the only place where people can ‘get to know’ gods who are really ‘present’ (1.41 *tam praesentis... diuos*). Here, Virgil lays another foundation of Augustan ideology: the charismatic and divine aspect of political

power. When the *Eclogues* were published as a book, no reader would have doubted the identity of the ‘young god’ encountered by Tityrus in Rome (and nowhere else): Caesar Octavian, still a very young man but already close to political primacy.

The kings of Alexandria, as well as those of Pergamum, Antioch, and other important centres of the Greek East, had modelled their image as sovereigns on popularly acclaimed divine figures (thereby following in Alexander’s footsteps), particularly Dionysus and Heracles, but also Hermes and Apollo, and (in the queens’ case) Aphrodite. Similarly, during Rome’s civil wars, most of the major political figures had cultivated an association with a corresponding god, or with whichever deity best represented his intentions and aspirations. Virgil avoided falling into the trap of excessive allegorizing: a trap the interpreter must still avoid. Yet the text of the *Eclogues* is free from eulogistic rhetoric, precisely because it keeps its pastoral fiction constantly in place and blends political praise with the herdsmen’s lives, as well as with other aspects of pastoral society, recalling contemporary landscape painting, especially the so-called ‘sacro-idyllic’ genre.

Particularly instructive is the fifth eclogue, in which ancient readers, according to Servius, saw the shadow of the assassinated and deified Julius Caesar. Yet nothing in Mopsus’ and Menalcas’ songs authorizes such a precise allegory. The Virgilian text stays at the sublime level of divine models. Through Daphnis and his fellow herdsmen, the *Eclogues* convey an idea of divinization that never derogates from its status as an *exemplum*. In fact, any historical actualization of it appears merely contingent, and therefore perishable. In the figure of Daphnis, just as in the *puer* of the fourth eclogue, Virgil the Epicurean strove to reconcile gods and divine values that civil strife had alienated from one another as well as from the Roman people.

Thus, should the readers become sensitive to the rhetoric of divine models in the *Eclogues*, they would discover Virgil’s search for a deep synthesis (which, if not understood or at least respected, is one of the decisive reasons for Thyrsis’ defeat and Corydon’s victory in the seventh eclogue). Hence comes the impression that Virgil’s *Eclogues* look especially to Asinius Pollio, to the dream of peace and prosperity that his consulship had represented, rather than to the oracular responses of a young god whose redeeming power had been granted solely to him by the civil wars.



# INTRODUCTION



# 1

## The *Eclogues* in their time

The date of the *E.* is much debated. A preliminary distinction is in order: that between the composition of the individual poems (which, at least in certain cases, were doubtless read immediately<sup>1</sup> and circulated within a restricted group around the poet) and the publication of the final collection. There are only two obvious clues to the dating of the book: the land confiscations in the territory of Cremona and Mantua, which peaked in the aftermath of the battle of Philippi<sup>2</sup> (though continuing during the early 30s BCE), and the consulship of Asinius Pollio, in 40 BCE (*E.* 4).

As we shall see in greater detail, it is very likely that Virgil (hereafter, V.) kept working on his pastoral book for a few years after 40;<sup>3</sup> but that should not distract us from an essential fact. The poet intended to situate his work between those two events: the grievous chaos generated by the confiscations and the hopes awakened by Pollio's consulship in the central section of the book. Such a chronology, which dominates current Virgilian scholarship, is consistent with two essential pieces of ancient biographical information concerning V. (which, however, cannot easily be reconciled with each other). Firstly, V. is said to have composed and published the *E.* when he was twenty-eight (in 42 BCE); secondly, V. is said to have worked on the collection for three years.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the likeliest hypothesis is that the

Here and in the commentary, Greek authors are cited with LSJ abbreviations (adapted when appropriate); citations of Latin authors follow the *ThL* system, with extremely rare disloyalties. V.'s works are abbreviated as follows: *E.*; *G.*; *Aen.* For more information on the citation and reference style of the book see p. 507.

<sup>1</sup> In this regard, the best testimony is Hor. *sat.* 1.10.44–5 (around 35 BCE). In his satirical *libellus*, Horace himself shows his great familiarity with the themes and structure of V.'s work, especially when it comes to the number of poems (i.e. ten).

<sup>2</sup> See Appian's account, *bell. civ.* 5.3 (11–13); Cass. Di. 48.6–12.

<sup>3</sup> We shall not, however, posit 35 BCE as the date of the final publication: at least not on the basis of the identification of Octavian with the addressee of *E.* 8, following Bowersock (1971); cf. Tarrant's (1978) convincing refutation; for a different view, see Clausen's commentary, esp. pp. 233–7, along with our observations at 8.6n.; on the relationship between the *E.* and their historico-political context, see the balanced, comprehensive picture offered by Tarrant (1997, esp. pp. 169–75). It cannot be ruled out that V. reworked the text of the *E.* at a later stage, even without assuming a true 'second edition' (as some scholars did in the past: cf. Michel 1990, esp. p. 58 and p. 61, n. 5). At any rate, it seems preferable to interpret V.'s text as a whole in its current, definitive form, and there is no decisive argument for dating it to 35 (or later).

<sup>4</sup> On Virgil's age at the time of the *E.*: Serv. *praef. E.* p. 3.26–7 (III.1 Th.-H.); Prob. *praef. E.* p. 323.13 (III.2 Th.-H.) (= *uita Verg.* p. 198.6 Brugn.-Stok); cf. also p. 329.5–7 (III.2 Th.-H.) (where Asconius Pedianus is cited as source). For the three years: Serv. *uita Verg.* p. 2.8–9 Th.-H. = p. 152.10–12 Brugn.-Stok; Don. *uita Verg.* 89–90 Brumm. = p. 29.5–6 Brugn.-Stok.

composition of the earliest poems, and the first samples for a selected audience, go back to 42–41; hence the tradition according to which V. published the whole work in that year. During the three following years, until 39, the most intense phase of composition and revision continued, culminating in the definitive publication of the book for a wider audience, sometime between 38 and 37. This is consistent with the fact that, in the *E.*, Maecenas is never mentioned: V. became closer to him at a later time (probably around 38 BCE).

One question still ought to be asked: why did Virgil, despite continuing to work on the *E.* for some time, want to remain loyal to an earlier setting, which corresponds to the inception and early composition of the poems? We are, of course, talking about the difficult aftermath of Philippi, when even the individual citizen's security was threatened by constant turmoil—of which confiscations and proscriptions are but some of the countless examples.<sup>5</sup> By emphasizing the traditional values of farming, agriculture, and animal husbandry, the *E.* draw attention to the issue of land distribution, to which the Caesarian warlords had already devoted some of their energies. Right after the murder of Caesar, in fact, Mark Antony had to manage a land distribution project that was soon abandoned. The idea was to confiscate lands and reassign them to the veterans. Note that the Perusine War broke out (at least officially) over the way in which Octavian had managed a similar project.<sup>6</sup> The related phenomenon of old landowners like Meliboeus being driven into exile (along with their various workers and slaves) is documented by historical and political evidence. Meanwhile, Sextus Pompey kept stirring turmoil among both the plebs and the republican aristocracy by generating food shortages. He intercepted wheat supplies and welcomed all kinds of exiles and refugees (including slaves) into his anti-triumviral army. Sextus Pompey had his headquarters in Sicily itself, Theocritus' homeland (and a key region for Roman agriculture).<sup>7</sup> In 40 BCE, the *foedus Brundisinum* consolidated

<sup>5</sup> As is confirmed by the victims' complaints in Appian. *bell. civ.* 5.14 (59), confiscations were even less fair than proscriptions, since the latter were used against enemies, the former against innocents. *E.* 1 may be read against Suet. *Aug.* 15.1, where Octavian is said to have replied *moriendum esse* to those asking for mercy after the capitulation of the city at the end of the Perusine War.

<sup>6</sup> Significantly, according to the agreement, Octavian was responsible not only for his own veterans but also for Antony's: Appian. *bell. civ.* 5.3 (11) and 13–14 (51–9); Cass. Di. 48.6–7. Mark Antony's early land confiscations (in 44 BCE) seem to be echoed in the fragments of Varius Rufus' poem *De morte*, in which Antony is harshly criticized (cf. *E.* 1.71–2n.). During the Perusine War, Lucius and Fulvia sided with the dispossessed Italian landowners against Octavian, without succeeding in getting Mark Antony directly involved: the main historical sources are Appian. *bell. civ.* 5.14–49 (54–208); Cass. Di. 48.3–14; Liv. *per.* 125–6; Vell. 2.74.2–4; Plut. *Ant.* 28–30 (for further reading see Osgood 2006, pp. 159–67). Wimmel (1998) reads the *E.* (esp. *E.* 1) in the light of the Perusine War (41–40 BCE). That many people were interested in these issues at the time is confirmed by Horace, who reports (in Book 2 of his *Satires*) that Roman commoners wondered whether the lands that Caesar Octavian intended to assign to the veterans after Actium (30 BCE) would be in Italy or in Sicily (*sat.* 2.6.55–6).

<sup>7</sup> The sources unanimously agree that Sextus Pompey never hesitated to welcome exiles and refugees of any sort, including slaves. Note Hor. *epod.* 9.7–10 (written after the battle of Naulochus); cf. Vell. 2.72.5; 77.2; Appian. *bell. civ.* 4.25 (105); 36 (150–2); 85 (355–7); 5.53 (219–20); 72 (304–7); 143 (596–7); Cass. Di. 47.12; 48.19.4. Sextus succeeded in forcing the triumvirs to give (some of) the

the triumvirs' alliance (particularly between Antony and Octavian), which can be regarded as Asinius Pollio's main political achievement (celebrated by V. in *E.* 4). This further kindled the anger of Sextus Pompey, who intensified pirate attacks in Sicily as well as in the harbours of Puteoli and Ostia (see Florus, *epit.* 2.18.2).<sup>8</sup>

In the face of such a complex situation, which lasted from the murder of Caesar to the publication of the *E.* and beyond in a constant emergence of new dangers and challenges, the poet decided to anchor the text of the *E.* to two firm points: the expropriations and Pollio's consulate. The former is one of the most obvious negative effects of the triumvirs' action, while the latter represents the hopeful climate of *détente* that followed the *foedus Brundisinum*. This can also be explained by the particular importance of Pollio<sup>9</sup> both in the *E.* and in the context in which they were written. V. says explicitly that Pollio was a patron of his Muse but, beyond their personal relationship, the poet probably surmised that the circle of intellectuals around Pollio (who did not come from the aristocratic elite and owed his influence to his own merit) was in the process of outlining a new model of artistic patronage. Thanks to his well-known moderation, Pollio always avoided direct conflict whenever possible, and fostered any and all attempts to harmonize different cultural and political impulses, which inevitably ended up in conflict with each other (Antony's side vs Octavian's side) despite Pollio's efforts. Pollio was himself an intellectual: he was a poet, tragedian, and (later) historian; he loved the arts and had a very well-defined taste in literature. He was also active as a culture manager, and in a way he represented a new political elite that succeeded in navigating the competitive landscape of the civil wars. His ties with Antony ultimately put an end to Pollio's political career. His model of patronage, however, had already been established: after the *E.*, V. soon reworked it and transferred it to a

confiscated lands back to their original owners (Appian, *bell. civ.* 5.72 [306]; Cass. Di. 48.36.4). However, as Appian frequently points out, Sextus was unable to capitalize on his victories: Appian, *bell. civ.* 5.25 (101); 91 (382–3); 140 (583); 143 (597). For the importance of Sextus Pompey in Virgil, and in the historical and political context of V.'s work, see A. Powell 2008 (pp. 181–225 for the *E.*), which is not free from some exaggeration. See also Welch (2012) on the figure of Sextus Pompey more generally (including his ideological and cultural significance).

<sup>8</sup> In Rome, the general public's reaction to the *foedus* was rather negative: the peace between Antony and Octavian, albeit a source of relief, was widely regarded as benefiting the two of them alone and giving them an opportunity to crush Sextus' resistance together. As a result, both plebs and landowners had to suffer from famines and higher taxes: cf. Appian, *bell. civ.* 5.67 (281–4); Cass. Di. 48.31.1–2.

<sup>9</sup> On Pollio's achievements in both the political and the cultural domain, see *E.* 3.84n. For further reading, see esp. Osgood (2006, pp. 54–5; 252–5; 296–7); Dufallo (2013, esp. pp. 75–92). The reader of the *E.* must keep in mind Pollio's personal relationship with Cornelius Gallus, which Pollio seems to allude to in two of his letters to Cicero (Cic. *fam.* 10.31.6 and 32.5). Their relationship may not have been conflict-free, if it is true that Gallus wrote a speech against Pollio (Quint. *inst.* 1.5.8; but cf. Manzoni 1995, pp. 23–4). Pollio's personality is best summarized by a passage of his letter to Cicero, which deserves to be quoted in full (Cic. *fam.* 10.31.2; 5): *natura autem mea et studia trahunt me ad pacis et libertatis cupiditatem. itaque illud initium ciuilis belli saepe defleui... qua re eum me existima esse qui primum pacis cupidissimus sim (omnis enim ciuis plane studeo esse saluos), deinde qui et me et rem publicam uindicare in libertatem paratus sim.*

new patron, Maecenas—another ‘newcomer’ from the Roman aristocracy’s point of view, despite his noble Etruscan lineage. Unlike Pollio, Maecenas always sided with Octavian, and was an important political figure who decided (significantly) to remain in the equestrian class.

V.’s first work contributes to the creation of a literary language that is to become a crucial resource for the ‘Augustan culture.’ In V.’s central eclogues, this language is closely connected with the figure of Pollio. Yet the *E.* also testify to a political transition: Pollio remains in the background, compared to the young *deus* that almost all readers (rightly) equate with Octavian.<sup>10</sup> While the events make Pollio appear tied to a defunct political dream (such as the conciliation of the two triumvirs), the opening of the *E.* brings Rome’s young god to the foreground: a god who is all the more present and necessary after Pollio’s failure.<sup>11</sup> History had left its mark on the ten eclogues, but V.’s new poetry for the future was already a reality.

## 2

### Biographical issues

Closely connected to the date of the collection is another fundamental question: to what extent was V. personally affected by the confiscations? There is no reason to doubt the kernel of the ancient biographical tradition, according to which the poet’s ancestral land possessions were at least temporarily confiscated. To be sure, the young poet must have shared the anxieties of his fellow citizens, family members, and friends. The biographical tradition is, however, not persuasive in its attempt to reconstruct a detailed sequence of events on the basis of *E.* 1 and 9: the results, often incoherent, are not substantiated by genuine, extra-textual (and therefore trustworthy) records.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The very structure of V.’s work reflects this transition: the reader first encounters Pollio, an illustrious patron, in *E.* 3; Pollio is then the co-protagonist of the grandiose prophecy in *E.* 4, after which his name disappears from the *E.* The sequence of *E.* 3–4 places great emphasis on Pollio within a book that starts with the *deus*–Octavian and ends with a supporter of Octavian (i.e. Cornelius Gallus, who seems to be depicted as a military commander: cf. 10.44n.). The gradual vanishing of Pollio is particularly evident in the prologue to *E.* 8, which is most probably addressed to him—yet his name is not mentioned. The subsequent poem, *E.* 9, contains an explicit mention of Varius Rufus (9.35n.), a poet who always opposed Antony (note also the verbatim quotation at 8.88n.). The opening and the ‘framing’ of the book, both of which centralize Octavian, hint at the fact that the equilibrium between Antony and Octavian (Pollio’s main political project) has already failed the test of history.

<sup>11</sup> One of the achievements of the soon-to-be Augustus, and one that contributed greatly to the stability of his regime, was his ability to safeguard individuals’ property (cf. Vell. 2.89.4; Galinsky 1996, esp. pp. 7 and 55–6). This is precisely what is granted to Tityrus in *E.* 1, in spite of his humble social status.

<sup>12</sup> For issues of priority between the two poems, see pp. 61; 430–1. Such guesswork, very common in ancient exegetical and biographical practices, is tied to a more broadly allegorizing approach, well exemplified (with sound methodological caveats) by Servius *ad E.* 1.1 *et hoc loco Tityri sub persona Vergilium debemus accipere; non tamen ubique, sed tantum ubi exigit ratio*; cf. also *praef. E.* p. 2.17–22

Nevertheless, even if V. was not subject to the same vexations as Meliboeus, Menalcas, or Moeris, he was certainly aware of how his audience would react to a pastoral book in which Mantua and Cremona were mentioned by name. Theocritus, who moved from Syracuse to Alexandria (just as V. moved to Rome), set the adventures and love stories of Daphnis and the other shepherds in his native Sicily. In a non-pastoral idyll, Theocritus clearly expressed, in the form of an encomium, his wish for protection at the court of Hieron II (probably not a successful attempt, given his later decision to move to the Ptolemies' court: *id.* 16.106–7). Moreover, ancient commentators identified Simichidas (*id.* 7) with the poet himself, who was said to have spent time in Cos.<sup>13</sup> Thus, the Theocritean precedent would have justified, in the eyes of contemporary readers, a biographical interpretation of the *E.*: correspondingly, Tityrus' bewildered gazing at the big city's wonders may hint at the emotion felt by the young soon-to-be poet when he first set foot in Rome. Early readers of the *E.* started detecting references to historical reality in the text: Pollio's son Asinius Gallus apparently claimed to be the *puer* of *E.* 4 (Serv. Dan. *ad E.* 4.11).<sup>14</sup> The *E.*'s typical combination of humble pastoral life and important topics of general interest must have stimulated a sort of unbridled allegorizing, which led interpreters to read hidden references into the plainest utterances of V.'s herdsmen.<sup>15</sup> To this day, excessive allegorizing continues to be a dangerous temptation for readers and scholars of V.

