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Abstract

JOHN H. HENKEL: Writing Poems on Trees:
Genre and Metapoetics in Vergil’s *Eclogues* and *Georgics*.
(Under the direction of James O’Hara.)

This dissertation seeks to provide firmer grounding for the study of metapoetics in Roman poetry by investigating Vergil’s use of metapoetic narrative, symbolism, and metaphor in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. I argue that Vergil’s patterning of characters in the *Eclogues* after existing narratives, his discussion of farming in the *Georgics*, and the related references to trees and shade in the *Eclogues*, can be read as reflecting metaphorically on the theory and practice of poetry in Rome in the late first century BCE. By comparing Vergil’s discussions of trees and farming with passages of explicit literary criticism in Horace, Cicero, and others, I show that Vergil structures the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* in a way that allows references to agriculture and the natural world to be read as metaphors not only for life, as some *Georgics* scholars have shown, but also for poetry.

My first chapter demonstrates my method by discussing a specific, pointed allusion to Aratus and his Hellenistic reception in Vergil’s passage on the farmer’s nighttime activities (*Geo.* 1.291–296). Here, as throughout the dissertation, I argue that certain passages about trees and/or farming can also be seen as literal reflections of the terms of literary-critical metaphors, such as the “wakefulness” (*agrypnie*) for which Callimachus praises Aratus’s *Phaenomena* (Callimachus *Epigram* 27). My second, third, and fourth chapters discuss a coherent pattern of literary symbolism in Vergil’s references to trees, forests, shade, and grafting in the *Eclogues* (Ch. 2–3) and the
Georgics (Ch. 4). In Chapters 2–3 I also argue that Vergil patterns the narratives of Eclogues 2, 8, and 10 after erotic narratives from Callimachus, Theocritus, and Gallus in order to represent the interaction between Gallan love elegy and Theocritean pastoral in the Eclogues through the love affairs of characters in these poems. In my conclusion I outline further patterns of metapoetic symbolism in Vergil and show that other Augustan poets both allude to Vergil’s metapoetic symbols and, using the same technique, devise metapoetic symbols of their own.
For Franny...

ducción amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus.
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Introduction

Vergil is prolific in his use of metaphor to reveal his poetic program. In fact, compared to some of his contemporaries, he gives us very little information about his poetic program in any other form. Many of the metaphors he uses are highly allusive and depend for their meaning on the recognition of specific allusions. So in *Eclogue* 6 Vergil expresses his Callimacheanism in part by styling his poem as “fine-spun” (*deductum carmen*, 6.5), using a weaving metaphor that alludes to the metaphorical fineness (*λεπτότης*) of Callimachean poetry. Other metaphors are more or less conventional (although these are sometimes also specifically allusive), as when in the *Georgics* Vergil characterizes his progress through the poem as a chariot race or sea journey. On the handful of occasions when Vergil seems to be telling us something straightforward about his poem, as when he characterizes the *Eclogues* as “Sicilian”/“Syracusan” (= Theocritean; *Ecl.* 4.1, 6.1) verse or the *Georgics* as an “Ascraean” (= Hesiodic; *Geo.* 2.176) song, he seems at least partly to mislead us, since, as Farrell has shown, he makes these claims at the same time as his imitative program is departing from these models.¹ By contrast, while other Augustan poets are likewise prolific in their allusive use of programmatic metaphors, they also make straightforward statements that help us to contextualize their metaphorical claims. So Propertius and Ovid engage openly in literary polemic between elegy and hexameter epic (Prop. 1.7, 1.9; Ov. *Am.* 2.18), and Horace’s hexameter poetry is rife with

both explicit literary criticism and open discussion of literary history and technique (especially in the *Ars Poetica*).

This dissertation will argue that, aside from overtly programmatic metaphors, Vergil uses metaphor in another, more subtly programmatic way as well. What is distinctive about Vergil, and has not been fully appreciated by earlier studies of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, is that Vergil often literalizes the terms involved in programmatic and literary-critical metaphors. Thus passages with no overtly programmatic claims can function as metapoetic self-commentary. Metaphors drawn either from the natural world or from agriculture and farm life supply much of the Latin vocabulary for talking about other areas of life. This is frequently the case with literary-critical terms: to take an example I have already mentioned, *tenuis* and *deductum*, the familiar Latin terms for Callimachean refinement, are treated by the poets as metaphors drawn from weaving; the opposite term, *pinguis*, can be seen either as a biological metaphor (“fat”) or as an agricultural one (“rich,” as in “rich soil”). Even the technical vocabulary of literature and books is often found to be metaphorical in origin—or at least is treated as such by the ancients. So Servius tells us that *liber*, “book,” is derived from *liber*, “bark,” because “before the use of papyrus book rolls were put together from the barks of trees” (ad *Aen.* 11.554). By literalizing the terms of metaphors like these, Vergil is able to talk metapoetically about literature and literary criticism at the same time as he talks literally about weaving, soil, etc. Essentially, this practice reverses the usual direction of metaphorical language: whereas usually literature is described in language that metaphorically evokes agriculture and the natural world, here Vergil’s discussion of agriculture and the natural world is arranged so as to evoke the literary and literary-critical terms for which they elsewhere serve as metaphors. Vergil’s use of these metaphors is systematic and coherent, and it constitutes a major avenue of metapoetic self-commentary in the *Eclogues* and
This metapoetic technique engages with important intellectual trends of the first century BC. First, inasmuch as Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism consists of the continuous and connected use of metaphor, it fits the ancient definition of allegoria—a term that may have been new to Greek and Latin critical discourse in the first century BC—which, according to Cicero, occurs “when very many metaphors have poured forth at once” (Orat. 94). This Vergilian allegory is not of the biographical/historical type familiar from Servius and other Vergilian commentators, but rather specifically metapoetic allegory, i.e. poetry that uses a system or systems of related metaphors to reflect implicitly on poetry and on its author’s poetic program. Such metapoetic allegory is known especially from the non-Servian scholia; although Servius himself makes a number of such comments on Ecl. 10, elsewhere he follows Donatus in categorically rejecting allegory when it does not pertain to the praise of Caesar and the loss of Vergil’s lands. Second, since Vergil’s metapoetic technique seems to identify

---

2See Innes 2003, 19–20 and cf. Orat. 3.166, Quint. Inst. 8.6.44, and Plut. Quomodo adul. 19EF. Quintilian cites examples including Horace’s “ship of state” (Odes 1.14), as well as extended metaphors like Vergil’s sed nos immensum spatis confecimus aequor, | et iam tempus equum fumantia solvere colla (Geo. 2.541–542) and what Quintilian refers to as “allegory without metaphor” at Ecl. 9.7–10, where he says that Vergil is to be understood beneath the figure of Menalcas. On the newness of the term allegory see Boys-Stones 2003, 2–3, who notes that both Plutarch (Quomodo adul. 19e–f) and Cicero (Orat. 94) speak of allegory as if it is a newly coined term; cf. also Whitman 1987, 263–268 on the history of the term.

3On the term “metapoetic” and on similar “meta-” terms, see Beardsley and Raval 1993, 756.

4See VSD 66, illud tenendum esse praedicimus: in Bucolicis Vergillii neque nusquam neque ubique aliquid fiquare dici, hoc est per allegoriam. vix enim propter laudem Caesaris et amissos agros haec Vergilio conceduntur, cum Theocritus simpliciter conscriptos, quem hic noster conatur imitari, and cf. Serv. praef. in Buc., aliquibus locis per allegoriam agat gratias Augusto vel alius nobilibus, quorum favore amissum agrum receptat et Serv. ad Ecl. 3.20, refutandae enim sunt allegoriae in buclico carmine, nisi cum, ut supra diximus, ex aliqua agrorum perditorum necessitate descendunt. One example of such a metapoetic allegorical reading is found in the ancient commentaries on Ecl. 3.70–71, quod potui, puero ex silvestri ex arbori lecta | aurae mala decem nisi; cras altera mittam. The Scholia Bernensia preserve the following comment: allegorice ex agresti carmine decem eclogas misi Octauiano scriptas. Servius, as often, dismisses this type of interpretation: et volunt quidam hoc loco allegoriam esse ad Augustum de decem eclogis: quod superfluum est: quae enim necessitas hoc loco allegoriae? Outside of Ecl. 10, Servius admits metapoetic allegory in the Eclogues only three times, at 3.111, 5.48, and 8.12 (cf. 10.17, 10.31, and 10.71); he specifically rejects such allegories at
a literal reality behind the metaphorical terms of literature and literary criticism, it is connected also to contemporary etymologizing, which treated metaphor as an important means of word formation. The most important Latin treatise on etymology, Varro’s *De Lingua Latina*, was probably published only a decade or less before the *Eclogues*,\(^5\) and scholars have amply shown that this contemporary intellectual trend had important effects on Augustan poetry and, especially, on Vergil.\(^6\)

This dissertation will focus mostly on Vergil’s use in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* of metapoetic symbolism associated with trees and related images and ideas, such as forests, shadows, and arboriculture. Forests and trees are ubiquitous in the *Eclogues* and arboriculture is the primary topic of *Georgics* 2, so these texts (along with one passage from *Geo.* 1) will receive the most direct consideration. Throughout these poems, trees and related images come to symbolize poetry and literary traditions, and Vergil uses the metapoetic symbolism attached to features of the natural world as one means of articulating his literary program and of expressing his own views on how he fits into literary history, especially in terms of genre. In any attempt to write literary history, genre plays an important role in constituting discreet literary traditions and determining how poets relate to their predecessors. Not surprisingly, then, we find that the primary aim of Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism—at least in relation to trees, etc.—is to situate his poetry within one or more generic traditions. Thus we find in the *Eclogues* that Vergil uses metapoetic symbolism associated with trees, forests, and shade to represent his collection as both Theocritean bucolic and Callimachean/Gallan elegy at the same time, and in *Georgics* 2 we find Vergil asserting through metapoetic symbolism that the *Georgics* are Hesiodic agricultural didactic,

---

\(^{5}\)See below Ch. 2 n. 21.

\(^{6}\)See conveniently O’Hara 1996.
even though the imitative program of *Georgics* 2 is thoroughly Lucretian.

Chapter 1 is both a close study of one passage in *Georgics* 1 and a methodological consideration of Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism. Unlike Chapters 2–4 it does not specifically treat the symbolism of trees, but it establishes that Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism results largely from the literalization of literary and literary-critical metaphors. In this chapter I examine a brief agricultural vignette at Geo. 1.291–296 that highlights the work ethic of a certain farmer, who along with his wife labors hard at his agricultural tasks, even at night. This passage is shown to be a metapoetic allusion to Aratus, since a number of the literal components of this vignette show detailed correspondence to the metaphorical terms in which Hellenistic and Roman poets praised Aratus for the hard work and refinement of his didactic poem on astronomy, the *Phaenomena*. Aside from establishing the methodology of Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism, this chapter also shows that *labor*, a term that is central to the ethics and metaphysics of the *Georgics*, functions also as a metapoetic symbol for stylistic refinement in poetry.

Chapters 2 and 3 look at Vergil’s development of tree-related metapoetic symbolism in the *Eclogues*, especially as it pertains to genre, literary traditions, and literary influence. These chapters argue that this symbolism depicts the *Eclogues*—or at least *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10—as a generic hybrid between bucolic and elegy, and that Vergil uses metapoetic symbolism to figure the literary relationship between his own pastoral composition in the *Eclogues* and the elegiac poetry of Cornelius Gallus. Chapter 2 contains a full methodological discussion of metapoetic symbolism of the type seen in the Aratus vignette in *Georgics* 1. It also introduces the idea of “metanarrative” symbolism, through which, as I argue, Vergil suggests generic affiliations with both pastoral and elegy through the congruency of his characters’ narratives with well-known and generically exemplary narratives from literary history. This
chapter goes on to look at pastoral and elegiac metanarratives in *Eclogues* 2 and 8. Chapter 3 discusses generic metanarratives in *Eclogue* 10 and takes a new approach to the question of whether Gallus wrote pastoral poetry, arguing that Gallus’s own elegiac poetry probably expressed his commitment to elegy, and that Gallus’s speech in *Ecl.* 10 addresses the tension between this programmatic commitment in his own poetry and his appearance as a shepherd in Vergil’s pastoral *Eclogues*. Finally, Chapter 3 also contains detailed consideration of the metapoetic symbols related to trees in the *Eclogues*, including forests (*silvae*), trees (*arbores*), shade (*umbra*), and echoing landscapes.

Chapter 4 returns to the *Georgics* to argue that Vergil’s treatment of arboriculture in *Georgics* 2 can be seen as an extension and development of the tree-related metapoetic symbolism of the *Eclogues*. Because trees and forests stand metapoetically for poetry and literature, Vergil is here able to use Theophrastus’s treatise on how to grow trees (*Historia Plantarum* 2) as an intertextual model for his own metapoetic discussion of how to compose poetry. Throughout the introductory section of *Georgics* 2, artificial and natural means of tree propagation figure artificial and natural methods of poetic composition, mirroring the opposition of *ars* and *ingenium* in contemporary literary theory. In particular, Vergil’s treatment of grafting, which presents notorious difficulties when read literally, can be seen as a metapoetic analogy for Vergilian intertextuality, which produces a new poetic whole by grafting together intertextual components from other poems.

In my concluding chapter, I briefly discuss further metapoetic symbolism in Vergil and argue that this Vergilian technique was recognized and imitated by other Augustan poets. Although metapoetic tree symbolism is especially important in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, tree symbolism appears also in the *Aeneid*, where one scholar has shown that grafting stands for intertextuality also in Vergil’s description of the
scepter of Latinus (Aen. 12.206–211). Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism, moreover, is not confined only to images and ideas related to trees. Here I briefly lay out the case that, from the very first line of the *Georgics*, Vergil broadly relates farming to versification using the metaphorical derivation of “verse,” *versus*, from “plowing,” *terram vertere*. Finally, I suggest briefly that metapoetic symbolism of the type that Vergil develops in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* is broadly employed by other Augustan poets and is characteristic of Augustan poetry generally. Although there is no way to know that it is Vergil, instead of some lost predecessor (Gallus is an obvious candidate), who is responsible for the development of this technique, metapoetic symbolism is nevertheless associated especially with Vergilian contexts in other Augustan poets. Whether or not Vergil invented this poetic technique, metapoetic symbolism is strongly characteristic of Vergil’s style, and an understanding of it can help us understand much about Vergilian poetry, including why Vergil chose to write about such topics as he did, and why—as in his discussion of grafting—his precepts in the *Georgics* seem sometimes to be lies.

---

7 Marquis 2008.
Chapter 1

Aratus and Nighttime labor: A Self-Reflexive Metaphor in Georgics 1

1.1 Introduction: A Metapoetic Vignette

This chapter aims to demonstrate the plausibility of my claim that Vergil’s treatment of agriculture in the Georgics can be read as a metaphorical treatment of literature and literary composition in the 1st century BC. I hope to accomplish this goal by showing that the poem’s central metaphysical theme, the necessity of labor (‘toil’) in the present age, is, in at least one important passage, a dense metapoetical allegory for the central importance of hard work and constant refinement in the practice of modern poetic composition. The passage discussed below, a six-line vignette on nighttime farm work, has no explicit relevance to Vergil’s literary program in the Georgics; it rather illustrates a general principle—that modern man must labor constantly—by describing the chores that occupy a farmer and his wife even at night. Vergil’s description of these chores, however, is based not on the experience of any real or
imagined farmer, but rather on the language that two Hellenistic poets used to characterize the poetry of one of their contemporaries: in almost every line Vergil has literalized an agricultural metaphor that Callimachus or Leonidas used to characterize the hard work and refinement evident in Aratus’s *Phaenomena*, the most eminent and successful work of Hellenistic didactic poetry.

Through the dense and consistent metapoetic allusions in this passage, Vergil forges a permanent link between the most important metaphysical theme of the *Georgics*, *labor*, and the quality most consistently associated with Aratus, λεπτότης (“refinement”). The association of *labor* with poetic refinement has implications not just for *Geo.* 1, with its heavy emphasis on this theme (especially in the “Aetiology of *labor*” at lines 118–159), but also for the themes of later books, which are defined in terms of *labor* (e.g., the superiority of the olive over the vine in *Geo.* 2). I hope to treat some of these themes individually later; in this study, the present chapter will confine its scope to the metapoetic vignette at *Geo.* 1.291–296, and to demonstrating that the density of poetological metaphor found in these lines reflects their programmatic importance for *Geo.* 1 and for the entire poem.

In the midst of a notably Hesiodic discussion of nighttime and winter work (*Geo.* 1.287–310), Vergil inserts the following brief episode, describing, in picturesque detail, the household work done at night by a certain farmer and his wife.

And a certain man stays up nights by the late blaze of a winter fire, and with sharp knife points torches; his wife the while solaces with song her
long toil, runs the shrill shuttle through the web, or on the fire boils down the sweet juice of must, and skims with leaves the froth of the bubbling cauldron.¹

This rustic vignette has long charmed readers with its apparent simplicity, but beneath this seeming humility, these six lines act to effect a sophisticated and programmatic metapoetic allusion to Aratus and his astronomical didactic poem, the *Phaenomena*. Other scholars have identified metapoetic passages in the *Georgics*, notably in Vergil’s description of the Corycian gardener at *Geo*. 4.125–148, but the present example offers a unique chance to explore the phenomenon, since we have preserved both a full text of the *Phaenomena* and a substantial tradition of its Greek and Latin reception, a luxury we do not have for the figures supposed to stand behind the old gardener in Book 4.² Aratus, moreover, is important to the *Georgics* not only as a source of didactic material—as he is in the weather signs in Book 1 (*Geo*. 1.351–463)—but also, and more importantly, as Vergil’s most prominent Greek didactic predecessor after Hesiod.

### 1.2 Hellenistic Epigram and the Roman Reception of the *Phaenomena*

Aratus’s prominence in didactic poetry could be shown simply from his influence on Hellenistic and later poetry,³ but we also have three literary-critical epigrams

---

¹Translations throughout this chapter are adapted from Fairclough (Vergil), Murray (Homer), Nisetich (Callimachus), Kidd (Aratus), Rouse (Lucretius), and Paton (Leonidas); the translation of Cinna is my own.

²For recent bibliography on the Corycian gardener, see Thibodeau 2001, and more recently Harrison 2004.

³For an outline of Aratus’s influence on his contemporaries and among later Latin poets, see Kidd 1997, 36–43. For debate over the reason for this immediate and lasting popularity (for a poet much excoriated in 20th-century scholarship), see Kidd 1961; Sale 1966; Lewis 1992.
devoted to praising the *Phaenomena*: Callimachus *Epigram* 27 Pfeiffer (= AP 9.507 = 56 Gow-Page), Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 9.25 (= 101 Gow-Page), and *SH* 712 by “King Ptolemy” (= Page, *FGE* 311–314). The poem itself is an adaptation into hexameter verse of a prose treatise on astronomy by Eudoxus, an impressive poetic feat, which was admired all the more for the stylistic refinement that its author achieved in accomplishing this difficult task: the epigrams of Callimachus, Leonidas, and Ptolemy all praise Aratus or his poem with some form of the important 3rd-century stylistic term, λεπτός (“slender,” “subtle”). In particular, Aratus seems to have been admired for certain technical features of his style, including a pun that Callimachus and Leonidas seem to have recognized, and a programmatic acrostic apparently known to all three epigrammatists. Of these three epigrams, those of Callimachus and Leonidas were known to the Romans through Meleager’s *Garland*, and their regard for Aratus’s stylistic accomplishments had demonstrable influence over Aratus’s reception at Rome: Cinna, Lucretius, and Vergil allude to Aratus using the terms established in these two epigrams, and Vergil, as part of his imitation of Aratus in *Geo.* 1, seems even to imitate the stylistic features to which Callimachus and Leonidas advert in their epigrams.

The first of these stylistic features is a pun on Aratus’s name in the first two lines of the *Phaenomena*. Aside from its prominent position, the pun is notable for its pointed irony, since Aratus plays on his name, Ἀράτος or Ἀρητος—which he leaves

---

4 *SH* 712 is transmitted in the life of Aratus (p. 79 Maass) under the name Πτολεμαῖος ὁ βασιλεύς; on its probable ascription to Ptolemy Philadelphus, see Page 1981, 84 and Cameron 1995, 323 n. 106 (with further references).

5 Callim. *Epig.* 27.3–4: λεπταὶ ῥῆσιες [of the *Phaen.*], Leonidas *AP* 9.25.1–2: λεπτὴ φροντίδα [of Aratus’s style in the *Phaen.*], Ptolemy *SH* 712.4: λεπτολόγος [of Aratus]; the epigrams of Callimachus and Leonidas are quoted in full below.

6 Farrell 1991, 157–168 (esp. 163–168) makes a similar point about the influence of Callim. *Epig.* 27 by arguing that Vergil’s imitation of Hesiod and Aratus together in *Geo.* 1 is inspired partly by the connection that Callimachus draws in this epigram between Aratus and Hesiod.
otherwise unmentioned in the poem—with the word ἀρρήτον, “unuttered”: Ἕκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ’ ἄνδρες ἐδοµὲν ἅρρητον...(Phaen. 1–2). The second of these features is an acrostic of the important stylistic term ΛΕΠΤΗ, which begins six lines into Aratus’s discussion of weather signs.

Λεπτὴ μὲν καθαρὴ τε περὶ τρίτον ἠμαρ ἐυάσα
ἐνδοκαὶ τε έη, λεπτὴ δὲ καὶ ευ ναλ’ ἐρευνής
πνευματίη παχίων δὲ καὶ ἀμβλείται κεραίαι
πέτραον ἐκ τριτάτοιο φόως ἀμενὴν ἐβίουσα
νέ νότω ἀμβλύνετ ἡ ὑδατος ἐγγὺς ἐώνος.

(Arat. Phaen. 783–787)

It is virtually certain that Aratus intended this acrostic, since (1) it is a so-called “gamma-style” acrostic, which reads both across and down, and (2) it is supported by another λεπτη in the second line. The acrostic is remarkable because it is not an authorial signature, as most acrostics are, but rather an apparent declaration of its author’s adherence to the Hellenistic stylistic program of stylistic refinement (λεπτότης). Although modern scholarship has rediscovered these two features of the Phaenomena only in the last fifty years, Aratus’s contemporaries seem to have known them, since both Callimachus and Leonidas allude to both of them in epigrams that become important for the Roman reception of the poem.

7 The pun has been independently observed at least four times: Levitan 1979; Kidd 1981; Hopkinson 1988, at Phaen. 2; and Bing 1990. Notice of all of these is found in the full and helpful notes of Bing 1993 (see esp. 105 n. 11), which revises Bing 1990.

8 The acrostic was discovered by Jacques 1960, who pointed out that the device seems to imitate a similar, probably fortuitous, five-letter acrostic at Il. 24.1–5, ΛΕΥΚΗ (Kidd 1997 points out at Phaen. 738 that Aratus has λεπτη for Homer’s λευκή also at Phaen. 80 = Il. 6.45). The term “gamma-style acrostic” is coined by Morgan 1993.

9 On acrostics as authorial signatures and the abnormality of Aratus’s thematic acrostic see Courtney 1990, esp. 10-11. Vogt 1967 is the best treatment of the literary-critical significance of Aratus’s pun in light of the Hellenistic program of λεπτότης, the most polemical proponent of which was Callimachus; for a briefer summary of the aesthetic implications of λεπτός see Kidd 1997, at Phaen. 783. Cameron 1995, 321–328 has suggested, perhaps rightly, that this program originated not with Callimachus but with Aratus, who titled a collection of short poems κατά λεπτόν (whence the pseudo-Vergilian Catalepton).
Callimachus *Epig.* 27 is almost universally quoted in discussions of Aratus and his reception, both because of its apparent recognition of Aratus’s acrostic, and because it connects the poem’s theme (ἀείσµα) and style (τρόπος) to that of the first didactic poet, Hesiod.

῾Ησιόδου τὸ τ´ ἄεισµα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδόν ἔσχατον, ἀλλ’ ὁκνέω μη τὸ μελιχρότατον τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεύς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε λεπταί ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη.

(Callim. *Epig.* 27 Pf.)

The song is Hesiod’s in theme and style, but it isn’t Hesiod to the last drop: No the man of Soloi has skimmed the sweetness and left the rest. Hail, delicate discourses, earnest vigil of Aratus.

Callimachus praises the style of Aratus’s poem by hailing it as λεπταὶ ῥήσιες, a gesture that many scholars believe alludes to Callimachus’s recognition of and approval of Aratus’s ΛΕΠΤΗ acrostic. And in the same words, Callimachus seems to reveal his recognition of Aratus’s pun, since Callimachus himself has punned on Aratus’s name (“Ἀρητὸς ≈ ἀρρήτος, “unuttered”) by juxtaposing it with ῥήσιες (“utterances”): χαίρετε λεπταί ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη.

Aside from these two allusions,

---

10 The text of this epigram is notoriously problematic. I follow Cameron 1995, 374–379 in accepting ἀοιδόν and σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη as transmitted in the *Anthology* (cf. also Lohse 1967 and Cameron 1972). Ruhnken’s conjecture of σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης line 4, however, is attractive because neither of the transmitted variants—σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη (AP) and σύνγγονος ἀγρυπνίης (Achill. Vit. Arat.)—sits comfortably in apposition to ῥήσιες (see conveniently Gow and Page 1965 ad loc.). Recently Stewart 2008 has made the interesting and attractive suggestion that we read σύντοµος (“concise”) ἀγρυπνίη, a reading that fits well with the importance of concision to Callimachean poetics. A new papyrus find might also support the formerly conjectural reading of ἀοιδόν for ἀοιδόν in line 1 (see Obbink 2005, 114 n. 34).


12 See Bing 1993, 105–107 on allusions to Aratus’s pun in both Callimachus and Leonidas. Bing argues that both poets have furthered their puns by (uniquely) preferring the Ionic form of Aratus’s

13
the epigram is noteworthy also for Callimachus’s influential use of the word “wakefulness” (ἀγρυπνιή) to praise Aratus’s hard work in writing astronomical poetry.\footnote{Thomas 1979a has argued that Callimachus’s epigram plays on New Comedy’s use of ἀγρυπνιή of the agitated sleeplessness brought on by erotic infatuation, and that Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνιή characterizes Aratus’s composition of refined poetry in specifically erotic terms. Thomas goes on to discuss the later development of this metaphor by 1st-century Roman poets as a “means of exclusive acknowledgment between contemporary writers of Alexandrian, neoteric, and Augustan verse” (205); see pages 201–205 on the re-adaptation of this metaphor to erotic poetry in Cat. 50 and Prop. 1.10. Lyne 1978 makes a similar point in his note on Ciris 46, remarking that the Augustan elegists “could humorously play between the ideas of lucubration the product of diligence and lucubration enforced by the cares of love.”}

This reference to “wakefulness” refers either to sleep lost in late-night stargazing or to time spent “burning the midnight oil” toiling over refined poetry, but there is pronounced irony in the first of these meanings if, as ancient sources report, Aratus was himself ignorant of astronomy and simply versified the prose treatise of Eudoxus.\footnote{Cf. Gow and Page 1965, 2.209. For ancient testimony of Aratus’s ignorance of astronomy see Cic. De Orat. 1.69 as well as the Vitae collected in Martin 1974, 6–21. The first life not only reports that Aratus versified Eudoxus at the command of Antigonus Gonatus, but even cites a story that Antigonus ordered Aratus, a doctor, to write on astronomy and Nicander, an astronomer, to write on medicine; the Vita claims, however, that the two were not contemporaries. On the question of Aratus’s synchrony with Nicander see Cameron 1995, 194–205.}

Nevertheless, the metaphor of “wakefulness” is remarkably influential not only on the Roman reception of Aratus, but also on Roman references to learned poetry more generally. As Thomas remarks, “[f]rom this point the concept is fixed with the new poetic significance bestowed on it by Callimachus.”\footnote{Thomas 1979a, 200.}

Less frequently cited but no less important to the reception of the Phaenomena is Leonidas AP 9.25, which characterizes Aratus as “toiling at a great task” as he composed his astronomical poem.

name (usually Ἀρατός) and lengthening the first syllable of the name to make it metrically equivalent to ἄρρητον. Assuming that the Aratus of Theoc. 6 and 7 was not the poet, Gow-Page found the evidence for the quantity of this vowel to be ambivalent, since other instances of a short first vowel are not contemporary (see Gow and Page 1965, at Callim. 56.4 G.-P. = Epig. 27.4 Pf.); but the acceptance that SH 712 is the work of one of the Pharaohs Ptolemy (see Fraser 1972, 2.841 n. 305, 2.1090 n. 459) supports Bing’s contention that Callimachus and Leonidas have willfully altered Aratus’s name.
This is the book of learned Aratus, whose subtle mind once explored the long-lived stars, both the fixed stars and the planets with which the bright revolving heaven is set. Let us praise him for the great task at which he toiled; let us count him second to Zeus, in that he made the stars brighter.

Like Callimachus, Leonidas too seems to allude to Aratus’s programmatic ΛΕΙΠΤΗ acrostic by explicitly praising the style of the Phaenomena as λεπτός (λεπτῇ φροντίδι... ἐφράσατο, 1–2; cf. χαίρετε λεπταὶ ῥήσιες, Callim. Epig. 27.3–4). Like Callimachus, too, Leonidas adverts to Aratus’s pun with a pun of his own, here not on Aratus’s name but on his poem’s title, Phaenomena: Leonidas says that Aratus should be praised second to Zeus because he has made the stars “more visible” (φαινότερα): αἰνείσθω δὲ καμὼν ἔργον μέγα, καὶ Διὸς εἶναι δεύτερος, ὅστις ἔθηκ’ ἀστρα φαινότερα (1–2). The phrase “second to Zeus,” moreover, seems to refer specifically to the position of Aratus’s name pun, which immediately follows the poem’s opening invocation of Zeus (᾿Εκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ᾿ ἄρρητον...).¹⁶

Leonidas’s epigram also contributes an important motif to the reception of Aratus, in his reference to the Phaenomena as a great labor (καμὼν ἔργον μέγα, 5). Although the characterization of poetry as labor or toil is not unique to Leonidas, as the metaphorical reference to wakefulness is unique to Callimachus, nevertheless Leonidas’s epigram is probably responsible for the appearance of this motif in connection with Aratus in Roman literature.¹⁷

¹⁶See Bing 1993, 105–107 (n. 12 above).