The poet himself made a clear statement concerning the relationship between himself and his œuvre, and that statement is contained in the only explicit mention of his first poetic work: in the *envoi* of the *G.* (4.564), he distinguishes between himself and Tityrus, the object of his song, even though it is clear that

(III.1 Th.-H.); *ad E.* 1.12; 6.13; 7.21; Serv. and Serv. Dan. *ad E.* 9.1; Philargyrius (as he is now commonly known; Philagrius seems to be a more correct version of his name: henceforth Philargyrius/Philagrius) *ad E.* 8.1; for Menalcas-Virgil in *E.* 9, however, cf. Quintilian's testimony, *inst.* 8.6.47. V. himself legitimated allegorical readings, albeit to a minimal extent, at e.g. *E.* 6.4–5 (cf. Calp. *ecl.* 4.62–3; Mart. 8.55). Nevertheless, that we cannot group all occurrences of a given pastoral name under one identity (in this case, the poet's) was observed by Wendel in his seminal work (1901, p. 50). On V.'s biographical tradition, see further Horsfall (1995b); *Enc. Virg.* V.1, pp. 570–88, s.v. *Vitae Vergilianae* (H. Naumann, G. Brugnoli); *Virg. Enc.* II, pp. 751–5, s.v. *Lives* (F. Stok), with references. Of particular interest is also the interplay between biographies and pseudepigraphic literature, on which see Peirano (2012, esp. pp. 61–3; 107–14).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *schol.* Theocr. *id.* 7.21, pp. 84–5 Wend.; in *id.* 7.93, moreover, an allusion to Zeus-Ptolemy can be detected, whereas *id.* 4.31 mentions Glauce, the renowned flute-player from Chios and mistress of the king; Fantuzzi (2008, p. 578); concerning *id.* 15, finally, the scholia presuppose an analogy between the two Syracusan women and Theocritus, since all three were 'foreign upstarts' in Alexandria (p. 305, esp. 2–3 and 14–15 Wend.); cf. Korenjak (2003, p. 68). Servius may thus be said to exaggerate in arguing that Theocritus' poems are entirely free from cues for allegorical interpretation (*praef. E.* p. 2.19–20 Th.-H.). For further reading on allegory in pastoral poetry, the sources collected in Hamblin (1928) are still useful (cf. esp. pp. 12–19 on Theocritus).

<sup>14</sup> A different yet comparable claim is the grammarian Remmius Palaemon's assertion that V. had predicted his infallibility as a literary critic in *E.* 3.49 (cf. Suet. *gramm.* 23.4 Brugn.).

<sup>15</sup> Note esp. the allegorical interpretations transmitted by Servius *ad E.* 3.74; 93; 94; 96 (see nn. ad locc.): it is possible that the agonistic context of *E.* 3 proved particularly conducive to allegory.

they both enjoy the benefit of a calm *otium* (cf. *E.* 1.6). In other words, while making an obvious distinction between the two, V. leaves room for an overlap between the poet and his character. In *E.* 1.28, at any rate, the mention of a white beard advises against any naive identification between the roughly 30-year-old poet and Tityrus.

### 3

## The poet, the herdsmen, and *mimesis*

The poet of the *E.* explicitly acknowledges his literary debts: the ‘game’ in ‘Syracusan verse’ (6.1) is often revealed as imitative, with a constant echo of Theocritean names and situations.<sup>16</sup> Equally explicit are some occasional deviations, exemplified by the opening of *E.* 4: ‘Sicilian Muses, let us sing something greater for the consul Pollio’. Perhaps Theocritus could not yet conceive of the pastoral genre as such—even though he did, in effect, lay its foundations. At any rate, he certainly realized that he was inventing a new world, whose rules and customs he was to establish. Theocritus’ Cyclops in *Idyll* 11, for instance, is entirely constructed in opposition to the great Homeric text of *Odyssey* 9—or, rather, carves out a pastoral space on the margin of epic poetry (which is also a way to renew a Homeric theme without ‘honking’ like a pathetic goose who imitates the bard of Chios: *id.* 7.47–8).

Such a systematic dependence on Theocritus does not prevent V. from paradoxically asserting his poetic freedom: his herdsmen are Theocritean in character and bear Siculo-Greek names (and often a Siculo-Greek past), but speak Latin.<sup>17</sup> Far from embracing any ‘rationalistic’ reality principle, V. combines references to the Mantuan countryside and the city of Rome with hints to Sicilian geography and, above all, with Arcadia’s imaginative and poetic dimension. The merger is sketched in *E.* 1, where the Hyblaean bees of l. 54 are featured in the context of

<sup>16</sup> The most systematic catalogue of Theocritean passages imitated by V. is still Posch’s (1969), but very helpful annotations are to be found in Hosius’ work (now forgotten are the numerous, and in fact still useful, contributions by Weyman [from 1917 to 1931]; cf. also Gebauer 1861); add at least Garson (1971); Lipka (2001, pp. 29–65). Certain idylls are left out of obvious imitation: 14, 19, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30. For further documentation and updated literature reviews, esp. on the relationship between the *E.* and the Theocritean pastoral tradition, see *Virg. Enc.* III, pp. 1260–1, s.v. *Theocritus* (B. W. Breed); I, pp. 395–401, s.v. *Eclogues* (B. W. Breed).

<sup>17</sup> If indeed Valerius Messalla wrote pastoral poetry, he must have written in Greek, as *Catal.* 9.13–20 seems to suggest. A possible pastoral forerunner of V. in Rome is Porcius Licinus, who wrote a Latin epigram in elegiac couplets, featuring erotic-pastoral themes (fr. 6 Bläns. = 7 Court.); for pre-Virgilian pastoral poetry, see Luiselli (1967, pp. 49–90). Somewhat relevant to V.’s Arcadia is the tradition whereby an Arcadian, Evander, was responsible for introducing the alphabet into Rome (cf. below, p. 14, n. 34); moreover, the development of Latin itself was said to have been influenced by the Greek language via the Arcadian presence at Rome, according to a doctrine seemingly shared by Cato and Varro: *Lyd. mag. pop. Rom.* 1.5.

the Mantuan confiscations, and will reappear even more vividly in *E.* 10 (note the ring-composition effect).<sup>18</sup> Even Theocritus' hierarchy of pastoral values, known to ancient interpreters (in a decreasing order of importance: cowherd, shepherd, goatherd), is generally disregarded, or at least loosely employed, by *V.*<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, the *E.* display a certain affectionate realism at the level of detail: the reader occasionally catches glimpses of a small society of herdsmen, often engaging in agricultural work as well. Their world is full of hierarchies and power dynamics, which at times bleed into the everyday minutiae typical of a farming neighbourhood (including curious glances, jealousy, and envy).<sup>20</sup> On the whole, *V.*'s botanical terminology is accurate, and his references to various agricultural tasks appear technically appropriate, generally free from the mannerist vagueness that sometimes characterizes *V.*'s Greek models, from Theocritus onwards.<sup>21</sup>

Elsewhere, *V.* and his characters stay faithful to Theocritus, particularly through the use of images, thought patterns, and metaphors that can indeed be categorized as 'rustic'. Due to a widespread rhetorical principle, variously applied in ancient literary criticism, immediate correspondences were perceived between a character's nature (or the poet's, or at least the speaker's) and the imagery used by him: it was hardly surprising, for instance, that Alcaeus, born on an island, was wont to employ marine metaphors (Heracl. *all. Hom.* 5.9 ὁ νησιώτης θαλαττεύει).<sup>22</sup>

<sup>18</sup> In *E.* 10, which begins with a reference to Theocritus' Sicily, Arcadia is revealed to be a sort of 'parallel dimension' that poets can access through poetry itself. The phenomenon is particularly evident at 10.44, where the transmitted *me* must probably be retained in the text (see n. ad loc.). Another Sicilian reference is found at 2.21, whereas at 7.31 the singing contest of the two Arcadian shepherds Corydon and Thyrsis takes place on the banks of the Mincius, with Daphnis (= the bucolic hero from Syracuse?) listening to them. For a pre-Virgilian encounter between Italian landscapes and Theocritean elements, cf. [Mosch.] *epit. Bion.* 93–7: it is possible that the Greek pastoral tradition featured other similar phenomena. Yet *V.* has his own distinctive way of activating Greek geography, which is made primarily of literary and metapoetic coordinates rather than concrete references to actual places (the latter, by contrast, is the case with Italian cities like Mantua and Rome). For a useful and extensive discussion on the setting of the *E.*, see Flintoff (1974); cf. also Perutelli (1976, pp. 763–80); Cucchiarelli (2021b, pp. 205–12).

<sup>19</sup> As is clear from *E.* 1.9; Theocritus' pastoral hierarchy is well epitomized by Don. auct. *uita Verg.* p. 122.2–6 Brugn.-Stok (cf. *schol. Theocr. proleg.*, p. 17.21–6 Wend.): *tria sunt pastorum genera, quae dignitatem in Bucolicis habent, quorum minimi sunt qui αἰπόλοι dicuntur a Graecis, id est caprarii; paulo honoratiores, qui ποιμένες, id est ouiliones dicuntur; honestissimi et maximi βουκόλοι, quos bubulcos dicimus*; see Gow (1952, II, p. 20, ad *id.* 1.86); cf. also Van Groningen (1958, pp. 313–17); but cf. E. A. Schmidt (1969); significantly, the hierarchy is disobeyed in the pseudo-Theocritean *id.* 8: see Rossi (1971, pp. 6–7).

<sup>20</sup> The obvious relations of preeminence and subordinations (e.g. Damoetas grazing a herd that the owner, Aegon, entrusted to him: *E.* 3.1–2) are never defined at precise social levels: this is the case with Corydon, whose alleged servile status has been refuted by Mayer (1983b); cf. 2.1n.

<sup>21</sup> On Virgilian flora, still useful are Sargeaunt (1920) and Abbe (1965), to which we must add Maggiulli (1995) as well as Grant (2004). On *V.*'s plants and their cultural, literary, and ideological implications, see the acute and methodologically accurate analysis of Armstrong (2019), to which I refer for further reading; for Theocritus' flora, see Lembach (1970); on technical aspects of farming life in the Italian countryside, see White (1970); note also Dyson's (2003) synthesis, especially valuable for its archaeological and topographical approach.

<sup>22</sup> The idea goes back—at least—to Aristotle's ethos doctrine, formulated in *rhet.* 1.2.1356a1–20 (cf. 3.17, esp. 1418a37–9; 1418b23–9; see also [Aristot.] *rhet. ad Alex.* 22.1434b25–30).

By the same token, Theocritean shepherds revealed their ethos through rural analogies, as is exemplified by *id.* 9.31–5. An elaborate rural analogy, moreover, is employed by Tityrus at the very beginning of V.'s book (*E.* 1.19–25).<sup>23</sup>

Here, V. begins to experiment with a focalization technique soon to become crucial to his creation of the great protagonists of the *Aeneid*. As a result, the landscape fills up with single details or actions without displaying itself as an organic spatial whole: some scrubby bushes here, some rocks and a cliff there, a marsh invading the fields, smoking chimneys and mountain-shadows, a cave hosting the singers, the oxen coming back to the barn, an old tomb. These are all fragments of a larger, yet indefinite, world, and they only reach the reader's imagination because a single herdsman-poet has cast his eyes on them: in other words, they have been filtered through pastoral imagination. The elements of 'reality' that pile up eclogue after eclogue belong to an irretrievably atomized space, perceived as a function of the observing subject and his point of view. Such a mimetic technique is interestingly paralleled by the significant (albeit rare) testimony of contemporary Roman painting, and especially of its 'landscape' genres. Here are, for instance, some of the scenes painted by Studius (or Ludius) in the Augustan age, according to Pliny the Elder's account: *lucos, nemora, colles, piscinas, euripos, amnes, litora, qualia quis optaret, uarias ibi obambulantium species aut nauigantium terraque uillas adeuntium asellis aut uehiculis, iam piscantes, aucupantes aut uenantes aut etiam uindemiantes* (Plin. *nat.* 35.116). Although there is no need for detailed comparisons, made more difficult by the uncertain chronology and context, it is clear that, when V. provides the reader's imagination with fragments of rural landscape and fleeting sketches of country life (such as hunting or agricultural work), his poetry resonates with a taste already widespread in pictorial culture.<sup>24</sup> The visual arts of V.'s age made the subject matter of pastoral poetry all the more familiar and welcome, while V.'s work, in turn, must have contributed to the further success of this style of painting.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. also 2.63–5; 5.16–18; 45–7; 82–4. Lysias was deemed to be a master of ethopoeia, with special regard to simple and naive characters, such as herdsmen: Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 8.19; cf. Quint. *inst.* 3.8.51. On the modalities of Theocritean characterization, which actually mitigated the humblest aspects of pastoral life, certain observations are found in the ancient exegetical tradition: *schol.* Theocr. *proleg.*, pp. 5.2–6; 11.18–21 Wend.; on the Virgilian side of things, recall Servius' note *ad E.* 1.29 *et bene tempora, quasi rusticus, computat a barbae sectione*. The so-called 'pathetic fallacy', namely the pastoral singer's illusion that nature shares his amorous feelings (esp. his lovesickness), may be explained in terms of the poet's characterization of herdsmen as naive: Fantuzzi (2006, esp. pp. 242–4) (Nemesianus dwells on the practice, perhaps with some irony: *ecl.* 2.44–52); see also Posch (1969, pp. 92–101); Jenkyns (1998, *index*, s.v. *pathetic fallacy*); and Witek (2006, esp. pp. 73–82). A comparison employed for the sake of characterization, albeit extra-pastoral (the young, handsome, sport-loving city-dweller), is found at *id.* 2.114–16. Note also the Homeric Cyclops' address to his ram, where the animal is assumed to participate in the Cyclops' grief (Hom. *Od.* 9.447–60): this may be considered the Homeric archetype of a 'pastoral' pathetic fallacy.

<sup>24</sup> In Pliny's passage, note the parenthetical remark on the customers' individual tendencies: *qualia quis optaret*. On Roman landscape painting, see La Rocca (2008, esp. pp. 29–61), with a rich bibliography; for spatial perception in the *E.*, see Leach (1988, pp. 148–55); specifically on garden painting, closely connected with *ars topiaria*, see Settis (2002).

In creating his 'humble' world of herdsmen, V. blends together several different cultural components, which are unified into a primeval, archaic dimension constructed of song and direct contact with nature. Various *Realien* of Italy (and the Po area in particular) are combined with elements of biographical history as well as History with a capital H—not to mention references to Greek literature and to the visual arts. All this forms the backdrop against which V.'s characters sing their songs. And each character is sketched in detail, both as an individual and as a 'type'. Certain names recur frequently: Tityrus, Meliboeus, Menalcas, Corydon, Daphnis. This elicits in the reader a sense of familiarity that makes cross-references and connections within the text more apparent. Yet it would be fruitless to assign fully fledged individual personalities to single names that occur in different eclogues. Nothing assures us, for instance, that the Meliboeus of *E.* 7 is 'the same person' as Meliboeus in *E.* 1. What we can be assured of is that each name is associated with a 'mask', a sort of stock character that appears in different contexts within the book. Readers who keep this in mind are rewarded with a stereophonic soundscape of internal echoes.<sup>25</sup>

At any rate, V.'s complex treatment of masks and characters is replete with irony and fun (poetry itself is a 'game' of sorts: *E.* 1.10 *ludere quae uellem*), particularly owing to the discrepancy between the 'humble' herdsmen and the learned poet. V.'s eminently urban readers must have perceived the playful component inherent to the *E.*'s pastoral world, even though V. is rather far from certain Theocritean extremes. Through his herdsmen's vicissitudes, the poet probably expects to elicit a smile or two from his privileged, well-educated readers. Commentators have appropriately called comedy to witness. At times, the *E.* share with comedy a certain humorous levity, as well as some colloquial traits of style (cf. below, pp. 26–8). According to an ancient tradition, which I deem reliable, a few eclogues were staged by famous actors.<sup>26</sup> The best testimony, however, is perhaps found in Horace, who ascribes a 'soft and humorous' taste to V.'s Italic Muses: i.e. the Camenae (Hor. *sat.* 1.10.44–5 *molle atque facetum / Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae*). Asinius Pollio, who was V.'s patron as well as one of his first and most significant readers, most probably remembered that, by contrast, *rus* appeared *infacetum* (or *inficetum*) to Catullus (22.14). Redeeming it from that reputation was among the poetic and worldly challenges of the young, 'audacious' poet from Mantua (*G.* 4.465 *audax... iuuenta*).<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Following Flintoff (1975–6) and, more recently, Kania (2016, pp. 24–32), Kronenberg (2016, p. 25) rightly argues that the *E.* display 'some degree of character consistency for characters with the same name'.