¹⁷Hellenistic poets several times use “toil” to refer to poetry. The most straightforward examples
Following the reception Aratus received from his contemporaries in the third century, Roman literary society embraced the *Phaenomena* in the first century BC, as we can tell from translations and adaptations by Cicero, Varro of Atax, Vergil, and Germanicus Caesar. It is unclear whether Aratus’s pun and acrostic were generally well-known to the Roman literary audience, but Roman authors do seem to have known the epigrams in which Callimachus and Leonidas praised the poem and alluded to these two features.\(^{18}\) The first Roman allusion to either of these epigrams appears in a literary-critical epigram by the neoteric poet Cinna, who apparently dedicates a copy of the *Phaenomena* that he brought back from Bithynia.\(^{19}\)

haec tibi Arateis multum vigilata lucernis
\[\text{carmina, quis ignes novimus ærëios,}\]
\[\text{levis in aridulo maluae descrippta libello}\]
\[\text{Prusiaca vexi munera navicula.}\]

(Cinna fr. 11 Courtney = Hollis, FRP 13)

These poems were the object of much wakefulness by the light of Aratus’s lamps, and it is through them that we have come to know the heavenly fires. Borne by a Bithynian boatlet, I have brought them to you as a gift, written out in a dry little booklet of smooth mallow-bark.

Cinna’s epigram plainly alludes both to the *Phaenomena* and to Callimachus’s epigram praising it, and his reference to poems that were “the object of much wakefulness

---

\(^{18}\)See n. 29 below, however, on one scholar’s finding that several poets after Vergil not only recognized but also imitated Aratus’s acrostic.

\(^{19}\)On the occasion for the epigram see Hollis ad FRP 13.
by Aratus’s lamps” (Arateis multum vigilata lucernis, 1) is the first extant reference in Latin literature to the ἀγρυπνιή that Callimachus uses to characterize Aratus’s poem.²⁰

When Callimachus referred to Aratus’s “wakefulness,” he used the term with light irony, and it was unclear whether Aratus’s vigil was metaphorical or literal, since his chosen subject matter would seem to involve vigils of the astronomical type rather than the poetic type. In Cinna, however, the reference to “envigilated” poems is clearly a metaphor for poetic refinement, since his vigil is lit not by “Aratean stars” but by “Aratean lamps.” We will see below that Lucretius and Vergil also refer to “wakefulness” in contexts that allude to Aratus, and although neither poet mentions Aratus explicitly, both poets follow Callimachus in playing with the materiality of this metaphor.²¹

Like Cinna, Lucretius has no clear allusion to either the pun or the acrostic that impressed Aratus’s contemporaries, but he does show his knowledge of the epigrammatic tradition that responds to these features.²² In the proem to DRN 1, Lucretius expresses his own motivation to write didactic poetry in the same terms that Callimachus and Leonidas use of his didactic predecessor, Aratus. To suit the context of his Epicurean poem, however, Lucretius casts these metaphors for poetic refinement in terms not of astronomy, but of Epicurean ἀταραξία.

sed tua me virtus tamen et sperata voluptas
suavis amicitiae quemvis efferre laborem

²⁰On the use of Latin vigilare to translate Callimachus’s ἀγρυπνιή, especially in the Augustan elegists (see n. 13 above), see Lyne 1978 on Ciris 46, which cites Ovid Ars 2.285, Fast. 4.109, Trist. 2.11, Stat. Theb. 12.811, Juv. 7.27, along with Lucr. DRN 1.142 (see below) and Ovid Trist. 1.1.108.

²¹The metaphorical status of Callimachus’s ἀγρυπνιή is further complicated if, as Thomas 1979a argues (see n. 13 above), the primary sense of the word is erotic.

²²On Lucretius’s knowledge of and engagement with Hellenistic epigram, see Edmunds 2002, with bibliography at 348 n. 23.
suadet et inducit noctes vigilare serenas
quaerentem dictis quibus et quo carmine demum
clara tuae possim praepandere lumina menti,
res quibus occultas penitus convisere possis.

(Lucr. DRN 1.140–145)

...but still it is your merit, and the expected delight of your pleasant friendship, that persuades me to undergo any labor, and entices me to spend the tranquil nights in wakefulness, seeking by what words and what poetry at last I may be able to display clear lights before your mind, whereby you may see into the heart of hidden things.

At least two scholars have independently suggested that the phrase noctes vigilare serenas in line 142 is an allusion to the poetic “wakefulness” that Callimachus praises in Aratus.²³ Like Cinna, Lucretius translates Callimachus’s ἀγρυπνίη with a form of the verb vigilare, but while Cinna translates Callimachus’s pun as a literary-critical metaphor, Lucretius has put it to the service of his Epicurean poem by casting his nights of poetic composition as nights of Epicurean serenity (noctes... serenas).²⁴

The allusion to Callimachus in this line seems relatively certain on its own, but it is supported by the previous line as well, where Lucretius has alluded to the other epigram praising Aratus that Meleager included in his Garland.

In line 141 Lucretius characterizes the composition of poetry as labor when he says he is willing to “carry out any labor” (quemvis efferre laborem) in the name of his Epicurean project and the friendship he hopes it will bring him from Memmius.

²³See Gale 1994, 107 n. 41 and the fuller discussion of Brown 1982, 83 (with bibliography at n. 34); cf. also Lyne 1978, who cites both passages in his comment on vigilata at Ciris 46.

²⁴On the Epicurean significance of noctes... serenas cf. Gale 2000, 153 n. 30 and Brown 1982, 83 n. 37. One might compare Lucretius’s decontextualizing move to his “demythologization” of traditional mythological topoi, discussed by Hardie 1986, 178 and Gale 1994, 185–189: one would thus see Lucretius emptying Callim. Epig. 27 and Leon. AP 9.25 (see below) of their praise for Aratus’s poetics, while preserving their now-familiar connection to didactic poetry to characterize his own philosophical program.
The Hellenistic poets used “toil” as a metonym for “poem,” but this line is no simple reference to that metonymy; rather it is a specific allusion to Leonidas AP 9.25, which praises Aratus for “laboring at a great task” (καµὼν ἔργον µέγα, AP 9.25.5), and for versifying a dry and abstruse subject like astronomy in such a refined style (λεπτ’ εταιοταχιρχυµ φροντίδι, 1–2).25 Such praise has clear implications for Lucretius’s own poetic project in the DRN, which he famously characterizes as the honeyed cup for the bitter wormwood of Epicurean philosophy (1.935–950). Lucretius’s appropriation of this metaphor is somewhat surprising, since he generally deplores the vain labores of human life that result from man’s unenlightened condition, but, as Monica Gale has shown, Lucretius consistently characterizes poetry as an acceptable, even pleasant, labor. The proem to DRN 1 is the first of three such characterizations, and it is here that Lucretius most fully justifies his willing acceptance of poetic labor by weighing it against an acknowledged Epicurean pleasure, friendship (sperata voluptas... amicitiae, 1.140–141).26 It seems almost certain that this incongruous metaphor—like the metaphorical “wakefulness” in the next line—comes directly from Hellenistic praise of Aratus, the father of modern didactic poetry.

Vergil too seems to have known the epigrams of Callimachus and Leonidas, and has alluded to them in the lines I discuss below. The two epigrams, moreover, seem to have been read together: both Lucretius and Vergil use them side by side to allude to their important predecessor in didactic poetry. As a pair, they seem to have shaped the Roman reception of Aratus, and thus defined somewhat the Roman conception of didactic poetry.27 I will discuss Vergil’s allusion to these epigrams in

25 On the Hellenistic use of “toil” for poetry see n. 17 above; Brown 1982, 83 n. 39 lists Leonidas among several examples of this metaphor, but does not claim any special significance for it.
26 Cf. 2.730–731, nunc age dicta meo dulci quaesita labore | percipe, and 3.419–420, conquisita diu dulcique reperta labore | digna tua pergam disponere carmina vita; see Gale 2000, 147–154 on labor in Lucretius, and especially 152–153 on poetic labor.
27 One is free to imagine that these epigrams may even have been included at the beginning of a
the section below, which constitutes the main argument of this chapter, but before I do so, it seems worthwhile to review the evidence that Vergil alludes also to the stylistic features for which Aratus’s contemporaries seem to have admired him.

A number of scholars have argued that Vergil knew Aratus’s acrostic, and some have even suggested that he knew Aratus’s pun. The argument for Vergil’s knowledge of the acrostic rests on E. L. Brown’s discovery of an acrostic of Vergil’s name (Publius Vergilius Maro) at Geo. 1.429–433, in Vergil’s adaptation of the section where Aratus set his acrostic (lunar weather signs). Like Aratus’s, Vergil’s acrostic begins six lines into the section:

Si uero solem ad rapidum lunasque sequentis
ordine respicies, numquam te crastina fallet
hora, neque insidiis noctis capiere serenae.
luna reuertentis cum primum colligit ignis,
si nigrum obscuro comprenderit aera cornu,
MAnnus agricolis pelagoque parabitur imber;
at si urgenceum suffuderit ore ruborem,
VEntus erit: uento semper rubet aurea Phoebe.
sin ortu quarto (namque is certissimus auctor)
PUra neque obtunsis per caelum cornibus ibit,

volume of the *Phaenomena*, as Cinna’s poem seems to have been: cf. Farrell 1991, 47, who points out however that Cinna’s epigram was clearly intended to stand at the head of such a volume while Callimachus’s epigram seems rather like an independent piece of contemporary literary polemic. Nevertheless, the fact that two Latin poets allude to the epigrams of Callimachus and Leonidas as if they comprised a single unit suggests that they may have found their way to the head of a roll in spite of their independent composition. On other prefatory epigrams, compare the epigram at the head of Ovid’s *Amores*, and the comparanda that McKeown 1987–<1998> lists ad loc. (including Callim. *Epig.* 6 on the ps.-Homer. *Capture of Oechalia*).

28See Brown 1963, 96–104, which enumerates ten arguments in favor of this acrostic (including a reference to Vergil’s nickname, *Papævias*, on line 430 in *virgineum*, which expresses no detail of the Aratean source text).

29Damschen 2004 has now found that later poets too found passages on the moon or moon goddess appropriate sites for acrostics: Damschen finds that Ovid, Grattius, Manilius, and Silius Italicus have all hidden five-letter programmatic acrostics in such passages. By including thematic acrostics, they follow Aratus more directly than Vergil, who uses his five lines as an authorial seal (but see below on suppression in Vergil’s acrostic). One wonders whether the young Cicero, whose knowledge of acrostics we know from *De Div.* 2.111–112, translated Aratus’s *ÆIITH* acrostic with a form of some Latin equivalent (*TENUTI?*).
totus et ille dies et qui nascentur ab illo
exactum ad mensem pluia uentisque carebunt,
notaque seruati soluent in litore nautae
Glauco et Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae.

(Verg. Geo. 1.424–437)

There are several important differences between Aratus’s acrostic and the acrostic that Brown found in Geo. 1, including the fact that Vergil’s acrostic is syllabic, moves backwards, and skips lines. Nevertheless, and despite continuing skepticism, Brown’s acrostic has won increasing support in the years since its discovery, based partly on the discovery of supporting evidence and of other acrostics elsewhere in Vergil. Peter Bing has even suggested that Vergil’s acrostic represents a blending of Aratus’s acrostic with Aratus’s pun, and it is for this reason that Vergil uses his acrostic as an authorial seal, while Aratus used his for a programmatic statement about style. Bing’s suggestion addresses the apparent problem that Vergil’s acrostic is simply his name, not any Latin equivalent of λεπτός, such as tenuis or deductum. As Thomas notes, however, Vergil does not omit reference to Aratus’s λεπτή casually,

30 Recently, however, Feeney and Nelis 2005 has argued that both Vergil and Aratus announce the presence and method of their acrostics with cryptic advice in the first line of the section. So, when Aratus says Σκέπτεο δὲ πρ’οµεγαχιρχυµτον κεράων ήκάτερθε σελήνην (Phaen. 778), he can be understood as instructing his reader to “look first at the edges” (κεράων meaning generally the edge or end of something), and when Vergil says Si uero solem ad rapidum lunasque sequentis | ordine respicies, numquam te crastina fallet (Geo. 1.424–425), he can be understood as instructing his reader to “look at the following in order”, or even (together with reuertentis cum primum, 427) to announce that the acrostic runs backwards. Cf. also Haslam 1992, who argues that Sol...signa dabit (Geo. 1.438–439) suggests that the reader take his cue from ὁ Σολεὺς (= Aratus of Soloi, cf. Callim. Epig. 27.3).

31 The chief parallel is found at Aen. 7.601–604, where the words prima movent...Martem (603) seem to alert one to MARS in acrostic (cf. Feeney and Nelis 2005 on sequentis ordine respicies):

Mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes
Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum
Roma colit, cum prima movent in proelia Martem,
Sive Getis inferre manu lacrimabile bellum.

For convenient bibliography on this acrostic see Horsfall 2000, at Aen. 7.601, but note also Feeney and Nelis 2005 and Brugnoli-Riccardo Scarica 1987 (whence prima [elementa] movent Martem). On other possible acrostics in Vergil see Clauss 1997 and Danielewics 2005.
but rather, intentionally suppresses it.\textsuperscript{32}

Bing’s argument, moreover, may not be necessary to show that Vergil recognized and alluded to the pun on Aratus’s name at \textit{Phaen}. 1–2. Indeed, it seems that Vergil may have alluded to Aratus’s pun by making his own pun on Aratus’s name in the opening two lines of the \textit{Georgics}: \textit{Quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram }\textit{vertere} (Geo. 1.1–2). As Stephen Harrison has pointed out to me, \textit{terram vertere} is a periphrasis for \textit{arare}, the past participle of which, like Greek \textit{ἀρρήτος}, is homonymous with Aratus’s name.\textsuperscript{33} Vergil’s wordplay here is not explicit, but relies instead on the association of synonyms to activate a literary wordplay. This pattern of wordplay by synonym is a type of suppression, a common feature of Vergil’s etymological wordplay, and it appears repeatedly in Vergil’s manipulation of literary metaphors, which I shall discuss in Chapters 2–4.\textsuperscript{34} It emerges that the \textit{Eclogues} and \textit{Georgics} are characterized throughout by subtle literary wordplay that relies on suppression, but offers intertextual or etymological clues to the rich layer of literary double meaning below an apparently unremarkable exterior. Thomas is probably right, therefore, to claim that Vergil has conspicuously suppressed a more explicit reference to stylistic \textit{λεπτότης} in his allusion to Aratus’s acrostic. Indeed, we shall see below that Vergil

\textsuperscript{32}Thomas 1988, at 1.433, who suggests that Vergil reserves such important literary terms for explicit discussions of poetics. Haslam 1992, 202 criticizes Thomas’s argument that “suppression of the expected may serve as a means of emphasis,” calling it a retort to the “deafening silence” ploy. While suppression is notoriously difficult to demonstrate, I hope that the argument below will be sufficient even for some skeptics.

\textsuperscript{33}Serv. ad loc.: \textit{terram vertere} \textit{περιφραστικῶς} \textit{arare}. A number of scholars have seen a pun on Aratus’s name also at \textit{Ecl}. 3.40–44; for bibliography see Lipka 2001, 175 and O’Hara 1996, 79–82, and now see Katz 2008 for a version of the argument I make here. Vergil’s use of \textit{terram vertere} for \textit{arare} is also important to his development of farming, and especially plowing, as a metaphor for composing poetry (\textit{-versus < vertere}).

\textsuperscript{34}On suppression in etymological wordplay see O’Hara 1996, 79–82, who notes that “Alexandrian or Augustan scholar-poets use suppression (or \textit{antonomasia} or “kenning”) not only for etymological wordplay, but for a broad range of allusions to things not made explicit, but sufficiently clear to the learned readers for whom they wrote” (80–81). The term “suppression” comes from Servius’s note on the \textit{felix malum} at Geo. 2.126: \textit{apud Medos nascitur quaedam arbos, ferens mala, quae medica vocantur: quam per periphrasin ostendit, eius supprimens nomen}. 22
is consistent in suppressing the Latin equivalents of λεπτός in his programmatic allusions to Aratus, and that, by suppressing this term, he draws attention to even subtler allusions to Aratus and his stylistic program.

1.3 A Metaliterary Vignette at *Georgics* 1.291–296

Like Cinna and Lucretius, Vergil also alludes to the literary-critical metaphors that Callimachus and Leonidas use to praise Aratus for the refined style of his didactic verse. But while Cinna and Lucretius allude to these epigrams in contexts that explicitly concern either Aratus or didactic poetry, Vergil does so in a context that makes no explicit reference to poets or poetry. He has instead literalized the terms of their literary-critical metaphors and recontextualized them as part of the agricultural landscape of *Georgics* 1. The result is the vignette at *Georgics* 1.291–296 describing the nighttime labor of a farmer and his wife in terms that refer metapoetically to Aratus and to the Hellenistic reception that praised him for “wakefulness” and “toil.”

Vergil’s scene opens, following a brief introduction to the topic of nighttime work (287–290), at line 291, sixty lines before Vergil’s large-scale adaptation of the *Phaenomena* in the weather signs of *Geo.* 1.351–463. In lines 291–292 Vergil introduces an anonymous farmer who stays up nights at his chores, carving torches by firelight.

\[
\text{et quidam seros hiberni ad luminis ignis pervigilat ferroque faces inspicat acuto.} \\
\text{(Geo. 1.291–92)}
\]

One I know spends wakeful hours by the late blaze of a winter fire, and with sharp knife points torches...
The very first verb of this passage is a concrete agricultural manifestation of the metaphorical “wakefulness” that Callimachus used to praise Aratus’s careful style.\footnote{35} Vergil has followed Cinna and Lucretius in translating Callimachus’s $\alpha\gamma\rho\pi\nu\iota\eta$ with a form of vigilare, but he has cast the tireless effort of poetic composition instead in terms of the ceaseless toil of farm work, demanded from farmers even at night. Thus do we find “a certain man” who “stays up nights” at his task ($quidam\ldots pervigilat$), just as Aratus is supposed to do in Callimachus Epig. 27. Callimachus’s metaphor sits so easily in its new home, and resonates so deeply with the fundamental conception of the Georgics and their theme of labor, that its additional status as a metaphor has never been suspected.

The language that Vergil uses to describe this farmer’s task, moreover, alludes not only to Callimachus’s epigram and its literary descendants, but also to the best-known passage of Aratus’s Phaenomena. Vergil’s night-laboring farmer is said in line 292 to spend his nights carving torches ($pervigilat ferroque faces inspicat acuto$), a seemingly unremarkable task recommended also by Cato.\footnote{36} The verb inspicat (“to make to resemble a spica [an ear of wheat]”), however, is more remarkable than the activity it seems to describe: as commentators note, it is effectively a hapax and appears nowhere independent of this passage.\footnote{37} Vergil’s “certain man” is said

\footnote{35}{As an interesting, if indirect, measure of the influence of this metaphor, one might compare Horace’s criticism of Homer for his occasional stylistic lapse: *indignor quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus* (*Ars* 359). In his note here, Brink 1963–1982 points out that Quintilian compares this passage to similar language used by Cicero about Demosthenes (*nonnumquam fatigantur, cum Ciceroi dormitare interim Demosthenes, Horatio vero Homerus ipse videatur*, Inst. 10.1.24; cf. 12.1.22). Brink suggests that both authors reflect some Hellenistic criticism of Homer, but it is also possible that both reflect the language of Callimachus’s epigram, which Cicero at least, as Aratus’s first Latin translator, was surely familiar with; Horace shows his familiarity with Callimachus’s metaphor also at *Ars* 269 (see Brink ad loc.).}


\footnote{37}{For full citations see *TLL* s.v. *inspicare*. Aside from glosses of this passage (including a definition by Servius), a similar phrase appears only in the *Cynagetica* of Grattius (*spicatas faces*, 484), which owes much of its diction to the *Georgics*. On the extent and degree of Grattius’s debt to the *Georgics*,}
to use a sharp iron (ferro...acuto) to make torches (faces) resemble ears of wheat. Although much of the rest of this vignette alludes to the Hellenistic reception of the Phaenomena, a passage from the Phaenomena itself sheds light on this coinage. We find the target of this allusion in the opening lines of the poem’s longest and most famous digression, the Departure of Δίκη (Phaen. 96–136), which contributed much to Vergil’s treatment of the Golden Age theme in the Georgics:38

\[ \text{Ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ ποσσὶν ὑπὸ σκέπτοιο Βοώτεω} \]
\[ \text{Παρθένον, ἣ ἐν χειρὶ φέρει Στάχυν αἰγλήντα.} \]

\[ \text{(Arat. Phaen. 96–97)} \]

Beneath the two feet of Boötes you can observe the Maiden, who carries in her hand the radiant Wheat-Spike.

sub pedibus † profertur † finita Booti
Spicum illustre tenens, splendenti corpore Virgo.

\[ \text{(Cic. Arat. fr. 16.5–6 Soubiran)} \]

Being carried forward, delimited beneath the feet of Boötes, holding the bright Wheat-Spike, is the Maiden with her shining body.

Aratus’s well-known digression on Δίκη is introduced as a possible aetiology for the zodiacal constellation Maiden (Virgo, Παρθένος), whose essential attribute—the ear of wheat she holds in her left hand—is represented by the 1st-magnitude star that the

\[ \text{see Enk 1918, 9–20.} \]

38Vergil’s debt to Aratus’s myth of the Departure of Δίκη (narrated in a digression on the constellation Παρθένος/Virgo) is most vivid at the end of his praise of rustic life (Geo. 2.458–474): extrema per illos | Iustitia excedens terris vestigia fecit (473–474), on which see Barchiesi 1981a; Thomas 1988, ad loc.; Perkell 1989, 113–115; and Farrell 1991, 161–162. Regarding the fame of this passage cf. Kidd 1997, 41–43, who notes that, although there are relatively few passages in Aratus with which the Roman poets show general familiarity, several of them belong to this digression.
ancients called Spicum/Spica or Στάχυς.  

Aratus tends to use both the beginning and end of his hexameters to emphasize important pairs of words (especially proper names), and here the brightest star in the constellation, Στάχυν αἰγλήεντα, seems to have emphasis comparable to that of the name of the constellation, Παρθένος.  

By apparently coining the word inspicat at Geo. 1.292, Vergil uses the Maiden’s brightest star, Στάχυς/Spica, as a subtle and suitably agricultural metonym for alluding to Aratus’s famous digression on the Maiden/Δίκη. He thereby makes reference to the Phaenomena in the course of his systematic allusion to its reception in Hellenistic epigram.

---

39Cf. Bede, De Orthographia 1080: Stachys gracee, latine spica. For the close association of Virgo with Spica, cf. Vit. 9.4.1, Man. 5.271, Col. 11.2.65, Plin. Nat. 18.311, Nonn. D. 2.655. See Kidd 1997, at Phaen. 96–136 for technical and historical information on Virgo and Spica, including evidence that the Babylonians also figured this star (α Virginis) as an ear of wheat, probably because its morning rising coincides with harvest-time. Regarding the star’s Latin name, Ewbank 1933, at Cic. fr. 16.6 notes that the word appears in all three genders. The Maiden’s other important attribute, her wings, seems to have been a later development: see Kidd 1997, at Phaen. 134 and 138.

40Kidd 1997 notes enjambment at Phaen. 96–97, but the prevalence of this word pattern, which I would term “bookending,” (cf. e.g. Phaen. 231–232, 445–446, 577–578, 607–609), argues that Παρθένον and Στάχυν αἰγλήεντα receive equal emphasis. Note that Cicero has preserved Aratus’s line-end emphasis on Spicum illustre and Virgo, despite reversing their order. Cicero seems generally to have admired Aratus’s word patterning, because he often respects Aratus’s patterns in a line, although sometimes, as here, applying them to different words (cf. Cic. Arat fr. 33.183–4 Soubiran = Arat. Phaen. 402–3, which shows analogous enjambment, but of different words).

41The details of Vergil’s vignette might also be seen to contribute to a metaphorical allusion to Aratus: (a) poets commonly use ignis, as in Vergil’s seros ignis (“late-night fires”), as a metonym for “star” (so Cinna’s ignes aerios, “heavenly stars”, at 11.2 Courtney; cf. also TLL 7.1.290.45–62, which includes quotations from Catullus and Vergil); (b) stars are most visible in the winter (seros hiberni ad luminis ignis), when skies are clear (cf. Lucretius’s noctes serenas above); (c) fax, “torch,” is used sometimes for sidus (TLL 6.403.85–404.9) and may perhaps have been so used in now-lost portions of Cicero’s Aratea; (d) “sharp iron” (ferro acuto) might suggest a stylus, especially since Isidore 6.9.1 reports that the Greeks and Etruscans used iron styli to write on wax until the Romans ordered a halt to the practice and bone styli came into prominence (cf. Plin. Nat 34.139, where the development of bone styli is linked to Porsona’s order that the Romans use no iron except in the cultivation of fields); a number of iron styluses have been preserved in anaerobic conditions at Vindolanda: see Bowman and Thomas 1974, 14 and plate 4. Thus the metaphor might be seen as thoroughgoing: there is a certain man (→Aratus) who stays up nights in the wintertime (when skies are clear for stargazing) and uses a sharp iron instrument (→stylus) to make torches (→stars?) resemble an ear of wheat, i.e. he keeps late hours describing in verse how the stars of this constellation form [a maiden holding] an ear of wheat. The form of this cryptic reference might be compared to Menalca’s riddle at Ecl. 3.40–2, where at least two scholars have seen Aratus: see Ross 1975, 23–24 and Fisher 1982; cf. Clausen 1994, ad loc.
This allusion continues in lines 293–296, where the wife of this unnamed farmer is described in terms no less metapoetic than her anonymous husband. The husband and wife of this scene do not function as individual metapoetic figures, but rather as pieces of a single metapoetic tableau, the features of which are literal manifestations of Hellenistic metaphors used to praise Aratus. Skipping ahead to lines 295–296: Vergil has again precisely alluded to Callimachus Epig. 27, and seems even to have coined another new word to express its poetological metaphors. Here he figures the farmer’s wife as cooking down and skimming grape must (the newly pressed, unfermented juice) to produce a sweet syrup fit for storage:

\[
\text{aut dulcis musti Volcano decoquit umorem} \\
\text{et foliis undam trepidi despumat æni.} \\
\text{(Geo. 1.295–296)}
\]

... or on the fire boils down the sweet juice of must, and skims with leaves the froth of the bubbling cauldron.

Elsewhere in the poem, at the beginning of Geo. 2, unfermented grape juice (must) stands metaphorically for poetry, when Bacchus, as the patron god of a book dealing largely with vines and the vintage, is asked by the poet to remove his tragic buskins and stain his bare legs with the pressing of a new must.\(^2\)\(^2\) We have evidence, too, from Cicero that Romans used “cooking down” as a stylistic metaphor for the production of a densely sweet quality (desirable in poetry, not in prose).\(^4\)\(^3\) Here again, however, the precise language of these lines looks particularly to Epig. 27:

\(^{42}\)\(\text{huc, pater, o Lenaee, veni, nudataque musto} \mid \text{tinge novo mecum dereptis crura coturnis (2.7–8); see Thomas 1988, ad loc.}\)

\(^{43}\)\(\text{Cic. De. Orat. 3.104, suavitatem habeat orator austeram et solidam, non dulcem et decoctam. Bramble 1974, 139 n. 1 cites this and other stylistic uses of decoctus as a parallel for Persius 1.125 (aspice et haec, si forte aliquid decoctus audis). On the terminological overlap between discussions of rhetorical style and declarations of poetic style (esp. between Cicero and Catullus) cf. Batstone 1998.}\)
It is Hesiod’s song and style. The man from Soloi has not captured the poet entire, but skimmed off the sweetest part of his verses. . . .

In discussing this epigram, Alan Cameron has emphasized that the metaphor Callimachus uses for Aratus’s imitation of Hesiod is one of wiping or skimming off the top of a liquid, and recent translators have preferred a vivid rendering like Cameron’s to the bland “imitated” or “copied” that once prevailed as a gloss for ἀπεμάξετο in line 3. When Callimachus’s epigram is understood in this way, one can again see in Vergil’s nighttime chores a literalization of a Callimachean metaphor: in line 295, one sees the farmer’s wife boiling down grape must to leave only τὸ µελιχρότατον from the dulcis musti umor. Moreover, just as he coined the word inspicat to allude precisely to Aratus’s Spica, so in line 296 he has coined the word despumat to translate Callimachus’s ἀπεµάξετο. Thus, says Callimachus, did Aratus boil down Hesiod’s sweet verses and skim off only the sweetest parts for his own didactic poem.

44Cameron 1995, 374–379, translation at 379.

45Cf., e.g., the translation of Nisetich (Oxford, 2001): “. . . but it isn’t | Hesiod to the last drop: No the man of Soloi | has skimmed the sweetness and left the rest. . . .”

46It is worth noting that although both Vergil and Callimachus talk of reduction and skimming, the process that Vergil describes is not exactly the same as the process that Callimachus’s metaphor presupposes. While Vergil describes the reduction of wine must by boiling and skimming off the foam, Callimachus seems rather to refer to the skimming of cream off of raw milk, since the sweetest part is what is skimmed off instead of what is left behind. This may be a case of Vergil’s “correcting” Callimachus’s metaphor, or it may simply be a case of Vergil recontextualizing a literary-critical metaphor, as he does with such metaphors throughout the Georgics.

47As Thomas 1988 notes ad loc., despumare appears first here, then not later until Silver Latin. Thomas also cites several epicisms in these lines (Vulcano, undam) and suggests that this passage, like Ovid’s treatment of Baucis and Philemon in Met. 8, may owe something to Callimachus’s Hecale. It is possible that Vergil here filters the language of Callimachus’s epigram through an image he has drawn from Callimachus’s epyllion.
So in the first two and last two lines of this passage, Vergil has alluded precisely to the literary-critical metaphors of Callimachus *Epig.* 27, which neatly sum up Callimachus’s views on (a) the stylistic refinement Aratus demonstrates in putting didactic subject matter into verse, and (b) the admirable way that Aratus imitates his eminent generic predecessor, Hesiod. Together these metaphors constitute a manifesto with obvious implications for Vergil’s own project of didactic imitation. Vergil has effected these allusions by literalizing the terms of a stylistic metaphor, a practice that, as we shall see in later chapters, is characteristic of his metapoetic practice throughout the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. In the central two lines of this vignette, Vergil literalizes two more metaphors, one of which he has drawn from Leonidas’s epigram praising Aratus. The second of these metaphors involves the stylistic quality that Aratus claims for himself in his acrostic, and for which he is praised by Callimachus, Leonidas, and Ptolemy: λεπτότης.

In this central couplet, Vergil introduces the wife of his anonymous farmer, who sings and weaves cloth while he carves torches.

interea longum cantu solata laborem  
arguto coniunx percurrit pectine telas...  

(Verg. *Geo.* 1.293–294)

The poetological tenor of these lines is first suggested by Vergil’s phrase *longum cantu solata laborem*, which links the Hellenistic notion that poetry is labor to the pastoral conceit that poetry is the most effective solacium.\(^4^8\) This passage, however, is no vague reference to a common conceit, and labor, moreover, cannot simply be a

\(^{4^8}\) On “toil” and poetry see n. 17 above; particularly interesting in this context is *AP* 7.11 (= 28.1 G.-P.), where Asclepiades seems already to link poetry, weaving, and toil when he characterizes the *Distaff* of Erinna as a γλυκὸς πόνος. Regarding the consolatory power of song, pastoral song is specifically able to console the suffering of love. Theocritus thematizes this credo at *Id.* 11.1–3, and Vergil clearly intends this pastoral meaning when he uses the word *solari* at *Ecl.* 6.46 and *Geo.* 4.464. See further Ch. 2 p. 58.
metonym for poetry, since it is distinct from the song of consolation. Like *quemvis efferre laborem* at *DRN* 1.141, Vergil’s *longum... laborem* at *Geo*. 1.293 is a metaphor for painstaking composition, because, like Lucretius’s phrase, Vergil’s alludes specifically to Leonidas *AP* 9.25 and its characterization of Aratus as “toiling at a great task” (*καµὼν ἔργον µέγα*, 5) in the composition of the *Phaenomena*.\(^49\) Like Lucretius, Vergil has alluded in tandem to the same two Hellenistic epigrams on Aratus, both of which themselves allude to stylistic features of the *Phaenomena* that Vergil seems to have replicated in analogous places in *Georgics* 1.

The threads common to Leonidas’s and Callimachus’s epigrams are (1) allusion to Aratus’s pun (see n. 12 above), and (2) explicit praise of Aratus’s *λεπτότης*, which many scholars have understood as an allusion to Aratus’s *ΛΕΠΤΗ* acrostic.\(^50\) From the evidence discussed above, it seems that Vergil alluded to—even emulated—Aratus’s pun and acrostic, but, despite the fact that he has coined two new Latin words to express the nuance of Callimachus’s metaphors in *Epig*. 27, Vergil has here used no Latin equivalent of *λεπτός*, although he uses two such terms prominently in the *Eclogues*.\(^51\) Even in Vergil’s own acrostic, the context in which one might most expect reference to Aratus’s stylistic program-word, Vergil used no such equivalent aesthetic term. As in his acrostic, so too here Vergil has consistently suppressed *λεπτός* and its equivalents in his allusions to Aratus.\(^52\) But Vergil’s method of literalizing metaphors remains unchanged: before *λεπτός* (=“fine-spun”) was a Hellenistic

\(^{49}\)Horace too uses *labor* in this sense in connection with poetry; cf. *limae labor et mora*, *AP* 291, with Brink 1963–1982 ad loc.

\(^{50}\)This latter feature is shared also by the epigram of Ptolemy: see n. 5 above.

\(^{51}\) *tenuis*: *Ecl*. 1.2, 6.8; *deductum*: *Ecl*. 6.5 (where Servius notes: *tenue*; *translatio a lana, quae deductur in tenuitatem*). Cf. Clausen 1994, ad loc.

\(^{52}\)Cf. above at n. 32 on the suppression of the term in Vergil’s acrostic.
program-word, it was in Homer a common attribute of woven fabrics.\textsuperscript{53} Vergil has literalized this Hellenistic metaphor in the literal weaving of his farmer’s wife, and by again suppressing allusion to the word \textit{λεπτός}, he draws attention to his literal rendering of this most important stylistic metaphor.\textsuperscript{54}

It is difficult to demonstrate suppression without arguing \textit{ex silentio}. In the present case, however, we may look to Vergil’s reuse of \textit{Geo.} 1.293 in the opening of \textit{Aen.} 7, where he makes only a single change to the line. In this passage Aeneas and his crew are said to sail past the palace of Circe, where the Homeric sorceress sits weaving and singing:

proxima Circaeae raduntur litora terrae,  
dives inaccessos ubi Solis filia lucos  
adsiduo resonat cantu, tectisque superbis  
urit odoratam nocturna in lumina cedrum  
arguto \textit{tenuis} percurrens pectine telas.

\textit{(Aen. 7.10–14)}

These lines from \textit{Aen.} 7 have attracted considerable critical attention, not least because of Vergil’s use of the term \textit{tenuis}, an established equivalent of \textit{λεπτός}, in a passage with programmatic implications for the second half of the \textit{Aeneid}. As Thomas remarked in his article on this passage, the substitution of \textit{tenuis} for \textit{coniunx} renders

\textsuperscript{53} Of 20 times Homer uses a form of \textit{λεπτός}, the adjective is in 10 cases a direct attribute of fabric: \textit{Il.} 18.595, 22.511; \textit{Od.} 2.95, 5.231, 7.97, 10.223, 10.544, 17.97, 19.140, 24.130. Cf. also Servius’s note at \textit{Ecl.} 6.5 (n. 51 above). Already in Homer, however, the cognate term \textit{λεπταλέος}, in its single use, is used as an aesthetic term: in a pastoral scene on the shield of Achilles a boy is said to sing the Linus-song with a \textit{λεπταλέος} voice to the accompaniment of a \textit{λιγύς} lyre, \textit{τούς δ’ ἐν μέσσουσι πάξ φόρμυγγι λιγεί΄εταιοτα} \textit{κιθάριζε, λίνον δ’ ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδε | λεπταλέ΄εταιοτα φων´εταιοταχιρχυµ}, \textit{Il.} 18.569–71. On this acoustic aspect of \textit{λεπτός} see Asper 1997, 177–179.

\textsuperscript{54} Prominent passages in Catullus and Vergil show that Roman poets drew a persistent and important link between weaving and poetry: e.g. the Song of the Parcae in Cat. 64; \textit{Ecl.} 10.70–1, where Servius remarks that Vergil has used basket-weaving as a metaphor for poetic style; and the spinning/singing scene from \textit{Geo.} 4, in which the nymph Clymene recounts the Homeric story of the affair of Mars and Venus (known from Demodocus’s song in \textit{Od.} 8). These examples are discussed apropos of weaving in Ovid by Rosati 1999.
the *Aen.* 7 line “oddly like a metaphor for Alexandrian or neoteric poetic composition.”

Stratis Kyriakidis later argued that the specific source of this programmatic language was Homer’s description of Circe weaving and singing in *Od.* 10; he proposed that *tenuis* alludes programmatically to the λεπτός quality of Circe’s weaving in the passage (λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα, *Od.* 10.233), while *arguto pectine* alludes to the specification that her singing is λιγύς (λίγ’ ἂειδεν, 10.254).

*ἔσταν δ’ ἐν προθύρουι θεᾶς καλλιπλοκάµοι,*

*Kίρκης δ’ ἐνδον ἄκουον ἀειδούσης ὑπὶ καλὴν*

*ιστόν ἐποιχομένης μέγαν ἄμβροτον, οἰα θεάων*

*λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργα πέλονται.*

(Hom. *Od.* 10.220–3)

So they stood in the gateway of the fair-tressed goddess, and within they heard Circe singing with sweet voice, as she went to and fro before a great imperishable web, such as is the handiwork of goddesses, finely woven and beautiful, and glorious.

*ἔνθα δὲ τις μέγαν ἱστόν ἐποιχομένη λιγ’ ἂειδεν*

*ἡ θεᾶς ἦ γυνῆ· τοὶ δ’ ἐφθέγγοντες καλεύτειν.*

*(Od. 10.254–5)*

There someone was going to and fro before a great web, and singing with a clear voice, some goddess or some woman, and they cried aloud and called to her.

Although Kyriakidis’s argument is attractive, *arguto pectine* is not as close to Homer’s λιγ’ ἂειδεν as one might like. Instead, the clearest proof that *Aen.* 7 relies specifically

---

55 Thomas 1985, 66. Thomas 1988 discusses *Geo.* 1.293–294 (ad loc.) at some length and finds “some tantalizing resonances” with other passages in Augustan poetry. Few readers, however, have been as captivated by the rustic housewife’s song as they are by Circe’s: Kyriakidis 1998, 90-117, who is very sensitive to metapoetic significance in Circe’s tuneful weaving, remarks insistently that the nearly identical weaving and singing of *Geo.* 1 “is to be taken literally and has no possibility of operating metaphorically” (100). Erren 2003, however, sees at *Geo.* 1.293 the traces of a neoteric adaptation of Homer.

on *Od.* 10 comes from *Geo.* 1.293–294, where Homer’s Circe seems to have served as a model for Vergil’s weaving *coniunx* before she was a model for Vergil’s Circe.\(^57\) Not only does Circe’s weaving literalize the weaving metaphor that underlies Callimachus’s \(\lambda\varepsilon\pi\tau\alpha\ \rlaposies\) ((Epig. 27.3–4), Leonidas’s \(\lambda\varepsilon\pi\tau\hbar\ \phi\rho\omicron\nu\tau\iota\delta\iota\), and Aratus’s \(\Lambda\varepsilon\iota\iota\iota\) acrostic, but this suppressed program-word is a direct attribute of her weaving (\(\lambda\varepsilon\pi\tau\alpha\ \tau\varepsilon\ \kai\ \chi\alpha\rho\iota\epsilon\nu\tau\eta\), 10.223). And it is at *Geo.* 1.293–294, not in *Aen.* 7, that one finds intact the allusion to Homer’s \(\lambda\iota\gamma^\prime\ \aei\delta\epsilon\nu\):

\[
\text{interea longum } \textit{cantu} \ \text{solata laborem} \\
\textit{arguto coniunx} \ \text{percurrit pectine telas}
\]

\((Geo. 1.293–294)\)

Although most commentators have read *arguto* with *pectine*, as one must in *Aen.* 7, the word’s placement in *Geo.* 1 allows it to be read either with its own line or the previous line; by reading it with *cantu* one finds an allusion to Homer’s Circe and her melodious weaving in *Od.* 10.\(^58\)

Vergil’s reuse of this line in *Aen.* 7 sounds “oddly like” (in Thomas’s words, quoted in full above) a poetological metaphor because it alludes to his own literalization of a poetological metaphor in *Georgics* 1. In the *Georgics* Vergil had used Homer’s Circe to literalize the metaphorical \(\lambda\varepsilon\pi\tau\omicron\theta\gamma\) that Hellenistic epigram attributed to

---

\(^57\) The Circe scene from *Od.* 10 was familiar not only from Homer, but also from an allusion at Theocritus *Id.* 15.79: see Burton 1995, 173–175.

\(^58\) Page 1898, Mynors 1990, and Thomas 1988 all read *arguto* with *pectine*, following Heyne 1830, ad loc., who argues the point based on “ratio poetica” and on the attribution of melodious sound to the *shuttle* by Greek poets. This reading, however, has sparked controversy over how the weaver’s *comb* can be said to be *argutos*: see Mynors at 1.293–294 and the reply of Horsfall 2000, at *Aen.* 7.14; ingenious solutions are suggested by Henry 1873–1889, at *Aen.* 7.14 and by Yates 1842, 943. More recently, Erren 2003, at *Geo.* 1.287–96 and 1.293, has realized the degree to which *Aen.* 7.14 depends on *Geo.* 1.293–294 (although he sees a reference to Calypso in the *Georgics*, not Circe) and has preferred *arguto conantu* to “dem unverständlichen Ausdruck” *arguto pectine*. While many factors urge one to read *arguto* with *pectine*—among them the symmetry of *Geo.* 1.294 and *Aen.* 7.14 (the latter, where *tenais* is no longer suppressed, is a golden line)—there is much to gain from reading it with *cantu* and little to stop a Roman, reading or hearing lines 293–294 one word at a time, from connecting *arguto* with *cantu*.
Aratus. In the *Aeneid* he reuses his own allusion to Aratus through Circe instead of alluding directly to *Od.* 10; in this process he reveals the previously suppressed aesthetic term *tenuis* (=λεπτός), but he severs *arguto* from its complement *cantu*, obscuring the full allusion to Homer’s Circe (λεπτὰ τε καὶ χαρίεντα, λίγ’ ἀείδεν) from any who did not recognize the allusion in *Geo.* 1. Why would Vergil so complicate an allusion to Homer’s Circe in his own description of the Homeric sorceress? Thomas answered this question when he discussed the interaction of Callimacheanism and epic in the proem to *Aen.* 7: “precisely because at the point where his epic will become particularly traditional or Homeric Vergil is concerned to avoid the taint deriving from mere Homeric imitation.”⁵⁹ Certainly, Vergil cannot be accused of simplicity or “mere” Homeric imitation in either of these passages. In *Geo.* 1 he requires his reader to recognize an allusion to Homer’s Circe and to read it against his systematic allusion to Hellenistic praise of Aratus, cross-referencing the two to arrive at the suppressed program-word λεπτός. In *Aen.* 7 he makes a Homeric allusion less “merely” Homeric by requiring that it be read through his own earlier allusion to Aratus in *Geo.* 1.

### 1.4 Conclusion

Vergil’s admiration for Aratus, evident in his large-scale adaptation of the *Phaenomena* in *Georgics* 1, has often puzzled modern critics, to whom technical verses on astronomy and meteorology seem dry and unengaging. I hope that, by demonstrating concerted intertextual engagement on Vergil’s part with well-known Hellenistic praise of Aratus, I have shed some light not just on the nature of this admiration, but perhaps also on its origin. The fascinating complexity, moreover, of Vergil’s

---

⁵⁹Thomas 1985, 64. It is here worth considering the implications of the argument of Cameron 1995, 321–328 (see n. 9 above) that the Hellenistic stylistic program of λεπτότης originated not with Callimachus, but with Aratus. In that case, an allusion to Aratus could serve well as a modernist stylistic disclaimer in the most Homeric section of Vergil’s epic.
metaphorical allusion to Aratus suggests that the latter was no second-class model for *Georgics* 1.

Vergil’s method in these lines shows us much about the nature of this most complex poem. D. O. Ross remarked that Vergil wrote about agriculture partly because “the very subject allows metaphor to become reality,” and here we have indeed seen a whole complex of poetological metaphors rendered into literal agricultural reality.60 The literal rendering of Homeric similes contributes much to the texture of reality in the *Georgics*, as in the allusion to Achilles and the Scamander in the passage on irrigation at *Geo.* 1.104–10, but we must be as alive to the appearance of poetological metaphors in the *Georgics* as we are in the *Eclogues*. The fact, moreover, that such an important and central theme as labor is here revealed to be a metaphor for poetry should put readers on their guard throughout the poem, especially during the “Aetiology of labor” at *Geo.* 1.118–159. But it is characteristic of Vergil’s technique in this difficult poem that passages of major significance, metapoetic or otherwise, are often not trumpeted with clearly programmatic language. Rather, every innovation on or departure from a model may hide some important clue to Vergil’s intentions in this challenging and learned work. I do not suggest that we can find metapoetic meaning behind every passage of Vergil’s poetry, but I insist that we must be willing to see metapoetic commentary in even the most unassuming line or passage. I will discuss a number of these passages in the next three chapters; I hope to show that, although Vergil sometimes advertises his intentions through clearly programmatic language (*Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen, Geo.* 2.176), he more often does this implicitly, through metapoetic elements in his poetry.

---

60 Ross 1987, 26.
Chapter 2

Gallus, Acontius, and Elegy

This chapter and the next will look at two types of metapoetic symbolism in the *Eclogues*. The first type consists in Vergil’s use of well-known literary narratives as intertextual models for his own narratives and the characters in them. These narratives model different ways to use poetry (written or sung) in approaching love, and Vergil uses them to reflect on the generic affiliation of his own poetry and that of Cornelius Gallus. I will refer to this phenomenon as metanarrative symbolism. The second type of metapoetic symbolism is like what I discussed in the last chapter: it uses metaphorical language to produce two levels of meaning in the text, one literal(ized) and narrative, the other metapoetic and self-reflexive. Metapoetic symbols of this type are sometimes developed in conjunction with metanarrative symbolism of the first type, but their use of literalized metaphorical language makes them intelligible in other contexts as well. In these two chapters, I will specifically discuss Vergil’s metapoetic approach to genre in *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10, paying particular attention (1) to his metapoetic use of the story of Acontius and Cydippe from Callimachus to represent the new genre of Gallan love elegy, and (2) to his cultivation, in connection with this story, of metapoetic symbolism in his references to trees and related images. As part of this discussion, I will also argue that the *Eclogues* can be seen in one sense
as a response to Gallus’s development of the new genre of Roman love elegy, and that, at least in Eclogues 2, 8, and 10, elegy and pastoral exert competing generic influence on Vergil’s pastoral collection.

The first half of the present chapter will lay out the premises for this argument, making the case that elegy exerts a significant generic influence in the Eclogues, and that the story of Acontius from Callimachus’s Aetia serves as a metanarrative symbol for the elegiac genre. The second half of this chapter will specifically discuss Vergil’s use of elegy and the Acontius metanarrative in Eclogues 2 and 8. The next chapter will continue this discussion by looking at Eclogue 10, in which the influence of elegy is already widely acknowledged. I hope to show that elegy and pastoral stand in a reciprocal relationship in this poem, and that this relationship represents the continuation of a theme found also in Ecl. 2 and 8. Finally, in the second half of Ch. 3, I will discuss Vergil’s development of trees, forests, echoes, and shadows as metapoetic symbols throughout the Eclogues. This symbolism is tied to the poet’s use of the narrative of Acontius, which also appears most clearly in Eclogue 10. Chapter 4 will extend my discussion of metapoetic tree symbolism by considering Vergil’s discussion of arboriculture in Geo. 2.

2.1 Metanarratives and Metapoetic Symbolism

One of the effects that Vergil cultivates as part of his highly allusive poetic style is the coordinated use of allusion to align characters in his poems with characters from other literary narratives. In the Eclogues this technique can be seen in the second poem in the collection, where coordinated allusions to Theocritus Idylls 6 and 11 cast Corydon in the role of the Cyclops Polyphemus, and in Eclogue 10, where allusions to Idyll 1 cast Gallus in the role of the arch-pastoral singer Daphnis. In the Aeneid, complicated examples of such intertextual character development are
well known. We find Dido, for example, cast variously into a number of well-known roles, including Medea, Ariadne, Nausicaa, Hypsipyle, Ajax and others. We also find different characters competing to play a single role, as when Turnus and Aeneas are alternately cast as Achilles. Sustained, coordinated allusions such as these do more than simply remind the reader of a familiar line or passage: they suggest a general, if sometimes temporary, congruency between Vergil’s characters and narratives and the ones to which he alludes. Vergil is then able to create meaning either by adhering to these patterns or by deviating from them.¹ For this reason, and for another reason I will explain presently, I will refer to this type of allusion as “metanarrative allusion,” and to its use as a characterizing device as “metanarrative characterization.” I will use the term “metanarrative” to describe a literary narrative to which Vergil alludes in a sustained and coordinated way that suggests congruency between that narrative and Vergil’s own narrative, or between characters in that narrative and Vergil’s own characters. This type of allusion is an important source of thematic meaning in Vergil’s poetry,² and it is highly productive of metaliterary meaning as well.

The characters Vergil chooses as literary exemplars are archetypal figures who loom large in the history of their genres, who come to represent a particular character type within these genres. Homer’s Nausicaa, Apollonius’s Medea, and Catullus’s Ariadne are epic or epyllion princesses, and are representative of this character type in Homeric epic, Hellenistic epic, and Neoteric epyllion, respectively. Achilles, Odysseus, and (in his own way) Jason are all epic heroes, and each is representative

¹Fowler 2000, 120 discusses intertextuality specifically as a tool for character development, and refers the reader to the useful discussion of Lyne (1987, 100–144), which argues that allusion, generally speaking, invites the reader to compare and contrast characters or passages to other well-known characters or passages from literature. See below at n. 6 on the use of this technique with reference to Achilles; on its use with reference to Jupiter and the story of the Gigantomachy, see Hardie 1986, 150 and O’Hara 2007, 101 with n. 64.

²See, e.g., Fowler 2000, 121.
of the form that this role takes in the different branches of the epic tradition. By modeling characters in the *Aeneid* after such epic prototypes as these, Vergil marks his adherence to the epic tradition; but by shifting the alignment between characters and metanarrative prototypes, he recombines character types in new and original ways, which are nevertheless eminently traditional. Thus, to consider only examples drawn from epic, Dido is by turns an epic queen (Apollonius’s Hypsipyle), an epic princess (Nausicaa, Apollonius’s Medea, Ariadne), and an epic witch (Homer’s Circe). By importing models from other genres, moreover, Vergil “enriches” (to use Stephen Harrison’s term\(^3\)) epic with foreign character types, who bring along with them elements of the narrative for which they—and their genres—are known. The well-known affinity of *Aeneid* 4 with Greek tragedy, for example, results in large part from Dido’s resemblance, at different parts of the narrative, to such quintessentially tragic figures as Euripides’ Medea, Euripides’ Phaedra, and Sophocles’ Ajax.\(^4\) For this reason, the term “metanarrative” is again aptly chosen for this phenomenon, because Vergil uses archetypal characters, and their archetypal narratives, to stand for the genres to which they respectively belong. These narratives, in other words, act as metaphors for their respective genres.

Vergil’s metanarrative alignments are not static, but change and develop in ways that suggest temporary affinities of one sort before settling finally into patterns that suggest affinities of another sort. To continue the analogy to the theater, different characters wear different masks (*personae*) at different times.\(^5\) Sometimes a single

---

\(^3\)See Harrison 2007a, esp. 1–33

\(^4\)Heinze 1915, 119 called Book 4 a “tragic epyllion.” On the connection of this book to tragedy see further, e.g., Hardie 1997, 321–322 and further references cited at Panoussi 2009, 5 n. 5; Panoussi 2009, 182–198 discusses the relationship of Dido and Ajax.

\(^5\)I use the analogy to theater advisedly, since Latin *agere*, like English “act,” uses theatrical role-playing broadly as a metaphor for role-playing in real life (see *TLL* 1.1398.8–1400.2, esp. 1398.66–1399.50). In one passage of the *Remedia Amoris*, which I will refer to again below, Ovid uses the theatrical metaphor in a context similar to my discussion of metanarrative role-playing: in
mask is worn by different characters at different points in a narrative. So in the second half of the *Aeneid*, Vergil complicates the question of who will win the war in Italy by alternately casting both Turnus and Aeneas in the role of Achilles. Statements made by the Sybil (6.89–90) and by Turnus (9.742) suggest that Turnus will play Achilles in the war in Italy, and comments by Amata (7.363–364) and Juno (7.319–321) suggest that Aeneas is a second Paris—putting the Trojans once again on the losing side of a war over a woman. Vergil himself uses allusions to the *Iliad* to cast both Aeneas and Turnus, alternately, in the role of the Homeric hero. The last four books of the poem, however, show a general trend towards giving this role to Aeneas, starting at the end of Book 8, when he receives divine armor from his mother, and culminating in the final lines of Book 12, where his killing of Turnus replays Achilles’ killing of Hector in *Iliad* Book 22. At other times, a single character, such as Dido, can be seen over the course of the narrative to wear different masks belonging to different genres: Dido is introduced to the poem as an epic princess, through a simile that likens her to Homer’s Nausicaa (*Aen.* 1.498–502: *Od.* 6.102–109), and she plays a number of different roles as a tragic hero, from the echoing in her reproaches to Aeneas of the Euripidean Medea’s words to Jason (*Aen.* 4.362–392: Eur. *Med.* 465–519), through the resemblance of her violent suicide to that of Sophocles’ Ajax (*Aen.* 4.663–666: Soph. *Aj.* 826–828). She remains an Ajax (although now an epic figure), moreover,

---


when Aeneas encounters her in the underworld, where her cold silence towards Aeneas matches that of Ajax towards Odysseus in the Homeric underworld in *Od*. 11.8

Because Dido, Aeneas, and Turnus are all central figures in the *Aeneid*, Vergil’s alignment of these characters with generically representative metanarratives has important bearing on the generic affinities of Vergil’s narrative. As I remarked above, Dido’s alignment with figures from tragedy, and especially with Euripides’ Medea and Sophocles’ Ajax, is an important factor in readers’ perception of Book 4 as a tragedy centering on Dido.9 Because the figure of Achilles, moreover, is so central to the genre of martial epic, it can be said in one sense that the *Aeneid* is not fully an Iliadic epic until its hero Aeneas becomes the poem’s Achilles figure and his opponent Turnus becomes its Hector. (Looking at this question in a different way, we can at least say that, to the degree that Vergil’s Italian war replays Homer’s Trojan war, it is unclear who will play which Iliadic hero.) When characters within the poem express opinions about these important metanarrative alignments, these opinions can also be said to reflect the way they perceive the generic identity of their own narrative. So the Sybil, Turnus, Juno, and Amata believe that the war unfolding in Latium will be a martial epic on the pattern of the *Iliad*, and that Turnus will play the hero Achilles, while Aeneas will play the bride-stealer Paris.10 In this case, these characters are right about the epic genre of their narrative but wrong about the roles that Turnus and Aeneas

---

8See now Panoussi 2009, 182–198. Feldherr 1999 points out the generic affinities of the *lugentes campi* scene with both epic and love elegy.

9See n. 4 above.

10See Lyne 1987, 108–109, who discusses the examples cited above at n. 6. Lyne argues that, because Vergil’s characters express opinions about the literary role that they or other characters are playing in the narrative, there is a sense in which they, as well as the author, can be said to allude. I will follow Lyne throughout this chapter and the next in attributing to Vergil’s characters in the *Eclogues* some degree of literary and metaliterary awareness. One could say that the characters in the *Aeneid* are alluding to history instead of literature, but there is no difference in the case of the Trojan war. Similarly, for the shepherds of the *Eclogues* there is no difference between a reference to Theocritus and a reference to the pastoral world, which Theocritus created.
are respectively playing. We will see a similar example in Ecl. 8, where a character seems to know he is in a pastoral poem, but has naive ideas about what that means. In both cases, the structure of Vergil’s poem can be said to have encouraged these characters in their wrong or naive views.\footnote{To take a single example of allusion encouraging the conclusion that Turnus plays Achilles in the Aeneid, Thomas 1998a, 278–281 shows that Turnus’s killing of Aeolus in Book 12 (542–547) replays the near-death of Aeneas himself at the hands of Achilles (mentioned by Achilles at Il. 20.188–194).}

In this chapter and the next I will discuss Eclogues 2, 8, and 10—the three poems in the Eclogues that deal most directly with the theme of love—and the generic metanarratives that emerge as models for Vergil’s treatment of love in these poems. The story of Polyphemus from Theocritus Idyll 11 and that of Acontius from Callimachus Aetia 3 emerge as metanarratives to represent the figure of the lover in pastoral and elegiac poetry, respectively. The two narratives have much in common, since both prominently involve characters singing a song of erotic lament, but they are representative of their respective genres because they differ fundamentally on the two important issues, the consolability of the lover and the purpose of song (and poetry).

A third metanarrative emerges in the story of Daphnis. Within the Eclogues, however, different characters understand differently what it means to play the role of Daphnis, a misunderstanding that arises from the fact that Daphnis appears in two very different contexts in Theocritus. In Idyll 1, Daphnis is a distant, mythological character—the subject of the archetypal pastoral song, “The Woes of Daphnis,” which details his inconsolable suffering in connection with heterosexual love.\footnote{Besides being the subject of Thyrsis’s song at Idyll 1.64–145 and Tityrus’s song at 7.72–77, the woes of Daphnis (τὰ ∆άφνιδος ἄλγεα) are also mentioned as a proverbially hard fate at 5.20. Hunter 1999 remarks at 1.19 that “to (be able to) ‘sing the sufferings of Daphnis’ [19] is virtually the same as ‘reaching mastery in bucolic song’ (20)”} In Idyll 6, however, Daphnis appears as a young shepherd in the contemporary pastoral world.
He and the slightly older Damoetas engage in a non-eristic singing contest with no winner and no loser—the most perfectly idyllic scene in Theocritean pastoral—which can also be read as a scene of homosexual pederasty. As a symbol, therefore, Daphnis can mean two quite different things, since he participates in Theocritus in two quite different, but equally paradigmatic narratives.

As in the *Aeneid*, metanarrative characterization in the *Eclogues* is not static, but involves various characters in a shifting series of intertextual alignments that bear on both the themes of the collection and its generic affiliation. Unlike epic, pastoral has no single continuous narrative, so different characters are aligned with pastoral and elegiac metanarratives in each poem. These metanarrative alignments, however, provide a measure of continuity between poems with otherwise unrelated narratives. Thus because *Ecl. 2* and *Ecl. 10*, as I will argue, use the same metanarratives to characterize pastoral and elegiac figures, *Ecl. 10* can be read, on one level, as a continuation of and response to *Ecl. 2*. Moreover, when Vergil in *Ecl. 10* involves himself and Gallus as contemporary representatives of pastoral and elegy, respectively, he adds to this metanarrative fiction another layer of metapoetic self-reflexivity, which extends retrospectively to *Ecl. 2* (and *Ecl. 8*) as well. The interaction of pastoral and elegiac characters across *Eclogues* 2 and 10 (and perhaps across the entire collection) constitutes an erotically-themed metanarrative story, which is by turns both archetypically pastoral and archetypically elegiac. This generically hybrid story figures the influence that Gallan elegy has had on Vergil in the composition of the *Eclogues*, and

---

13 On Theocritus’s differing characterization of Daphnis in *Id.* 1 and 6 see Fantuzzi 1998, 62–69, who suggests that Theocritus may be trying to present two incompatible versions of the Daphnis legend, one in which his sufferings were the first theme of pastoral song, and another in which he was its inventor (see 65–66). Although scholars disagree over whether Daphnis and Damoetas are lovers in *Id.* 6, Fantuzzi argues that, even if Theocritus did not intend them to be such, Hermesianax may have understood the poem in this way (assuming he wrote after Theocritus), since he makes Daphnis the homosexual lover of Menalcas (*Herm.* fr. 2 P: see Fantuzzi, pages 66–67). I will argue below that Vergil too read *Id.* 6 in this way, and that he used the relationship between Daphnis and Damoetas as a paradigm for pederastic homosexual love in the *Eclogues*. 
which Vergil, according to the fiction of this metanarrative story, hopes that his own poetry will have on Gallus’s future elegiac compositions. My interpretation of these poems takes a new approach to the question of whether Ecl. 10 constitutes evidence that Gallus wrote either pastoral poetry or pastorally-themed elegy: I do not think that Ecl. 10 warrants either of these assumptions—or even that it is grounds for us to believe that Vergil and Gallus were actually friends\(^\text{14}\)—but rather that Vergil in the Eclogues has created a metanarrative fiction that dramatizes an attempt by Vergil, who meets with deliberately mixed success, to make Gallus and Gallan elegy a part of the pastoral world.