<sup>26</sup> Don. *uita Verg.* 90–1 Brumm. = p. 29.6–7 Brugn.-Stok *Bucolica eo successu edidit ut in scena quoque per cantores crebro pronuntiarentur*; cf. Tac. *dial.* 13.2; Serv. *ad E.* 6.11; Highet (1974); Horsfall (1995d, pp. 249–52); cf. also p. 21 and nn. 52–4 below. A further proof of the (visual) popularity of pastoral subject matters in the Roman world comes from iconographic testimonies, albeit fragmentary: Ling (1991, p. 39 and fig. 38; p. 55 and fig. 55; p. 142 and fig. 153).

<sup>27</sup> The idea of 'humour', to be kept distinct from that of 'ridicule', encompasses stylized elegance: Quint. *inst.* 6.3.20 (referring to Horace's mention of the *E.*) *facetum quoque non tantum circa ridicula*

A recurring theme in the *E.* is the idea that the singing herdsmen have mutual relationships full of friendship, tension, conflict, alliances, and oppositions. All this probably mirrors the dynamics at play within the learned circle of intellectuals gathered around Pollio. The two dimensions overlap as soon as the illustrious patron makes his first appearance, in *E.* 3. It then becomes clear that Pollio is the centre around which many poets and artists revolve, and a special addressee thanks to whom the herdsmen's songs can be met with appreciation and applause—though also, on occasion, with scorn and contempt (see *E.* 3.84–91). While the *E.* were originally intended to be read and appreciated within a restricted literary circle, they soon acquired the status of a classic in Rome and beyond.

## 4

### Arcadia, Epicureanism, and the 'gods'

The humorous vein occasionally perceptible in the *E.* makes the contrast with the cruelty of history all the more vivid. Certain erudite traditions, perhaps accessible to V., had connected the origin of pastoral poetry with an unsettled civil context: 'since there was once a civil war in Syracuse (*στάσειός ποτε γενομένης*), and many citizens were killed, when the people made peace Artemis was given credit for the reconciliation. The farmers (*ἀγροῖκοι*) brought offerings and sang hymns to the goddess in their happiness. Subsequently, their songs became customary' (*schol.* Theocr. *proleg.*, pp. 2.21–3.2 Wend.). It is no longer Theocritus' Syracuse but the Mantuan countryside that now suffers discord, which has led Meliboeus and his fellow-citizens to so much grief and violence (1.71 *en quo discordia ciuis...*). The redeeming divine figure, replacing Artemis as the object of veneration, is that of a new, brilliant *iuuenis*.<sup>28</sup> Here, too, just as in Syracuse's

*opinor consistere: neque enim diceret Horatius, facetum carminis genus natura concessum esse Vergilio. decoris hanc magis et excultae cuiusdam elegantiae appellationem puto.* The notion is also employed by Pliny the Elder to qualify the painting style of Studius himself: *plurimae praeterea tales argutiae facetissimi salis* (*nat.* 35.117). Pollio must have appeared to be the right person to appreciate the *E.*'s *facetum*, given that his youthful *lepores* and *facetiae* were appreciated by Catullus (12.8–9; cf. *E.* 3.84n.). Regarding the much-debated passage in Horace, *sat.* 1.10, it must be noted that it is possible to take the two adjectives *molle* and *facetum* not as substantives, but as attributes referring to *epos* (43). This interpretation, while attractive, is unnecessary, because it is evident that, by naming Varius' *epos*, Horace moved to hexametric poetry (no reader of Virgil could ignore that his *E.*, unlike Theocritus' *Idylls*, were exclusively in hexameters), and Horace has already used similar forms of adjectives as substantives at l. 14 of the same *sat.* 1.10 (*ridiculum acri*). Quintilian himself, cutting the quotation from Horace in the form *cum illo Horatiano 'molle atque facetum Vergilio'* and opening the paragraph with *facetum* (see above), probably took the two adjectives as substantives.

<sup>28</sup> It should be noted that, in V.'s *E.*, Artemis-Diana plays a considerable role: for instance, in a programmatic context, at 7.29–32; also at 3.67; note also the references to hunting at 2.28–30; 10.55–60. She is in effect absent from Theocritus and his imitators, as Fantuzzi (2008, p. 50) observes; the absence of discord between citizens is one of the effects of Artemis' benevolence in Callim. *hymn.* 3[*Dian.*].133.

foundation myth, the first eclogue depicts the establishment of a cult, albeit one confined to private use.<sup>29</sup>

The virgin huntress-goddess, who lives in the woods, and whom city-dwellers regard as personifying a free, primitive life, is part of the poetic invention that represents V.'s most significant, or at least distinctive, contribution to the ancient and modern tradition of pastoral poetry: Arcadia. In the *E.*, to be sure, references to Arcadians and Arcadia (cf. *E.* 4, 7, 8, 10) are limited to the evocation of a simple lifestyle, close to nature, full of hunts and pastures, love and songs. It is only through semantic extension that we may describe V.'s Arcadia as an idealized pastoral dimension (in this sense, for instance, we may define the scene evoked by Meliboeus at 1.46–58 as 'Arcadian'). Yet, properly speaking, the current idea of Arcadia as pastoral Utopia, a world in which melancholy, songs, and love affairs, however passionate, cannot perturb an eternal serenity (sometimes an unshaken, ecstatic one), should rather be ascribed to a modern reinvention whose birth certificate is Sannazaro's *Arcadia*.<sup>30</sup> In fact, while Cornelius Gallus in *E.* 10 yearns for Arcadian life, so as to let his love bloom (but cf. 10.38 *quicumque furor*), in *E.* 8 the 'Maenalian song' is that of a desperate lover who has resolved on suicide.

The question remains, however, why the poet of the *E.* assigned to Arcadia a significance that, as we shall see in greater detail, is only sporadically pioneered in Theocritus and is not allotted a comparable space even in later Latin pastoral poetry. The real extent of V.'s innovation has been thoroughly discussed.<sup>31</sup> It is perhaps impossible, given the absence of positive data, to reach a conclusion

<sup>29</sup> Fundamental testimonies concerning the origin of pastoral poetry are Diod. Sic. 4.84; Aelian. *uar. hist.* 10.18; an exhaustive collection of the ancient sources can be found in *schol. Theocr. proleg.*, pp. 1–22 Wend. (Latin sources at pp. 13–22); cf. Luiselli (1967, pp. 7–47); see further Effe (1977); Halperin (1983, pp. 78–84); Graf (1986); Lucarini (2007). According to a wholly different tradition, pastoral poetry originated from a love song addressed by the poetess Eryphanis to the young hunter Menalcas (Clearchus, apud Athen., 14.619c–d = fr. 32 Wehrli; cf. *PMG* 850, p. 452 P.). Note that V.'s second eclogue corresponds to this alternative 'foundation myth'.

<sup>30</sup> This has been proven, in an accurate revision of Snell's (1945) famous argument, by E. A. Schmidt (1975), to which I refer for the rich bibliography as well; for a much more critical view, see Jenkyns (1989). On the Edenic notion of Arcadia, as defined in Snell (but also in F. Klingner), cf. Leach (1974, p. 21 and n. 6); on modern Arcadia, esp. in the visual arts and in Italian and Spanish literature, cf. *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 273–85, s.v. *Arcadia* (A. Quondam, G. Caravaggi, A. Rinaldi); *Virg. Enc.* I, p. 117, s.v. *Arcadia* (R. Jenkyns). Fabre-Serris (2008, pp. 13–162) offers the most recent discussion of the various 'Arcadias' of ancient Rome, with useful *comparanda* based on first-century BCE and first-century CE wall painting.

<sup>31</sup> According to Snell (1945), the *E.*'s Arcadia is essentially V.'s own invention; others, however, have hypothesized a Peloponnesian school of pastoral poetry predating Theocritus (Reitzenstein 1893, esp. pp. 121–36; the poet Anyte of Tegea is taken to be a major representative of the school: cf. *HE* 664–759 G.P.) or assumed, conversely, V.'s debt to a post-Theocritean pastoral tradition (Jachmann 1952b, esp. p. 171). Note, finally, Wilamowitz's (1906, p. 111) hypothesis according to which V. was influenced by erudite *prolegomena* to Theocritus' corpus, not substantially different from the extant ones; for further reading, see *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 272–3, s.v. *Arcadia* (G. Barra). Concerning Erucius' epigram, *Anth. Pal.* 6.96 (= *GPh* 2200–5 G.-P.), which shows remarkable affinities with *E.* 7.4, many scholars believe that it was later than V. (rather than the opposite), following Cichorius' arguments (1922, pp. 304–6; cf. G. Williams 1978, pp. 125–6); see now Jolowicz (2021, p. 18 and n. 131).

if the question about Arcadia is posed in literary-historical terms: after all, V. may have been influenced by literary precedents entirely unknown to us today. At any rate, it is beyond doubt that V.'s Arcadia has much in common with the ancient sources' description of the Arcadian people.

Being a mountain-dwelling population, naturally isolated and as such untouched by the great migrations (Thuc. 1.2.3), the Arcadians led an extremely simple life, raising livestock (they sometimes even resorted to acorn-eating: Herodot. 1.66.2). Thus, they gained a reputation for being the oldest inhabitants of the earth, like the oak in the woods (Plut. *quaest. Rom.* 92.286a; cf. also Callim. *hymn.* 1 [*Iou.*] 40–1; according to Ov. *fast.* 2.289–302 they even predated Jupiter's birth).<sup>32</sup> Never yielding to Spartan domination, the Arcadians even retained several archaic features in their dialect, but at the same time they managed to foster music and poetry, which they practised from a very early age, according to the extensive account provided by Polybius (4.19.13–21.6: Polybius, himself an Arcadian, crucially refers to amoebean song-exchange in a rural context). While Theocritus' most significant reference to Arcadia is *id.* 1.125–6, in which Daphnis urges Pan to abandon his usual dwelling and join him (cf., however, *id.* 22.156–7), Arcadia itself and its most representative god make many appearances in Latin literature.<sup>33</sup> Only in the Augustan age, however, did the Arcadians enjoy unmatched prestige as the ancestors of Italic peoples, a development to which V. himself contributed (probably following late Republican antiquarianism). Dionysius of Halicarnassus explicitly identifies the Arcadians with Latium's first inhabitants, whose descendants are the Romans themselves (Dion. Hal. 1.13; cf. Plut. *quaest. Rom.* 76.282a). Finally, V. himself, in *Aeneid* 8, evokes the Arcadian Evander's settlement on the Palatine hill, emphasizing its pastoral aspect and connecting the Trojans' race (and thus the Romans') with Arcadia (cf. esp. *Aen.* 8.131–42; Dion. Hal. 1.31; Ov. *fast.* 2.267–82; and also Liv. 1.5.1–2; Plin. *nat.* 3.56).<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> A significant story, somewhat popular in antiquity, concerns Aglaos of Psophis: he never left his native village in Arcadia and was called by the Delphic oracle happier than Gyges (Val. Max. 7.1.2; Plin. *nat.* 7.151; and even the sceptical Pausanias, 8.24.13). Equally significant is Lucian's question (*bis acc.* 11): 'how can a sophist or a philosopher come out of Arcadia?'. At Rome, *Arcadicus* was the name of a particular kind of donkey: Varr. *rustic.* 2.1.14; 2.8.3 (cf. Iuv. 7.160).

<sup>33</sup> For some poetic instances, cf. Porcius Licinus, fr. 3.7 Bläns. = 3.8 Court. (Arcadia); Laevius, fr. 34 Bläns. = 31 Court. (Pan); and finally Lucretius, 4.586–9 (Pan), 5.25 *Arcadius sus*. For a significant reference to Arcadia in Theocritus (but in an urban idyll), note the mention of *hippomanes* at *id.* 2.48–9 (this Arcadian plant was said to have aphrodisiac effects on mares).

<sup>34</sup> In the same book (*Aen.* 8), V. establishes a connection between the Lupercal and the Arcadian mountain known as Lycaeus (8.343–4), whereas the Arcadians display a certain singing ability at 8.285–305, when they sing the praises of Hercules and his endeavours (as in Theocritus; note the line-ending resonance—a typically pastoral effect—at l. 305 *consonat omne nemus strepitu collesque resultant*). It should be recalled that Evander was credited with introducing the alphabet: thus, perhaps, in Fabius Pictor, fr. 1 P.<sup>2</sup>, and Cincius Alimentus, fr. 1 P.<sup>2</sup>; cf. Liv. 1.7.8; Dion. Hal. 1.33.4; Tac. *ann.* 11.14.3; see further *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 270–2, s.v. *Arcadi* (D. Musti). The Arcadian herdsmen of *Aen.* 8, therefore, allow V. to neutralize the negative connotations (roughness and violence) commonly associated with Latium's primitive inhabitants (cf. *Aen.* 7, esp. 505; 513 *pastorale . . . signum*); as a matter of fact, gangs of robbing herdsmen continued to dwell in certain areas of the Italian territory, especially in the south,

Regardless of the extent to which the idea of a pastoral Arcadia was available in pre-Virgilian literature, V.'s Arcadia in the *E.* plays a very important structural role: it allows the poet to define the geographical and cultural coordinates within which his poetic invention takes place. V. must have felt the need for a 'centre of gravity' that could ensure the coherence and consistency of his pastoral world, in which Theocritus' Sicily had been replaced by the Mantuan countryside (and, conversely, the 'big city' was Rome and no longer Alexandria). In the *E.*, V.'s relationship with the historical events of his time is mediated by the Roman and Italian setting. As a result, Theocritus' Sicily is transformed into a 'parallel dimension' constructed as a free literary creation, especially given the fact that the island of V.'s time no longer corresponded to Theocritus' description of Sicily.<sup>35</sup> This process of abstraction, which turns Greek references to concrete realities into imaginary, literary landscapes, is a source of strength rather than weakness in V.'s pastoral world. Thus, V. adds to Theocritus' Sicily another, perhaps more primeval (and continental) land: the mountainous region of Arcadia in the ancient heart of the Peloponnese. Significantly, V. unites these two focal points, Sicily and Arcadia, through the Muse-like figure of the nymph Arethusa (see *E.* 10.1n.; 10.5n.). Both lands are part of a broader cultural landscape, which is eminently Greek: it is against this backdrop that V.'s Latin-speaking herdsmen, who live near Mantua, outline their own identity in the historical and geographical *hic et nunc* of the poet and his audience.

Being mainly a literary and poetic dimension, freely interlinked with the Italian landscape of the *E.*,<sup>36</sup> V.'s Arcadia includes numerous traces of idealized primitivism, which are typical of V.'s pastoral world. The herdsmen's lives in caves or simple huts, along with their direct contact with woods and herds, may bring to mind the imagined primitive founding era of Roman culture.<sup>37</sup> In this connection, we

up to V.'s time and beyond: Giardina (1997, esp. pp. 196–206). After all, even at Alexandria the βουκόλοι could be equated with brigands: Borca (1998, pp. 195–9). On pastoral myth in the *Aeneid* cf., more recently, Suerbaum (2005, with references).

<sup>35</sup> Rome's well-to-do citizens had direct communication with Sicily, particularly as they often owned land and goods on the island. In V.'s time, Sextus Pompey had his headquarters there: thus, Sicily became a theatre of war (see above, pp. 4–5 and nn. 7–8). As early as 130–100 BCE, two violent slave revolts took place in Sicily, as Diodorus Siculus reports (in two Byzantine excerpts: 34/35.2.1–3; 27–31). According to Strabo, skirmishes among herdsmen of servile status occurred in the Augustan age (Strab. 6.2.6). In general, on the differences between Theocritus' Sicily and the 'historical' Sicily, see Leigh (2016, esp. pp. 420–1). E. Curtius observed that the rise of pastoral poetry as a permanent part of the Western tradition was largely due to the fact that Virgil did not merely imitate Theocritus but transformed Theocritus' literary landscape: Sicily, in particular, had long been a Roman province, and was no longer a 'dreamland' ('Sizilien... war kein Traumland mehr') (Curtius 1948, p. 195 = 1953, p. 190 = 1992, p. 214).

<sup>36</sup> Thus, Cornelius Gallus may well be imagined as dwelling in Arcadia (where he may never have set foot) and also declare, in his own monologue, that he actually is in a battlefield (*E.* 10.44n.).