Because the metanarratives of Acontius, Polyphemus, and Daphnis use words (written or sung) to deal with their love, they can be understood to reflect by analogy on the contemporary world of poets and poetry that lies behind the pastoral veneer of the Eclogues.\(^\text{15}\) By extension of this analogy, elements of these metanarratives come to act as metapoetic symbols of the sort I discussed in the last chapter, and Vergil uses these in the Eclogues to comment more directly (although still metaphorically) on poetological concerns like genre and style. This symbolism is most apparent in Eclogue 10, where figures from contemporary poetic society are cast into the metanarrative roles that are elsewhere filled by singing shepherds and figures from Theocritean pastoral. It is also present, however, in earlier poems as well, where it is manifested through Vergil’s metapoetic alignment between poetry and the sylvan landscape of the Eclogues (which I will discuss in the second half of Chapter 3). This

\(^{14}\)For a skeptical reappraisal of what we actually know about Vergil’s life see Horsfall 1995b.

\(^{15}\)Hubbard 1998, in discussing the history of pastoral as a genre, argues that it is from its very beginnings fundamentally concerned to reflect on poetry and its own literary nature, and that in Theocritus, e.g., the emphasis on song and its powers is one of the things that distinguishes the bucolic from the non-bucolic Idylls. More particularly, Hubbard’s approach revives elements of the “pastoral masquerade” approach associated with the argument of Reitzenstein 1893 that Idyll 4 is a pastoral representation of contemporary literary society. On the importance of analogy as a structuring principle in pastoral see Gutzwiller 1991 and Ch. 3 p. 153 below.
alignment is clearest when Gallus is cast as Acontius in Ecl. 10, where he says he will write his amores on tender trees (certum est in silvis...malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus, 52–54): on the narrative level, he means that he (like Callimachus’s Acontius, whose story I shall review in the next section) will carve his beloved’s name into trees, but on the metapoetic level the elegist means that he will write his love poetry (amores) in books of elegy, a genre that vaunts its “soft” or “tender” (teneris arboribus) style. A symbolic link between trees and poetry books, moreover, helps make metapoetic symbols out of other images structurally related to trees in the Eclogues, such as forests, echoes, and shadows, to name a few that I will consider specifically. Inasmuch as this metapoetic symbolism consists of the coordinated, sustained use of metaphor, it constitutes allegory. This is not, however, the historical / biographical allegory that Servius often remarks on, but rather metapoetic allegory, a type that occurs not infrequently in the ancient commentaries, but which modern critics (following Servius) generally dismiss.16

Like the metapoetic symbols of Geo. 1.291–296, the major metapoetic symbols of the Eclogues can also be understood as literalized metaphors, though here it is not only literary-critical metaphors that are literalized, but even Latin’s technical vocabulary for talking about reading, writing, and poetry, which developed from metaphors drawn from the natural world.17 The metaphorical prehistory of these words is visible in the literary double meanings associated with words like liber, which can mean “bark” or “book,” or legere, which can mean “gather” or “read” (among other meanings, like “choose”). Vergil uses these literary double meanings in the Eclogues to help establish and reinforce the metapoetic symbolism seen also in his use of metanarrative patterns to reflect on contemporary poetic society. To

16See above p. 3.

17On metaphor as a source of technical and literary-critical vocabulary see Innes 2003, 12.
preview briefly one of the primary examples I discuss in these two chapters, the double meaning of *liber* supports the symbolic link between books and trees, because writing on trees is necessarily done on their bark.\(^{18}\) It is not clear that the Romans thought of technical terms like this as metaphorically derived, as such, but they did see an etymological connection between the two senses of the words, and they considered the sense connected with nature to be logically and historically prior to the sense connected with reading and writing. Thus Servius says that *liber* “book” is derived from *liber* “bark,” because scrolls were assembled from bark before the invention of papyrus,\(^ {19}\) and Varro says that *legere* “read” is derived from *legere* “gather,” because letters on a page are gathered by the eyes.\(^ {20}\) Etymologizing of this sort was an important part of Roman intellectual society, particularly in the first century BC, and was given an extensive and important treatment by Varro in his *De Lingua Latina* only a few years before Vergil composed the *Eclogues*.\(^ {21}\) The importance of etymologizing to Vergil’s compositional method, moreover, has been thoroughly demonstrated in recent years.\(^ {22}\) This important intellectual trend, which produced myriad subtle etymological glosses across Vergil’s three works, seems also to have been an important impetus behind Vergil’s development of metapoetic symbolism.

\(^{18}\) This sentence glosses over an important difficulty, namely that *liber* is properly the inner bark, or the cambium, of the tree, while *cortex* is the outer bark, on which one could more easily write (cf. *Ecl.* 5.13–14: *in . . . corticis fagi | carmina descripsi*). Vergil solves this problem, I believe, by suppressing the word *liber* beneath *arbor*; see below p. 156.

\(^{19}\) Serv. ad *Aen.* 11.554, *liber dicitur interior corticis pars . . . unde et liber dicitur in quo scribimus, quia ante usum chartae vel membranae de libris arborum volumina . . . compaginabantur* (=Isid. *Orig.* 6.13.3); cf. Maltby 1991 s.v. *liber*. Cf. below Ch. 3 n. 124.


\(^{21}\) On the date of Varro’s *De Lingua Latina* (probably before 43 BC) see Cardauns 2001, 30–31. For a summary of the issues involved in the dating of the *Eclogues* as a collection (perhaps 39 BC, perhaps 35 BC), see Clausen 1994, 233–237.

\(^{22}\) See esp. O’Hara 1996.
By establishing trees as a metapoetic symbol for poetry books, Vergil makes poetological symbols out of the most common and ubiquitous elements of the pastoral landscape of the *Eclogues*, and by doing so he becomes able to express himself programmatically not only through the narrative voice or even the actions of his characters, but through the very fabric of his poetic world, its landscape. When trees come to symbolize poetry in a poem where both trees and poetic singing are central to the poem’s thematic structure, then everything that trees do or that characters do to trees—which is quite a lot in the *Eclogues*—has the potential to reflect metapoetically on the literary world of the poet. We see this potential most clearly when Gallus writes his *Amores* onto tender trees (10.53–54) or when Mopsus recounts writing down his song on the bark of a birch tree (5.13–15), but we see other important examples in the prominent mentions of shade or forests in the opening lines of *Eclogues* 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10. In these and other passages Vergil uses the poem’s sylvan setting and the shade cast by these trees to give substance to the literary traditions into which he situates his new collection of poems and to the shadow of literary influence that both protects him and stunts his poetic development. Vergil uses these metapoetic symbols throughout the *Eclogues* to give substance to his views about poetic style and literary history. His use of such symbolism in the *Eclogues*, moreover, helps us understand his even more sophisticated use of these symbols in *Georgics* 2, where he will have more to say about the dynamics of literary influence.

The consideration of trees and their metapoetic symbolism will take up much of this and the following two chapters, but first we must consider Vergil’s use of the Acontius story as an elegiac metanarrative, and then examine his representation of the pastoral and elegiac literary traditions within the *Eclogues*. 
2.2 The Story of Acontius as an Elegiac Metanarrative

The story of Acontius and Cydippe was originally an obscure piece of local mythology from the island of Ceos, recorded by Xenomedes in his Cean local history.\textsuperscript{23} It came to be important and influential after Callimachus included it in his Aetia as a foundation narrative for the clan of the Acontiadae.\textsuperscript{24} Callimachus’s extensive treatment seems to have filled much of Aetia 3, and what remains of it (frr. 67–75 Pfeiffer) includes the longest narrative fragment preserved from the collection (fr. 75 Pf.: 77 lines). This once-obscure story was influential on the Augustan Roman poets, and its direct influence can be detected in Vergil’s Eclogues (2, 8, and 10),\textsuperscript{25} Propertius’s Monobiblos (1.18), and Ovid’s Heroides (20–21). By an unfortunate coincidence, the longest Callimachean fragment resumes the story well after the two incidents in which Roman poets show the greatest interest, the stratagem of the apple, in which Acontius tricks Cydippe into swearing to marry him by inscribing the oath on an apple, and Acontius’s sylvan lament, in which the boy withdraws to the woods and laments his love for Cydippe while carving her name on trees.\textsuperscript{26} We are informed about this section, however, by the prose summary of the sixth-century AD epistolographer

\textsuperscript{23}See Callim. Aet. fr. 75.50–77 Pf. (= FGrH 442 F1).

\textsuperscript{24}For general information and bibliography on Callimachus’s treatment of this Cean myth, see conveniently Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 60–66, who note the story’s great influence on Roman literature.

\textsuperscript{25}Although Kenney 1983 argued that the story of Acontius was visible in Ecl. 2, 8, and 10 (see below), his argument concerning Ecl. 8 was both weaker and more novel than those concerning Ecl. 2 and 10, and seems to have been less universally accepted (Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 60 cites only Ecl. 2 and 10 as Vergilian poems influenced by Callimachus’s narrative). In my arguments below, I will support Kenney in detecting the influence of this story also on Ecl. 8.

\textsuperscript{26}As Ross 1975, 72 points out, however, frr. 72 and 73 Pf. do cover Acontius’s wandering in the woods and carving Cydippe’s name in trees.
Aristaenetus, who seems to reproduce the Callimachean narrative reliably. From the remains of Callimachus and the summary of Aristaenetus we get a fairly complete picture of the Callimachean narrative. Acontius was a youth from Ceos whose remarkable beauty drove a number of men of the island to lust after him; they would crowd round to watch him as he walked to school, and were driven by their passion even to fit their feet into his footsteps. But Acontius himself had not known passion until he fell in love with the beautiful young Cydippe of Naxos, whom he saw at a festival on Delos. Taking a quince (also called a Cydonian apple) from the orchard of Aphrodite, he inscribed a message on it and threw it in front of Cydippe’s nurse, who asked Cydippe to read her the inscription. Cydippe read aloud: “I swear by Artemis to marry Acontius.” Cydippe blushed when she realized what she had said, threw away the apple, and returned home to Naxos, where her parents had already arranged a marriage for her. Acontius returned to Ceos and lamented his hopeless love for Cydippe, withdrawing often to the woods, where he complained to the forest and carved “Cydippe is beautiful” into the bark of the trees. Meanwhile, after Cydippe had three times fallen ill on the eve of her wedding, her father consulted the oracle of Delphi and learned of her daughter’s inadvertent oath, which had been ratified by Artemis. On the oracle’s advice, he saw to it that Cydippe fulfilled the oath by marrying Acontius, who was revealed to be a worthy match, descended from the priests of Zeus Aristaeus. Their union resulted in the line of the Acontiadae, and their story was recorded by Xenomedes’ local history of Ceos, from which it passed into Callimachus’s Aetia.

It seems likely that the story of Acontius and Cydippe figured somehow into the elegies of Cornelius Gallus, either in narrative form or as an exemplum for Gallus’s own relationship with Lycoris. The best support for this hypothesis comes from

---

27 Aristae. 1.10 Vieillefond; on Aristaenetus’s date see Vieillefond 1992, ix–xi.
Gallus’s speech in Eclogue 10, in which he declares his intention, like Acontius, to suffer in the woods and carve his love’s name onto trees.

certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
arboreis: crescent illae, crescutis amores.

(Butil. Ecl. 10.52–54)

This passage comes very soon after the line on which Servius comments, hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus (ad 10.46), and although most scholars understand Servius’s notice to refer to lines 46–49, Gallan influence of some sort is most likely both here and throughout Eclogue 10.28 Further support comes from Prop. 1.18, which alludes to the Callimachean version of the story and, as Ross has argued, probably also to the version of Gallus.29 Like Gallus in Ecl. 10, Propertius here adopts the posture of Acontius and carves the name of his beloved onto trees.

vos eritis testes, si quos habet arbor amores
fagus et Arcadio pinus amica deo.
a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras,
scibitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus!

(Prop. 1.18.19–22)30

Citing neoteric stylistic features common to both Eclogue 10 and Prop. 1.18, Ross argued that Propertius here alludes to Gallus as well as Callimachus, and that Gallus

---

28Gallus’s speech seems to owe much to Gallus’s poetry throughout: see Clausen 1994, 291–292 and 292 n. 17 and cf. Conte 1986, 109 (with citations to Jacoby and F. Skutsch) and Skutsch 1969, 166. On the extent of Vergil’s “translation” of Gallus see Kidd 1964, 61; Kelly 1977; Yardley 1980; and especially Jocelyn 1964, 1965 (esp. 1965, 139–144) and Hollis 2007, 236–237. Hollis and Courtney 1993 (ad Gallus fr. 3) both take Servius’s notice as broadly applicable (they respectively define Ec. 10.42–63 and 42–61 as fragments), while both Clausen and Coleman (ad loc.) see it as referring only to Ec. 10.46–49.

29On Propertius’s debt here directly to Callimachus see Cairns 1969b. On Gallus see Ross 1975, 71–74, 88–89.

30Here and elsewhere my quotations of Propertius follow Fedeli’s 1994 Teubner text unless indicated.
himself probably used Acontius as an exemplum for his own elegiac poetry about Lycoris.\textsuperscript{31} Subsequent researchers have concurred with Ross’s conclusion,\textsuperscript{32} and the idea that Gallus treated the Acontius myth has now won wide approbation. I argue in this chapter that Vergil’s association of Acontius and Gallus in \textit{Eclogue} 10 not only reflects Gallus’s own adoption of the Callimachean narrative, but is also part of a broader program of metapoetic symbolism in the \textit{Eclogues}, which uses this story as a metanarrative symbol for the elegiac literary tradition. The story of Acontius encapsulates the plot of Roman love elegy as a genre, and is all the more compelling as an elegiac metanarrative because of its apparent prominence in both Gallus and Callimachus, two pillars of the later elegiac tradition at Rome.\textsuperscript{33}

Like Vergil in the \textit{Eclogues} and Propertius in the \textit{Monobiblos}, Ovid too uses the story of Acontius and Cydippe as a model in his \textit{Heroides}, devoting the last two poems of his collection (\textit{Her.} 20–21) to the Callimachean hero and heroine. Barchiesi has argued that Ovid gave them this special place at the end of his collection (which is also the end of his corpus of erotic elegies), because he had “rediscovered the Acontius story as a convincing ‘plot’ for Roman elegy as a whole.”\textsuperscript{34} Acontius and Cydippe, as Barchiesi notes, stand out from the other correspondents of the collection because

\textsuperscript{31}See Ross 1975, 73, which argues that these shared features, which include neoteric \textit{a!} at Prop. 1.18.21 and the \textit{hapax} at \textit{Ecl.} 10.52, \textit{spelaea} (attributed to Gallus by Norden in his comment on \textit{Aen.} 6.10), constitute characteristically Gallan elements of style and diction; Cairns 2006, 161, 170–171, 229 adds metrical arguments.


\textsuperscript{33}For the \textit{Eclogues} at least, the argument based on the role of Acontius in Callimachus and Gallus is perhaps stronger, or at least less circular, than the argument that the Acontius story encapsulates the story of Roman elegy. Because of the loss of most of Gallan elegy, this latter argument must be made on the evidence of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, all of whom postdate Vergil’s \textit{Eclogues} as well as Gallan elegy. Nevertheless, the surviving remains of Gallan elegy do point to important commonalities with the extant representatives of the genre. If Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid recognized Vergil’s use of the Acontius story to represent the elegiac tradition, then the prominence of this narrative pattern in later elegy must be reevaluated with this fact in mind.

\textsuperscript{34}Barchiesi 1993, 360–363 (quote from 362); cf. also Hardie 2002, 121–125.
they owe their fame not to dramatic or narrative poetry, but to Callimachus’s elegiac *Aetia*, a collection that the Augustan poets represent as foundational for their own genre of love elegy.\(^{35}\) As a distressed lover who withdraws to the woods to lament his love alone, Acontius serves as a prototype for the figure of the solitary lover in Propertius 1.18 and *Eclogues* 2 and 10,\(^{36}\) but Acontius is a model for Roman elegy in a different sense as well: like the *amator* of Roman elegy, he is hopelessly in love with a woman who does not return his affection, and he tries unsuccessfully to woo her through the use of writing.\(^{37}\) In this sense the oath that Acontius inscribes on the apple is analogous to the *werbende Dichtung* that Roman love elegy frequently presents itself as.\(^{38}\)

Furthermore, there is direct evidence (which Barchiesi does not discuss) that Ovid considered the story of Acontius and Cydippe to be representative of elegy. Near the center of the *Remedia Amoris*, Ovid discusses literary decorum in order to mount a literary defense of the *Ars Amatoria*, arguing that sexual license was perfectly appropriate for the kind of poetry he was writing in the *Ars*. In a passage that resembles Horace’s discussion of generic decorum in the *Ars Poetica*, Ovid lays out

\(^{35}\)Barchiesi 1993, 361.


\(^{37}\)In Acontius’s case, this failure is only apparent, since Artemis had ratified Cydippe’s oath, and the two youths were ultimately to be married. Although Barchiesi, following Ovid’s lead, focuses on the (ultimately successful) stratagem of the apple, Hardie 2002, 122 points out that the efficacy of this use of writing is an important difference between elegy and this aspect of Acontius’s story, and that a better parallel is found in the inefficacious writing of the later stage of the story, where Acontius vainly carves Cydippe’s name into trees. It is this aspect, I believe, that Vergil focuses on in the *Eclogues*; Ovid may have found it useful, on this account, to focus on a different aspect of the story in the *Heroides*.

\(^{38}\)On elegy as a means of gaining sexual access, see James 2003, 71–107 and cf. Stroh 1971 (whence the phrase *werbende Dichthung*); cf. also Tib. 2.4.13–20; Prop. 1.7 and 1.9, 3.23.1–6; Ov. *Am.* 2.1.21–38, 3.1.41–52.
the proper subject for several genres, including epic, tragedy, comedy, iamb, and
elegy.\(^{39}\)

\[\text{at tu, quicumque es, quem nostra licentia laedit,} \]
\[\text{si sapis, ad numeros exige quidque suos.} \]
\[\text{fortia Maeonio gaudent pede \textit{bella} referri;} \]
\[\text{deliciis illic quis locus esse potest?} \]
\[\text{grande sonant tragici; tragicos decet ira cothurnos;} \]
\[\text{usibus e mediis soccus habendus erit.} \]
\[\text{liber in adversos hostes stringatur iambus,} \]
\[\text{seu celer, extremum seu trahat ille pedem.} \]
\[\text{blanda pharetratos Elegia cantet \textit{amores},} \]
\[\text{et levis arbitrio ludat amica suo.} \]
\[\text{Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles,} \]
\[\text{\textit{Cydippe} non est oris, Homere, tui;} \]
\[\text{quis ferat Andromaches peragentem Thaida partes?} \]
\[\text{peccet, in Andromache Thaida quisquis agat.} \]
\[\text{Thais in arte mea est: lascivia libera nostra est;} \]
\[\text{nil mihi cum vitta; Thais in arte mea est.} \]

\begin{center}
\textit{(Ov. Rem. 371–386)}
\end{center}

But you, whoever you are whom my freedom hurts, suit each theme, if you are wise, to its proper numbers. Valiant \textit{wars} rejoice to be sung in Maeonian metre; what place can be found there for lovers’ tales? Tragedians sound a noble strain; anger becomes the tragic buskin: the sock must be used for common scenes. Let the free iambus be drawn against the opposing foe, whether it rapidly advance, or drag its final foot. Let winsome \textit{Elegy} sing of quivered \textit{loves}, and lightly sport in kindly mood at her own pleasure. Achilles must not be told of in the numbers of Callimachus; \textit{Cydippe} suits not thy utterance, Homer. Who could endure Thais playing Andromache’s part? she would err, who in Andromache played the part of Thais. Thais is the subject of my art; unfettered is my love-making: naught have I to do with fillets; Thais is the subject of my art. (trans. Mozley, adapted)

After Ovid says that epic should sing of wars (\textit{bella}, 373), elegy of \textit{loves} (\textit{amores},

\(^{39}\)On Ovid’s discussion of decorum in this passage, and on its probable relationship to Horace, see Gibson 2007, 133–142.
etc., he selects four specific characters as representatives of their respective genres, in order to claim that it would be indecorous for one of these to appear outside of his or her own proper genre. For epic Ovid picks Homer’s Achilles, while for elegy he picks Callimachus’s Cydippe. In this chapter I hope to show that, like Ovid, Vergil conceived of the story of Acontius and Cydippe as representative of elegy, and that he used it as a textual model for certain passages in the *Eclogues* because he too saw it as a “convincing ‘plot’ for Roman elegy as a whole.”

### 2.3 Two Genres in the *Eclogues*

While Vergil uses the Callimachean story of Acontius to represent the elegiac literary tradition, he also draws paradigmatic narratives from Theocritus to represent the pastoral tradition. By juxtaposing pastoral with elegiac metanarratives, and by casting his characters as participating in first one, then the other, he uses the paradigmatic quality of these metanarratives to figure the interaction of the pastoral and elegiac traditions in the *Eclogues*. The clearest instance of this sort of juxtaposition is in *Eclogue* 10, where lines 52–54 present Gallus as an Acontius figure (see above, and also Ch. 3), but where the main body of the poem (9–69) presents the elegist as Daphnis. Conte too, in his influential reading of *Eclogue* 10, sees Daphnis in this poem as a symbol of pastoral, and he argues that when Vergil “dresses his Gallus in Daphnis’s clothes,” he aims to present a dialogue between the elegiac and pastoral genres, in which the two contemplate a merger but ultimately remain distinct.

---

40I take *amores* here as a common noun, although Kenney and others prefer to capitalize it; see further below p. 64 on this word. Gibson 2007, 137 speaks of “*amores / Amores*” here.

41See Gibson 2007, 142 on the problematic nature of this claim, especially since Andromache plays an important role in the *Ars Amatoria* (esp. 2.707–710, 3.777–778).

42Conte 1986, 100–129, quotation on 105.
will argue in this section, and further throughout my discussion of the Eclogues, that this paradoxical combination of the unity and distinctness of the pastoral and elegiac genres does not begin in Eclogue 10, but is characteristic of Vergil’s treatment of love in Eclogues 2, 8, and 10, and to some degree throughout the collection. My analysis will concentrate on Eclogues 2, 8, and 10 because scholars frequently group these poems together based on what Kenney calls their “elegiac sensibility,” an effect that Vergil achieves partly through his use of the Acontius narrative as a metaphor for the elegiac tradition.

Both elegy and pastoral had perceptible influence on the Eclogues, and the collection contains two scenes of literary initiation corresponding to these two literary traditions. One of these initiation scenes is well known and has been very influential on interpretations both of the poem in which it appears and of the collection as a whole. Near the end of Eclogue 6, the shepherd Linus presents the elegist Gallus with a set of pipes that Hesiod once used to charm ash trees down from the mountains, and which Gallus himself is to use to sing the origin of the Grynean grove (Ecl. 6.64–73). This passage has been discussed most famously by David Ross, who argued that this scene represents Gallus’s initiation into a single universal poetic tradition that obviated the traditional rules and constraints of individual genres. Scholars since Ross, however, have considered it more likely that it was Vergil in Ecl. 6 who

43Kenney 1983.

44I follow those who reject Ross’s insistence that Linus refers to Orpheus when he describes the power of these pipes to charm nature (Ecl. 6.70–71): see Zetzel 1977, 254, responding to Ross 1975, 23. Aside from the grammatical argument against understanding ille (Ecl. 6.70) to refer to Orpheus (who is mentioned only at line 30 in this poem, and there only as a contrast to the power of Silenus’s song), it is noteworthy that Orpheus is by no means the only magical singer mentioned in the Eclogues: aside from the magic carmina of Alphesiboeus’s song in Ecl. 8, compare the mention of Amphion at Ecl. 2.24 and Arion at Ecl. 8.56. See further below on the magical power of song as a motif generally associated with elegiac poetry.

conceived of a unified poetic tradition.\textsuperscript{46} It may be best, therefore, to see this passage as representing Gallus’s initiation into the elegiac literary tradition, since (a) Gallus’s only other appearance in the \textit{Eclogues}, in \textit{Ecl.} 10, is in his capacity as a contemporary elegiac poet,\textsuperscript{47} and (b) \textit{Ecl.} 6 adapts much from Callimachus’s elegiac \textit{Aetia} (a cornerstone of the Roman elegiac tradition), and Gallus is here commissioned to tell the \textit{origo} (\textasciitilde{} \textit{αἴτιον}) of the Grynean grove.\textsuperscript{48}

The other initiation scene in the \textit{Eclogues} has been less frequently noted by critics, but is arguably more pertinent to Vergil’s project in the \textit{Eclogues}, since it depicts a pastoral singer’s induction into the tradition of pastoral song. In \textit{Eclogue} 2 Corydon recounts the story of his own pipes, which he received from Damoetas as Damoetas lay dying.

\begin{quote}
est mihi disparibus septem compacta cicitis
fistula, Damoetas dono mihi quam dedit olim,
et dixit moriens: “te nunc habet ista secundum”;
dixit Damoetas, invidit stultus Amyntas.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Ecl. 2.36–39)}

I will argue below that these lines can be read with specific and self-reflexive reference

\textsuperscript{46}\textsuperscript{\textit{Cf. Zetzel’s remarks in his} review of Ross 1975: “As Ross so clearly points out, it is the Sixth Eclogue that stressed the unity of all poetry and the obliteration of formal distinctions between genres. Ross thinks that Gallus did this before Virgil; I suspect that it was Virgil himself” (Zetzel 1977, 258). My own discussion of \textit{Ecl.} 2, 8, and 10 also supports the notion that generic universalism was a specific concern of Vergil’s in the \textit{Eclogues}.}\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{47}\textsuperscript{\textit{Although Parthenias dedicates his} \textit{Erotika Pathemata} to Gallus as potential material “for hexameter and elegiac verse” (\textit{eis ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείας}, p. 308 Lightfoot = \textit{FRP} 143), we have evidence only for Gallan elegies, and Ross himself argues that Gallus’s literary output was entirely elegiac and consisted entirely of the four books of \textit{Amores} mentioned by Servius (Ross 1975, 39–46; cf. Serv. ad \textit{Ecl.} 10.1 = \textit{FRP} 139a).}\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{48}\textsuperscript{\textit{Cf. Farrell 1991, 300, who points out that in} \textit{Ecl.} 6 Vergil associates the Callimachean tradition with Gallus, not with himself (even if Tityrus is a mask for Vergil, this mask distances Vergil from the Callimachean scene at \textit{Ecl.} 6.2–8). On Vergil’s well-known adaptation of Callimachean literary polemic at \textit{Ecl.} 6.2–8, see conveniently Clausen 1994, 174–175 and ad loc., along with Cameron 1995, 454–471; Clauss 2004 argues that the entire structure of \textit{Ecl.} 6 reproduces that of the \textit{Aetia} (cf. also Berg 1974, 181–182).}
to the allusive program of *Ecl.* 2, but I note for now Hubbard’s argument that, in a more general sense, Corydon’s initiation by Damoetas can be seen to represent Vergil’s own initiation into the tradition of Theocritean pastoral.\(^{49}\) When Damoetas says that his pipes possess Corydon (instead of being possessed by him: *te nunc habet ista secundum, Ecl.* 2.38), he seems to mean that they will control his poetic output. Damoetas’s pipes, in this sense, are analogous to a literary genre, which likewise predetermines certain choices about poetic composition.\(^{50}\) These arguments, along with others I will discuss below, provide reasons to think that Corydon in *Ecl.* 2 stands as a literary allegory for Vergil, and that his implicit initiation in *Eclogue* 2 should be understood as analogous with Gallus’s explicit initiation in *Eclogue* 6.\(^{51}\)

In *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10, pastoral and elegy are juxtaposed not only as two different literary traditions, but also as two different paradigms for love. By selectively deploying generic conventions from these two traditions, Vergil aligns the characters in these poems, at least initially, with one or another generic tradition. One tool he uses to do this is the manipulation of formal aspects of genre, such as setting, characters, and naming conventions. Because Theocritean pastoral relies on the conceit of singing shepherds, its setting is in the countryside and its characters are shepherds.

\(^{49}\)See Hubbard 1998, 64, who argues that pederasty in *Ecl.* 2 is a way of troping literary influence: “The relation of Damoetas and Corydon can thus in a certain sense be seen as expressing the relationship of literary succession between Theocritus and Vergil”; cf. Van Sickle 1986, 41–42. See also Philargyrius ad *Ecl.* 2.37: *TE NUNC IDEST VIRGILIUM. SECUNDUM IDEST THEOCRITO, QUEM HIC DAMOETAM DICT.*

\(^{50}\)See below on *Ecl.* 2 for a more nuanced reading of the function of Damoetas’s pipes, which, I argue, determine / annotate the correspondence between Corydon’s song in *Ecl.* 2 and Damoetas’s song in Theocritus *Idyll* 6.

\(^{51}\)It is no impediment to this argument that Gallus is explicitly named but Vergil is not: this may, instead, be seen as a function of their respective genres, since surviving Roman elegy routinely pretends to realism and includes the author as a named character, while Theocritean pastoral relies on the conceit of singing shepherds (with pastoral names) to make statements about poetry (cf. Hubbard 1998, 31–32, which revives and revises Reitzenstein’s idea of the “bucolic masquerade” in Theocritus 4; see below n. 88). Others have seen Corydon as an allegory for Vergil, but in a biographical, rather than literary sense: see n. 116 below.
who carry shepherds’ names, even when they seem to represent contemporary literary figures. The primary conceit of Roman love elegy, on the other hand, is the author’s erotic involvement with a learned, sophisticated woman (docta puella), so the usual setting is the city, and the author “himself” appears as a narrating character. Apart from more formal aspects of genre, Vergil also marks a character’s generic alignment through the alignment of these characters with the metanarratives of Acontius, Polyphemus, or Daphnis, as I discussed above. In selecting these metanarratives, the poet has not relied on such incidental considerations as setting or naming conventions, which he himself frequently manipulates, but looked rather to such fundamental questions as how pastoral and elegy, respectively, conceive of love and the power of poetry.

As Vergil represents it in the Eclogues, the pastoral literary tradition conceives of passionate erotic love as a wound or affliction and poetry or song as a solace (solacium) for love. Such a conception of love and song comes from Theocritus’s Cyclops (Id. 11), which is the most important model for Vergil’s own first extensive treatment of love, the song of Corydon in Eclogue 2. In the lines that introduce Polyphemus’s love song for Galatea in Id. 11, Theocritus characterizes love as a grievous wound, for which

52 Cf. below n. 88 on Reitzenstein’s theory of the “bucolic masquerade,” recently revised by Hubbard. Theocritus has no problem mentioning contemporary poets by name (e.g. Asclepiades and Philetas at Id. 7.40), but to the degree that the bucolic Idylls dramatize Theocritus’s own literary program (Hubbard 1998, 19–44), they do so through the allegory of singing shepherds; compare Vergil’s mentions in the Eclogues of Pollio, Bavius, and Maevius (3.84–91), and perhaps his mention of the addressee of Ecl. 8 (8.6–10).

53 Conte 1986, 113 refers to the realism of elegiac convention as the genre’s “pretense” to verisimilitude. To the degree that the narrating authorial voice may be considered a generic convention of Roman love elegy, then in Ecl. 2, 8, and 10, the apparent unity in the anonymous framing narrator (cf. Breed 2006, 355) might be considered another further link with elegy; cf. below n. 78 on the difficulty of interpreting the narrative voice in the Eclogues. On the connection between elegy and the city cf. Conte 1986, 114–115.