<sup>37</sup> Don. auct. *uita Verg.* pp. 124.12–125.5 Brugn.-Stok; according to Dicaearchus, the livestock-rearing age followed the first and oldest one, in which humans lived on the fruits spontaneously offered by nature (fr. 48 Wehrli = Varr. *rust.* 2.1.3–4; cf. also 3.1.3); Livy, 5.53.8 (among others), insists on the 'bucolic' simplicity of Rome's origins. Suffice it to recall a figure like Silvius, son of Aeneas and

can explain how the city-countryside opposition, which will be allotted ample space in the Augustan age (e.g. in Horace, *carm.* 3.29 and *epist.* 1.10, not to mention love-elegy), is so clearly outlined in the *E.*, starting from the first poem, then in the eighth (within an erotic context). Ancient interpreters did not fail to notice this, as we know from Quintilian's generalization, *inst.* 10.1.55 *musa illa rustica et pastoralis non forum modo uerum ipsam etiam urbem reformidat*. Contrast Theocritus' *id.* 7, where the three companions left the city for the countryside in order to celebrate the *Thalysia*, without any tension or conflict.<sup>38</sup>

According to an ancient tradition, V. attended (along with Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus, and Quintilius Varus) the Epicurean gatherings in Campania, and particularly the group led by Siro.<sup>39</sup> V.'s audience could not fail to notice the Epicurean colour of a type of poetry centred upon the serene pleasure of a simple life, far away from urban sophistication. Suffice it to mention, in this respect, a fragment of Epicurus' letter to Pythocles: 'shun all education (*παιδείαν... πᾶσαν*) and go away on your little boat' (quoted in Diog. Laert. 10.6 = fr. 163 Us.; cf. Quint. *inst.* 12.2.24). The author of *Catal.* 5, whom some identify with V. himself, appears to be well aware of this exhortation, connecting it with the image of a harbour, typical of Epicureanism: *ite hinc, inanes, ite, rhetorum ampullae... nos ad beatos uela mittimus portus / magni petentes docta dicta Sironis* (1; 8–9; cf. D. Clay 2004).

Such an Epicurean atmosphere in the *E.* is enriched in detail by prominent Lucretian reminiscences located at important points within the text.<sup>40</sup> Some have

Lavinia, whose name derives from the *siluae* themselves: *Aen.* 6.765; Liv. 1.3.6 (where he is Ascanius' son); Dion. Hal. 1.70.2.

<sup>38</sup> On the motif of the city in the *E.*, see Skoie (2006), with references. It is symptomatic of a change in political climate that Calpurnius' seventh eclogue is centred entirely on the city's delights, which attract the herdsman Corydon, keeping him from returning to his usual pastoral life. The fascination of writers and intellectuals in general with the countryside is highlighted by Horace, *epist.* 2.2.77 (but cf. Quint. *inst.* 10.3.22–4, 28–30).

<sup>39</sup> V.'s name, along with those of Tucca and the others, has been read in a fragment of a Herculeum papyrus transmitting a text by the Epicurean Philodemus: *PHerc. Paris* 2; cf. Gigante, Capasso (1989); Gigante (2001 and 2004); whether the poet is mentioned in *PHerc.* 1082 is much more doubtful. For a collection of ancient sources, particularly concerning V.'s apprenticeship under Siro (cf. Serv. *ad E.* 6.13), see *Enc. Virg.* II, pp. 328–31, s.v. *epicureismo* (L. Alfonsi); *Virg. Enc.* I, pp. 439–41, s.v. *Epicureanism* (L. Kronenberg); see additionally Horsfall (1995b, pp. 7–8); Janko (2000, p. 6). In his account of the journey to Brundisium, Horace recalls that Plotius, Varius, and V. joined Maecenas' other *comites* at Sinuessa (thus coming from Campania): *sat.* 1.5.40–1.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. esp. *E.* 1.2, where V. shows familiarity with Lucr. 4.580–9 (cf. also *E.* 2.34; 10.25–6), whereas, at the outset of the second half of the book, he echoes Lucr. 5.1398 (cf. *E.* 6.8n.). The *E.*, finally, are concluded by a 'physical' doctrine previously taught by Lucretius: cf. 10.76n. In Lucretius, too, the Epicurean ideal life appeared as a pastoral *locus amoenus* (esp. 2.29–30 *in gramine molli / propter aquae riuum*). Furthermore, according to Lucretius, poetry originated within a specifically pastoral dimension, and there is a strong connection between the sounds of nature and human music (Lucr. 5.1379–1411, esp. 5.1383 *agrestis docuere cauas inflare cicutas*; cf. *E.* 1.5 *doces* [n.]); see notably Hardie (2006, p. 281 and n. 13); for Epicureanism as a kind of 'pastoral' philosophy, see Rosenmeyer (1969, esp. pp. 11–12). A comprehensive picture of Lucretian echoes in the *E.* is offered by Castelli (1966–7); Ramorino Martini (1986); Lipka (2001, pp. 66–80); Kronenberg (2016, pp. 26–7). It would, of course, be pointless to expect philosophical coherence from Tityrus or other characters in the *E.*: see Roskam's (2007, pp. 155–60) discussion.

objected that the conspicuous presence of the gods in the *E.* is at odds with Epicureanism. It is worth noting, however, that the gods always make their appearance without any particular religious emphasis and are always seen from the point of view of simple herdsmen (who are by no means free from a magical or superstitious mentality: cf. esp. *E.* 1.16–17; 8.95–9; 9.14–16). On the other hand, it is significant that, in a Hesiodic-didactic passage such as Silenus' cosmology, the gods do not appear at all, in line with Epicurean cosmological doctrine (Traina 1965). In his proem, Lucretius had memorably celebrated the parent goddess Venus, whereas in his eulogy of Epicurus he had gone so far as to call his master *deus* (esp. *Lucr.* 5.8). Finally, while Epicurus fought superstition, he nevertheless taught the importance of honouring the gods: in a letter to Polyænus (fr. 157 *Us.*), he is said to have asserted that the Anthesteria must be celebrated, and in another epistle (to Phirso) he seems to have declared that he personally took part in all the city's festivals, especially in the Eleusinian mysteries (fr. 169 *Us.*). Even in *V.*'s *Georgics*, the poet's mention of *mystica uannus Iacchi* (*G.* 1.166) may not have disappointed Epicurus.

If placed against the backdrop of Epicurean doctrine, the first eclogue must be read as a narrative of how humans construct their idea of deity and ascribe precise roles to it. The Hellenistic notion of *praesens deus*, which *V.* puts to work at the very beginning of his poetic collection,<sup>41</sup> clarifies the deity's practical function and lends consistency to a world in which human beings can become gods, provided that they are capable of following and actualizing a specific divine model. From this point of view, the *E.* are a foundational text of Augustan culture, as they contribute to the definition of a new language that poets and intellectuals can use to talk about divine models. Note, for instance, the opposition between Dionysus and Apollo, which is destined to great success in literature and arts (not to mention political and ideological communication).<sup>42</sup>

Epicureanism and Arcadia, in the sense I have attempted to clarify, are two fundamental themes of the *E.* that tend to be intertwined, acting together in

<sup>41</sup> In the opening of his next work, *V.* will ask the question which god Octavian is to become (*G.* 1.24–42; cf. also, towards the end, 4.560–2 *Caesar... uiam... adfectat Olympo*). This is an even more explicit treatment of Octavian's deification than *E.* 1. At the beginning of the *Aeneid*, the poet broaches the typically epic question of what role the gods play in human affairs, and seems to allude to a philosophical issue crucial to his Epicurean background: can the gods be so emotionally invested in what happens to us down on Earth? Cf. *Aen.* 1.11 *tantaene animis caelestibus irae?*, with discussion in Davis (2012, p. 5).

<sup>42</sup> The various divine figures, and their corresponding socio-cultural models, are harmonized in the *E.* through a very subtle interplay of cross-references and echoes between one eclogue and the next, particularly in the central poems of the collection (*E.* 4–5–6–7). The search for a poetic language capable of interlinking different values embodied by different deities is necessary to a poetic work that aims to harmonize complex ideological systems, ready to enter into conflict with one another. In this sense, the *E.* are the poetic counterpart of Pollio's *foedus Brundisinum*. Yet a true 'rhetoric' (and a dialectic) of divine models will only be fully achieved in the Augustan age, once any political reconciliation between the two protagonists (Octavian and Antony) becomes impossible: cf. Cucchiarelli (2010 and 2011).

opposition to the painful dynamics of history. It is precisely this opposition that V. intended to express in a poem which, at least in the final form of the collection, he must have conceived of as ‘inaugural’ (*E.* 1). Through an escape from contingency made possible by his herdsmen, the poet gave birth to an intuition that would remain crucial to his whole *œuvre*, up to its final point (Turnus’ death at the end of the *Aeneid*): the irreconcilable contrast between the fate of the vanquished and that of the conquerors—between those who stay, protected by Epicurus and the Arcadian gods, and those who are swept away by the storm of history.<sup>43</sup> Through his representation of a humble but foundational *rus*, V. constructs a complex literary world in which nature, human beings, and deities are in constant communication with one another as they share values and role models. The *E.* are far from being ‘escapist’ poems centred around idle aesthetic contemplation, as readers might expect from poems about trees and woods—note Socrates’ famous statement in Plato’s *Phaedrus*: τὰ μὲν οὖν χωρία καὶ τὰ δένδρα οὐδὲν μ’ ἐθέλει διδάσκειν, οἱ δ’ ἐν τῷ ἄστει ἄνθρωποι ‘The countryside and the trees won’t teach me anything, while the people in the city do’ (*Phaedr.* 230d). V.’s trees can and do teach us something: there can be an equilibrium in things, a consonance between human beings, nature, and the gods, as long as the destructive forces of History and strife do not intervene.

## 5

### The bucolic book

#### 5.1. Title

In all likelihood, the original title of the collection is *Bucolica*, a Greek nominative plural form, just like *Georgica*: it is attested in the biographical tradition (Don. *uita Verg.* 30; 66 Brumm. = pp. 22.1; 26.10 Brugn.-Stok; Prob. *praef. E.*, p. 323.13 [III.2 Th.-H.] = *uita Verg.* p. 198.6 Brugn.-Stok) and confirmed by Numitorius’ parodic *Antibucolica* (Don. *uita Verg.* 172 Brumm. = p. 38.10 Brugn.-Stok). Moreover, it appears as such in the late antique manuscripts in capital script, as well as in ancient authors’ and grammarians’ quotations.<sup>44</sup> Going back to a very early period, if not to V. himself, the term *ecloga*, which involves the idea of choice

<sup>43</sup> For this reason, *E.* 1 (which, in a way, is the ‘birthplace’ of Virgilian poetry) is the first and foremost touchstone used by interpreters, who can be divided between the so-called ‘optimists’ (e.g. Otis 1963, pp. 128–36) and the ‘pessimists’ (e.g. Putnam 1970, pp. 51–5); for a balanced view, see Winterbottom (1976), and, more recently, R. Tarrant, *Virgil, Aeneid, Book XII*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 16–30 (focusing on the final scene of the *Aeneid*).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Quint. *inst.* 8.6.46; Macr. *Sat.* 5.17.20; note also Ov. *trist.* 2.537–8 *bucolicis...modis* and Colum. 7.10.8 *bucolicum...poema* (featuring, in both cases, an allusion to V.); see, moreover, Serv. *praef. E.* pp. 2.3, 3.27, etc. (III.1 Th.-H.). For further sources and discussion, see Horsfall (1981, pp. 108–9); Geymonat (1982); Schröder (1999, pp. 68–70).

or selection, must have proved very convenient to denote each single poem.<sup>45</sup> The ancient tradition, once again well epitomized by Donatus (*uita Verg.* 304–15 Brumm. = pp. 51.6–52.6 Brugn.-Stok), labels each eclogue with a specific title, usually coinciding with a character's name. Such titles do appear in the manuscript tradition (which, nevertheless, also features different or more extensive titles): 1 *Tityrus*; 2 *Alexis*; 3 *Palaemon*; 4 *Pollio*; 5 *Daphnis*; 6 *Varus* or *Silenus*; 7 *Corydon*; 8 *Damon* or *Pharmaceutria*; 9 *Moeris*; 10 *Gallus*. Only in the case of *E.* 6, however, might the title retain traces of an original *praescriptio*, meant to identify the eclogue through the addressee's name (Varus): the *praescriptio* was probably included in the copy of the poem that V. sent to him as a present, and we cannot rule out that the poet kept it in the final book roll edition (but cf. *E.* 6.12n.).

## 5.2. Order and structure

That Theocritus' works, like those of other pastoral poets, were re-arranged by a later editor must have been clear in V.'s time, considering the epigraph placed by the grammarian Artemidorus of Tarsus (II–I cent. BCE) at the outset of his edition of pastoral poetry: 'Bucolic Muses, once dispersed: now they are all / together in a single herd, a single fold' (*Anth. Pal.* 9.205 = *Furth. Gr. Epigr.* 113–14, pp. 32–3 P.).

It is likely that V. was influenced by the shape of the Theocritean collection in arranging his pastoral book. Accordingly, interpreters have read the testimony of Servius, *praef. E.*, p. 3.20–1 (III.1 Th.-H.) *sane sciendum VII eclogas esse meras rusticas, quas Theocritus X habet* as implying the existence of a Theocritean book including ten 'purely' pastoral poems, which would have been used by V. as a model for his ten eclogues.<sup>46</sup> However, the available evidence only allows us to assert that a Theocritean (pastoral?) collection, perhaps much larger than the one we have, probably included at its outset a sequence of ten Theocritean poems, consisting of the current *id.* 1–11 (except *id.* 2). As for their order, we may be sure that the current *id.* 1, *Daphnis*, occupied the initial position, whereas *id.* 8 and 9, considered authentic in antiquity, must have occupied the final positions, perhaps with the addition of *id.* 11 (*Cyclops*) at the very end.<sup>47</sup> The existence of a Theocritean book featuring *id.* 1 and *id.* 3–11 would explain not only the decimal

<sup>45</sup> As a result, the term suggests the existence of a broader patrimony of 'songs': precisely those *carmina* to which Meliboeus bids farewell in *E.* 1.77; the term is employed, at least since Varro, to suggest an excerpt from a work (cf. Charis. *gramm.* I, p. 120.28–9 K. = p. 154.21–2 B.) or a short poetic composition (*Stat. silv.* 3 *praef.*; 4 *praef.*; *Plin. epist.* 4.14.9): *Enc. Virg.* II, p. 165, s.v. *ecloga* (A. Traina).

<sup>46</sup> Servius considers only seven of V.'s ten eclogues to be purely *rusticae*: the excluded poems are *E.* 4, *E.* 6 (cf. 6.21–3n.), and, as is clear from the context, *E.* 10. Significantly, Calpurnius Siculus will publish a collection of seven eclogues, which can be regarded as properly 'rustic' despite the presence of civil and political topics (always treated within a pastoral framework).

<sup>47</sup> According to the ancient exegetical tradition, the position of *id.* 1 was due to its grace and refinement (*schol. Theocr. id.* 1, p. 23.7–8 Wend. τὸ χαριέστερον καὶ τεχνικώτερον). Among the most important papyrus witnesses is *POxy* 2064 (+ 3548), II cent. BCE, from which we may infer, in all

standard used by V. in his pastoral collection but also the total number of lines in the *E.*: in fact, Theocritus' total lines would be under 900,<sup>48</sup> not too far from V.'s 830.

Thus, it is likely that some editorial effects à la Theocritus (i.e. tracing back to the Theocritean collection as it was read in the first century BCE) are mirrored by V.'s pastoral book. The opening farewell to Daphnis, and perhaps also the Cyclops' amorous anxieties (cf. esp. Theocr. *id.* 11 / *E.* 10), are quite relevant to Meliboeus in *E.* 1 and Cornelius Gallus in *E.* 10. Finally, if the current *id.* 7 occupied the fifth or the sixth position in the Theocritean collection known to V., we would see a noteworthy correspondence with *E.* 6: in both 'Theocritus' and V., the central part of the decimal sequence would contain a poem of obvious programmatic interest.<sup>49</sup> It is, at any rate, beyond doubt that V.'s familiarity with Theocritus is not limited to the 'purely rustic' idylls (according to Servius' definition).<sup>50</sup>

Without further positive evidence, it is better to focus on the arrangement of V.'s book as it stands. In fact, regardless of any possible (Theocritean or other) precedent, the arrangement itself appears to be very carefully crafted, essentially based on two principles: sequence and balance.

In accordance with the first of these principles, V.'s book is designed for a seamless reading experience, as is shown by the numerous internal allusions, which always refer to previous eclogues—i.e. those that V.'s readers must know, if they read sequentially as the book roll unrolled. The most obvious case is *E.* 5, which includes (in its final lines) an explicit quotation of *E.* 2 and 3; but other references may be readily detected.<sup>51</sup>

likelihood, that the sequence of ten idylls also included *id.* 11 at the end (cf. Gutzwiller 1996a). As noted, the sequence could not have included *id.* 2, whose setting is urban. The order of the current *id.* 1 and 2, well attested in the manuscript tradition, and hence inherited by modern editions, was perhaps the result of a structural analogy between the two poems, both featuring a refrain. This analogy was perhaps observed by V. himself, who contaminates *id.* 2 with *id.* 1 (cf. below, p. 381).

<sup>48</sup> The total is 890, to be more precise, at least based on Gow's (1952) text, with an average of 89 lines per idyll. That number must be taken with a grain of salt, since even in V.'s time the Theocritean manuscript tradition may have varied significantly, due to interpolations and lacunae (for instance, in the text known to us, there may be a lacuna after *id.* 8.52, while 6.41 and 8.77 are certainly spurious). The same caution must be applied to V.'s text: see below, pp. 22–3 and nn. 56, 57.

<sup>49</sup> The idea of 'revamping' the pastoral song is found in *id.* 7 (echoing *id.* 1): see esp. *id.* 7.49 βουκολικᾶς ταχέως ἀρχώμεθ' αἰοιδᾶς (cf. *id.* 1.70 etc. and, of course, the prologue to *E.* 6, esp. 6.8n.). Simichidas, whom the ancients themselves identified with Theocritus, is a not-so-remote predecessor of the Tityrus-V. advised by Apollo: *E.* 6.4n. As for *E.* 7, note that its structural similarity to *id.* 8 (esp. in the opening: cf. *E.* 7.1–5n.) would be even more obvious if *id.* 8 had actually been the seventh poem in the Theocritean edition known to V.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Posch's (1969, pp. 29–30) repertoire; for instance, *E.* 2 seems to presuppose *id.* 20, almost certainly spurious but pastoral in theme (V., after all, imitates extensively the post-Theocritean *id.* 8 and 9). Recall, moreover, the considerable reworking of *id.* 2 in *E.* 8.64–100 (but also the echo of *id.* 24.93–8 in *E.* 8.101–2), and that of *id.* 13.58–60 in *E.* 6.44. A separate set of echoes and re-elaborations concerns Theocritus' encomia (esp. *id.* 16, 17, and also 24), particularly evident in *E.* 4: V., therefore, must have had access to an edition of Theocritus that was not limited to the ten pastoral idylls (perhaps, according to Wilamowitz's famous opinion, V. used the text edited by Artemidorus' son Theon): an overview of the issue in *Enc. Virg.* V.1, pp. 111–13 (G. Serrao).

<sup>51</sup> Thus, at the beginning of *E.* 6, the reference to 'previous' pastoral poetry is inextricably tied to what the reader has already encountered in the first half of the book: see *E.* 6.1n. That the amomum

V.'s alternate use of different stylistic forms, aiming at pleasant variations, is also enhanced by sequential reading. In fact, V. clearly alternates between the dialogic-mimetic form, in which only the characters can speak, and the narrative form, in which only the poet-narrator talks (and occasionally cedes the floor to the characters whose vicissitudes he narrates). The former is the case with the odd-numbered eclogues (*E.* 1, 3, 5, 7, 9), whereas the latter applies to the even-numbered poems (*E.* 2, 4, 6, 8, 10), all introduced by a prologue, which the poet utters *ex sua propria persona*.<sup>52</sup> In antiquity, Servius observed this alternation effect in his note to *E.* 3.1, referring to the originally Platonic distinction among three *characteres dicendi*: a narrative one, in which the narrator is the only speaker; a dramatic one, in which the characters are the only speakers; a mixed one, which combines the other two.<sup>53</sup> In Theocritus, the mimetic element was very prominent, partly as a result of his possible reworking of Hellenistic mimes (after all, Syracuse was the mimographer Sophron's homeland). Theocritus' ancient commentators made several remarks on the three *characteres dicendi*, and their comments were often similar to Servius.<sup>54</sup> These exegetical notions essentially go back to Plato and Aristotle, and V. probably took them into account. In his pastoral book, however,

spreads 'everywhere' (*uulgo*) at 4.25 is best understood as the miraculous generalization of a prodigy that the reader came across in 3.89, where its only beneficiary was Asinius Pollio. The exhortation to Daphnis at *E.* 9.46–50 appears much more effective to readers who know *E.* 5: the same goes for Moeris' name, occurring in both *E.* 9 and 8 (9.54n.). Finally, the echo of 1.73 at 9.50 becomes much more significant if the reader recalls Meliboeus' sad fate.

<sup>52</sup> The distinction between the two forms entails major differences for what concerns V.'s modes of representation: the mimetic poems are more coherently realistic, whereas greater freedom of imagination characterizes the narrative ones, in which the spatial and geographical coordinates do not abide by the same criteria of order, unity, and verisimilitude that apply to the odd-numbered eclogues. Correspondingly, any realistic geographical landscape, such as the Mantuan countryside (or the city of Rome), is only featured in the odd-numbered eclogues (e.g. 1.20 *huic nostrae* [scil. *urbi*]; 26 *Romam*; 7.13 *Mincius*; 9.27–8 *Mantua*... *Cremonae*). By contrast, in the narrative poems V. alternates between maritime or Sicilian landscapes (*E.* 2.21 *Siculis*... *in montibus*; 25–6 *in litore*; 26 *mare*; 8.59–60 *in undas deferar*) and Greek or mythological ones (e.g. 6.64 *Permessi*; 65 *Aonas in montis*; 8.30 *Oetam*; 10.1 *Arethusa*; 15 *Maenalus*; 26 *Arcadiae*).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. also Serv. Dan. *ad E.* 6.1; 9.1; Prob. *praef. E.* p. 329.10–16 [III.2 Th.-H.]; Diom. *gramm.* I.482.14–25 K.; *Enc. Virg.* II, pp. 63–4, s.v. *diegematico/mimetico* (G. Rosati). *E.* 7 is no exception: despite the agon being inherently mimetic and dramatic, the poem is entirely narrated and, therefore, diegetic. Yet the narrator is not the poet (or an 'authorial' voice), but a pastoral character named Meliboeus (on whose characterization see p. 348).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. e.g. *schol. Theocr. proleg.* D, pp. 4–5 Wend.: 'All poetry is divided into three types: diegetic, dramatic, and mixed. Pastoral poetry is a combination of these three, as if they were blended together. This is why pastoral poetry is so pleasant: it is because of the variation produced by blending [*διὸ καὶ χαριέστερον τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τῆς κράσεως*]. In fact, sometimes it seems to have a diegetic form, sometimes a dramatic one, sometimes a mixed one (i.e. diegetic and dramatic at once), depending on the cases'. See further Farrell (2016, pp. 405–6). On the mimetic component of pastoral poetry, in both Theocritus and V., see Höschele (2013, p. 42). That this component was known to ancient interpreters is demonstrated also by their use of theatrical terminology: cf., for instance, Serv. Dan. *ad E.* 9.1 *haec ecloga dramatico caractere scripta est: inducuntur enim duo pastores; scaena in agro Mantuano*. It is concretely possible that the *E.* were acted out in theatres, perhaps with a mime-like *mise en scène* (as will later be the case with Ovid's poetry, according to Ov. *trist.* 2.519–20; 5.7.25–8), cf. above, p. 11 and n. 26.

V. made the distinction between the mimetic and the narrative form even more apparent by systematically alternating between the two.

From a thematic perspective, another consequence of the sequential reading of the *E.* is that the reader perceives the gradual, incremental construction of V.'s pastoral world. After the first eclogue, which surprises the reader with a historical theme (the land confiscations), *E.* 2 and 3 return to the pastoral (Theocritean) tradition, which V. abandons in the central poems (*E.* 4–5–6) and rediscovers in *E.* 7–8–9 (each of which features significant innovations), only to cast it into doubt again in the conclusion (*E.* 10). The watershed between the two halves of the book, marked by *E.* 6 and its 'proem in the middle' (cf. also *E.* 5.90n.), is somewhat hidden and dissimulated by the solid unity of the three central poems (with clearly 'extra-pastoral' traits in *E.* 4 and 6, and a highly original content in *E.* 5).

The second principle (i.e. balance) affects the pastoral collection as a whole and establishes cross-references and correspondences between the two halves of the book (respectively, *E.* 1–5 and 6–10). Thus, *E.* 1 and 9 correspond to each other via the confiscation theme; 2 and 8 have an erotic motif in common; 3 and 7 are agonistic in both form and content; both 4 and 6 are exceptions to the pastoral rule. *E.* 5 and 10 are somewhat different, but even in this case it is possible to observe some correspondences, based on the model of *id.* 1 ('continued' in *E.* 5, reworked in *E.* 10). A structuring role, moreover, is played by Cornelius Gallus, opening and closing the second half of the collection (*E.* 6.64–73; 10), as well as by Daphnis, who is indirectly evoked in *E.* 1 and, above all, in *E.* 10, but is explicitly celebrated at the end of the first half of the book (*E.* 5).<sup>55</sup>

The thematic balance is further underscored by rather precise correspondences in the number of lines: 1 + 9 (150); 4 + 6 (149); 2 + 8 (183); 3 + 7 (181). Once again, 5 and 10 inevitably lie outside this network of symmetries, counting respectively 90 and 77 lines.<sup>56</sup> The 'eccentric' nature of *E.* 10 is, on the one hand, confirmed, as though it were a supplement to the pastoral book, meant to introduce a 'guest' poet. It is worth noting, on the other hand, that the sum of *E.* 5 and *E.* 10 (167 lines) lies halfway between the other four pairs (181/183; 149/150). Another kind of balance is that between the 420 lines of the first five eclogues combined and the

<sup>55</sup> A similar role is played by the word (and the idea of) *umbra*: the book begins under the cover, and thus the shade, of a beech tree (1.1); *umbræ* is the final word of *E.* 1, and appears three times (in both the singular and the plural) in the third-to-last and the second-to-last line of the whole *liber* (1.83; 10.75–6). The beech's shade will reappear in the finale of the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid* (12.952) will be concluded by (the underworld's) *umbræ*.

<sup>56</sup> As mentioned, the total number of lines in V.'s *libellus* is 830 (with an average of 83 lines per eclogue). The figures used here and below, like Theocritus' numbers, may vary more or less significantly depending on whether certain lines are deleted or not (these and other calculations are based on Mynors' text, which includes, in particular, 8.28a [see n. ad loc.]: without that line, and therefore without the corresponding 8.76n., the sum of *E.* 2 and 8 would yield a total of 181 lines, equal to the sum of *E.* 3 and 7). Textual critics may take these numerical data into account, when appropriate: for instance, when evaluating a proposed deletion. After all, the 'tally' (of sheep) is a typically pastoral activity: see *E.* 6.85n.

410 lines of the last five; similarly, the position of the longest eclogues (3 and 8) at the centre of the two halves of the book contributes to its overall balance. Note, finally, that *E.* 5 is preceded by a 330-line sequence, comparable to the 333 lines that separate *E.* 5 from *E.* 10.

These numerical correspondences may seem far from obvious; yet other, more evident instances of numerical balance can hardly escape the reader's attention, thereby proving beyond reasonable doubt that V. counted his lines.<sup>57</sup> Note, for example, the perfect balance between Mopsus' song and Menalcas' in *E.* 5, each of which contains 25 lines. Similarly, in *E.* 8, both Damon's and Alpheisiboeus' songs include the same number of lines.<sup>58</sup> A less evident yet equally significant correspondence is the one between the singing contests in *E.* 3 and *E.* 7, each of which has 48 lines.

The two principles that we have discussed (sequence and balance) guide V. through his process of measuring and distributing both content and form. These principles can be regarded as manifestations of an even more general principle: i.e. rationalization (or 'regularization'), which also affects the poet's relationship with his Greek models. Note, in particular, the careful way in which V. structures the herdsmen's dialogues, moving away from the somewhat whimsical freedom of Theocritus. First of all, the end of a speech always coincides with the end of a line in the *E.*, with no exceptions (Theocritus made only one exception: *id.* 5.66, which is divided between two different characters). As a result, the *E.* establish a standard that guides the rest of Roman pastoral tradition (while it is entirely ignored by other forms of dialogic hexameter poetry, such as Horace's *Satires*). Secondly, V. pursues systematic rationalization as to how speeches are distributed among characters: thus, in the 'properly dialogic' segments of odd-numbered eclogues, one of the characters opens the dialogue while the other concludes it, so that each character is given the same number of speeches.<sup>59</sup> In Theocritus (esp. *id.* 1 and 3–11), the situation is very different. In *id.* 1, for instance, Thyrsis opens the dialogue and the Goatherd concludes it, so that each of them has three speeches (note that Thyrsis' third speech is, in effect, Daphnis'

<sup>57</sup> In support of this argument, recall that the practice of numbering (or at least counting) lines in books was somewhat widespread in antiquity: some papyri show traces of stichometric notations, on which the standard work is still Ohly (1928). Unconvincing are, on the other hand, numerological attempts to find evidence of arcane arithmetical wisdom in V.'s book (see Maury 1944); for a balanced synthesis, with further bibliography, cf. *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 549–52, s.v. *Bucoliche*, II, *La struttura* (J. Van Sickle); Perutelli (1995, pp. 33–4); add at least Duckworth (1962, pp. 39–40); Otis (1963, pp. 129–30); Skutsch (1969 and 1980); Saint-Denis (1976); Rudd (1976, pp. 119–44); La Penna (1983a, pp. 61–5 = 2005, pp. 53–6); more recently, Breed (2006b); Heyworth (2007, pp. 149–50); Steenkamp (2011); Cucchiarelli (2021b, pp. 196–204).

<sup>58</sup> *E.* 5 and *E.* 8, two 'twin' poems, are interlinked by a complex web of internal echoes and symmetries: cf., respectively, 5.20–44n. and 8.64–109n.

<sup>59</sup> In *E.* 1, Meliboeus begins and Tityrus concludes. In the initial dialogue of *E.* 3 (i.e. before Palaemon appears on stage at 3.55 and 'forces' a proper agon), Menalcas begins and Damoetas concludes. In *E.* 5, Menalcas has the first words and Mopsus the last; the same is true of Lycidas and Moeris in *E.* 9.

song, while the Goatherd's second speech is an ecphrasis). In *id.* 4, by contrast, Battus has both the first and the last words, thereby uttering a total of sixteen speeches (while Corydon has only fifteen).

All these are but specific aspects (and certainly not *all* aspects) of a general tendency displayed by V. in the pastoral book: a tendency to aim for definite, harmonious shapes and quantities, which recur time and again throughout the collection.<sup>60</sup> The result is an acute sensitivity to structural patterns, which privileges the final shape of the volume (i.e. the book as it appears before the reader's eyes) over the process of composition *per se*. For this reason, issues of chronological priority among single eclogues lose much of their importance—even though such questions have entranced generations of scholars and critics (at any rate, it is certain that the book was composed within a relatively limited timespan: cf. above, pp. 3–4). Without a doubt, V. strove to construct a book to be read as a 'synchronic' whole. He must have intervened at various stages of its composition (and in various *loci*) to insert references and echoes. The most obvious case of relative priority, which we already mentioned, is that of *E.* 2 and 3, which, through their detailed Theocritean emulation, introduce a Theocritean style in the initial section of the book, after the unexpected opening of *E.* 1. From this point of view, *E.* 2 and 3 may have been composed among the last, with an eye to the larger picture, and then cited in the closing lines of *E.* 5 (which may themselves have been added or reworked at a later stage).<sup>61</sup> In fact, there is no reason why the composition process could not itself have been a source of inspiration for V. The biographical tradition informs us that V., when coming to grips with his masterpiece (the *Aeneid*), worked simultaneously on all the books into which he had divided the poem (Don. *uita Verg.* 83–9 Brumm. = pp. 28.8–29.5 Brugn.-Stok): it is possible, or even plausible, that he was already working in a similar fashion at the time of the *E.*

At the end of the collection, the poet depicts himself as a herdsman weaving together 'a basket of thin reeds' (*E.* 10.71): the pastoral book itself is the result of a similar process of weaving, featuring countless threads constantly connected to one another. The book is a finished object, to be appreciated in its entirety by the mind and the eyes alike: like a basket, it can be held and carried in the hand or

<sup>60</sup> The number five (along with its multiples) is a recurring quantity: note, above all, the two halves into which the ten-poem book is subdivided. In *E.* 5, each song has 5×5 lines. Five is also the standard number of lines in dialogic exchanges, i.e. the average length of the herdsman's dialogic units, considering the properly 'mimetic' segments alone. In other words, if we exclude *E.* 2, the agon in *E.* 3, the two songs in *E.* 5, and the entirety of *E.* 8 and 10 as well as *E.* 7, which strictly speaking is Meliboeus' continuous narrative, the total number of lines is 250, distributed among fifty speeches: hence, an average of 5 lines per speech. Consider also the first two speeches of the book, counting 5 lines each (*E.* 1.1–10n.).