54 The attention to song and its powers seems itself to be a generic property of pastoral: as Hubbard 1998, 20 points out, this is the primary concern of Theocritean bucolic, and one of the clearest factors that distinguishes it from Theocritus’s non-bucolic Idylls.
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there is no treatment other than the Muses, and he explains that the Cyclops was able to assuage his passion by turning to poetry as a curative drug.

Οὐδὲν ποτὶν ἐρωτα πεφύκει φάρµακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, οὔτ’ ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ’ ἐπίπαστον,
ἡ ταῖς Πιερίδεσ...

... ὁ δὲ τὰν Γαλάτειαν ἀείδων
ἀυτὸς ἐπὶ αἰών θανάτου κατετάκετο πυκνόπυκνος
ἐξ ἀσώσια ἐκ βοῶπον ὑποκάρδιων ἐλκος,
Κύπριδος ἐκ μεγάλας τὸ ὑπ’ ἡπατι πᾶξε βέλεµνον.

ἀλλὰ τὸ φάρµακον ἀνασπερχιρχυµα, καθεζόµενο δ᾿ ἐπὶ πέτρας
ὑψηλάς ἐς πόλιον ἀείδων αἰώνα τοιαύτα·

(Theoc. 11.1–3, 13–17)

In the lines that close the poem, moreover, Theocritus creates a metaphorical link between erotic consolation and the pastoral conceit of herding by claiming that Polyphemus successfully “shepherded” his love through poetry.

Οὕτω τοι Πολύφαµος ἐποίµαινεν τὸν ἐρωτα
μουσίσων, ῥὰλπηαιοταχιρχυµον δὲ διὰ ἢ εἰ χρυσὸν ἔδωκεν.

(Theoc. 11.80–81)

These lines foreground the implicit claim of this Idyll that disconsolate love—such as Polyphemus’s love for Galatea seemed to be until the end of the poem—is somehow alien to the pastoral world. Disconsolate love is perfectly well at home elsewhere in Theocritus, in both the bucolic and non-bucolic Idylls, but Theocritus’s influential treatment of love in the Cyclops seems to have helped establish the literary topos that bucolic poetry is a palliative for love. Later poets developed this idea in both bucolic and non-bucolic poetry, and by the time that Vergil wrote the Eclogues there was an established poetic opposition between bucolic life (and poetry) on one hand

---

55 This may be true in part because disconsolate love seems to violate the order of the herd: cf. Hunter 1999 ad 11.80, who highlights the analogy between a shepherd controlling his flock and Polyphemus bringing his love under control.

56 Cf. Hunter 1999, 222–223 on the influence of this Idyll on Callimachus Epig. 46 and Posidippus.
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and the life of love and erotic poetry on the other.\(^{57}\) Vergil himself is quite fond of the poetic conceit that song is a *solacium*, and while he does not always apply this schema specifically to bucolic song or specifically to the suffering of love, he seems to regard it as a property of the pastoral genre.\(^{58}\) By using Theocritus *Id.* 11, moreover, as the primary model for his own first extensive treatment of love in the *Eclogues*, Vergil establishes Polyphemus’s love—and its consolation—as a paradigm for bucolic love throughout the rest of the *Eclogues.*\(^{59}\)

To judge from Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, elegy takes a position on love and poetry that is directly contrary to that of pastoral. Elegy, like pastoral, sometimes presents love as a sickness or wound, but one from which recovery is neither possible nor desirable.\(^{60}\) Because unhappy love is the central conceit of the elegiac genre, the poet-lover can no more wish seriously for an end to his suffering than a Theocritean shepherd can wish for an end to herding. The elegists therefore conceive of poetry as having the power not to console their unhappy love, since this would destroy the central fiction of their genre, but to help them consummate it by winning them access

---

\(^{57}\)On the treatment of love in Theocritean and later pastoral see the section “Bucolic and Non-Bucolic Love” in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 170–190, esp. 176–178 on the contrast, already developing in Theocritus, between “unhappy, tormented love (and love poetry) on the one hand and bucolic life (and poetry) on the other” (176). They cite Bion fr. 10 and two epigrams of Meleager (*AP* 7.195, 196) to show the currency of this idea in the decades before Vergil wrote the *Eclogues.*


\(^{59}\)Especially important in this regard is Vergil’s close imitation of the end of *Id.* 11 in the closing lines of *Ecl.* 2 (*Ecl.* 2.69–73 = *Id.* 11.72–76); both passages are the first sign of self-consolation in each song. Although Vergil does not directly adapt the lines in which Theocritus used shepherding as a metaphor for love (*Id.* 11.80–81), Vergil’s close allusion may nevertheless invite us—as it so often does—to recall the fuller context of the target passage.

to their beloved: elegiac poetry consists fundamentally of a complaint of the lover’s unhappy condition \((\textit{querela})\), which the lover hopes will flatter the girl \((\textit{blanditiae})\) and win him access to her.\(^{61}\) The powers of elegy, in a sense, are magical instead of medicinal, since they have the ability to change reality by granting access to the beloved (or so, at least, the speaker hopes). Propertius and Ovid, in fact, are explicit about characterizing their poetry in Orphic and magical terms,\(^ {62}\) despite the fact that its powers must fail in order to preserve the status quo on which the elegiac fiction relies. Because the surviving Roman elegists are both explicit and unified in presenting their poetry as \(\textit{querelae}\) with the goal of winning access to their beloved, and because the remains of Gallan poetry show important thematic parallels with surviving Roman elegy, it seems relatively safe to assume that Gallan elegy shared this conception of elegy, and was perhaps equally explicit about it.\(^ {63}\) When Vergil in the \textit{Eclogues}, therefore, alludes to these themes in close connection, I see an allusion to the generic conventions of Roman love elegy, as already present, most likely, in Gallan elegy.

One reason for Vergil’s interest in juxtaposing the pastoral and elegiac genres

\(^{61}\)On elegy as persuasive speech, see James 2003, esp. 12–21 on “hortatory elegy” \((\textit{blanditiae})\) and 108–152 on \(\textit{querelae}\); cf. also Stroh 1971. That Prop. 1.18 (in which Propertius imitates Acontius’s lament in the forest) is, in James’s words, “the only pure \(\textit{querela}\) in Roman love elegy” (111) provides further support for my claim that Vergil uses the Acontius story as a metanarrative for the genre of Roman love elegy.

\(^{62}\)See Prop. 1.9.25–34, 2.13.1–8, Ov. \textit{Am.} 2.1.19–28, 2.1.33–34, 3.1.45–46. In connection with this theme, it may be significant that the epigrammatist Damagetus seems to have attributed to Orpheus the invention of the elegiac couplet: see \textit{A.P.} 7.9.5–6 with Gow-Page ad loc. Kennedy 1987, 53–54 sees both Linus and Orpheus, along with their famous parents Apollo and Calliope, as specifically elegiac figures when they are mentioned in connection with Arcadia at \textit{Ecl.} 4.55–57.

\(^{63}\)Although there is some unavoidable circularity in my assumption that the elegists are following Gallan elegy directly instead of Vergil’s presentation of it in the \textit{Eclogues} (see my argument below), this is as sure as we can be in cases where the poet’s scanty remains are not explicit. My approach is, however, supported by the discovery of the Qaṣr Ibrîm fragment \((\textit{FRP} 145)\), which confirms that Gallan elegy did share at least some important features with surviving Roman love elegy, such as referring to his beloved as his \textit{domina} (see Anderson et al. 1979, 144), and referring to her \textit{nequitia} and the sadness it produces \((\textit{FRP} 145.1)\).
in the *Eclogues* may be that Gallus, as seems likely, programmatically opposed his own elegiac poetry to hexameter epic. Although the state of our evidence does not allow for certainty on this point, all three of the extant major Augustan elegists either engage in or respond to this sort of intergeneric polemic between elegy and hexameter epic. Vergil himself engages in anti-epic literary polemic only in the introduction to *Ecl.* 6, a poem that addresses itself to an audience that is *captus amore* (6.10), alludes heavily to Callimachus’s elegiac *Aetia*, and culminates, as I have suggested, in Gallus’s initiation into the elegiac literary tradition. Horace, moreover, seems to

---

64 Propertius and Ovid write explicitly polemical letters to friends who write epic: Prop. 1.7, 1.9, and Ov. *Am.* 2.18. O’Neil 1967 and Bright 1978, 217–219 have argued that Tib. 2.6 can be read in the same tradition; I have argued orally (Henkel 2009a) and hope to argue in print that references to feet throughout Tibullus can be understood as responding to a tradition of intergeneric polemic between elegy and hexameter epic.

65 Gallus’s initiation, I believe, can be seen to figure Gallus specifically as a Roman Callimachus, anticipating Propertius’s later claim to the same title (Prop. 4.1.64). Although Linus is mentioned as the officiant in Gallus’s initiation, and the pipes Gallus receives have Orphic powers, only Hesiod is specifically said to have owned these pipes before (*Ecl.* 6.69–70; I reject Ross’s claim [1975, 23] that Orpheus is mentioned in line 70, along with his important claim [27–28] that the poetic genealogy here explicitly includes Apollo, the Muses, Linus, Orpheus, and Hesiod, along with all the major Alexandrians by implication). By having the Muses initiate Gallus, as they did before with Hesiod, Vergil has cast Gallus into the role of Callimachus from the *Somnium*, about which we know little for certain except that Callimachus compared his own encounter with the Muses to that of Hesiod in the beginning of the *Theogony* (fr. 2 Pf., alluding to *Hes. Th.* 22–34; it might even be possible to read the line immediately following Hesiod’s account of his initiation, ἀλλὰ τί ἐμοι ταύτα περὶ δυνάμεως ἦ περὶ πέτρην, 35, as textual precedent for attributing to Hesiod the Orphic power to move trees and stones). Vergil says of Gallus that he was wandering by the Permessus, when one of the Muses led him into the mountains, and he found himself—like Callimachus—confronted by all the Muses, presumably at one or another spring, although Vergil is not specific on this count (64–66); Clausen notes, moreover, that *Aonus* in line 65 is first attested in Callimachus. The involvement of Linus might be seen as a further reference to Callim. *Aet.* 1, in which the story of the shepherd Linus seems to have had programmatic significance (see Hunter 2006a, 22–27); Vergil’s emphasis on the fact that Linus, like Hesiod, is a shepherd (*Linus... pastor, Ecl.* 6.67) contributes to the vindication of this scene of Callimachean programmatic change from the elegiac tradition into the pastoral tradition.

Just as I argue that Vergil uses the Callimachean narrative of Acontius and Cydippe as a meta-narrative to represent a character’s participation in the elegiac tradition, so it seems that he has used scenes of programmatic importance from *Aetia* 1 (Apollo’s address to the poet, the poet’s encounter with the Muses, Linus) as elegiac metanarratives in *Ecl.* 6. When Vergil casts his character / persona Tityrus into the role of Callimachus at *Ecl.* 6.2–8 (≈ *Aet.* fr. 1.21–24 Pf.), he figures his own participation (in *Ecl.* 6 and throughout the *Eclogues*) in the same elegiac tradition into which he figures Gallus as an initiate below: both act the part of Callimachus from different scenes in the *Aetia*, though both scenes have been altered for inclusion in the pastoral *Eclogues* (on the pastoralization, so to speak, of the first scene cf. Clausen 1994, 174). As Zetzel suspected in his review of
associate the *recusatio* form specifically with the opposition of epic and erotic poetry, and Lyne has argued from Horace’s parodic use of the motif as early as *Sat.* 1.10 that it was current earlier than *Ecl.* 6, probably in the elegies of Gallus.66 Two scholars have argued specifically that lines 2–7 of the New Gallus can be read as just such a *recusatio*, in which Gallus explains why he has written elegies about the *nequitia* (*FRP* 145.2) of Lycoris instead of a panegyrical epic about the accomplishments of Caesar.67

If Gallus did engage in literary polemic (either in the extant fragment or elsewhere), and it is a Gallan literary program that the later elegists reflect in their polemical opposition of elegy to hexameter epic, then it is very likely that Gallus named his love for Lycoris as one criterion in his generic preference for elegiac love poetry. Propertius and Ovid both programmatically cite Love / love (personified and not) as a reason for writing elegy instead of hexameter epic,68 and the New Gallus may include the same motif when Gallus expresses his relief finally to have written something “worthy of his mistress” (*...tandem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae | quae possem domina deicere digna mea, FRP* 145.6–7). Gallus’s choice may also have been influenced by his regard for Callimachus, with whom he is associated in *Ecl.* 6: by working in a tradition that included Callimachus among its generic forefathers, Gallus could claim modernist poetics as his particular generic inheritance, anticipating the

---


68Prop. 1.7, 1.9; Ov. *Am.* 1.1, 2.18; and cf. Prop. 1.1 (although there is no mention of hexameter epic here). On the play between personified, non-personified, and metapoetic versions of *amor* see below, p. 64.
similar claims of Propertius and Ovid later.69

Love and Callimachean modernism are themes that are important both generally to the *Eclogues*, and specifically to *Ecl. 6* and 10, in which Gallus features as a character and scholars have seen Vergil as responding in one way or another to Gallus’s poetry. One approach to Vergil’s pastoral collection is to see it in part as a response to a Gallan / elegiac claim on these themes. Whatever Gallus himself said in his poetry about his relationship to Callimachus, Vergil casts both Tityrus and Gallus as Callimachus figures in *Ecl. 6* (3–5, 64–73),70 and by developing pastoral aspects in programmatic scenes from Callimachus, he seems to argue that elegy and pastoral, at least, overlap on some of the same grounds that the elegists use to oppose their genre to hexameter *epos*.71 I will specifically argue, moreover, that *Ecl. 2, 8, and 10* can be read as an argument that the theme of love belongs just as much to the hexameter as to the elegiac tradition, and that the essentializing opposition between love poetry and hexameter *epos* is an illusion, since bucolic too is a species of *epos* (not to mention epyllia like Catullus 64 and Calvus’s *Io*, to which Vergil alludes heavily in *Ecl. 4 and 6*). By thus changing the terms of the generic debate and substituting bucolic *epos* for heroic *epos*, Vergil vindicates for hexameter poetry several major criteria that elegy would use—and perhaps already had used—to counterdistinguish itself from “epic.”

Vergil’s attention to love as a criterion of generic definition can be seen especially

---

69 For Callimachus as a forebear of Roman elegy (frequently paired with Philetas) cf. Prop. 2.1.39–40, 2.34.31–32, 3.1.1, 3.9.43–44, Ov. *Am.* 2.4.19, *Ars* 3.329, *Rem.* 381, 759–760. Of these citations, Ov. *Rem.* 381 is most explicit in claiming Callimachean descent on the grounds of meter (*Callimachi numeris non est descensus Achilles*), while Prop. 2.1.39–40 does the best job emphasizing Callimachean style as an element of elegy’s literary inheritance (*sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus intonet angusto pectore Callimachus*).

70 Cf. Berg 1974, 181–182. It is perhaps significant that the scene with Gallus stresses the continuity of a (Callimachean) tradition, while that with Tityrus/Vergil stresses (Callimachean) style (particularly if Gallus drew a link between the elegiac meter of the *Aetia* and the stylistic refinement the collection advocated, such as the later elegists did: see n. 69 above).

71 Callimachean humility and refinement, e.g., are properties of Theocritean pastoral from its very inception, and are bluntly programmatized at *Id.* 7.45–49.
in his use of the word *amor*, which is suggestively ambiguous in both the singular and the plural. Because the ancients wrote in all capitals and had no editorial conventions to distinguish “love” from “Love,” the singular *amor* can refer simultaneously to both love as an emotion (*amor*) and Love personified as a god (*Amor*). In the elegists, moreover, personified Love sometimes functions as a symbol for love poetry. Both Propertius and Ovid refer thus to Love in their programmatic first elegies, where the generic significance of “Love” is highlighted by metapoetic wordplay between the metrical and anatomical meanings of *pes* “foot” (*tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus | et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*, Prop. 1.1.3–4; *Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam | edere... par erat inferior versus; risisse Cupido | dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem*, Ov. Am. 1.1.1–4). Harrison, moreover, has recently argued that this ambiguity is at work in *Ecl.* 10 as well, e.g. when Vergil’s Gallus claims that “Love conquers all” (*omnia vincit Amor; et nos cedamus Amori*, 10.69).

In the plural, *amores* can refer either to love affairs (*OLD* 2) or a love object (*OLD* 1c), but it can also refer to “love songs” or “love poetry,” as it does at Prop. 2.1.1 (*Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores, | unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber*) and at *Ecl.* 8.22 (*semper pastorum ille audit amores; cf. DServ. ad loc.: “amores” vero cantica de amoribus*). It is fairly certain that *Amores* was the title of Ovid’s collection of love elegies; although it was long thought that this was the

72 For one approach to the ambiguity *amor/eros*, see Park 2009.

73 On the metapoetic symbolism of Amor see Harrison 2007a, 30–32 on “symbolic metonyms,” and 65 on Prop., Ov., and Verg.; cf. also Wyke 1989b, 124 on *amor* in Ov. Am. 3.1.

74 On metapoetic Amor here cf. Harrison 2007a, 65. On the metrical wordplay with reference to “feet” see McKeown 1987–<1998> ad Am. 1.3–4 and Keith 1999, 56; I have discussed such wordplay orally (Henkel 2009a, cited at n. 64 above), and hope to do so soon in print.

75 Harrison 2007a, 65, which also discusses *Ecl.* 10.28–30 (“Ecquis erit modus” inquit “Amor non talia curat, | nec lacrimis crudelis Amor nec gramina rivis | nec cytiso saturantur apes nec fronde capellae.”).
title of Gallus’s as well, one scholar has now shown that there is no evidence for this.\textsuperscript{76} Nevertheless, Vergil uses the plural *amores* in its generic sense (“love songs”) to allude metapoetically to both Gallan love elegy (e.g. *sollicitos Galli dicamus amores*, 10.6) and to love poetry generally (as at 8.22). Both the singular and plural forms of the word occur in metapoetically suggestive contexts throughout the collection, and they annotate Vergil’s project of hybridizing pastoral and love elegy in the *Eclogues*.

### 2.4 *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10

*Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10 are frequently grouped together because of the thematic importance of erotic love and their consequent affinity with love elegy.\textsuperscript{77} A number of scholars have noted similarities among these poems that point to affinities with Roman love elegy. Breed, for example, notes that these poems are traditionally grouped together because they seem to share a narrator, who is sometimes identified with the historical author; although Breed does not himself suggest a connection with elegy here, one can compare the conceit that represents the narrator of elegy as the historical author.\textsuperscript{78} Each of these *Eclogues* also involves its speaking characters in the quintessentially elegiac relationship of a love triangle: these are apparent in Ecl. 2 (Corydon, Alexis, and Iollas), Ecl. 8A (the speaker, Nysa, and Mopsus) and Ecl. 10 (Gallus, Lycoris, and the soldier); one scholar has observed that the speaker of 8B

\textsuperscript{76}On Ovid’s title see McKeown 1987–<1998>, 1.103–107; the relevant text is Ov. *Am.* 3.343–344 *deve tener libris titulus quos signat Amorum | elige, quod docili molliter ore legas* (Kenney’s 1961 text). On Gallus’s title see Gauly 1990, 33–40 (favorably noted by Fantham 2001, 191 n. 19), who cites Prop. 2.1.1–2 (see above) as a certain case in which *amores* is a generic appellation for “love poetry”; Cairns 2006, 230–232 argues stridently that *Amores* is in fact Gallus’s title, but his argument is vitiated by his reliance on Ovid’s later title as evidence for Gallus’s.

\textsuperscript{77}Cf., e.g., Papanghelis 1999; Leach 1974, 146–170; and Fantazzi 1966 (who adds Ecl. 6).

\textsuperscript{78}Breed 2006, 354–357, esp. 355–356, with remarks on 356 about the problems presented by the framing voices of the other *Eclogues* for assuming the identity of this narrating voice with the authorial voice.
seems also to be in such a predicament, since she calls her beloved Daphnis *perfidus* in line 91, and I will argue in the next chapter (see p. 123) that there is a second love triangle in *Ecl.* 10 as well.\(^{79}\) Kenney, finally, in discussing the “elegiac sensibility” of these poems, observed that all three admit the important influence of the Callimachean story of Acontius, which Vergil associates clearly with Gallus in *Ecl.* 10, and which Ross argued was already important to Gallus’s own love elegy.\(^{80}\) Many of the elegiac motifs that appear in *Ecl.* 2, 8, and 10 also appear in the Callimachean narrative of Acontius, and I believe that their appearance can be better understood in connection with Vergil’s development of the Acontius story as an elegiac metanarrative for the *Eclogues*.

2.4.1 *Eclogue 2*

In *Eclogue* 2, Vergil does not use Acontius as a model solely for either Corydon or Alexis, but rather develops different aspects of both characters by alluding to different aspects of the Callimachean narrative. As Kenney puts it, Vergil seems to have “dichotomized” his model and assigned some aspects of Acontius to Corydon, while largely creating an alignment between Acontius and Alexis.\(^{81}\) Corydon in this poem plays Acontius the frustrated lover, who withdraws to lament his trouble in the woods,

---

\(^{79}\)See Papanghelis 1999, 54, who also notes a further similarity between 8A and 10 in that both Damon and Gallus are said to suffer from love that is *indignus* (8.18, 10.10), which commentators translate as “unworthy” or “unrequited” (page 50 with n. 27). It may be significant that Propertius calls his character Gallus *perfide* at Prop. 1.13.3.

\(^{80}\)Kenney 1983; on the influence of Acontius on *Eclogues* 2 see also La Penna 1963, 488 and Du Quesnay 1979, 48 and n. 127, 131; on an interesting argument for Acontian influence in the reclining posture of Tityrus in *Ecl.* 1 (*recubans sub tegmine fagi*, 1) see Wright 1983, 129–130; cf. also p. 141 below, where I discuss further link with Callimachus’s Acontius. Hardie 2002, 121–128 discusses the role of Acontius in all these *Eclogues* in light of *Heroides* 20–21 and Barchiesi 1993 (see above n. 34). On the arguments of Ross and others that Acontius figured in the poetry of Gallus see nn. 31, 32 above.

\(^{81}\)Kenney 1983, 50.
where Vergil’s beeches, *fagi*, seem to reproduce the oaks, *φηγοί*, of Callimachus’s narrative (Kenney calls this a "learned catachresis").

Alexis, meanwhile, is cast as Acontius the unattainable lover, from the early part of the story on Ceos, while Corydon is correspondingly figured as one of Acontius’s male pursuers. Like Acontius, Alexis is young, beautiful, and contemptuous of his pursuers, and like Acontius’s admirers, Corydon is driven even to fixate on the footprints of his beloved.

This apparent inconsistency in Vergil’s use of metanarrative characterization can be understood both in terms of a distinction between the characterization by the narrative voice in the frame and Corydon’s self-characterization within the song, and also in terms of metanarrative development over the course of the poem. In the opening frame, it is the narrator who represents Corydon as the disconsolate lover Acontius, lamenting his hopeless love in the woods while his beloved appears to forswear herself by returning to Naxos to marry another man. Within his song, however, Corydon represents himself as a Polyphemus figure from Theocritus (especially *Idyll 11*)—a pastoral singer like himself whose rusticity keeps his beloved away from him.

It is also Corydon, meanwhile, who figures Alexis as Acontius and himself as one of Acontius’s Cean admirers (while he continues also to play the role of Polyphemus).

This shift in characterization is significant for what it says about the power of song to assuage the suffering of love. While initially Corydon is characterized as a hopeless elegiac figure, not only by the narrative voice but by his own song (*mori me denique*).

---

82 *Ecl.* 2.3–5; cf. Callim. fr. 72, Aristaen. 1.10.51–81. On “learned catachresis” see Kenney 1983, 50 and compare *Ecl.* 2.3 (*inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos*) to Aristaen. 1.10.57–58 (*φηγοῖ τὸκαθήμενος ἢ πτελέαις*). Since I will later draw a connection between Acontius and Gallus, it bears mentioning that the phrase *densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos* is an example of the figure that O. Skutsch connected with Gallus and dubbed the *schema Cornelianum* (cf. Ch. 3 n. 133 below).

83 *Ecl.* 2.1–2, 17, 73; cf. Callim. fr. 67.8, 68, Aristaen. 1.10.14–17.

84 *Ecl.* 2.12; cf. Aristaen. 1.10.12–14.

85 Both of these distinctions will find parallel in Vergil’s metanarrative characterization in *Ecl.* 10: see Ch. 3 below.
in the end his song consoles him, turning him into the cured pastoral
Polyphemus of the end of *Idyll* 11. By the end of the poem Corydon, like Theocritus’s Cyclops, recognizes his love as madness and sets off to make himself useful by weaving baskets, assured that he will find some other Alexis if this one scorns him (*invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexîn, Ecl. 2.73; Ecl. 2.68–73 ≈ Theoc. Id. 11.72–76*). By casting himself in the role of Polyphemus, Corydon associates himself with a paradigmatic pastoral character, whom the Hellenistic poets acknowledged as an example of the consoling power of pastoral song. As a Polyphemus figure, and as a pastoral singer himself, Corydon is a natural representative of the pastoral literary tradition. By addressing Alexis as an Acontius figure, moreover, Corydon characterizes his beloved as a representative of the elegiac tradition, although, as we will see, he invites him to participate in the pastoral tradition by playing the role of another paradigmatic pastoral character, namely Daphnis.

The poem does not present a simple schema in which Vergil uses generically representative metanarratives to represent Corydon and Alexis as pastoral and elegiac characters, respectively. Instead, Vergil aligns both characters, to differing degrees, with the elegiac metanarrative of Acontius, because, as I will argue, he uses metanarrative characterization to problematize such straightforward alignments. Several factors do, however, contribute to the initial alignment of Corydon with pastoral and Alexis with elegiac. The strongest of these factors is Vergil’s use of pastoral and elegiac names for his characters. First, Corydon’s name is familiar from Theocritean pastoral as one of the shepherds of *Idyll* 4, where he appears in an antagonistic conversation with a shepherd named Battus. The choice of this pastoral name in *Eclogue* 86

---

86 This line alludes not to either Theocritean poem on Polyphemus (*Id.* 6 and 11), but to the pastoral paraclausithyron of *Idyll* 3 (*ἀπάγξασθαι με ποιητικός*, 3.9).

2 not only aligns Corydon with the pastoral tradition, which is natural enough for a pastoral singer in a pastoral collection, but it may hint that his addressee Alexis is a representative of the elegiac tradition, since Corydon’s interlocutor in Id. 4, Battus, seems to stand as an allegorical representation of the elegiac poet Callimachus (Battides), who calls attention in his epigrams to his own descent from Battus (Βαττίαδεω παρά σήμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν ἄοιδήν | εἰδότος, Epig. 35.1–2). The name Alexis, furthermore, is not drawn from pastoral poetry at all, but rather from another important antecedent of Roman love elegy, Greek erotic epigram: Meleager’s well-known Alexis epigram (AP 12.127) is the source of both the name Alexis and the motif of the twin fires (love and the sun) that burn the lover. Finally, the etymology of Alexis’s name evokes the typically elegiac motif of unrequited love. In lines 6 and 56, when he refers to Alexis’s unresponsiveness to poetry and gifts (nihil mea carmina curas, 6; nec munera curat Alexis, 56), Vergil seems to associate the name Alexis with Greek ἀλέγειν “to care,” using the lucus a non lucendo etymological principle to derive the meaning “he doesn’t care.” Both Corydon and Alexis are names that can be read as aligning their bearers with a specific literary tradition, and both names seem to conspire to associate Alexis not with the pastoral tradition of the Idylls and the Eclogues, but with the elegiac tradition that includes Callimachus, erotic epigram, and most recently Gallus.

88 This allegorical reading of Theoc. 4 was first suggested by Reitzenstein 1893, 229–234, who associated Battus with Callimachus and Corydon with Alexander of Aetolia; Hubbard 1998, 30–32 defends the principle of allegorical reading here, along with the association of Battus with Callimachus, but rejects Reitzenstein’s claim that Corydon represents Alexander. On the identification of Callimachus as Battides cf. Cat. 65.16, 116.2, Ov. Am. 1.15.13, Tr. 2.367, etc.

89 See Du Quesnay 1979, 59; Coleman 1977 ad Ecl. 2.1; and Hubbard 1998, 55 n. 18.

90 Du Quesnay 1979, 44 suggests derivation from either ἀλέξειν “to protect” or ἀλέγειν “to care”; Hardie 2002, 124 points out that lines 6 (nihil mea carmina curas) and 56 (nec munera curat Alexis) use the verb curo “to care” to activate an etymology of Alexis’s name from οὐκ ἀλέγειν “he doesn’t care.” Cf. O’Hara 1996 ad Ecl. 2.6 with further citations; on etymological derivation from opposites (the lucus a non lucendo, or κατ’ ἀντίφασιν, type), see O’Hara 1996, 66.
Vergil also uses the opposition of country and city to align Corydon with pastoral, a genre consistently associated with the countryside, and Alexis with elegy, a genre most frequently associated with the city.\textsuperscript{91} Corydon, however, through his defense of his pastoral circumstances, begins to make an argument that these two locales have more in common than the initial dichotomy suggests. Throughout the \textit{Eclogues} characters try to bridge the gap between city and country,\textsuperscript{92} and the relationship between these two locales can be seen also as a metapoetic reflection of the relationship between pastoral and elegy. The same argument that Corydon makes in \textit{Eclogue 2} will appear again in \textit{Eclogue 10}, where it becomes clear that country and city are coterminous with pastoral and elegy, respectively, because it is the elegist Gallus who is exhorted to join the pastoral world and take part in pastoral poetry.

The tensions between country and city manifest themselves in \textit{Eclogue 2} in the hopeless love of the rustic shepherd Corydon for the beautiful city-dwelling youth Alexis, whose affections are currently held by a certain rich Iollas. The explicit presence of a rival is an important difference between the song of Corydon in \textit{Ecl. 2} and that of Polyphemus in \textit{Id. 11}, and it provides an important link between \textit{Ecl. 2} and Roman love elegy.\textsuperscript{93} Like the poet-lover in elegy, Corydon is unable to compete with his rich rival in gift-giving: \textit{rusticus es, Corydon; nec munera curat Alexis, | nec ...}

\textsuperscript{91}Cf. Conte 1986, 100–129 (esp. 126–127) on the opposition of city to country and pastoral to elegy vis-à-vis Gallus in \textit{Ecl. 10}.