<sup>61</sup> Few scholars do not consider *E.* 2 to be one of the earliest eclogues: cf. La Penna (1963a, pp. 490–2). Horace himself, in his satirical *libellus*, assigns the initial position to the three satires that best approximate the cynic-diatribical style: then comes, in *sat.* 1.4, an innovative thrust (criticism of Lucilius; Old Comedy as a model).

stored away along with its content.<sup>62</sup> Thus, V. brings to completion an ongoing process of development in the materiality of poetic books, which seems to have undergone a great acceleration during the neoteric age. Catullus, however, lovingly put his *libellus* on display in his very first poem as though it were a miraculous event, but went on never to mention it again in the rest of his collection (at least as far as the book's physical and editorial materiality is concerned). V., by contrast, does not draw attention to the physical book right away, but gradually constructs the material perception of his work with rapid brushstrokes and flashes of colour. The pastoral book emerges as a collection of texts and pages presented sequentially and structured in the complex way outlined above. V.'s refined craftsmanship conceals the physical support precisely in the moment in which it is presupposed: the text of the *E.* contains all the information necessary to appreciate the collection's artful architecture (or, at least, all the information that the poet was interested in offering to his readers). The collection itself is like a codified matrix, which remains unchanged even if its physical support changes radically: as long as the order of the poems stays the same, the collection will stay true to its network of echoes, framing effects, cross-references, and intersections.

A long time has passed, in the history of poetic *libelli*, since the moment when Catullus offered his splendid 'little book' to Cornelius Nepos. Like his neoteric predecessor, V. speaks to an audience capable of understanding and appreciating his *libellus* as a refined repository of songs, even in its material form.<sup>63</sup>

### 5.3. Language and style

V.'s linguistic choices in the *E.* aim at two principal effects. On the one hand, he adopts a lively, colloquial tone corresponding to the herdsmen's simple ethos and to the dialogic (often mimetic) form of pastoral poetry.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand, he

<sup>62</sup> Not unlike Meleager's *στέφανος* (garland/Garland: cf. 10.71n.). Note, however, the even closer resemblance between a woven basket and a papyrus roll. In the finale of the *E.*, the poet's planning activity may include what appears to be an 'editorial link' to his next work, the *Georgics*: see *E.* 10.75–7n. (cf. also 10.24n.); Cucchiarelli (2008). On the one hand, it would hardly be surprising if, in *E.* 10, V. wanted to prearrange the transition to a poem that he had, in all probability, already decided to compose. It is possible, on the other hand, that he modified the finale of *E.* 10 at a later stage (when the *Georgics* were already under way). Both hypotheses are consistent with V.'s allusion to *E.* 1 at the end of the *Georgics*, thus confirming his own conception of the two 'rustic' works as a single whole.

<sup>63</sup> V.'s friends must have included several 'bibliophiles': especially Pollio, who was soon to build a large public library at the *Atrium Libertatis*. It is likely that Cornelius Gallus took an interest in the material production of books: a certain type of papyrus was prepared under his guidance during his stint as the governor of Egypt, and was later named after him (according to Isid. *orig.* 6.10.5, probably echoing Suetonius: cf. p. 132.4–5 Reiff.): *Corneliana a Cornelio Gallo praefecto Aegypti primum confecta*.

<sup>64</sup> The 'modesty' of the pastoral world, expressed in terms of 'delicacy' or 'frailty', is asserted on several occasions (esp. *E.* 1.2 *tenui... aeuena*; 4.2 *humiles myricae*; 10.71 *gracili... hibisco*); hence the ancients' well-known literary theorizations, exemplified by Servius, *praef. E.*, pp. 1.16–2.5 (III.1 Th.-H.).

employs a Hellenizing colour, typical of 'refined' poetry, making the Theocritean model more vividly relevant in the reader's eyes (the importance of Greek forms in V.'s language was known to the ancients: cf. Macr. *Sat.* 5.17.19). These two effects, artfully harmonized with one another, show the way in which V., following his own path, built upon a stylistic form that was previously Catullan and neoteric: everyday language mixed with extremely sophisticated turns (which often sound Greek, and specifically Hellenistic). Like Catullus, V. occasionally resorts to a kind of elevated vocabulary that must have belonged to traditional Roman epos: note, for instance, *amnis* (5.25); *pontus* (6.35); *ratis* (6.76).<sup>65</sup>

In his blending activity, which aims at a 'classicizing' type of moderation, V. constantly avoids excess. On the one hand, he eschews difficult constructions or erudite vocabulary of Alexandrian origin; the Hellenizing colour primarily affects features of inflection that were in relatively common use, and in V. are normally limited to Greek proper nouns.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, the colloquial style is never lowered to the level of vulgar usage, in either morphological or lexical terms: the adjective *cuius* (3.1n.), to name the most significant instance, must most likely be interpreted as an archaism belonging to colloquial language which nonetheless has some literary affectation, given its frequency in Plautus' language (it also makes the opening of *E.* 3 more memorable: the line will, in fact, be quoted at 5.87).<sup>67</sup> A colloquial effect is similarly produced by the use of diminutives (cf. 1.14 *gemellos*; 9.3 *agelli*) which, however, is fairly limited, especially if compared to Catullus and the neoteric poets. The lively contest of *E.* 3 shows remarkable familiarity with the language of comedy, which also occurs elsewhere, particularly in dialogic passages. At the lexical level, the subject matter fosters the use, sparing but not negligible, of technical terms, specifically belonging to the agricultural and pastoral world. These, too, contribute to the 'modest' characterization of the herdsmen's vocabulary, while also displaying signs of a malleable poetic language, capable of exactly (perhaps even affectionately) reproducing its object.<sup>68</sup>

According to a widespread rhetorical principle, the style aiming at the audience's delight (such as that of the *E.*) ought to stick to a 'middle' tone, free from excess, balancing various adornments, both elevated and lowly: cf. Cic. *orat.* 95–6. Moreover, the mimetic aspect of pastoral poetry often involves the use of comic language. Note that Theocritus' close relationship with Sophron's Syracusan mime is inherent to the very origins of pastoral poetry: see above p. 21 and n. 54.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *suboles* at *E.* 4.49; note also plural forms such as *otia* (1.6; 5.61) and *hordea* (5.36); archaic forms like *arbos* (3.56) or even the perfect *risere* (3.9; 4.62).

<sup>66</sup> Nom. sing. ending in *-os* (*Hesperos*), or *-as* (*Menalcas*), or *-e* (*Aegle*); voc. and acc. sing. according to Greek declension (*Alexi*; *Alexin*; *Nerea*); gen. sing. in *-os* (*Amaryllidos*); dat. sing. in *-i* (*Orphei*); acc. plur. in short */a* (*Dryadas*; also found in common nouns of Greek origin: *crateras*, *delphinas*, etc.). The nom. plur. ending in *-es* with a short vowel is perhaps favoured by metrical considerations, since it allows the poet to avoid a cretic sequence: cf. *Arcades* (7.4, etc.); *Proetides* (6.48); yet it has a primarily stylistic value, as is confirmed by its occurrence, without particular necessities, in the common noun *grypes* (8.27).

<sup>67</sup> Note also Numitorius' parody: 3.1n. Similar cases include *magis = potius* (*E.* 1.11); *da = dic* (1.18); *nec uertat bene = ne uertat bene* (9.6). Quite implausible, on the other hand, are attempts to find a 'true' vulgarism in *his = hi* (3.102n.).

<sup>68</sup> To this category belong nouns in *-men* and *-mentum*, which usually denote concrete objects, especially in the rural world: see the standard work by Perrot (1961); cf. Lipka (2001, pp. 16–21);

As for syntax, the search for simple yet elegant constructions led V. towards linguistic forms previously employed by the neoteric poets and often matching Greek usage: note the simple infinitives (1.55 *suadebit inire*; 5.9 *certet... superare*); *certare* + dat. (5.8; 8.55); and the infinitive governed by an adjective (5.1–2).<sup>69</sup> A Greek construction may also highlight the recollection of the model, as in the very noteworthy case of 8.41 (which presupposes *id.* 2.82). The marked position of the vocative, between noun and adjective, must be traced back to the neoteric style (cf. 6.10 *te nostrae, Vare, myrica*): the same goes for the use of parenthetical appositions, like *raucae, tua cura, palumbes* (*E.* 1.57), for which credit has been given to Cornelius Gallus (note the sobriquet *schema Cornelianum*, which is attested in Latin at least since Ennius; see n. ad loc.).

The use of anaphora and repetition, typical of Theocritus' pastoral style, is most probably meant to achieve a 'folk song' colour. Such devices abound in the *E.*, from the first poem (1.3–4) to the epilogue (10.75–7).<sup>70</sup> More specific to Roman taste is the use of alliteration. Already evident in the opening, where it suggests the pipe's delicate musicality (*Tityre, tu patulae*), alliteration often emphasizes meanings, as well as logical and syntactical links, sometimes with an effect of solemnity.<sup>71</sup> Finally, the evocation of spoken, colloquial language accounts for V.'s frequent use of hyperbaton and parentheses in the *E.*<sup>72</sup>

By blending elegance with colloquial tone, V.'s pastoral language proves to be very suitable both to lively dialogues and to the plain, immediate expression of the most intense emotions, such as Meliboeus' sorrow for the expropriations or Corydon's love for Alexis. Elevated vocabulary, in the wake of Hellenistic and neoteric poetry, occurs sporadically, dotting a flexible linguistic fabric which foreshadows the later developments of V.'s style, both epic and narrative. In conclusion, it must therefore be observed that already in the *E.*, V.'s linguistic creativity is

particularly significant is *incrementum* at 4.49. In *E.* 1, the everyday term *caseus* (34) alternates with a rather solemn periphrasis, *pressi copia lactis* (1.81n.). Other terms pertaining to agriculture: *depellere* (1.21; 3.82; 7.15); *fiscella* (10.71); *muletra* (3.30); *nouale* (1.70); *praesepe* (7.39); *ruminare* (6.54); *upilio* (10.19). Attaining an individual bucolic style is the rationale behind V.'s preference for the adjective *formosus* (16x) over *pulcher* (2x), the latter occurring more frequently in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*: see Lipka (2001, pp. 8–10).

<sup>69</sup> Note also the acc. of respect, i.e. the so-called 'Greek' accusative (in fact a quite variable and complex construction, whose interpretation is debated), at *E.* 1.54 *florem... depasta*; 6.15 *inflatum... uenas*; 5.3 *latus... fultus*; 7.5 *succinctam... inguina*; 7.32 *suras euincta*; also 3.106 *inscripti nomina*, as well as the neut. sing. used adverbially at 3.63 *suaue rubens*; 4.43. For a collection of illustrative Virgilian passages, cf. Courtney (2004, with references); see further *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 14–15, s.v. *accusativo alla greca* (*E.* Montanari).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Nisbet (1991, pp. 2–6); further, with examples, Casanova-Robin (2007); comparable cases include the redoubled use of proper nouns, as in 2.69, and the epanalepsis at 6.20–1; cf. also 5.51–2n. On figures of repetition, generally very significant in Latin poetry, see Wills (1996).

<sup>71</sup> Examples in Merone (1961); see further *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 113–16, s.v. *allitterazione* (*A.* De Rosalia); Di Lorenzo (1988); methodological definition and discussion, with bibliography, in Traina (1999b, pp. 75–7).

<sup>72</sup> Cf. *E.* 3.93; 8.109; 9.2–4; 23–5; 10.77; note also the elliptical construction at 3.1–2; 9.1 (two rather different instances, but both placed in a conspicuous, opening position); the euphemistic reticence at 3.8–9; and the sudden question, interrupting the thought, at 3.40, 8.7–8.

expressed not so much through neologisms or other more noticeable innovations, but rather through inconspicuous slips of meaning or, syntactically, through constructions that deviate (albeit imperceptibly) from normal usage—all the while being intuitive and straightforward.<sup>73</sup> Thanks to this complexity of styles and registers, V.'s characters acquire substance: they are, we might say, enlivened.

Among the main reference works on the language and style of the *E.*, note the still valuable account offered by Nisbet (1991); for further reading and bibliography, see Perutelli (1995, esp. pp. 47–51); Lipka (2001, with excellent discussion); von Albrecht (2007, pp. 47–51); Maurach (2008); see also, with further references, *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 572–6, s.v. *Bucoliche: 14 Lingua e metrica* (F. Cupaiuolo); *Virg. Enc.* II, pp. 820–6, s.v. *meter* (R. F. Thomas); III, pp. 1220–2, s.v. *style* (T. Reinhardt). More generally, on V.'s language, the reader can still profit from Bartoli (1900) and, specifically for the *E.*, Gimm (1910), to which we must add the two appendices on V.'s Latin in Jackson Knight (1966<sup>2</sup>) and the more recent Leclercq (1996); note also Horsfall (1995c) and Conte (2002 and 2007). The literature on more specific aspects of the *E.*'s language is vast. Several reference tools are available (among which see esp. Hofmann 1951, on the colloquial register of the herdsmen's dialogues [to be used alongside the Italian edition by L. Ricottilli, with further references, 2003<sup>3</sup>]). On Hellenizing features in V. and in Latin poetry, see Mayer (1999); on colloquial language in the *E.*, see Ottaviano (2013, pp. 11–12); also, more general and richly documented, Beghini (2020). On the Roman poetic language, much useful material is to be found in Lunelli (1980) (including Italian versions of famous papers by W. Kroll, H. H. Janssen, M. Leumann); on literary style more generally, see the standard work by Marouzeau (1946) (for verbal repetitions, cf. Marouzeau 1931); note also Bömer (1957). On V.'s sound effects specifically, the old work of Roiron (1908) may be complemented by Simonetti Abbolito (1987) (on euphony-cacophony, Hanssen 1942); on the so-called 'poetic plural', Gummere (1934); on chiasmic structures, Pasini (1991). On minute aspects of morphology, for which the standard work is Leumann (1977), see Bömer (1953 and 1954); further De Nigris Mores (1972) (adj. in *-ax*); Segura Ramos (1974) (adj. in *-bilis*); Ernout (1949); Knox (1986) (both on adj. in *-osus*); Ernout (1970) (compounds with privative *in-*); Langlois (1961) (adj. in *-bundus*). See also, on diminutives, Gow (1932); Hakamies (1951); on hypocorisms, Opelt (1976). On V.'s neologisms, see the seminal Ladewig (1870), along with Lohmann (1915) on Hellenisms (on the inflection of Greek nouns, cf. Cottino 1906). Besides lexica and concordances, research on various aspect of V.'s vocabulary may profit from useful tools such as Ott (1974) and Bastianini (1982), which must be

<sup>73</sup> The *E.* contain the first kernel of the *Aeneid*'s linguistic innovation: V.'s language, esp. in the *Aeneid*, is distinctive not so much in terms of lexical register or word choice, but in terms of artful estrangement (which was harshly criticized by his detractors: cf. Don. *uita Verg.* 180–3 Brumm. = pp. 39.10–40.3 Brugn.-Stok); see further Conte (2002, pp. 5–63 = 2007, pp. 58–122). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose doctrine sums up many elements of the literary and rhetorical theory of V.'s time, insists on the idea that stylistic value is determined by *compositio* (διὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν) rather than by word choice (διὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν). The example offered by Dionysius is Telemachus' arrival to Eumaeus' hut in *Od.* 16.1–16, where Homer achieves great poetic force by employing words of everyday use, which could readily be uttered by a simple farmer (cf. Dion. Hal. *comp.* 3.7–12 Aujac-Lebel). See further de Jonge (2019, pp. 253–7, 264–5).

complemented by Lecompe (1970) and Najock (2004), specifically on the *E*. For a thorough analysis of pastoral vocabulary (adj. and nouns), see Rumpf (1999). Devoted to several aspects of *V*.’s semantics and vocabulary are Heuzé (1985); Dubrocard (1990); and Dion (1993). On syntax, the standard work is still the old Antoine (1882), but for specific issues see, among the many available contributions, Vaccaro (1966); Malosti (1967); Serbat (1989). In particular, on the role of word order in defining expressiveness in *V*., and the mimetic or iconic use of hyperbaton, see Dainotti (2015).