\textsuperscript{92}The remarks of Tityrus in \textit{Ecl. 1} are programmatic for the relationship between country and city (and so pastoral and elegy) throughout the collection: \textit{urbem quam dicunt Romam, Meliboea, putavi | stultus ego huic nostrae similem... sic canibus catulos similis, sic matribus haedos | sic canibus catulos similis, sic matribus haedos | noram, sic parvis componere magna solebam. | verum haec tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes | quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi (19–25). Thus in \textit{Ecl. 2} and 10 characters try to overcome the separation between country and city, and between pastoral and elegy, but both of these attempts are based on the characters’ naïve understanding of generic and literary conventions (compare similar generic naïveté in \textit{Ecl. 8}), and both attempts end in failure.

\textsuperscript{93}Cf. Papanghelis 1999, 46–47, who however sees more important similarities with Callimachus than with surviving Roman elegy.
si muneribus certes, concedat Iollas (56–57). The reason for this inability is neither the poverty claimed by the lover in later elegy nor the rustic ugliness that keeps Galatea away from Polyphemus. In his own opinion, at least, Corydon is neither ugly nor without means—in fact, much of his song consists of a defense of his wealth and beauty (20–22, 25–27) and a demonstration that he too can be lavish in gift-giving (40–55). In the end, however, Corydon’s disadvantage is owed precisely to the fact that he and his gifts are rustic (rusticus es, Corydon, 56), a term used explicitly of pastoral poetry in the next Eclogue (Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam, 3.84).

The respect in which Corydon’s song departs most from its Theocritean models is also the respect in which the opposition between city and country most suggests an analogy to poetry, namely in Corydon’s increased emphasis on pastoral song and his skill as a pastoral singer.94 Here again the country and city stand for pastoral and elegy, respectively, and here again we find important parallels with Roman love elegy. In his first mention of song, Corydon attempts to bridge the gap between country and city by comparing his own pastoral songs to those of the famous singer Amphion: canto quae solitus, si quando armenta vocabat | Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho (23–24).95 Unlike the surrounding lines on wealth96 and beauty,97 these lines are wholly unlike the comparable lines in Theocritus. Moreover, Amphion

---

94 In Theoc. 11, Polyphemus devotes only two and a half lines to his skill as a singer, and in these he only compares himself to the other Cyclopes: συμφίλους δ’ ὡς οὕτις ἐπίσταµαι ὅθεν Κυκλώπων, | τίν, τὸ φίλον γλυκύλοι, ἁμισύλοις ἀείδων | πολλάκι νυκτὸς ἀωρί (11.38–40).

95 Line 24 is elegantly elaborate and, as Heyne pointed out, appears to be wholly Greek (᾿Αµφιών Διρκα’ιος ἐν ᾿Ακταῖο ᾿Αρακ’ιθη), but it is not Theocritean. Cf. Clausen ad loc. further on its possible origin (Parthenius’?), but see Thomas ad Geo. 1.138 on Vergilian lines that look like wholesale transliterations from Greek, which are often either conflations (as Geo. 1.138) or wholly Vergilian constructions (as Geo. 1.279).

96 Ecl. 2.19–22; cf. Theoc. 11.34–37.

is in no other extant sources associated with the country or with pastoral singing; he is known instead for the role that he played in the second foundation of Thebes, where his magical songs charmed rocks through the air and into the new city wall. By claiming that Amphion sang pastoral songs as a shepherd on Mt. Aracynthus, Corydon is pastoralizing a well-known magical, and specifically urban, singer as part of his attempt to appeal to the urbane Alexis.

Corydon further elaborates on pastoral song in lines 31–39, another passage with little direct precedent anywhere in Theocritus. In these lines Corydon represents pastoral singing as a poetic tradition, by citing Pan as its inventor (2.31–33) and by depicting his own initiation (as noted above) into the tradition by the dying Damoetas (2.36–39). By emphasizing that Corydon is not just a shepherd, but a pastoral singer in a tradition of pastoral singers, Vergil here creates an analogy between the tradition of pastoral singing into which Damoetas initiated Corydon and the literary tradition of pastoral poetry in which Vergil follows Theocritus. Corydon’s description of his initiation (36–38) falls at the mathematical center of *Eclogue* 2, and the poetological allegory that these lines suggest was seen by at least one commentator as early as late antiquity. Within their context, these lines function as an invitation from Corydon for Alexis to join him in pastoral singing, which Corydon seems to consider

---

98 See *OCD* s.v. Amphion.

99 Compare the pastoralization of “Dardan Paris” at 2.60–61 (although the foundling Paris was already a shepherd in the tradition, unlike Amphion). On the association of elegy and magical singing, cf. p. 61 and n. 62 above.

100 See Hubbard 1998, 62 n. 33 on the question of Theocritean precedent in these lines.

101 On the importance of analogy as a pastoral technique both for creating meaning within the text and for suggesting circumstances external to the text, see Gutzwiller 1991, who discusses this technique in Theocritus. Vergil also uses analogy as the structuring principle for his metapoetic reflections in the *Eclogues*, and I will discuss his use of analogy in connection with metapoetic symbolism in the next chapter.

102 See n. 49 for the remarks of Junius Philargyrius and, more recently, Hubbard.
his strongest gambit in his competition with Iollas, since Iollas can outmatch him in giving expensive gifts (57). This situation is a pastoral reproduction of the central conceit of Roman elegy, in which the poet-lover offers poetry because, as he claims, he cannot compete in munificence. But while the elegiac poet-lover offers his mistress elegiac poetry, the pastoral shepherd/lover Corydon invites Alexis to engage in a pastoral singing contest—the central conceit of his own genre. In fact, Corydon’s entire song, up to this point, can be considered a pastoralization of the same elegiac conceit, since it consists of a complaint (querela) that he hopes will gain him access to his beloved.

As well as inviting Alexis to join in the pastoral tradition, these central lines of Eclogue 2 also annotate Vergil’s program of metanarrative characterization in this poem and invoke a Theocritean model that will operate across Ecl. 2, 8, and 10 to figure the interaction and mutual influence of the elegiac and pastoral literary traditions. I now quote in full the lines in which Corydon invites Alexis to join him in pastoral singing, and in which he describes the pipes he received from the dying Damoetas.

mecum una in silvis imitabere Pana canendo
(Pan primum calamos cera coniungere pluris
instituit, Pan curat ovis oviumque magistros),
nec te paeniteat calamo trivisse labellum:
haec eadem ut sciret, quid non faciebat Amyntas?
est mihi disparibus septem compacta cicutis
fistula, Damoetas dono mihi quam dedit olim,
et dixit moriens: “te nunc habet ista secundum”;
dixit Damoetas, invidit stultus Amyntas.

(Ecl. 2.31–39)

The reference in these lines to Damoetas is a reference not merely to Theocritus but specifically to the Theocritean character of that name, and, like the reference to Corydon in Idyll 4 (see above), its specific context is highly significant. Damoetas
appears in Theocritus only in the non-eristic singing contest of *Idyll 6*, in which Daphnis sings of Galatea’s affection for Polyphemus, and Damoetas adopts the persona of Polyphemus to sing the Cyclops’s reply to her attentions. Corydon in *Eclogue 2*, by claiming to be the next in line from Damoetas, alludes specifically to the Theocritean provenance of his own song: just as Damoetas impersonated Polyphemus in *Id. 6*, so too Corydon is impersonating Polyphemus through the Theocritean intertextuality of his song. This song owes its greatest intertextual debt to Polyphemus’s song in *Idyll 11*, but, in defending his beauty in lines 25–27, Corydon borrows lines also from *Idyll 6*, in Damoetas’s song itself.\(^{103}\)

As elsewhere in the *Eclogues* (as well as in the *Aeneid*), allusions to a specific character also evoke the specific narrative in which that character appears.\(^{104}\) This is all the more true when, as here, the character in question appears only once in the text that is alluded to. When Corydon cites Damoetas as his Theocritean predecessor (36–38), we must understand this allusion—if it is to be meaningful—as a reference to the singing contest of Daphnis and Damoetas in *Idyll 6*. If we further understand Corydon’s allusion to Theocritean Damoetas as part of his invitation for Alexis to join him in pastoral singing (31–39), then it appears that Corydon is proposing the contest in *Idyll 6* as a metanarrative model for the pastoral singing that he proposes to do with Alexis. Not only is *Idyll 6* a perfectly idyllic singing contest with no winner and no loser, but it seems also to depict a sexual relationship between the two participants, both of whom are young men in the bloom of their youth (although

---

\(^{103}\) *Ecl. 2.25–28*, nec sum adeo informis: nuper me in litore vidi, | cum placidum ventis staret mare. non ego Daphnin | iudice te metuam, si nunquam fallit imago; cf. Theoc. *Id. 6.34–37*, καὶ γάρ θην οὐδ’ εἶδος ἔχω κακῶν ὡς με λέγοντι. | ἦ γάρ πράν ἐς πόντον ἐσέβλεπον, ἦς δὲ γαλάνα, | καὶ καλὰ μὲν τὰ γένεια, καλὰ δὲ μεν ἀ μιὰ κόρα, | ὅσ παρ’ ἐμίν κέκριται.

\(^{104}\) See section 2.1 above on metanarratives, and compare the remarks of Fowler 2000, 119–121 and esp. Lyne 1987, 100–104.
Damoetas is somewhat older than Daphnis). As such, *Idyll 6* presents an apt model for the relationship that Corydon, apparently the older man, proposes between himself and Alexis. *Idyll 6* is furthermore a fitting model for the interaction and mutual influence between elegy and pastoral in the *Eclogues,* because the poem ends with Damoetas and Daphnis kissing and exchanging instruments—a scene that is Vergil’s model also for the end of *Ecl. 5,* where Hubbard has seen the exchange of gifts by Menalcas and Mopsus as representing their mutual poetic initiation.

After Corydon alludes to the pastoral contest of *Idyll 6* by claiming to have received pipes from the dying Damoetas, his invitation for Alexis to “imitate Pan by singing” can be seen retrospectively as a specific invitation for Alexis to play the role of Daphnis. The detail of the dying Damoetas has no precedent either in *Idyll 6* or elsewhere in Theocritus, but it points us to the dying Daphnis of *Idyll 1,* whose sufferings are the theme of the goatherd’s song, “The Woes of Daphnis.” These two contexts are further linked by the invitation to imitate Pan, since Daphnis, as he lies dying in *Id. 1,* calls on Pan to receive his pipes.

---

105 ἕταλενισχιρχυµς δ᾿ ὃ µὲν αὐτ´οµεγαχιρχυµν | πυρρός, ὃ δ᾿ ἡµιγένειος, *Id.* 6.2–3; cf. Hunter 1999 ad loc.

106 Although we are not told Corydon’s age in *Ecl. 2,* the allusions to Callimachus’s Acontius and to Theocritus’s Polyphemus both suggest that he is still a young man. We may further assume that Corydon is older than Alexis because he plays the *erastes* (cf. again Hunter 1999 ad Theoc. 6.2–3).

107 Hubbard 1998, 86–99 argues that Mopsus and Menalcas in *Ecl. 5* represent “epic/elegiac” and pastoral poetry respectively, since Mopsus is a character from Euphorion’s poem on the Grynaean grove (and Gallus’s translation thereof; cf. Serv. ad *Ecl.* 6.72) and Menalcas represents himself as the composer of *Ecl.* 2 and 3 (*Ecl.* 5.86–87). I believe that Hubbard is substantially correct (if we substitute “elegy” for “epic/elegiac”), and that the reciprocal initiation scene at the end of this poem should be understood as part of the symbolic plot of the *Eclogues* that knits together the pastoral and elegiac genres.

108 Van Sickle 2000, 40 argues that this scene has foundational significance for the tradition of pastoral singing, pointing out that his pipe is the only possession that Daphnis destines for an heir; Hunter 2006a, 139 remarks on the importance of this scene to *Ecl. 2* as an intertext for Corydon’s claim to have received his pipes from the dying Damoetas: “Here the closural gesture of the Theocritean Daphnis in returning his pipe to Pan is transformed into a guarantee of the future of song.” It further appears from the proem to *Geo. 1* that Vergil considered this scene important, since Theocritus’s double reference to Lycaeus and Maenalus provide the basis for his own invocation of Pan at *Geo.* 1.16–18: *ipse nemus linguens patrium saltusque Lycaei | Pan, ovium custos, tua si*
As the inventor and patron of pastoral song, Pan is an important figure in both Theocritus and Vergil, and his symbolism, like that of Daphnis, is differently construed by different characters in the *Eclogues*. When Corydon in *Ecl.* 2 invites Alexis to imitate Pan, he means not only that Alexis should join him in pastoral song, but also that Alexis, like Pan, should take the pipes from the dying Daphnis, just as Corydon himself received the pipes of the dying Damoetas, and that together the two of them should play Daphnis and Damoetas in a metanarrative restaging of the idyllic scene of friendly pastoral in *Idyll* 6. Elsewhere in the collection, however, Pan is specifically linked not only with pastoral song but also with love songs (8.22–24; cf. Serv. ad 10.28), and Gallus in *Ecl.* 10 will use this connection to reinterpret Corydon’s invitation to “imitate Pan” as a reference to elegiac poetry rather than pastoral.\textsuperscript{109}

It is highly significant that Corydon here alludes side-by-side to two different versions of the Daphnis story—one in which he is a youth happily engaged in a homosexual relationship, the other in which he seems older and is dying of heterosexual

---

\textsuperscript{109}We will see in the discussion of *Ecl.* 8 that mentioning Pan as the inventor of pastoral has metapoetic implications for the interaction of pastoral and elegy, since, by that aetiology of the genre, the first pastoral song was Pan’s lament (*querela*) about his unhappy love for the nymph Syrinx.
love. In the metanarrative fiction of the *Eclogues*, the Daphnis of *Idyll 6* represents pastoral, while the Daphnis of *Idyll 1* represents elegy, and the symbolic ambiguity of Daphnis as a metanarrative is a central factor in the failure of the two genres to reconcile in *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10. Because Corydon in *Ecl. 2* is not fully in control of the implications of his metanarrative allusions, he invites Alexis to play the elegiac Daphnis, dying of heterosexual love, instead of the more pastoral Daphnis (as he intends), who is a beautiful young singing shepherd, engaged in a homosexual love affair with an older shepherd like Corydon. This invitation, moreover, looks forward to *Eclogue 10*, which stages its fulfillment: in that poem Vergil and Gallus are the representatives of pastoral and elegy, respectively, and Gallus, by playing the role of Daphnis—although from *Idyll 1* instead of *Idyll 6*—seems to accept the invitation issued by Corydon to Alexis in *Eclogue 2*.

Corydon’s claim that he is the successor to Damoetas and, as I have argued, that Alexis will be the successor to Daphnis has special significance since these two characters represent pastoral and elegy, respectively. In *Ecl. 2*, the participation of each character in a narrative proper to the other’s literary tradition can be seen to figure metapoetically the literary influence that the elegiac tradition has had on Vergil in the pastoral *Eclogues*, and that, according to this fiction, Vergil hopes that the pastoral tradition will have on the future compositions of the elegist Gallus. In this way, *Eclogue 2* can be seen to prefigure the interaction of pastoral and elegy seen in *Eclogue 10*, where Gallus does, in fact, appear in the role of Daphnis—a genre-crossing moment that critics have understood to represent the pastoral influences that Gallus either had imported into his elegies or at least contemplated importing over

---

110 Fantuzzi 1998, 65–66 sees these two idylls as representing two incompatible aetiologies of pastoral: see n. 13 above.

111 On *Id. 1* and elegy cf. Alpers 1996, 91–92, who considers Theoc. 1 to be a “pastoral elegy,” based largely on Vergil’s imitation of it in *Ecl. 10*. 
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the course of Ecl. 10. Through the manipulation of genre-specific characters and metanarratives, these two poems each stage metanarrative dramas of cross-generic influence by involving characters in narratives that are foreign to their genre and its meter. In Eclogue 2, Vergil shows that an elegiac metanarrative (Acontius and Cydippe) has room in it for a pastoral character (Corydon / Polyphemus), and even that he could write it in pastoral hexameters instead of elegiac couplets. In Eclogue 10, he shows that a pastoral narrative (the Woes of Daphnis) has room in it for the elegiac character Gallus, and that, as seems likely, he could write Gallan elegiac couplets into his own dactylic hexameters.

In these two Eclogues, and in Eclogue 8 as well, Vergil uses erotic metanarratives from pastoral and elegy to figure literary influence through the metaphor of erotic love. Catullus, in poem 50, uses erotic sleeplessness (ἀγρυπνία) as a metaphor for the experience of reading and writing poetry with his friend Calvus, and one scholar has argued that Propertius develops an “erotics of influence” through the relationship of his character to the character(s) named Gallus in the Monobiblos. Over the years Corydon’s love for Alexis in Eclogue 2 has been interpreted variously as a biographical

---

112 On Ecl. 10 see Ch. 3 below.

113 This, perhaps, is the incongruity that lies behind the narrator’s ironic characterization of Corydon’s song as incondita, “ill-composed, inelegant;” cf. the remarks of Breed 2007, 31 with further references at n. 13 on the meaning of incondita. As elegiac love poetry, Corydon’s pastoral song is “ill-composed” or “inelegant” for a number of reasons: (a) because it is rustic instead of urbane, (b) because it draws on the pastoral instead of the elegiac literary tradition, and (c) because it is written in hexameter instead of elegiac verse. There is special irony in this last reason, because elegiac writers at time pillory the rhythm of their own meter because of its metrical irregularities: cf. e.g. Lyne 1998, 176–177 and Keith 1999, 48–49; I hope to discuss this topic at greater length in a future written version of Henkel 2009a.

114 On the extent of Vergilian allusion to Gallus in Ecl. 10 see n. 28 above.

115 On Catullus’s use of ἀγρυπνία as a literary-critical metaphor in poem 50 see Thomas 1979a, 195–206; on Vergil’s adaptation of this metaphor, as applied by Callimachus to Aratus, see above Ch. 1. Pincus 2004 develops Thomas’s suggestion that Prop. 1.10 develops the metaphorical ἀγρυπνία of Cat. 50 and claims that the Monobiblos develops literary metaphors in the erotic relationships between men, as others have claimed that elegy does in the relationships between the the poet-lover and his puella.
allegory for Vergil’s love for a young slave boy, or at least as somehow reflective of the romantic sentiments of its author. This poem, however, might better be read as a literary rather than biographical allegory: on this reading, Corydon’s love for Alexis can be understood as a metaphorical expression of Vergil’s admiration for elegiac poetry, otherwise evident in his intertextual engagement throughout the Eclogues with Gallus, Catullus, Callimachus, and the Hellenistic erotic epigram. Vergil’s choice of details from the story of Acontius is telling in this regard: one of the strongest signs of the influence of this Callimachean story in Eclogue 2 is that Corydon says that he is “following in the footsteps” of his beloved (tua dum vestigia lustro, 2.12), just as the Cean lovers of Acontius were said to have followed the boy and placed their feet into his footsteps. Callimachus in the Actia prologue uses “following in someone’s tracks or footsteps” (Latin vestigia can mean both, as can Greek ἰχνια) as a metaphor for literary influence, a usage that Horace follows as well, and that persists in modern English idiom. Lucretius, moreover, uses the metaphor even more suggestively in the introduction to DRN 3, where it expresses the influence that Epicurus has exerted

\[116\] Ancient commentators read Corydon’s love for Alexis as an allegory for Vergil’s love of a slave boy belonging to Pollio and claimed the Vergil wrote Ecl. 2 out of gratitude to Pollio for presenting him with the boy: on this ancient tradition, known already to Martial and Apuleius, see VSD 28–31, Serv. ad Ecl. 2.15, and further Coleman 1977, 108–109. A similar affair with a slave boy is imputed to Valgius based on Hor. Odes 2.9 (see Nisbet and Hubbard 1977 ad loc. and Davis 1991, 54). A more recent and milder version of the biographical reading of Ecl. 2 is Büchner’s suggestion that Corydon is for Vergil “ein Symbol seiner Seele” (Büchner 1957, 170). Kenney 1983, after demonstrating the debt owed by Vergil in Ecl. 2 and 8 to Callimachus’s story of Acontius, suggested a parallel in Wordsworth’s “Solitary Reaper,” which, although based in part on an idea from a book, is meant to echo real experience (57–58). Against such biographical interpretations of Vergil see Horsfall 1995b (cited at n. 14 above).

\[117\] Compare Callimachus’s use of ἰχνια in the advice from Apollo in the Actia prologue, fr. 1.26–27 Pf. ἐτέρων ἰχνια μὴ καθ᾽ ὁμᾶ | [δἰδὼν ἐλ]γὼν, and Horace’s use of vestigia at Epist. 1.19.21–22 libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps, | non aliena meo pressi pede (where vestigia aliena = Callimachus’s ἰχνια; cf. Mayer 1994 ad loc.). AP 286–287 nec minimum meruere decus vestigia Graeca | ausi deserere et celebrare domestica facta, and Epist. 2.2.80 tu me inter strepitus nocturnos atque diurnos | vis canere et contracta sequi vestigia vatam?, where Brink notes that contracta vestigia “can well refer to the Callimachean road to true poetry, the narrow pathway of Act. 1.1.27-8” (on contractus as a stylistic term cf. Thomas 1978). Also comparable, though less directly so, is Epist. 2.1.160 manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris.
on him, and where he activates the erotic sense of the metaphor by saying that he follows in Epicurus’s footsteps not as a would-be rival, but because of love.

\[
\begin{align*}
te \ sequor, \ o \ Graiae \ gentis \ decus, \ inque \ tuis \ nunc \\
ficta \ pedum \ pono \ pressis \ vestigia \ signis, \\
on \ ita \ certandi \ cupidus \ quam \ propter \ amorem \\
quod \ te \ imitari \ aveo.
\end{align*}
\]

\[(DRN \ 3.3–6)\]

### 2.4.2 Eclogue 8

*Eclogue* 8, which resembles *Idyll* 6 in having no winner or loser, stages in the songs of both Damon (8.17–63) and Alphesiboeus (8.64–109) a mixing of generic traditions that shows just how many of the essential elements of elegy can be found in Theocritus—both in pastoral poems like *Idylls* 11 and 3, and in non-pastoral poems like *Idyll* 2. Both of the songs that make up *Ecl.* 8 approach the topic of love in ways that are generically characteristic of elegy rather than pastoral, but by using Theocritean intertexts and by crossing pastoral and elegiac metanarratives, they stage a conflation of generic conventions, to which they call attention through metapoetic

---

118This influence is probably philosophical rather than literary, but see Kenney 1970, Brown 1982, and King 1985 on the influence of Callimachus and Callimachean imagery on Lucretius, including the image of the “untrodden path” (related to that of “tracks”) at *DRN* 1.926–950 = 4.1–25. Knox 1999 looks further at Lucretius’s use of this metaphor and argues that, although Callimachus may have been Lucretius’s proximate inspiration, it is important that the image derives ultimately from philosophy, and it may even have appeared in Epicurus.

119Vergil may also allude to his admiration for love poetry when Corydon says near the end of his song that love (*amor*) burns him (*me tamen urit amor*, 2.68): on the metapoetic significance of *amor* see above p. 64 above. There may be further metapoetic point in the second half of this line, *quis enim modus adsit amori?*, since *modus* can mean “meter” as well as “limit,” and since, as I have argued, *Ecl.* 2 can in many ways be seen as an elegy written in hexameters. The same metapoetic point might also be seen in Pan’s words to Gallus in *Ecl.* 10, “*ecquis erit modus?” inquit. “Amor non talia curat…”, about which Harrison 2007a, 65 makes a similar, though not identical, point about the metapoetic significance of Amor (see above). Cf. Papanghelis on the double meaning of *genus* in connection with Amor (see p. 88 below, and cf. my remarks on *genus* in Ch. 4). On the metapoetic significance of *modus* and *genus* cf. too Ch. 4 on *Geo.* 2.20, *hos natura modos primum dedit, his genus omne…*; on metapoetic *fastus* in Corydon’s closing remark, *invenies alium, si te hic fastidit*, *Alexin* (2.73), see p. 104 below.
annotations throughout the poem.

Already in its opening lines, Eclogue 8 seems to insist on the pastoral nature of the two songs that follow, while simultaneously characterizing them in unpastoral terms.\(^{120}\)

\[
\text{Pastorum Musam Damonis et Alphesiboei,} \\
\text{immemor herbarum quos est mirata iuvenca} \\
\text{certantis, quorum stupefactae carmine lynces,} \\
\text{et mutata suos requierunt flumina cursus,} \\
\text{Damonis Musam dicemus et Alphesiboei. (Ecl. 8.1–5)}
\]

Commentators have remarked on the strident insistence of this opening, which emphasizes both that these songs are those of shepherds, and that the shepherds are engaged in a pastoral singing contest, “as if,” Clausen comments, “to assert the pastoral character of the poem as a whole in anticipation of the reader’s response to the unpastoral Muse of Alphesiboeus.”\(^{121}\) It is not, however, only Alphesiboeus that contributes to the “unpastoral” character of this Eclogue. While Damon and Alphesiboeus are mentioned as shepherds elsewhere in the Eclogues (3.17, 3.23, 5.73), neither name is known to the pastoral tradition before Vergil,\(^{122}\) and the nature of their song is obviously surprising to the nearby calf (\textit{immemor herbarum quos est mirata iuvenca}, 8.2)—the only element of this odd preface that could be considered typically pastoral.\(^{123}\) The Orphic power of their song, moreover, to stupefy lynxes

\(^{120}\) Compare the similar opening of Ecl. 2, which I have also argued conflates pastoral and elegy: Formosum \underline{pastor} Corydon \underline{ardebat} Alexin (2.1).

\(^{121}\) Clausen 1994, 233. Alphesiboeus’s song is widely considered unpastoral because it adapts the non-bucolic Theoc. \textit{Idyll} 2.

\(^{122}\) Although see Van Sickle 1978, 178 n. 71 (following Wendel 1900, 49) on the possibility that Vergil formed the name Alphesiboeus (the etymology of which points to cattle) from Theocritus’s Alphesiboa (\textit{Id.} 3.45).

\(^{123}\) Lynxes (8.3), e.g., belong neither to pastoral, nor to the either the Sicilian or Italian countryside; cf. Coleman 1977 ad 8.3, who notes nevertheless that they are associated with Pan and with
and change the course of rivers is nowhere else directly attributed to pastoral. In fact, pastoral is usually contrasted with Orphic song, and Damon’s song specifically lists Tityrus’s becoming Orpheus as an adynaton (8.55–56). As I argued above, moreover, Vergil seems to associate Orphic powers with the elegiac literary tradition rather than with pastoral. The songs of both Damon and Alphesiboeus have elegiac rather than pastoral aims—lamenting desperate love and seeking access to the beloved—and by insisting that these songs can be and are sung by shepherds, and by using Theocritean intertexts, Eclogue 8 enacts the conflation of pastoral and elegiac genres that is proposed and begun in Eclogue 2.

Just like Corydon in Eclogue 2, Damon and Alphesiboeus in Eclogue 8 seem to be self-consciously literary characters, whose songs allude to both pastoral and elegiac models, but who cannot fully control the implications of these allusions. Damon’s song takes Theocritus 3 and 11 as its primary intertextual models, but in a number of details, as well as in its general tone, it shows extensive engagement with the elegiac tradition. In particular, a number of details from Theocritus are made—either by Damon or by Vergil—to overlap with the story of Acontius, which I have argued constitutes a specifically elegiac metanarrative in the Eclogues. Both major Theocritean intertexts for this song share their themes with Roman love elegy: Id. 11, as we have seen earlier, is until the end the song of a forlorn lover, and Id. 3 is

Mt. Maenalus (h. Hom. 19.24, Callim. Hymn 3.88–89), for which reason (among others) he considers them “appropriate enough to the pastoral.”

124 At Ecl. 4.55–57, the speaker compares himself to Orpheus and Linus; at Ecl. 6.27–30, the song of Silenus is said to have Orphic powers, but this song also has important links to the elegiac tradition (see above p. 56 and n. 65). On Orphic powers to charm beasts and change the course of rivers cf. Ap. Rhod. 1.26–27, Hor. Odes 1.12.9–10, Prop. 3.2.3–4, Ov. Fast. 2.84, and other passages listed by Clausen ad Ecl. 8.4.

125 This may be connected with a link between Orpheus and the invention of the elegiac couplet: see p. 61 and esp. n. 62 above. Propertius, at 1.9.31–2, attributes Orphic powers to Amor and blanditiae. Cf. James 2001, 248 n. 64 on the link between elegy and magic.
a paraclausithyron set outside a cave instead of a city house. Papanghelis, who has recently discussed elegiac love in the *Eclogues*, notes that the speaker of Damon’s song suffers from the typically elegiac condition of unrequited love (*indigno... amore*, 8.18)—a condition, I would add, that he shares not only with the *amator* of elegy but also with Callimachus’s Acontius. Damon’s speaker himself, moreover, could be said to characterize his story as elegiac when he calls it a lament (*dum queror*, 8.18), a word that Vergil uses nowhere else in the *Eclogues*, but which is in Tibullus and Propertius nearly a technical term for elegy.

In his discussion of the influence of Callimachus’s Acontius on the *Eclogues*, Kenney has adduced a series of parallels that argue for the direct influence of this narrative on the song of Damon in *Ecl.* 8, including the speaker’s sylvan lament to the trees (8.22–24, 58), the motif of love at first sight (41), and the threat of suicide (58–60). Most specifically, he cites the fact that Damon’s speaker seems to have been engaged to marry Nysa, a situation that is without parallel in extant Roman love elegy, but well reflects the predicament of Acontius after Cydippe had sworn to marry him.

coniugis indigno Nysae deceptus amore
dum queror et divos, quamquam nil testibus illis
profeci, extrema moriens tamen adloquor hora.

(*Ecl.* 8.18–20)

Damon’s speaker names Nysa as his *coniunx* and mentions the gods as witnesses,

---

126 On the influence of Theoc. 11 and 3 see Hubbard 1998, 112–113, who further notes the influence of Vergil’s own Corydon (himself modeled largely on Polyphemus and the goatherd from *Id.* 3), as well as that of Cat. 60 and 64, and of the adynata of Theoc. 1.

127 Papanghelis 1999, 50.

128 The word occurs frequently in the elegists, often in self-characterization (e.g. Tib. 1.2.9, Prop. 1.7.8), and Horace (*Ars* 75) claims that *querimonia* were the first use of elegiac verse (based probably on an etymological connection between elegy and lament); see n. 61 above for the excellent discussion of elegiac *querelae* by James 2003.

129 See Kenney 1983, 54–57, who, aside from the general thematic resemblance, lists seven discrete parallels (including some that I will discuss in the following paragraphs).
which suggests that Nysa swore at some point that she would be the speaker’s wife. Although by itself the term *coniunx* could be considered inexplicit, it is used nowhere in the *Eclogues* outside of Ecl. 8, and Servius tells us that the speaker here uses the word proleptically (*non quae erat, sed quae fore sperabatur*) just as Dido uses the word *maritus* in Aen. 4 (*quos ego sim totiens iam designata maritos, Aen. 4.536*). Kenney, moreover, points out that this passage alludes to Ariadne’s speech in Catullus 64, in which she complains of desertion by Theseus, her husband. Although critics are sometimes uncomfortable admitting marriage into the pastoral world, these factors, along with the other parallels to the Callimachean narrative, suggest that the oath that Nysa broke to Damon’s speaker was in fact an oath of marriage, such as Cydippe unwittingly made to Acontius on Naxos.