#### 5.4. Metre

Ancient metricians and interpreters had observed that a typical feature of Theocritus’ hexameter style is the so-called ‘bucolic diaeresis’: i.e. the phenomenon by which the end of the fourth foot coincides with a word-boundary, where a syntactical break can add further emphasis. Bucolic diaeresis, which appears at the outset of the first idyll, occurs in the *E*. starting with the beginning of the first poem (1.7) and ending with the last line of the last poem (10.77).<sup>74</sup>

At times, *V*. openly displays the Hellenistic stylization of his hexameter. One of the most obvious instances is *E*. 2.24 (*Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho*), which could, if transliterated into the Greek alphabet, easily appear in a poem by Callimachus or one of his successors. Yet, following a general trend of Roman poetry, the *E*.’s hexameter frees itself from the specific ‘laws’ (or tendencies) that previously governed Hellenistic hexameter poetry.<sup>75</sup> Compared to his Latin predecessors, *V*. intensifies dactylic rhythm in the first four feet of the hexameter (before him, by contrast, only the first foot was usually dactylic, while spondees prevailed in the following three).<sup>76</sup> Note also a considerable decrease in *spondeiazontes* hexameters (= lines with a spondee in the fifth foot, of which only three instances appear in the whole book: see *E*. 5.38n.; Ott 1978, p. 62). In general, *V*. tends to avoid metrical shapes that hold back the flow of the hexameter, such as molossus-shaped words (i.e. three consecutive long syllables). In contrast to neoteric usage, *V*. often employs enjambement, with the effect of connecting one line to another into long metrical-syntactical sequences: a sense break often coincides with the main caesura (a pattern even more evident in Ovid).<sup>77</sup>

<sup>74</sup> On bucolic diaeresis, which *V*. mainly employs in its dactylic form (i.e. with a dactylic fourth foot, usually occupied by a pyrrhic-shaped word), see Ceccarelli (2008, I, pp. 113–15).

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *Enc. Virg.* I, esp. p. 575b, s.v. *Bucolice* (F. Cupaiuolo); Perutelli (1995, p. 52); more generally, *Enc. Virg.* II, pp. 375–9, s.v. *esametro* (F. Cupaiuolo); Horsfall (1995c, pp. 223–4); for a general overview and analysis of the main metrical phenomena in *V*., *Virg. Enc.* II, pp. 820–6, s.v. *meter* (R. F. Thomas). For a statistical analysis of rhythmical patterns in the *E*., the standard work is still Ott (1978); but cf. also Duckworth (1969, pp. 46–62).

<sup>76</sup> The *E*.’s hexameter, however, features certain peculiarities that distinguish it clearly from that of *G*. and *Aen.*: see Ceccarelli’s conclusions (2008, I, esp. pp. 82–3; 208–9).

<sup>77</sup> Note that *E*. 4 has opposite features, which confirm its neoteric character: esp. several molossi and fewer enjambements, for which cf. Catull. 64; see also below, p. 201.

Among the distinctive traits of metre and prosody in the *E.*, in comparison to V.'s later works, note the relatively sparing (yet remarkable) use of elision.<sup>78</sup> By contrast, hiatus is proportionally more frequent in the *E.* than in *G.* and *Aen.* Usually appearing in Hellenizing contexts, hiatus generally affects a syllable in arsis (in the third foot: *E.* 3.6; in the fifth: 2.24), but it can also affect a shortened vowel in thesis (occurring in monosyllables: 2.65; 8.108), whereas it very rarely affects a naturally short syllable in thesis (2.53).<sup>79</sup> Certain cases of lengthening in arsis are best explained as echoes of archaic prosody: cf. *E.* 1.38; 3.97; 10.69 (still uncertain, however, is the case of *puer* at 9.66; but cf. 7.23). It is likely that V. meant to define his own pastoral style through specific devices, such as the *clausula et mihi Damon* (3.23n.).

## 6

### Textual transmission

The editions by Ribbeck, Sabbadini, Mynors, Geymonat, and Conte (*Georgics* and *Aeneid*<sup>80</sup>) are standard works for V.'s text, as well as for the study of the manuscript tradition. The *E.* are now well served by S. Ottaviano's recent edition (2013), which is particularly noteworthy for its assessment of the manuscript tradition (including a systematic examination of six manuscripts in Beneventan script, each of which is assigned a siglum, while their consensus is denoted as *A*) and its thorough review of the Virgilian philological tradition from antiquity to the modern age.<sup>81</sup> As for the textual transmission of the *E.* (excluding the textual section between 3.72 and 4.51), we can consistently count on the testimony of at least two late antique manuscripts, as the reader can infer from the following synoptic account:

<sup>78</sup> Also known, more correctly, as *synaloepha*: *Enc. Virg.* II, pp. 201–2, s.v. *elisione* (M. Bonaria); still fundamental is Soubiran (1966).

<sup>79</sup> At 3.79 and 6.44, hiatus contributes to a very artful effect of rhythmic-prosodic variation; see *Enc. Virg.* II, pp. 886–8, s.v. *iato* (J. Veremans).

<sup>80</sup> Cf., respectively, *P. Vergilius Maro, Georgica*, edidit et apparatu critico instruxit G. B. Conte, Berlin-Boston 2013 (the same volume also features Ottaviano's edition of the *E.*, cited below); *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*, recensuit atque apparatu critico instruxit G. B. Conte, Berlin-New York 2009 (2019<sup>2</sup>; see further Conte 2016, 2020).

<sup>81</sup> A useful synthesis, specifically for the *E.*, is offered by Coleman, pp. 36–7; on the transmission of V.'s text, cf. Reynolds (1983); Geymonat (1995); further *Enc. Virg.* I, pp. 831–8, s.v. *codici* (M. Geymonat); III, pp. 432–43, s.v. *Medioevo, Tradizione manoscritta* (G. C. Alessio); pp. 964–5, s.v. *papiri* (A. Petrucci); *Virg. Enc.* II, pp. 786–8, s.v. *manuscripts* (C. E. Murgia, C. Kallendorf); II, pp. 966–7, s.v. *papyri and papyrology* (F. Schironi); III, pp. 1254–7, s.v. *text and transmission* (R. Tarrant). Among the most useful and noteworthy contributions to Virgilian philology, featuring divergent viewpoints, see Zetzel (1981, esp. pp. 27–54; 81–147); Timpanaro (1986 and 2001), cf. also Courtney (1981 and 2002–3).

- M** Mediceus (Florent. Laur. 39.1: late V cent.), containing 6.48–10.77 (but see below on  $\gamma$ );  
**P** Palatinus (Vatic. Palat. Lat. 1631: V cent.), lacking 3.72–4.51 (but see below on **a**);  
**R** Romanus (Vatic. Lat. 3867: early VI cent.), lacking 7.1–10.9;  
**V** fragmenta Veronensia (Veron. XL (38): V cent.), containing 3.27–52, 5.86–6.20, 7.12–37, 8.19–44.

To the late antique manuscripts we should add other witnesses, namely the oldest Carolingian manuscripts, dating back to the ninth century. These include:

- a** Bernensis 172 (*E.* 1–*Aen.* 5) cum Parisino lat. 7929 (*Aen.* 6–12): the MS, cut into two halves, lacks 1.1–47 in its first half (it probably derives from **R** for the text of the *E.*, and is therefore useful for recovering its readings in 7.1–10.9). The complete text of the *E.* is transmitted by: **b** Bernensis 165; **c** Bernensis 184; **d** Bernensis 255 + 239; **e** Bernensis 167 (deriving probably from **a**, but with many corrections);  
**f** Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. F. 2.8, complete, with the exception of 1.1–55;  
**h** Valentianensis 407, complete;  
**r** Parisinus lat. 7926, complete; **s** Parisinus lat. 7928, very fragmentary, containing 6.75–10.77; **t** Parisinus lat. 13043, lacking 1.1–8.11;  
**v** Vaticanus lat. 1570 (late IX cent.), complete;  
**\gamma** Guelferbytanus Gudianus lat. 2°.70, complete though very difficult to read due to its many corrections (probably a close relative of **P**, and therefore of some utility for recovering its readings in 3.72–4.51).

No significant contribution to the text of the *E.* has been made by the relatively scanty evidence found on papyri: note especially Pap. Strasb. Lat. 2 (Mertens-Pack<sup>3</sup> n. 2935), III–IV cent., containing *E.* 5.17–34 (II<sub>1</sub>), and Pap. Narm. inv. 66.362 (Mertens-Pack<sup>3</sup> n. 2935.1), I–II cent., containing *E.* 8.53–62.

Significant testimonies come from ancient grammarians, especially Servius, also surviving in an expanded version, i.e. the so-called Servius Danielis, or Servius auctus, first published by Pierre Daniel in 1600 (it is now a widely held view that the added material actually comes from other grammarians, including Donatus).<sup>82</sup> Finally, an inexhaustible source of information is provided by quotations of, or allusions to, V.'s text, which frequently occur in ancient literature.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>82</sup> On V.'s commentators, see now the useful overview in Zetzel (2018, pp. 262–7), with references.

<sup>83</sup> For the textual choices made here, diverging from Mynors' edition, see the *Note on the Text*, p. 35.



VIRGIL'S *ECLOGUES*



# Virgil's *Eclogues*

## Note on the text

The text printed here agrees with Mynors, with a few exceptions: *E.* 2.32; 4.52; 6.34; 8.43. Note also two passages in which my interpretation differs from Mynors' in terms of *personae loquentes* and use of quotation marks: Meliboeus in *E.* 7 (pp. 347–8); 8.105–6 (n. ad *E.* 8.105–8). In general, my punctuation frequently differs from Mynors' and Ottaviano's.

### ECLOGA I

#### MELIBOEUS TITYRUS

- M. Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi  
siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena;  
nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua.  
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra  
formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas. 5
- T. O Meliboee, deus nobis haec otia fecit.  
namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram  
saepe tener nostris ab ouilibus imbuet agnus.  
ille meas errare boues, ut cernis, et ipsum  
ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti. 10
- M. Non equidem inuideo, miror magis: undique totis  
usque adeo turbatur agris. en ipse capellas  
protinus aeger ago; hanc etiam uix, Tityre, duco.  
hic inter densas corylos modo namque gemellos,  
spem gregis, a! silice in nuda conixa reliquit. 15  
saepe malum hoc nobis, si mens non laeua fuisset,  
de caelo tactas memini praedicere quercus.  
sed tamen iste deus qui sit, da, Tityre, nobis.
- T. Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Meliboee, putau  
stultus ego huic nostrae similem, quo saepe solemus 20  
pastores ouium teneros depellere fetus.  
sic canibus catulos similis, sic matribus haedos  
noram, sic paruis componere magna solebam.  
uerum haec tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes

- quantum lenta solent inter uiburna cupressi. 25
- M. Et quae tanta fuit Romam tibi causa uidendi?
- T. Libertas, quae sera tamen respexit inertem,  
candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat,  
respexit tamen et longo post tempore uenit,  
postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit. 30  
namque (fatebor enim) dum me Galatea tenebat,  
nec spes libertatis erat nec cura peculi.  
quamuis multa meis exiret uictima saeptis,  
pinguis et ingratae premeretur caseus urbi,  
non umquam grauis aere domum mihi dextra redibat. 35
- M. Mirabar quid maesta deos, Amarylli, uocares,  
cui pendere sua patereris in arbore poma;  
Tityrus hinc aberat. ipsae te, Tityre, pinus,  
ipsi te fontes, ipsa haec arbusta uocabant.
- T. Quid facerem? neque seruitio me exire licebat 40  
nec tam praesentis alibi cognoscere diuos.  
hic illum uidi iuuenem, Meliboeae, quotannis  
bis senos cui nostra dies altaria fumant.  
hic mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti:  
'pascite ut ante boues, pueri; summittite tauros.' 45
- M. Fortunate senex, ergo tua rura manebunt  
et tibi magna satis, quamuis lapis omnia nudus  
limosoque palus obducat pascua iunco:  
non insueta grauis temptabunt pabula fetas,  
nec mala uicini pecoris contagia laedent. 50  
fortunate senex, hic inter flumina nota  
et fontis sacros frigus captabis opacum;  
hinc tibi, quae semper, uicino ab limite saepes  
Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti  
saepe leui somnum suadebit inire susurro; 55  
hinc alta sub rupe canet frondator ad auras,  
nec tamen interea raucae, tua cura, palumbes  
nec gemere aëria cessabit turtur ab ulmo.
- T. Ante leues ergo pascentur in aethere cerui  
et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis, 60  
ante pererratis amborum finibus exsul  
aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim,  
quam nostro illius labatur pectore uultus.
- M. At nos hinc alii sitientis ibimus Afros,  
pars Scythiam et rapidum cretae uenimus Oaxen 65  
et penitus toto diuisos orbe Britannos.

en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis  
 pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen,  
 post aliquot, mea regna, uidens mirabor aristas?  
 impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit, 70  
 barbarus has segetes. en quo discordia ciuis  
 produxit miseros: his nos consequimur agros!  
 insere nunc, Meliboee, puros, pone ordine uitis.  
 ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae.  
 non ego uos posthac uiridi proiectus in antro 75  
 dumosa pendere procul de rupe uidebo;  
 carmina nulla canam; non me pascente, capellae,  
 florentem cytisum et salices carpētis amaras.

T. Hic tamen hanc mecum poteris requiescere noctem

fronde super uiridi: sunt nobis mitia poma, 80  
 castanae molles et pressi copia lactis,  
 et iam summa procul uillarum culmina fumant  
 maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae.

## ECLOGA II

Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin,  
 delicias domini, nec quid speraret habebat.  
 tantum inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos  
 adsidue ueniebat. ibi haec incondita solus  
 montibus et siluis studio iactabat inani: 5  
 'O crudelis Alexi, nihil mea carmina curas?  
 nil nostri miserere? mori me denique cogis?  
 nunc etiam pecudes umbras et frigora captant,  
 nunc uiridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos,  
 Thestylis et rapido fessis messoribus aestu 10  
 alia serpyllumque herbas contundit olentis.  
 at mecum raucis, tua dum uestigia lustrō,  
 sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis.  
 nonne fuit satius tristis Amaryllidis iras  
 atque superba pati fastidia? nonne Menalcan, 15  
 quamuis ille niger, quamuis tu candidus esses?  
 o formose puer, nimium ne crede colori:  
 alba ligustra cadunt, uaccinia nigra leguntur.  
 despectus tibi sum, nec qui sim quaeris, Alexi,  
 quam diues pecoris, niuei quam lactis abundans. 20  
 mille meae Siculis errant in montibus agnae;  
 lac mihi non aestate nouum, non frigore defit.

canto quae solitus, si quando armenta uocabat,  
 Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho.  
 nec sum adeo informis: nuper me in litore uidi, 25  
 cum placidum uentis staret mare. non ego Daphnin  
 iudice te metuam, si numquam fallit imago.  
 o tantum libeat mecum tibi sordida rura  
 atque humilis habitare casas et figere ceruos,  
 haedorumque gregem uiridi compellere hibisco! 30  
 mecum una in siluis imitabere Pana canendo  
 (Pan primus calamos cera coniungere pluris  
 instituit, Pan curat ouis ouiumque magistros),  
 nec te paeniteat calamo triuisse labellum:  
 haec eadem ut sciret, quid non faciebat Amyntas? 35  
 est mihi disparibus septem compacta cicutis  
 fistula, Damoetas dono mihi quam dedit olim,  
 et dixit moriens: 'te nunc habet ista secundum';  
 dixit Damoetas, inuidit stultus Amyntas.  
 praeterea duo nec tuta mihi ualle reperti 40  
 capreoli, sparsis etiam nunc pellibus albo,  
 bina die siccant ouis ubera; quos tibi seruo.  
 iam pridem a me illos abducere Thestylis orat;  
 et faciet, quoniam sordent tibi munera nostra.  
 huc ades, o formose puer: tibi lilia plenis 45  
 ecce ferunt Nymphae calathis; tibi candida Nais,  
 pallentis uiolas et summa papauera carpens,  
 narcissum et florem iungit bene olentis anethi;  
 tum casia atque aliis intexens suauibus herbis  
 mollia luteola pingit uaccinia calta. 50  
 ipse ego cana legam tenera lanugine mala  
 castaneasque nuces, mea quas Amaryllis amabat;  
 addam cerea pruna (honus erit huic quoque pomo),  
 et uos, o lauri, carpam et te, proxima myrte,  
 sic positae quoniam suavis miscetis odores. 55  
 rusticus es, Corydon; nec munera curat Alexis,  
 nec, si muneribus certes, concedat Iollas.  
 heu heu, quid uolui misero mihi? floribus Austrum  
 perditus et liquidis immisi fontibus apros.  
 quem fugis, a! demens? habitarunt di quoque siluas 60  
 Dardaniusque Paris. Pallas quas condidit arces  
 ipsa colat; nobis placeant ante omnia siluae.  
 torua laena lupum sequitur, lupus ipse capellam,  
 florentem cytisum sequitur lasciua capella,

te Corydon, o Alexi: trahit sua quemque uoluptas. 65  
aspice, aratra iugo referunt suspensa iuueni,  
et sol crescentis decedens duplicat umbras;  
me tamen urit amor: quis enim modus adsit amori?  
a, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit?  
semiputata tibi frondosa uitis in ulmo est: 70  
quin tu aliquid saltem potius, quorum indiget usus,  
uiminibus mollique paras detexere iunco?  
inuenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin.’