The fifth stanza of Damon’s song, which begins at the song’s central verse (8.37), is particularly interesting for the way that it fuses pastoral and elegiac metanarratives. Although these lines are largely an allusion to Polyphemus and Galatea in *Id.* 11, subtle changes render the story equally evocative of Acontius and Cydippe.

\[
\text{saepibus in nostris parvam te roscida mala} \\
\text{(dux ego vester eram) vidi cum matre legentem.} \\
\text{alter ab undecimo tum me iam acceperat annus,} \\
\text{iam fragilis poteram a terra contingere ramos:} \\
\text{ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error.} \\
\]

\[\text{Ecl. 8.37–41}\]

Lines 37–38 are very close to Theoc. 11.25–29, in which Polyphemus recounts leading Galatea and his mother (also a nymph) to gather hyacinths on a hillside. As Kenney

---

130 Coleman 1977 cites the similar use of *coniunx* at Aen. 3.331; Horsfall 2000 ad Aen. 7.189 cites other proleptic uses of *coniunx*, including here at Ecl. 8.18. Cf. further Clausen ad loc., who remarks on the embarrassment of commentators over *coniunx* here, and points out that it is balanced by Alphesiboeus’s use of the same word at 8.66.

131 Cf. Cat. 64.188–191; Theseus is not called *coniunx* in these lines, but is so called by the narrator at 64.123 and by Ariadne herself at 64.182.
points out, however, the change of setting, from hillside to orchard, and the change from hyacinths to apples remind one of the story of Acontius, and of the role that a quince (Cydonian apple), plucked from Aphrodite’s orchard, played in his stratagem to marry Cydippe. Beyond Kenney’s observation, moreover, the ambiguity in Latin *legere* further contributes to the attractiveness of seeing Acontius and Cydippe as a second model for Damon and Nysa, since the influence of Callimachus’s Acontius looms all the larger if Damon’s speaker can equally said to have seen Nysa “gathering” apples or “reading” them. This sort of literary double meaning, which allows references to reading and writing to slip unobtrusively into the pastoral world, is typical of Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, and frequently adds a layer of metapoetic meaning to a line’s more obvious narrative sense. In this case, the double meaning contributes to the conflation of the pastoral metanarrative of Polyphemus with the elegiac metanarrative of Acontius, and to the accompanying conflation of pastoral and elegy in the *Eclogues*, which Vergil seemed to propose in *Eclogue* 2 and which he will further effect in *Eclogue* 10.

In the context of genre-blending such as Damon achieves with the metanarrative models of his song, Damon’s use of the word *amor*—in both the singular and the plural—can be seen metapoetically as a reflection on the relationship between pastoral song and love poetry within the pastoral literary tradition. After Damon’s speaker

---

132 Kenney 1983, 55, 56; cf. Arist. ἄντικα γοῦν κατὰ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ὡς ἠθεάσω προκαθημένη τὴν κόρην, τοῦ κήπου τῆς Ἀφροδίτης Κυδώνιον ἐκλεξάµενος µήλου ἀπάτης αὐτῷ περιεγράφηκες λόγον καὶ λάθρᾳ διεκύλισας πρὸ τὸν τῆς θεραπαίνης ποδῶν.

133 If we might imagine that these apples, like the ones that Acontius threw to Cydippe, were inscribed with an oath of marriage, then these lines would also help explain Damon’s feeling that he has been betrayed (8.17-20).

134 It is possible that Vergil is using *videre* in these lines as a marker of literary allusion, as Thomas (1992, 44–51) suggests that he is doing with the storm in *Geo*. 1 (*saepe ego... vidi*, 316–318), or in conjunction with *memini* of the Corycian farmer in *Geo*. 4 (*memini me... vidisse senem*, 4.125–127); cf. also Horsfall 1995a, 71–72; Cairns 2006, 117. The ambiguity of *cum matre* (38, cf. Serv. ad loc.) also suits this double allusion: see Kenney 1983, 56–57.
begins his self-characterized erotic lament in the first stanza of his song (dum queror, 8.19), he uses the refrain and second stanza (21–25) to defend the place of such a lament in the pastoral tradition. Although some readers have found Damon’s refrain, along with the verse that explains it, inappropriate to this song, these lines can more easily be fit to their context if they are seen as an aetiological explanation for the place of erotic lament in pastoral song.\footnote{On the supposed inappropriateness of Damon’s refrain see Clausen 1994, 238; Bethe 1892, 595–596.}

\begin{verbatim}
incipe Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus.
Maenalus argutumque nemus pinusque loquentis
  semper habet, semper pastorum ille audit amores
  Panaque, qui primus calamos non passus inertis.
  incipe Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus.
\end{verbatim}

\textit{(Ecl. 8.21–25)}

By calling his lament Maenalan verse and connecting it to Pan as the originator of pastoral song, Damon offers a precedent for erotic lament at the very beginning of the pastoral tradition, since it was Pan’s unhappy love for Syrinx that resulted in her transformation into a reed and his subsequent invention of the panpipes.\footnote{Cf. Coleman ad \textit{Ecl.} 8.24.} From the beginning of pastoral song, Damon claims, Mt. Maenalus has heard shepherds’ \textit{amores}, a word that here must mean “love songs,” just as it often means “love poetry” in elegy.\footnote{DServ. ad 8.22: \textit{“amores” vero cantica de amoribus}; cf. also p. 64 above. The explicitness of this passage makes it an important intertext for other passages in the \textit{Eclogues}—especially \textit{Ecl.} 10.6, 24, and 53—where \textit{amores} is more ambiguous, but where “love songs” is one of several senses present.} When read as an aetiological defense of elegiac-style lament in pastoral, these lines shed much light on the rest of Damon’s song, which finds precedent for such lament even in the story of Polyphemus and Galatea, which in \textit{Ecl.} 2 was paradigmatic of pastoral love, not elegiac love. Through subtle changes, however, Damon in \textit{Ecl.} 8 hybridizes pastoral and elegy by making this pastoral metanarrative congruent with
the equally paradigmatic elegiac metanarrative of Acontius and Cydippe.

In the sixth and seventh stanzas of his song (43–45, 47–50), Damon’s speaker reflects more explicitly on *amor*, in the singular, in terms that Papanghelis has argued specifically address the compatibility of love—and, I would add, love poetry—with the generic tradition of Theocritean pastoral.\(^{138}\) In these lines, Theocritus 3, the pastoral paraclausithyron, has replaced Theocritus 11 as the primary intertext, and the tone of Damon’s song has shifted from pastoral to elegiac.\(^{139}\)

\[\text{nunc scio quid sit Amor: nudis in cautibus illum aut Tmaros aut Rhodope aut extremi Garamantes nec generis nostri puerum nec sanguinis edunt. incipe Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus. saevus Amor docuit natorum sanguine maren commacularem mans...}\]

\[(Ecl. 8.43–48)\]

Papanghelis notes the shift in tone in these lines and compares them to the elegiac remarks of Gallus in *Eclogue* 10 (esp. 10.69, *omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori*), remarking that *nunc scio quid sit Amor* in 8.43 “announces the generic transposition of [Damon’s speaker’s] pastoral love.” He notes, moreover, that Damon’s speaker’s remark that *Amor/amor* is not *generis nostri* attempts to exclude *amor* from the pastoral tradition through a literary double meaning in the word *genus*, the primary meaning of which is “race” or “kind,” but which as a literary term means “genre” (*OLD* s.v. 6c). We will see Vergil use *genus* in this metapoetic sense again in *Geo.* 2, but for now I would add that he also plays here on the double meaning of *amor* in order to aim his lament both at the god Amor and at the love poetry that he patronizes. The following lines on Medea’s murder of her children can be seen to further

---

\(^{138}\) Papanghelis 1999, 51–53.

\(^{139}\) This movement starts before the refrain, in line 41, *ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error!*, which Vergil has modeled on both Theoc 3.41–42 and 2.82 (see below); cf. Clausen ad loc.
what Papanghelis calls the “differential” definition of amor by associating love and its effects specifically with tragedy: amor (love, love poetry), these lines seem to say, has its place in other generic traditions, including tragedy (where it causes Medea to kill her children), but is foreign to the tradition of Theocritean pastoral. Damon’s song has in common with Eclogue 2 and 10 that it portrays amor as either foreign to or in tension with the pastoral world, but in all three poems, characters are shown to have opinions about love poetry and pastoral song that are either wrong or naive.

Despite Damon’s objections that Amor is “not of our genus,” it is simply untrue that either love or love poetry is foreign to Theocritean pastoral, since the two major Theocritean intertexts of Damon’s song, Idylls 3 and 11, both comprise the lamentations of disconsolate lovers. Stephen Hinds has shown that Latin epic, too, feigns naiveté about its own generic conventions by repeatedly manifesting surprise to find women and love included as themes. In lines 52–56, Damon presents a series of adynata that, similarly, express his astonishment with his present state of affairs. These lines describe his romantic disillusionment, but they can also be read metapoetically as reflecting surprise at the violations of conceptions of genre that are shown to be as naive as the speaker’s ideas about love.

nunc et ovis ultro fugiat lupus, aurea durae mala ferant quercus, narcisso floreat alnus, pinguia corticibus sudent electra myricae, certent et cyncis ululae, sit Tityrus Orpheus, Orpheus in silvis, inter delphinas Arion.

(Ecl. 8.52–56)

\(^{140}\)Papanghelis 1999, 52–53.

\(^{141}\)Cf. Lyne 1987, 108–110 (see n. 10 above), who notes the productive irony that results from characters in the Aeneid having wrong opinions about the intertextual links of their own narratives.

\(^{142}\)Hinds 2000; cf. also Lyne 1987, 108–110 (noted already), and Farrell 2003 on the gap between theoretical conceptions of genre and their implementation by Roman poets.
These *adynata*, which precede the speaker’s apparent suicide at *Ecl.* 8.58–60, are loosely modeled on those that accompany the death of Daphnis at Theoc. 1.132–136. But although the *adynata* in Theoc. 1 are motivated by Daphnis’s impending death (*Id.* 1.135), those in *Ecl.* 8 seem to follow from Damon’s remarks about *amor* in the lines above.\(^{143}\) *Adynata* consist in the violation of natural boundaries, and since the previous stanzas seem to complain about the unnatural confusion of love poetry into pastoral poetry, we might see these lines as a reaction to the confusion of natural generic boundaries both generally in the *Eclogues* and specifically in Damon’s speaker’s own life and song in *Ecl.* 8. In lines 52b–54 Damon’s speaker presents three biological *adynata* (including two impossible grafts) to represent what he feels to be the confusion of his world’s natural order through the admission of tragic or elegiac love into the pastoral world. We will see in Ch. 4 that biological *adynata*—again in the form of impossible grafts—accompany genre-blending in *Geo.* 2 as well, and it is attractive to view such *adynata* in both *Ecl.* 8 and *Geo.* 2 as extending a metapoetic link between trees and poetry (which I will discuss further in Ch. 3) in order to comment on the unnatural (from Damon’s speaker’s view) trespass of elegiac material into the pastoral genre.\(^{144}\) The last two lines of this stanza, moreover, pertain explicitly to music and singing, and can be read specifically as reflecting on pastoral poetry and its boundaries. First, swans—which, when they are compared to other birds in *Ecl.* 9 as well, are a clear symbol for good poets\(^{145}\)—are said to have competition from

\(^{143}\) Although Vergil explicitly connects the *adynata* of *Ecl.* 8 neither with the preceding or following stanza, Damon’s death is not even hinted at before line 58, and is not explicit until line 60. Because of the lack of explicit connection in either direction, the *adynata* would seem, logically, to depend on what precedes them, at least until the following revelation about Damon’s suicide.

\(^{144}\) Cf. also Hor. *A.P.* 1–12, which uses impossible zoological hybrids as an *exemplum* to introduce his discussion of generic conventions and their violation.

\(^{145}\) *Ecl.* 9.35–36, *nam neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna | digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores.* On the probable allusion here to Gallus *FRP* 145.6–7 see Hinds 1983, 45–46 and below at n. 17. At Prop. 2.34.83–84 the *olor* also compares favorably to the *anser*, here specifically as a symbol for Vergil in the *Eclogues*: *nec minor hic animis, ut sit minor ore, canorus | anseris indocto*
noisy owls. Next, the shepherd and pastoral poet Tityrus is said to become a magical singer, like Orpheus or Arion, with powers that I have argued are associated rather with elegiac than with pastoral poetry. While Damon’s song confutes generic boundaries by combining the metanarratives of Polyphemus and Acontius (and throwing in some Daphnis), it objects to this very same confutation in its reference to genus and through its use of adynata. Augustan poets, however, frequently manipulate generic boundaries as they write themselves into literary history, and Eclogue 8 has still more examples of such manipulation in the song of Alphesiboeus.

In the second half of Eclogue 8 the “unpastoral” song of Alphesiboeus, as Clausen puts it, does even more to confute the boundaries of genre than Damon’s song did, not only by manipulating generic conventions and metanarratives, but also by redefining boundaries of the pastoral genre, and even the meaning of “song” in the pastoral world. Whereas Damon’s song shared with elegy its theme, the lament of a disconsolate lover, Alphesiboeus’s song shares with elegy its goal, to win access to a lover through carmina. These carmina, however, are no longer “songs” or “poems,” but rather “spells” (ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin, 8.68, etc.: OLD 1b), and they seem to possess the very magical powers that Damon specifically disclaimed as a property of pastoral in the adynata of 8.52–56.146 To find generic precedent for these carmina, Vergil seems here to rely on a different way of defining the pastoral genre, based not on theme, but rather on meter and on the authorship of Theocritus.147 The primary intertext of Alphesiboeus’s carmina is the unpastoral
carmine cessit olor.

146 On the ambiguity of carmina cf. Papanghelis 1999, 54 n. 38, and Putnam 1970, 280, who notes that in Ecl. 2, carmina have taken the place of Simaetha’s ἵντελε χρύσακε as the primary instrument of magic.

147 Augustan poets frequently define generic traditions by their originator (here the same as authorship), as Vergil refers to the didactic Georgics as an Ascracem carmen (Geo. 2.176), but this leaves room for ambiguity when, as in the case of Theocritus, the poet wrote more than one type of poetry. On the fuzziness of ancient definitions of genre see Farrell 2003, who points out that ancient generic theory was less sophisticated than was the practice of ancient poets.
Idyll 2, which has more in common with Hellenistic mime than with Theocritus’s pastoral Idylls, but which nevertheless provides Theocritean precedent for songs having magical powers of the sort that Damon disclaims above (8.55–56). These magical powers, moreover, are deployed in both Ecl. 8 and Id. 2 in pursuit of the goal that elegy seeks as well, namely gaining access to one’s beloved.148

By invoking Idyll 2 as a large-scale model for his song, Alphesiboeus seems to have capped Damon’s elegiac-pastoral lament (queror, 8.19), with its complaint about amor in pastoral and its mention of magical powers as an impossibility, with a pastoral—or, at least, Theocritean—precedent for both of these at once, in the love magic of the sorceress Simaetha in Id. 2. The elegiac metanarrative of Acontius can be seen as representing the two major functions of elegy in the two episodes of this story that most interest Roman poets: the stratagem of the apple (≈ blanditiae with the goal of winning access to the beloved) and the sylvan lament (= querelae). When the song of Damon finds a pastoral precedent for erotic querelae in the lament of Polyphemus for Galatea, the song of Alphesiboeus finds precedent in the spells of Simaetha for the use of carmina (“songs,” “spells”) to gain access to one’s beloved.

On several counts, moreover, the song of Alphesiboeus can be seen as capping the hybridization of elegy and pastoral found in Damon’s song. In a general sense, Theoc. 2 provides an example of the sort of powers that Damon’s adynata at Ecl. 8.52–56 seem to disclaim for pastoral. In a more specific sense, it is an allusion to Id. 2 in Damon’s song that begins the shift, as Papanghelis puts it, from elegiac to pastoral tone in Damon’s song: Ecl. 8.41 (ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error) resembles a line from Id. 3 (ἀ δ’ Ἀταλάντα | ὦς ἠδεν, ὦς ἐμάνη, ὦς ἐς βαθύν ἁλατ’ ἔρωτα,

148 Only here in the Eclogues does Vergil use a non-pastoral Idyll as a major intertext, and this interruption of the generic consistency of the collection may be one reason why the speaker of this Eclogue must invoke the Muses to sing Alphesiboeus’s song for him (vos, quae responderit Alphesiboeus, | dicite Pierides: non omnia possumus omnes, 8.62–63).
3.41–42), to which the immediately subsequent lines also allude, but *ut vidi, ut perii...* is in fact closer to the first-person words of Simaetha at *Id.* 2.82, χὼς ἴδον, ὡς ἐµάνην, ὥς µοι πυρὶ θυµὸς ἰάφθη. By adapting *Id.* 2 at large scale, Alphesiboeus finds in one of Damon’s own intertexts the material to disprove his assertions about the pastoral genre.

To sum up, Vergil has made several significant changes to the story of *Id.* 2 in order to help contextualize the song of Alphesiboeus as a part of the metanarrative development that takes place across *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10. By setting the song of Alphesiboeus in the country instead of the city, and by renaming its love object Daphnis instead of Delphis, Vergil aligns the singer of Alphesiboeus’s song with Corydon from *Ecl.* 2, whose song to Alexis expressed his desire that Alexis should come to the country from the city, where he would play Daphnis to Corydon’s own Damoetas. Corydon and Alexis in *Ecl.* 2 each represented a single literary tradition, and the genre-blending entailed in Alexis playing the pastoral character Daphnis was contemplated but not yet accomplished, since Corydon would have to wait to find another Alexis (2.73).

In *Eclogue* 8, this genre-blending has been accomplished, at least from the pastoral side, since the pastoral songs of both Damon and Alphesiboeus (*Pastorum Musam Damonis et Alphesiboei... certantis*, 8.1–3) are both thoroughly elegiac, representing in different ways the elegiac metanarrative of Acontius. Daphnis, however, has still not appeared in the countryside (except through the songs of Mopsus and Menalcas in *Ecl.* 5). This final movement of metanarrative development must wait for *Eclogue* 10, where Gallus, as that poem’s representative of the elegiac literary tradition, appears in the pastoral world and plays the role of Daphnis from

---

149 *Ecl.* 8.43–46: *Id.* 15–16.

150 Cf. Clausen ad loc.

151 Although Corydon began the poem as an Acontius figure, he quickly began to play the pastoral role of Polyphemus (which did not seem as evidently elegiac at that point as it does in *Ecl.* 8).
Theocritus *Idyll 1.*
Chapter 3

Gallus, Acontius, and the Metapoetics of Trees

3.1 Eclogue 10

I argued in the previous chapter that Vergil, in Eclogues 2 and 8, uses what I have called metanarratives to represent the influence of pastoral and elegy in the Eclogues. I have claimed that these two traditions exert reciprocal influence within the Eclogues, and that this influence corresponds (a) to the influence that elegy has had on Vergil in the composition of his pastoral poetry, and (b) to the influence that, according to the metanarrative fiction of the collection, Vergil hopes for pastoral to have on Gallus in his future elegiac compositions. So far, my discussion has focused on pastoral characters, such as Corydon in Ecl. 2, taking part in elegiac metanarratives. I turn in this chapter to Ecl. 10, in which an elegiac character, Gallus, takes part in a pastoral metanarrative. When Vergil depicts the elegist Gallus as Daphnis from Theocritus Idyll 1, he casts Gallus in the starring role in “The Woes of Daphnis,” the song that epitomizes pastoral poetry in Theocritus’s Idylls. The appearance of Gallus as Daphnis in Ecl. 10 closes the circle of reciprocal generic influence in the Eclogues,
completing the movement—first suggested by Corydon in Ecl. 2—of a refined urban (= elegiac) character into the rustic countryside (= pastoral).

Vergil’s technique in Eclogues 2 and 8 was to have pastoral characters participate simultaneously in both pastoral and elegiac metanarratives. By showing how much these genres have in common, the poet argues implicitly for their cross-compatibility. In both of these poems, pastoral characters incorporate elegy into pastoral by playing pastoral and elegiac roles simultaneously. Thus, in Eclogue 2, Corydon plays the pastoral role of Polyphemus from Theocritus Idyll 11 while also playing the elegiac role of Acontius from Callimachus Aetia 3. Likewise, in Ecl. 8A, the speaker of Damon’s song plays Polyphemus and Acontius at the same time. In both Ecl. 2 and Ecl. 8B, moreover, a pastoral character invites an urban/elegiac character to incorporate pastoral into his own story by playing Daphnis in the country. Thus Corydon, as I have argued, invites Alexis to play Daphnis to his own Damoetas in Ecl. 2, and thus the speaker of Alphesiboeus’s song tries to bewitch a lover named Daphnis away from the city and back to the country in Ecl. 8B. Both of these poems, moreover, pastoralize prominent elegiac themes: Ecl. 2 and 8A blend the elegiac erotic lament (querela) with the pastoral lament of Polyphemus in Idyll 11; Ecl. 8B blends the “magical” power of elegiac poetry to gain one access to one’s beloved with the actual love magic of Simaetha in Theocritus Idyll 2. In both Ecl. 2 and Ecl. 8, moreover, the sexual union between a pastoral character and an elegiac/urban character can be seen as further symbolizing the hybridization of these two characters. Corydon proposes such a relationship with Alexis, just as Alphesiboeus’s speaker does with Daphnis. In both cases the proposed union is to take place in the country (2.31; 8.68 et al.), and in both cases the fulfillment of the speaker’s erotic desire is deliberately put beyond the scope of the song at hand (2.69–73, 8.106–108).

In all these ways, Eclogues 2 and 8 can be said to point forward in the collection
to *Eclogue* 10, in which an elegiac/urban character finally does appear in the pastoral countryside. Thus when the elegist Gallus plays Daphnis in *Ecl.* 10, his appearance can be seen as fulfilling the requests of both Corydon and the speaker of 8B. Here for the first time an elegiac character takes part in a pastoral metanarrative, as the pastoral characters of *Ecl.* 2 and 8 had taken part in elegiac metanarratives. Because Daphnis is an ambiguous figure, however, the role that Gallus plays in *Ecl.* 10 is different from the one that Corydon hoped for Alexis to play in *Ecl.* 2. When Corydon seemed to suggest Daphnis as a textual model for Alexis in *Ecl.* 2, he was referring to *Idyll* 6, where Daphnis appeared as the lover and singing partner of Corydon’s own textual model, Damoetas. By proposing that Alexis imitate Daphnis, Corydon meant not only that Alexis should become his lover, but also that he should join Corydon in a contest of pastoral song between shepherds—the primary conceit of the pastoral genre.

When Gallus plays Daphnis in *Ecl.* 10, however, he chooses instead the Daphnis of *Idyll* 1, who is paradigmatic of pastoral in an entirely different way. This Daphnis is known not for his singing, but for his suffering, and he is paradigmatic not of happy, tranquil love between herdsmen, but of love that is unhappy and frustrated—a motif that, as well as being prominent in Theocritus (e.g. *Id.* 1, 2, 3), constitutes the primary conceit of Roman love elegy. So although Gallus appears here in Vergilian pastoral to take part in one of the most important narratives from Theocritus, this narrative has so much in common with elegy that Gallus’s appearance here is consistent with his identity as an elegiac poet-lover. I will argue, in fact, that the Gallus of *Ecl.* 10 resists all attempts to pastoralize him, including an attempt by the pastoral narrator to engage Gallus in a pastoral sexual relationship.

In addition to finding an elegiac character playing a pastoral role for the first time in the *Eclogues*, we also find in *Eclogue* 10 one final instance of a pastoral character
taking part in an elegiac metanarrative. The second major speaking part in this poem is the pastoral narrator, whom many readers have identified with Vergil. This identification is attractive both because the narrator refers to his love for Gallus (10.72–74), and because he alludes to the structure of the *Eclogue* book by referring to *Ecl.* 10 as an *extremus labor* (10.1).\(^1\) I will argue in this chapter that Vergil here adopts the generic conventions of Roman love elegy and casts himself as the fictionalized first-person poet-lover who is in the unhappy love affair that constitutes elegy’s basic conceit. Just as Gallus’s song in *Ecl.* 10 (31–69) tells of the elegist’s unrequited love for Lycoris, who is herself going north to follow a soldier (46–49), so too the narrative frame of *Ecl.* 10 (1–8, 70–77) can be read as describing the narrator’s unrequited love for Gallus, who is himself in love with Lycoris. These songs are no more autobiographical than the elegies of Propertius and Ovid, but rather, just as Propertius and Ovid use love as a metaphorical domain for reflecting on their poetry and genre, so too the love songs of *Ecl.* 10 use this double erotic conceit to reflect metapoetically on the literary programs of Vergil and Gallus, and on the pastoral and elegiac literary traditions, which these two poet-lovers respectively represent.

The generic hybridization in *Eclogue* 10 means that this poem can be seen, on one hand, as the fulfillment of Vergil’s project of generic universalism in the *Eclogues*. On the other hand, however, the poem equally dramatizes the failure of this project, since it shows that pastoral and elegy are ultimately incompatible in their respective treatments of love. There is no ideological conversion in this poem: although Vergil and Gallus both play roles in metanarratives belonging to the other man’s genre, each retains attitudes towards love appropriate to his own genre, and the resulting tensions cause both characters to reject the poem’s initial characterization of them.

\(^1\) For a skeptical view of this identification see Breed 2006, 354–357; cf. also Thomas 1998b, 671–672.
and return to the more generically appropriate metanarratives we saw in *Eclogue* 2. Thus Gallus rejects the role of Daphnis for that of Acontius, and thus, I will argue, Vergil rejects the role of Gallus for that of Polyphemus. As Conte observed of *Eclogue* 10, “the aim of Vergil’s exploration here is not to link and blur two poetics, but to gain a deeper insight into that which divides them.”² When Gallus rejects pastoral in *Ecl.* 10, he reiterates the separation of genres that Vergil has implicitly argued against throughout *Ecl.* 2, 8, and now 10.

From a literary-historical standpoint, Gallus’s rejection of pastoral for elegy must be regarded as the inevitable *telos* of Vergil’s attempt to reconcile elegy and pastoral in the *Eclogues*. Regardless of whether Vergil and Gallus were actually friends, our knowledge of Vergil’s highly allusive literary technique suggests that the figure of Gallus in *Ecl.* 10 should be based not on Vergil’s private interactions with the elegist, but on how Gallus presented himself through his poetry. And to whatever degree Gallus’s song in *Ecl.* 10 consists of allusions to Gallan poetry, Vergil’s character Gallus is based on—in fact, constituted from—Gallus’s own poetic self-presentation. Even if *Ecl.* 10 contained no Gallan allusions, Gallus’s *persona* in this poem would necessarily be informed by the *persona* he presented in his own poetry. I hope to show that our reading of *Ecl.* 10 is enriched by seeing Vergil’s Gallus as speaking on behalf of this *persona*. By introducing Gallus in this poem as a representative of elegy, Vergil makes the interaction of pastoral and elegy in the *Eclogues* inevitably teleological, since it is impossible to change the elegist’s generic disposition if it is based on work that has already been published—*nescit vox missa reverti*, as Horace says (*A.P.* 390).

²Conte 1986, 126. Conte’s classic discussion of *Ecl.* 10 (1986, 100–129) is still the most important and insightful reading of the poem, and my own interpretation owes much to it, as it does also to the readings of Perkell 1996 and Harrison 2007a, 59–74.
From a generic perspective as well, Vergil’s success as a generic universalist depends on Gallus’s rejection of generic universalism. In both *Ecl. 2* and *Ecl. 10*, Vergil casts the interaction of pastoral and elegy in erotic metaphorical terms. For this erotic metaphor to be elegiac as well, however, Vergil’s romantic overtures must fail, since the erotic conceit of elegy is predicated on rejection. So Gallus, by rejecting the conversion to pastoral in *Ecl. 10*—and, as I will argue, by rejecting a sexual relationship with the narrator—paradoxically consummates the union of elegy and pastoral by rejecting pastoral. Meanwhile, however, Gallus has already become a pastoral figure by appearing in *Ecl. 10* to reject pastoral, and just as Gallus’s elegiac disposition is a fact of literary history, so too now is his appearance in *Ecl. 10* as a pastoral shepherd, even though he goes on to reject pastoral. It is in this way that Vergil has interwoven pastoral and elegiac in *Ecl. 10* without either losing its identity, just as, in the poem’s introduction, the sweet spring Arethusa passes through the bitter sea without their waters mingling (10.4–5).

Finally, there are several ways in which *Eclogue 10* can be considered specifically comparable to Ovid *Amores* 3.1, in which the poet brings on personifications of elegy and tragedy to stage a dialogue between these two genres. Both poems feature representatives of both a foreign genre and of the genre at hand, but where Ovid does so through female personifications of Elegy and Tragedy, Vergil does through his narrator and Gallus, who feature respectively as characters in Vergilian pastoral and Gallan elegy. Just as in the *Amores* Ovid presents tragedy as a rival for his poetic attentions (*Am. 2.18.13–18*), so too in *Eclogue 10* Vergil presents pastoral as a rival for Gallus’s poetic attentions (while himself engaging, I will argue, in elegy). Both poems, furthermore, involve conspicuous generic incongruity, when the character

---

3Both Kennedy 1987, 47–49 and Harrison 2007a, 59–63 see this reference to Arethusa as representing the distinctness of elegy and pastoral in *Ecl. 10*, although they disagree about the details of this interpretation.
representing a foreign genre speaks in the meter of the genre at hand. When Ovid’s personified Elegy responds to Tragedy’s claim that a grand genre is better suited to Ovid’s talent, she notes that, although Tragedy has brought along the heavy diction characteristic of her own genre, she has nonetheless condescended to conduct their generic debate in elegiac verse.⁴

“quid gravibus verbis, animosa Tragoedia,” dixit
“me premis? an numquam non gravis esse potes?
imparibus tamen es numeris dignata moveri;
in me pugnasti versibus usa meis.”