### ECLOGA III

#### MENALCAS DAMOETAS PALAEMON

M. Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? an Meliboei?  
D. Non, uerum Aegonis; nuper mihi tradidit Aegon.  
M. Infelix o semper, oues, pecus! ipse Neaeram  
dum fouet ac ne me sibi praeferat illa ueretur,  
hic alienus ouis custos bis mulget in hora, 5  
et sucus pecori et lac subducitur agnis.  
D. Parcius ista uiris tamen obicienda memento.  
nouimus et qui te transuersa tuentibus hircis  
et quo (sed faciles Nymphae risere) sacello.  
M. Tum, credo, cum me arbustum uidere Miconis 10  
atque mala uitis incidere falce nouellas.  
D. Aut hic ad ueteres fagos cum Daphnidis arcum  
fregisti et calamos: quae tu, peruerse Menalca,  
et cum uidisti puero donata, dolebas,  
et si non aliqua nocuisses, mortuus esses. 15  
M. Quid domini faciant, audent cum talia fures?  
non ego te uidi Damonis, pessime, caprum  
excipere insidiis multum latrante Lycisca?  
et cum clamarem ‘quo nunc se proripit ille?  
Tityre, coge pecus’, tu post carecta latebas. 20  
D. An mihi cantando uictus non redderet ille,  
quem mea carminibus meruisset fistula caprum?  
si nescis, meus ille caper fuit; et mihi Damon  
ipse fatebatur, sed reddere posse negabat.  
M. Cantando tu illum? aut umquam tibi fistula cera 25  
iuncta fuit? non tu in triuiis, indocte, solebas  
stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?  
D. Vis ergo inter nos quid possit uterque uicissim  
experiamur? ego hanc uitulam (ne forte recuses,

- bis uenit ad mulctram, binos alit ubere fetus) 30  
depono; tu dic mecum quo pignore certes.
- M. De grege non ausim quicquam deponere tecum:  
est mihi namque domi pater, est iniusta nouerca,  
bisque die numerant ambo pecus, alter et haedos.  
uerum, id quod multo tute ipse fatebere maius 35  
(insanire libet quoniam tibi), pocula ponam  
fagina, caelatum diuini opus Alcimedontis,  
lenta quibus torno facili superaddita uitis  
diffusos hedera uestit pallente corymbos.  
in medio duo signa, Conon et — quis fuit alter, 40  
descripsit radio totum qui gentibus orbem,  
tempora quae messor, quae curuus arator haberet?  
necdum illis labra admoui, sed condita seruo.
- D. Et nobis idem Alcimedon duo pocula fecit  
et molli circum est ansas amplexus acantho, 45  
Orpheaque in medio posuit siluasque sequentis;  
necdum illis labra admoui, sed condita seruo.  
si ad uitulam spectas, nihil est quod pocula laudes.
- M. Numquam hodie effugies; ueniam quocumque uocaris.  
audiat haec tantum — uel qui uenit ecce Palaemon: 50  
efficiam posthac ne quemquam uoce lacessas.
- D. Quin age, si quid habes; in me mora non erit ulla,  
nec quemquam fugio: tantum, uicine Palaemon,  
sensibus haec imis (res est non parua) reponas.
- P. Dicite, quandoquidem in molli consedimus herba 55  
et nunc omnis ager, nunc omnis parturit arbos,  
nunc frondent siluae, nunc formosissimus annus.  
incipite, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca.  
alternis dicetis; amant alterna Camenae.
- D. Ab Ioue principium, Musae: Iouis omnia plena; 60  
ille colit terras, illi mea carmina curae.
- M. Et me Phoebus amat; Phoebus sua semper apud me  
munera sunt, lauri et suaue rubens hyacinthus.
- D. Malo me Galatea petit, lasciuia puella,  
et fugit ad salices et se cupit ante uideri. 65
- M. At mihi sese offert ultro, meus ignis, Amyntas,  
notior ut iam sit canibus non Delia nostris.
- D. Parta meae Veneri sunt munera: namque notauit  
ipse locum, aëriae quo congressere palumbes.
- M. Quod potui, puero siluestri ex arbore lecta 70

- aurea mala decem misi; cras altera mittam.
- D. O quotiens et quae nobis Galatea locuta est!  
partem aliquam, uenti, diuum referatis ad auris!
- M. Quid prodest quod me ipse animo non spernis, Amynta,  
si, dum tu sectaris apros, ego retia seruo? 75
- D. Phyllida mitte mihi: meus est natalis, Iolla;  
cum faciam uitula pro frugibus, ipse uenito.
- M. Phyllida amo ante alias; nam me discedere fleuit  
et longum 'formose, uale, uale', inquit, 'Iolla'.
- D. Triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbres,  
arboribus uenti, nobis Amaryllidis irae. 80
- M. Dulce satis umor, depulsis arbutus haedis,  
lenta salix feto pecori, mihi solus Amyntas.
- D. Pollio amat nostram, quamuis est rustica, Musam:  
Pierides, uitulam lectori pascite uestro. 85
- M. Pollio et ipse facit noua carmina: pascite taurum,  
iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam.
- D. Qui te, Pollio, amat, ueniat quo te quoque gaudet;  
mella fluant illi, ferat et rubus asper amomum.
- M. Qui Bauium non odit, amet tua carmina, Maeui,  
atque idem iungat uulpes et mulgeat hircos. 90
- D. Qui legitis flores et humi nascentia fraga,  
frigidus, o pueri (fugite hinc!), latet anguis in herba.
- M. Parcite, oues, nimium procedere: non bene ripae  
creditur; ipse aries etiam nunc uellera siccatur. 95
- D. Tityre, pascentis a flumine reice capellas:  
ipse, ubi tempus erit, omnis in fonte lauabo.
- M. Cogite ouis, pueri: si lac praeceperit aestus,  
ut nuper, frustra pressabimus ubera palmis.
- D. Heu heu, quam pingui macer est mihi taurus in eruo!  
idem amor exitium pecori pecorisque magistro. 100
- M. His certe neque amor causa est: uix ossibus haerent!  
nescio quis teneros oculus mihi fascinat agnos.
- D. Dic quibus in terris (et eris mihi magnus Apollo)  
tris pateat caeli spatium non amplius ulnas. 105
- M. Dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum  
nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus habeto.
- P. Non nostrum inter uos tantas componere lites:  
et uitula tu dignus et hic, et quisquis amores  
aut metuet dulcis aut experietur amarus. 110  
claudite iam riuos, pueri; sat prata biberunt.

## ECLOGA IV

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus!  
 non omnis arbusta iuuant humilesque myricae;  
 si canimus siluas, siluae sint consule dignae.  
     Vltima Cumaei uenit iam carminis aetas;  
 magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo. 5  
 iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,  
 iam noua progenies caelo demittitur alto.  
 tu modo nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum  
 desinet ac toto surget gens aurea mundo,  
 casta faue Lucina: tuus iam regnat Apollo. 10  
 teque adeo decus hoc aeui, te consule, inibit,  
 Pollio, et incipient magni procedere menses;  
 te duce, si qua manent sceleris uestigia nostri,  
 inrita perpetua soluent formidine terras.  
 ille deum uitam accipiet diuisque uidebit 15  
 permixtos heroas et ipse uidebitur illis,  
 pacatumque reget patriis uirtutibus orbem.  
     At tibi prima, puer, nullo munuscula cultu  
 errantis hederas passim cum baccare tellus  
 mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho. 20  
 ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae  
 ubera, nec magnos metuent armenta leones;  
 ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores.  
 occidet et serpens, et fallax herba ueneni  
 occidet; Assyrium uulgo nascetur amomum. 25  
 at simul heroum laudes et facta parentis  
 iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere uirtus,  
 molli paulatim flauescet campus arista  
 incultisque rubens pendebit sentibus uua  
 et durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella. 30  
 pauca tamen suberunt priscae uestigia fraudis,  
 quae temptare Thetim ratibus, quae cingere muris  
 oppida, quae iubeant telluri infindere sulcos.  
 alter erit tum Tiphys et altera quae uehat Argo  
 delectos heroas; erunt etiam altera bella 35  
 atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles.  
 hinc, ubi iam firmata uirum te fecerit aetas,  
 cedet et ipse mari uector, nec nautica pinus  
 mutabit merces; omnis feret omnia tellus.  
 non rastros patietur humus, non uinea falcem; 40  
 robustus quoque iam tauris iuga soluet arator.

nec uarios discet mentiri lana colores,  
 ipse sed in pratis aries iam suaue rubenti  
 murice, iam croceo mutabit uellera luto;  
 sponte sua sandyx pascentis uestiet agnos. 45

‘Talia saecla’ suis dixerunt ‘currite’ fusis  
 concordēs stabili fatorum numine Parcae.  
 adgredere o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores,  
 cara deum suboles, magnum Iouis incrementum!  
 aspice conuexo nutantem pondere mundum, 50  
 terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum;  
 aspice, uenturo laetantur ut omnia saeclo!  
 o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima uitae  
 spiritus et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta!  
 non me carminibus uincet nec Thracius Orpheus 55  
 nec Linus, huic mater quamuis atque huic pater adsit,  
 Orphei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo.  
 Pan etiam, Arcadia mecum si iudice certet,  
 Pan etiam Arcadia dicat se iudice uictum.

Incipe, parue puer, risu cognoscere matrem 60  
 (matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses)  
 incipe, parue puer: qui non risere parenti,  
 nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est.

### ECLOGA V

#### MENALCAS MOPSUS

- ME. Cur non, Mopse, boni quoniam conuenimus ambo,  
 tu calamos inflare leuis, ego dicere uersus,  
 hic corylis mixtas inter consedimus ulmos?
- MO. Tu maior; tibi me est aequum parere, Menalca,  
 siue sub incertas Zephyris motantibus umbras 5  
 siue antro potius succedimus. aspice, ut antrum  
 siluestris raris sparsit labrusca racemis.
- ME. Montibus in nostris solus tibi certat Amyntas.
- MO. Quid, si idem certet Phoebum superare canendo?
- ME. Incipe, Mopse, prior, si quos aut Phyllidis ignis 10  
 aut Alconis habes laudes aut iurgia Codri.  
 incipe: pascentis seruabit Tityrus haedos.
- MO. Immo haec, in uiridi nuper quae cortice fagi  
 carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notaui,  
 experiar: tu deinde iubeto ut certet Amyntas. 15
- ME. Lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit oliuae,  
 puniceis humilis quantum saliuunca rosetis,

- iudicio nostro tantum tibi cedit Amyntas.  
 sed tu desine plura, puer: successimus antro.
- MO. Exstinctum Nymphae crudeli funere Daphnin 20  
 flebant (uos coryli testes et flumina Nymphis),  
 cum complexa sui corpus miserabile nati  
 atque deos atque astra uocat crudelia mater.  
 non ulli pastos illis egere diebus  
 frigida, Daphni, boues ad flumina; nulla neque amnem 25  
 libauit quadripes nec graminis attigit herbam.  
 Daphni, tuum Poenos etiam ingemuisse leones  
 interitum montesque feri siluaeque loquuntur.  
 Daphnis et Armenias curru subiungere tigris  
 instituit, Daphnis thiasos inducere Bacchi 30  
 et foliis lentas intexere mollibus hastas.  
 uitis ut arboribus decori est, ut uitibus uuae,  
 ut gregibus tauri, segetes ut pinguibus aruis,  
 tu decus omne tuis. postquam te fata tulerunt,  
 ipsa Pales agros atque ipse reliquit Apollo. 35  
 grandia saepe quibus mandauimus hordea sulcis,  
 infelix lolium et steriles nascuntur auenae;  
 pro molli uiola, pro purpureo narcisso  
 carduus et spinis surgit paliurus acutis.  
 spargite humum foliis, inducite fontibus umbras, 40  
 pastores (mandat fieri sibi talia Daphnis),  
 et tumulum facite, et tumulo superaddite carmen:  
 'Daphnis ego in siluis, hinc usque ad sidera notus,  
 formosi pecoris custos, formosior ipse.'
- ME. Tale tuum carmen nobis, diuine poeta, 45  
 quale sopor fessis in gramine, quale per aestum  
 dulcis aquae saliente sitim restinguere riuo.  
 nec calamis solum aequiperas, sed uoce magistrum:  
 fortunate puer, tu nunc eris alter ab illo.  
 nos tamen haec quocumque modo tibi nostra uicissim 50  
 dicemus, Daphninque tuum tollemus ad astra;  
 Daphnin ad astra feremus: amaui nos quoque Daphnis.
- MO. An quicquam nobis tali sit munere maius?  
 et puer ipse fuit cantari dignus, et ista  
 iam pridem Stimichon laudauit carmina nobis. 55
- ME. Candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi  
 sub pedibusque uidet nubes et sidera Daphnis.  
 ergo alacris siluas et cetera rura uoluptas  
 Panaque pastoresque tenet Dryadasque puellas.

nec lupus insidias pecori, nec retia ceruis	60
ulla dolum meditantur: amat bonus otia Daphnis.	
ipsi laetitia uoces ad sidera iactant	
intonsi montes; ipsae iam carmina rupes,	
ipsa sonant arbusta: 'deus, deus ille, Menalca!'	
sis bonus o felixque tuis! en quattuor aras:	65
ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo.	
pocula bina nouo spumantia lacte quotannis	
craterasque duo statuam tibi pinguis oliui,	
et multo in primis hilarans conuiuia Baccho	70
(ante focum, si frigus erit; si messis, in umbra)	
uina nouum fundam calathis Ariusia nectar.	
cantabunt mihi Damoetas et Lyctius Aegon;	
saltantis Satyros imitabitur Alphesiboeus.	
haec tibi semper erunt, et cum sollemnia uota	
reddemus Nymphis, et cum lustrabimus agros.	75
dum iuga montis aper, fluuios dum piscis amabit,	
dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae,	
semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.	
ut Baccho Cererique, tibi sic uota quotannis	
agricolae facient: damnabis tu quoque uotis.	80
MO. Quae tibi, quae tali reddam pro carmine dona?	
nam neque me tantum uenientis sibilus Austri	
nec percussa iuuant fluctu tam litora, nec quae	
saxosas inter decurrunt flumina uallis.	
ME. Hac te nos fragili donabimus ante cicuta;	85
haec nos 'formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin,'	
haec eadem docuit 'cuium pecus? an Meliboei?'	
MO. At tu sume pedum, quod, me cum saepe rogaret,	
non tulit Antigenes (et erat tum dignus amari),	
formosum paribus nodis atque aere, Menalca.	90

## ECLOGA VI

Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu  
 nostra neque erubuit siluas habitare Thalea;  
 cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem  
 uellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis  
 pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.' 5  
 nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,  
 Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)  
 agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:

non iniussa cano. si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis  
 captus amore leget, te nostrae, Vare, myricae, 10  
 te nemus omne canet; nec Phoebo gratior ulla est  
 quam sibi quae Vari praescrispsit pagina nomen.

Pergite, Pierides. Chromis et Mnasyllus in antro  
 Silenum pueri somno uidere iacentem,  
 inflatum hesterno uenas, ut semper, Iaccho; 15  
 serta procul tantum capiti delapsa iacebant  
 et grauis attrita pendebat cantharus ansa.  
 adgressi (nam saepe senex spe carminis ambo  
 luserat) iniciunt ipsis ex uincola sertis.  
 addit se sociam timidisque superuenit Aegle, 20  
 Aegle Naiadum pulcherrima, iamque uidenti  
 sanguineis frontem moris et tempora pingit.  
 ille dolum ridens 'quo uincola nectitis?' inquit;  
 'soluite me, pueri; satis est potuisse uideri.  
 carmina quae uultis cognoscite; carmina uobis, 25  
 huic aliud mercedis erit.' simul incipit ipse.  
 tum uero in numerum Faunosque ferasque uideres  
 ludere, tum rigidas motare cacumina quercus;  
 nec tantum Phoebo gaudet Parnasia rupes,  
 nec tantum Rhodope miratur et Ismarus Orphea. 30

Namque canebat uti magnum per inane coacta  
 semina terrarumque animaeque marisque fuissent  
 et liquidi simul ignis; ut his ex omnia primis,  
 omnis et ipse tener mundi concreuerit orbis;  
 tum durare solum et discludere Nerea ponto 35  
 coeperit et rerum paulatim sumere formas;  
 iamque nouum terrae stupeant lucescere solem,  
 altius atque cadant summotis nubibus imbres,  
 incipiant siluae cum primum surgere cumque  
 rara per ignaros errent animalia montis. 40  
 hinc lapides Pyrrhae iactos, Saturnia regna,  
 Caucaciasque refert uolucris furtumque Promethei.  
 his adiungit, Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum  
 clamassent, ut litus 'Hyla, Hyla' omne sonaret;  
 et fortunatam, si numquam armenta fuissent, 45  
 Pasiphaen niuei solatur amore iuenci.  
 a, uirgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit?  
 Proetides implerunt falsis mugitibus agros,  
 at non tam turpis pecudum tamen ulla secuta  
 concubitus, quamuis collo timuisset aratrum 50