(Ov. Am. 3.1.35–38)

Just as Tragedy speaks elegiac verses in heavy tragic diction in Am. 3.1, it is likely that Gallus speaks hexameter verses in elegiac diction in Ecl. 10, since this poem contains at least one allusion to Gallus’s own poetry, and may contain much more of the actual language of Gallan elegy.⁵ As Brian Breed has argued, Gallus may be remarking on this very incongruity at Ecl. 10.50–51, when he says that he will take songs that he wrote “in Chalcidic verse” (probably elegiac) and sing them to the tune of the “Sicilian shepherd’s pipe” (pastoral).⁶ Although Ecl. 10 is subtle and allusive while Am. 3.1 is bluntly typological, the confrontation between Elegy and Tragedy in Am. 3.1 offers a provocative model for our reading of Ecl. 10 also as a confrontation

⁴Compare the phrasing that Elegy chooses at Am. 3.1.37, *imparibus tamen es numeris dignata moveri*, to the language that Vergil uses in to characterize the hierarchy of genres the *Eclogues*, esp. Ecl. 6.1, *prima Sycacosio dignata est ludere versu | nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea* (but note also the similar language at 4.3, 8.10, 9.36, as well as similar, non-generic uses of *dignus* language at 3.109, 4.63, 5.54, 5.89, 8.18, 8.32, and 10.10). Vergil himself is probably imitating language that Gallus used to brag that he had written poetry “worthy of his mistress,” *tandem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae | quae possem domina deicere digna mea:* cf. Hinds 1983 (n. 17 below) on Gallan *dignus* language.

⁵See Servius’s note at 10.46, *hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus (=FRP 141b)*, along with Clausen, 291–292 and Hollis ad *FRP* 141. For further references see Ch. 2 n. 28 above. For a further specific observation about elegiac diction in Gallus’s speech see nn. 31 and 120 below.

⁶Breed 2007, 129–133; see further at n. 41 below.
between representatives of incompatible genres.  

### 3.1.1 The Elegiac Poet and the Pastoral Conceit

In *Eclogue* 10 Vergil casts the elegist Gallus into the role of the cowherd Daphnis from Theocritus *Idyll* 1. As an elegiac poet, Gallus is a natural representative of the elegiac literary tradition, but by appearing in this passage as a singing herdsman, he participates in the foundational conceit of pastoral poetry. Daphnis, moreover, is no ordinary herdsman, but rather the archetypal pastoral singer of Theocritean pastoral, who stars in *Idyll* 1 in the genre’s archetypal narrative, “The Woes of Daphnis.”

Critics since Conte have noticed the intensely metapoetic nature of this conflation of genres, and a number of sensitive readings of *Eclogue* 10 have emphasized the dialogue between elegy and pastoral that plays out through the figure of Gallus in this poem. As I argued in the previous chapter, the dialogue between pastoral and elegy is not limited to *Eclogue* 10, nor limited within *Eclogue* 10 to the figure of Gallus. This dialogue also includes the poem’s pastoral narrator—whom I will call Vergil—and it continues the interactions between pastoral and elegy that we saw before in *Ecl.* 2 and 8. As contemporary poets, Vergil and Gallus are natural representatives of their respective genres, and their pairing in *Ecl.* 10 constitutes the final, and most nearly explicit, movement in the metapoetic negotiation of generic boundaries, which I have argued is an important theme in *Ecl.* 2, 8, and 10.

---

7It is noteworthy that Elegy in *Am.* 3.1 is opposed to “rusticity,” just as Vergil presents the elegiac characters Alexis and Gallus in the *Eclogues*: Elegy says that even Venus would be “rustic” without elegy to act as her “procuress and companion”: *rustica sit sine me lascivi mater Amoris:* | *huic ego proveni lona comesque deae* (3.1.43–44). On elegiac contempt for rusticity and pastoral see below p. 104; on the metapoetic significance of rusticity see p. 143.

8See Ch. 2 n. 12 above.

9Especially good on this aspect of the poem are Conte 1986, 100–129; Perkell 1996; and Harrison 2007a, 59–74. Hubbard 1998, 127–139 also makes useful observations.
As I have already discussed, a number of details suggest that Ecl. 10 can be read as the continuation and fulfillment of the program of generic hybridization first articulated in Corydon’s song in Ecl. 2. Most specifically, Ecl. 2, 8, and 10 are united by the appearance—actual or desidered—of an elegiac/urban Daphnis in the countryside. When Corydon invited Alexis to join him for pastoral song in the woods (2.31–39), he seemed to propose that Alexis play the role of Daphnis from Idyll 6, since Corydon himself was playing Damoetas from the same poem (along with the Cyclops from Id. 11). When Alexis had not appeared by the end of the poem, Corydon, like Theocritus’s Cyclops, set himself to weaving baskets (2.71–72), and he consoled himself by looking to the future, when he would surely find another Alexis (invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin, 2.73). Whereas in Ecl. 2 Corydon hopes implicitly that Alexis will play Daphnis in the countryside, the speaker of Alphesiboeus’s song in Ecl. 8B wishes explicitly for Daphnis to come join her in the countryside: ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin (8.68, 72, etc.). And although this request comes closer to fulfillment than Corydon’s in Ecl. 2, its consummation is still put beyond the scope of the present song, which closes as the speaker thinks she hears Daphnis approaching but is still unsure (8.105–109). Both of these poems can be said to look forward within the collection to Ecl. 10, since it is in this poem that we finally encounter an urban/elegiac character (the elegist Gallus) playing Daphnis in the countryside.

Vergil and Gallus in Ecl. 10 occupy the same relative positions as Corydon and Alexis in Ecl. 2. Not only does Gallus play Daphnis for Vergil, just as Corydon seemed to hope that Alexis would do for him, but we find at the end of Ecl. 10 that the character Vergil has been weaving baskets throughout the poem (haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poëtam, | dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco, 10.70–71), just as Corydon promised to do at the end of Ecl. 2 (quin tu aliquid saltem
When Gallus appears as Daphnis in *Ecl. 10*, it is possible to see him as accepting the invitation to pastoral that Corydon extended to Alexis in *Ecl. 2* (reinforced by the speaker of *Ecl. 8B*), even though he accepts the invitation to play Daphnis on terms different from those Corydon intended. Because Vergil and Gallus, moreover, are actual contemporary poets who have generic affiliations through their poetry, their association with Corydon and Alexis strengthens the generic affiliations that these earlier characters seemed to have in *Ecl. 2* (which likewise strengthens the metapoetic gestures associated with the characters of *Ecl. 2* and 8).

In both *Eclogue 2* and *Eclogue 10*, a major theme associated with the relationship between pastoral and elegy is the anxiety expressed by a pastoral character that an elegiac character will be contemptuous of the pastoral world and pastoral singing. This elegiac disdain for the pastoral world is presented in terms of haughtiness (*fastidium*, *fastidire*) and resentment (*paenitet*) and is connected with the use of “contempt” (*fastus*, *fastidium*) in literary-critical contexts in Augustan poetry. In such contexts, these terms generally allude to the idea of a literary hierarchy, often applied specifically to genre and/or style. Because they are associated with the interaction between pastoral and elegy in the *Eclogues*, it is useful to consider these terms within the framework of genre-based literary polemics in Augustan poetry.

In *Ecl. 2*, Alexis’s haughty contempt is a central concern of Corydon’s song, just as Galatea’s contempt is the main concern of Polyphemus’s song in *Id. 11*. But since Corydon’s song focuses especially on pastoral singing, so too in *Ecl. 2* Alexis’s scorn seems to focus especially on Corydon’s pastoral songs. Alexis’s name, as I have discussed, can be etymologized as an expression of haughtiness (< οὐκ ἀλέγει, “he doesn’t care”), and when Corydon’s song glosses his name in its first line, Alexis’s

---

10See Ch. 2 n. 90 above.
contempt is connected specifically with Corydon’s pastoral songs (O crudelis Alexi, nihil mea carmina curas? 2.6). The rest of the song, moreover, continues to present the elegiac figure Alexis as considering himself too good for both the countryside and for pastoral song: in the central lines that invite Alexis to join him in pastoral singing, Corydon must ask that Alexis “not be ashamed to have worn down his lip with a reed-pipe” (mecum una in silvis imitabere Pana canendo... nec te paeniteat calamo trivisse labellum, 2.31–34). In the final line of Ecl. 2, Corydon again reiterates Alexis’s fastidium—invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin (2.73)—but when Corydon looks to the future, we can now see Vergil as foreshadowing the fulfillment of Corydon’s wish through Gallus in Ecl. 10.

The theme of haughty contempt returns when Gallus appears as an explicitly elegiac figure in Ecl. 10, although it now is associated not with pastoral song, but with its necessary prerequisite, shepherding. Whereas Alexis was an implicitly elegiac character whose contempt for pastoral was explicit, Gallus is an explicitly elegiac character whose contempt for pastoral is implicit.

stant et oves circum; nostri nec paenitet illas
nec te paeniteat pecoris, divine poeta:
et formosus ovis ad flumina pavit Adonis.

(Ecl. 10.16–18)

Gallus is urged in these lines not to be ashamed of sheep, since the sheep themselves are not ashamed of their shepherds. Although Gallus’s shame is of sheep, not of pastoral singing, it is expressed in the same terms and in the same metrical sedes as Alexis’s shame of pastoral singing in Ecl. 2 (cf. 2.34 nec te paeniteat calamo trivisse

11 Elsewhere in the poem Alexis’s haughtiness is connected not to Corydon’s singing but to his gifts (nec munera curat Alexis, | nec, si muneribus certes, concedat Iollas, 2.56–57). Because Corydon’s competition with Iollas in gift-giving, however, mirrors the elegiac competition between the poet-lover and the dives amator (2.19–20, 56–57; see p. 71 above), Corydon’s gifts can be read as symbols for poetry, which is routinely the gift of the elegiac poet-lover.
labello); Servius, moreover, saw the reference to shepherding in these lines as pertaining allegorically to the composition of pastoral poetry: *allegoricos hoc dicit: nec tu erubescas bucolica scribere* (Serv. ad loc.). In both of these poems, a pastoral speaker projects contempt for pastoral onto an elegiac character, and in both cases too, the speaker adduces a mythological exemplum to urge the elegiac character not to be ashamed of pastoral (Amphion: 2.23–24) or of herding (Adonis: 10.18). Although *Ecl.* 10 lacks the explicit focus on pastoral singing found in *Ecl.* 2, its metapoetic dimension relies instead on the fact that its main speaking character is a poet. Taken together, these two poems present a coherent picture, in which pastoral manifests an inferiority complex in relation to elegy—much as elegy itself manifests an inferiority complex to epic in poems like Prop. 1.7, 1.9, and Ovid *Am.* 2.18.

In terms of the generic literary program of the *Eclogues*, the inferiority complex we see associated with pastoral characters in *Ecl.* 2 and 10 can be seen as an ironic manifestation of pastoral’s programmatically low style. As such, these passages are comparable to the programmatic openings of *Eclogues* 1, 4, and 6, which stress the genre’s low style (*non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae*, 4.2; *Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu | nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea*, 6.1–2) and its yokel Muse (*silvestris Musa*, 1.2; *agrestis Musa*, 6.8). And since both pastoral and elegy (at least later elegy) make genre-based claims on the low, “slender” (*λεπτός, tenuis*, et al.) style advocated by Callimachus, we might even see this pastoral inferiority complex as an ironic game of one-upmanship in stylistic humility. On a metapoetic and extratextual level, moreover, the perceived haughtiness of elegy can be connected to an important literary-critical concept, as well: Augustan poets seem to have felt a keen sense of literary hierarchy, and they speak specifically of literary

---

12Berg 1974, 176 similarly connects *fastidia* at *Ecl.* 4.61 (where it is used of pregnancy) to the idea of haughtiness in the literary program of the collection.
disdain in the context of their literary and generic apologias. Horace uses the word *fastidium* in this sense two or three times.\(^{13}\) Propertius, like Vergil, talks about erotic, as well as literary, contempt, and there is reason to think that the two are linked in Propertius as they are in Vergil: when Propertius tells us in 1.1 that his own erotic *fastus* was overcome by love for Cynthia (*tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus* | *et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*, 1.1.3–4), he may be foreshadowing his polemical letter in 1.7 to the epic poet Ponticus, in which he predicts that love of a woman will someday overcome the epicist’s literary *fastus* for writing elegiac love poetry (*tu cave nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu: | saepe venit magno faenore tardus Amor*, 1.7.25–26).\(^{14}\) When Vergil talks about erotic contempt in *Ecl.* 2 and 10, he too seems to allude to a literary hierarchy between his own genre and that of his addressee, but whereas Propertius addresses his comments to the author of a genre grander than his own—epic—Vergil rather ironically invokes the idea of literary haughtiness in characterizing the relationship between two equally humble genres—pastoral and elegy.

It may be that Vergil and Propertius are both alluding to some Gallan passage that used words like *fastus*, *fastidium*, and *paenitet* to describe the generic relationship between elegy and epic.\(^{15}\) Although we do not know for certain that they are making such an allusion, we do know that the idea of worthiness and superiority featured in

---

\(^{13}\)Horace refers to *fastidium* twice in *Ep* 2.1: once of the contempt that modern Romans feel for modern Roman poetry (*nisi quae terris semota suisque | temporibus defuncta videt, fastidit et odit*, *Epist.* 2.1.21–22), and a second time of the disdainful incredulity of theater-goers (*verum age et his, qui se lectori credere malunt | quam spectatoris fastidia ferre superbi*, *Epist.* 2.1.214–215). The word occurs again in the preface to *Sat.* 1.10 (which is probably an early interpolation), where it refers to the sense of stylistic superiority felt by modern poets over the older, unrefined poets like Lucilius (*ut esset opem qui ferre poetis | antiquis posset contra fastidia nostra*, *Sat.* 1.10.[6–7]).

\(^{14}\)This claim is supported by the suggestions of Harrison 2007a, 65 and Keith 1999, 56 that the opening of Prop. 1.1 can be read metapoetically as referring also to the composition of love poetry.

\(^{15}\)Such a passage, if it existed, would also be the model for Ov. *Am.* 2.18, which has a structure very similar to that of Prop. 1.7.
Gallus’s poetry in a somewhat different way. Gallus’s Lycoris—a _docta puella_ like Propertius’s Cynthia—was evidently discerning about the poetry that Gallus wrote for her: we see this in lines 6–7 of the Qaṣr Ibrim fragment, where Gallus expresses relief that he has finally composed something “worthy of my mistress”: . . . _tañdem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae | quaे possem domina deicere digna mea_ (FRP 145.6–7).\(^{16}\) Vergil seems to allude to this passage in the opening lines that frame Gallus’s song in _Eclogue_ 10 ( _pauca meo Gallo, sed quae legat ipsa Lycoris, | carmina sunt dicenda_ , 2–3), and it is attractive to suppose that, when he deploys the theme of haughtiness in the _Eclogues_ in connection with the opposition between pastoral and elegiac poetry, Vergil is responding to Gallus’s apparent position that only Gallan love elegies were worthy of his mistress Lycoris.\(^{17}\)

Regardless of the literary background, it is not without reason that the pastoral characters of _Ecl._ 2 and 10 fear that the elegiac characters will disdain their genre. Although Gallus in _Ecl._ 10 appears in a pastoral poem playing the archetypal pastoral singer Daphnis, he nevertheless rejects one of the fundamental premises of pastoral poetry, namely that love poetry can console the suffering of love, as Corydon’s song consoled his love for Alexis in _Ecl._ 2.\(^{18}\) Although Gallus does not explicitly reject pastoral consolation until the last part of his song ( _tamquam haec sit nostri medicina furoris, | aut deus ille malis hominum mitescere discat_ , 10.60–61), this attitude

\(^{16}\)Cf. Hollis ad loc.: “The poems are ‘worthy of Lycoris’ perhaps not only because of her beauty but also because she was a discriminating critic (cf. _Ecl._ 10.2 ‘quae legat ipsa Lycoris’), like Propertius’ Cynthia (2.13.12 ‘auribus et puris scripta probasse mea’).”

\(^{17}\)Hinds 1983 considers the use of the phrase _carmina digna_ in Augustan poetry and concludes that, while it is something of a commonplace, a number of passages, including _Ecl._ 10.2–3, can probably be linked with Gallus. Other examples Hinds cites from the _Eclogues_ include 4.3, 8.9–10, and 9.35. To this list I might add other instances of _dignus_ and _indignus_ throughout the _Eclogues_, but especially Vergil’s programmatic statement in _Ecl._ 6.1–2 that his Muse first deigned to write Theocritean verse and did not blush to live in the woods ( _prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu | nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea_ ).

\(^{18}\)On pastoral and consolation see Ch. 2 p. 58.
is characteristic of his attitude throughout the poem, especially when he expresses his “preference for suffering” in lines 52–53 (certum est... malle pati...). In fact, nowhere in his own speech does Gallus even portray himself as a Daphnis figure—this characterization is limited to the narrative spoken by the pastoral narrator in lines 9–30.19

Although Gallus does not characterize himself as a Daphnis figure, he nevertheless seems to exert significant influence over his portrayal as Daphnis in Ecl. 10, and can even be said, in a sense, to have hijacked for elegy the pastoral plot line that aimed to see an elegiac character playing Daphnis in the countryside. When Corydon in Ecl. 2 cited Damoetas as his own textual model, he seemed to invite the elegiac Alexis to play Daphnis in a reenactment of Theocritus Idyll 6, a poem that presents Daphnis and Damoetas as a paradigm of happy pastoral love. When Gallus in Ecl. 10, however, accepts what seems to be a standing invitation for an elegiac character to play Daphnis in the pastoral world, he chooses instead to play the paradigmatically unhappy lover from Idyll 1. As an elegiac love poet, Gallus has a generically-motivated preference for erotic suffering (certum est... malle pati, 10.52–53), and he seems to have exercised this preference in choosing the nearly-elegiac Daphnis of Id. 1 over the more tranquil figure of Id. 6.20 Vergil’s Gallus, in accepting Daphnis as a literary

19See the correspondence tables at Posch 1969, 22, which cite only one reference to Theoc. Id. 1 over the course of Gallus’s speech (Ecl. 10-31–69). The single correspondence Posch cites (Ecl. 10.69 omnia vincit amor: et nos cedamus Amori ≈ Theoc. 1.98 ἦ ἄρα ὁ διὸς Ἁρώτος ἔρρητας Εὐρωπὸς ἄν’ ἀργαλέω ἐλευθέρος) is not especially close and is not mentioned by Coleman or Clausen in their commentaries ad loc.

20If Mopsus represents Gallan elegy in Ecl. 5 (see above Ch. 2 n. 107), it may be significant that his song is the first mention of Daphnis in the Eclologiaes with particular reference to his erotic suffering and death (crudeli funere, 5.20, is used by Vergil only of death tied to passionate love: cf. Geo. 3.263, Aen. 4.308); the song of Menalcas, although it attends to the apotheosis of Daphnis, says nothing of his connection with erotic suffering. In fact, despite the apparently paradigmatic status of “The Woes of Daphnis” in Theocritus (see Hunter 1999 on Id. 1.19, cited at Ch. 2, n. 12), it is only Mopsus’s song in Ecl. 5 and Alphesiboeus’s song in Ecl. 8, besides Ecl. 10, that connects Daphnis at all with his well-known suffering and death.
model, engages in tendentious literary allusion from within Vergil’s Tenth Eclogue, just as Vergil and other Augustan poets engage routinely in tendentious allusion to their own literary models.\(^{21}\) As Christine Perkell points out, Gallus even changes (we might say rewrites) one of the most important aspects of the Daphnis narrative from Idyll 1, since he does not, as Daphnis did, resist love to the death.\(^{22}\) Thus when Gallus admits defeat at the hands of love (omnia vinct Amor: et nos cedamus Amori, 10.69), we can see this too as an effort on Gallus’s part to make more elegiac the pastoral role proposed by Corydon in Ecl. 2.

When Gallus in Ecl. 10 speaks in propria persona, he persistently rejects the idea that pastoral love poetry can console his erotic suffering. From the very beginning of his song, Gallus defends his voluntary decision to suffer on account of his unrequited love for Lycoris. Both Apollo and Pan appear to ask Gallus why he insists on suffering, pointing out that Lycoris has taken up with another man (venit Apollo: | “Galle, quid insanis?” inquit. “tua cura Lycoris | perque nives alium perque horrida castra secuta est,” 21–23), and that his lamentation will do nothing to change Love (Pan deus Arcadiae venit... “ecquis erit modus?” inquit. “Amor non talia curat, | nec lacrimis crudelis Amor nec gramina rivis | nec cytiso saturantur apes nec fronde capellae,” 26–30). Gallus, however, rebuts them both. The first word of his introduction is “sad” (tristis at ille... , 31), which Harrison points out is fitting for a pastoral poet,\(^{23}\) and throughout his subsequent speech Gallus defends his prerogative to this sadness. In reply to Pan’s remark about Love’s insatiability, Gallus asserts that,

\(^{21}\)On tendentious allusion and tendentious versions of literary history see Hinds 1998, 99–144.

\(^{22}\)See Perkell 1996, 129–131, who sees the allusion to Daphnis in Ecl. 10 as ironic. See also Torlone 2002, who argues that Vergil shifts the Theocritean emphasis on Daphnis as a metonymy for the pastoral world to Daphnis as a sufferer for love.

\(^{23}\)Harrison 2007a, 66, who cites Pichon 1902, 283–284. Tristis is also the first extant word in the New Gallus, where sadness seems to be occasioned by Lycoris’s misdeeds: tristia nequit[ia]... Lycori tua, FRP 151.2.
“nevertheless, you Arcadians will sing these things to your mountains” \textit{(… “tamen cantabitis, Arcades,” inquit | “montibus haec vestris,” 31–32).} As the subsequent lines make clear, “these things” \textit{(haec, 32)} are Gallus’s \textit{amores (vestra meos olim si fistula dicat amores, 34)}, which the narrator has prominently characterized as “troubled” \textit{(sollicitos Galli dicamus amores, 6).} Far, then, from relinquishing his own erotic lament \textit{(querela)}, Gallus seems instead to assert that the Arcadians will sing the same erotic lament that he does.

It is significant that Gallus’s speech is introduced as a response to Pan, whereas the analogous encounter in \textit{Idyll} 1 is between Daphnis and Aphrodite \textit{(95–141).} In fact, if we read Gallus’s whole speech as a response to Pan, as Daphnis’s speech in Theoc. 1 is a response to Aphrodite, we find that Gallus here too defends his erotic lamentations by tendentiously alluding to \textit{Ecl.} 2. When Corydon in that poem invited Alexis to pastoral song, he said that Alexis would “imitate Pan by singing,” since Pan was the inventor of pastoral song, and Pan cared both for sheep and for their shepherds \textit{(mecum in silvis imitabere Pana canendo | (Pan primum calamos cera coniungere pluris | instituit, Pan curat ovis oviumque magistros), Ecl. 2.31–34).} Damon’s song in \textit{Ecl.} 8 cited Pan again as the inventor of pastoral, but tied the god specifically to the lamentation of unhappy love: the speaker argued that erotic lament was a natural

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Although Servius takes these lines to mean that Gallus will find solace in the fact that the Arcadians will sing about his unhappy love \textit{(licet ego duro amore consumar, tamen erit solacium, quia meus amor erit vestra cantilena quandoque)}, this interpretation is inconsistent with the lines that follow, in which Gallus more than once explicitly rejects the idea of consolation \textit{(52–53, 60–61).} It seems to me better to follow the alternate reading mentioned by Servius and connect \textit{tamen} with what Pan has just said above \textit{(alii “tamen” superioribus iungunt)}, making Gallus’s lines a response to Pan’s rebuke.
\item Although it would seem at first glance that the speech of Apollo in \textit{Ecl.} 10 \textit{(21–23)} would be analogous to that of Hermes in \textit{Id.} 1 \textit{(77–78)} and that of Pan \textit{(Ecl.} 10.26–30) to that of Priapus \textit{(Id.} 1.81–93), it is instead Apollo’s speech in \textit{Ecl.} 10 that alludes to the speech of Priapus in \textit{Id.} 1, while that of Pan has no major allusions to \textit{Id.} 1: see Clausen ad \textit{Ecl.} 10.21–23, and the correspondence tables of Posch 1969, 22.
\item There may be sexual overtones when Corydon says that Pan cares for shepherds, since Corydon hopes not only that Alexis will join him in singing, but also that he will be his lover.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
part of pastoral, since Pan had invented the pipes to lament his unhappy love for the nymph Syrinx (see p. 86 above).

\[
\text{incipe Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus.}
\]

\[
\text{Maenalus argutumque nemus pinusque loquentis semper habet, semper pastorum ille audit amores Panaque, qui primus calamos non passsus inertis.}
\]

\[(Ecl. 8.21–24)\]

Damon’s song of erotic lament is here referred to as “Maenalan verse” because Mt. Maenalus in Arcadia has always heard the *amores pastorum*—by which the speaker refers to erotic laments like Pan’s and his own. These laments, sung to Arcadian mountains like Maenalus, are what Gallus seems to refer to in *Ecl. 10*, when he says to the Arcadians, “you will sing these things to your mountains” (31–32). It seems that when Pan rebukes Gallus for his disconsolate suffering, Gallus reminds the god that, ever since Pan himself invited pastoral music, it has consisted of songs of unhappy love sung to the empty countryside. The elegiac song of Acontius was such a lament, but so too were the pastoral songs of Polyphemus in *Id. 11*, Corydon in *Ecl. 2*, and even the song of Pan himself mentioned in *Ecl. 8*.28

In the lines that follow, Gallus proceeds to fantasize about a life of pastoral tranquility, in which he would have a pastoral occupation (35–36) and be happy either with a pastoral love interest (37–41) or with Lycoris in the pastoral world (42–43). Gallus’s pastoral fantasy, however, is based on an explicitly counterfactual premise, which he prefaces by saying that only Arcadians can sing songs of pastoral consolation.

---

27 Breed 2007, 121 also compares *Ecl. 8.21–24* to 10.31–34, noting that both offer alternative aetiologies for pastoral. At 121 n. 9 Breed cites arguments that these passages signal Vergil’s allegiance to a theory that pastoral originated before Theocritus in Arcadia. We might instead say that Gallus signals *his* own allegiance to such a theory.

28 Compare Servius’s remark on Pan’s rebuke to Gallus: *AMOR NON TALIA CURAT*: *quasi expertus in Syringa loquitur* (*in Syringa* is added by DServ.).
In these lines Gallus’s consolation is presented as possible, although conditional not on his own singing, but on that of the Arcadians. The lines that follow this conditional premise, however, are presented as a mixed-tense counterfactual.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{atque utinam ex vobis unus vestrique fuissem} \\
&\text{aut custos gregis aut maturae vinitor uvae!} \\
&\text{certe sive mihi Phyllis sive esset Amyntas} \\
&\text{seu quicumque furor (quid tum, si fuscus Amyntas?} \\
&\text{et nigrae violae sunt et vaccinia nigra),} \\
&\text{mecum inter salices lenta sub vite iaceret;} \\
&\text{serta mihi Phyllis legeret, cantaret Amyntas.} \\
&\text{hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata, Lycoris,} \\
&\text{hic nemus; hic ipso tecum\textbf{ consumerer} aevo.}
\end{align*}
\]

\((Ecl. 10.35–43)\)

In these lines Gallus’s happiness is dependent on the doubly impossible wish that Gallus not only be an Arcadian, but that he \emph{have been} one in the past.

Gallus’s alienation can be explained partly in terms of genre, meter, and the foregone conclusion that comes along with staging a literary debate with a poet whose generic program is already publicly known. One way of explaining Gallus’s use of tenses in lines 35–43, as well as throughout the rest of his song, is by noting that Augustan poets tend to use the past tense to look back at poetry that they are finishing or have written, and that they use the future tense to look forward to their reception and poetic immortality.\(^{29}\) By this grammatical logic, Gallus can be seen as

\(^{29}\)Compare Hor. \textit{Odes} 3.30, which looks back on the collection he has just completed (\emph{exegi monumentum}, 1) and forward to the immortality that it will ensure (\emph{non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei | vitabit Libitinam}, 6–7; \emph{crescam}, 8; \emph{scandet}, 9; \emph{dicar}, 10). Cf. also Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.15, in which Ovid uses the future tense to talk not only about his own poetic immortality (\emph{canar}, 8; \emph{legar}, 38; \emph{vivam}, \emph{parsque mei multa superstes erit}, 42), but about poetic immortality generally (\emph{carmina morte carent}, \textit{Libitinam}, 6–7; \emph{crescam}, 8; \emph{scandet}, 9; \emph{dicar}, 10). Cf. also Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.15, in which Ovid uses the future tense to talk not only about his own poetic immortality (\emph{canar}, 8; \emph{legar}, 38; \emph{vivam}, \emph{parsque mei multa superstes erit}, 42), but about poetic immortality generally (\emph{carmina morte carent},
looking back on his own poetic career and commenting on the immortality that he is currently enjoying through his reception by Vergil in Ecl. 10. If Gallus had been a pastoral character in his own poetry (atque utinam ex vobis unus... fuissem, 36), then he would currently be enjoying a literary immortality of the sort that he describes in the present-counterfactual statement (37–43) that follows his past-counterfactual wish (35–36). By virtue of his elegiac genre, however, Gallus’s love affair (amores) with Lycoris was necessarily “troubled” (Verg. Ecl. 10.6, sollicitos Galli dicamus amores), and through his love poetry (amores), he now enjoys troubled elegiac love as his poetic immortality.30 It is only through the fiction of Eclogue 10, in which Gallus exists as the composition of the pastoral narrator, that the elegist is able to speak in pastoral hexameters, and even here his diction is elegiac,31 just as in Amores 3.1 Ovid’s Tragedy speaks in grand diction and style despite the poem’s humble elegiac meter. Vergil’s Gallus must resist attempts to pastoralize him in Ecl. 10 because he cannot be otherwise than Gallus’s self-presentation in his elegies.

After indulging in the counterfactual pastoral fantasy of lines 35–43, Gallus explains that such a condition is impossible because of the hold that “mad love” has on him: nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis | tela inter media atque adversos

30On amores see above p. 64; on the metapoetic resonance of amores here and elsewhere in Ecl. 10 see Hollis ad FRP 141; Harrison 2007a, 66; Breed 2007, 130–131; Conte 1986, 108; Kennedy 1982, 377–378; Ross 1975, 73.

31Consider Ecl. 10.33, o mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant, where Clausen points out that the term molliter is fitting for the author of “soft” elegiac verse (cf. Prop. 1.7.19, 2.1.2, Ov. Trist. 2.349, Ex Pont. 3.4.85, and cf. Harrison 2007a, 66). Clausen also cites Barchiesi 1981b, 162–163 as showing similarities between the language of the new Gallus and that of Ovid. I would add that Gallus’s mention of “tender feet” (teneras... plantas) at Ecl. 10.49 is also specifically elegiac (see n. 120 below).
detinet hostis (44–45). The interpretation of this ambiguous line has been controversial since antiquity, because it is not clear whether the genitive duri Martis depends on amor (“love of hard Mars”) or on armis (“in the arms of hard Mars”). On either reading, Gallus can be said in these lines to demur from pastoral because of conflicting obligations to a different genre. If duri Martis is construed with armis, we can see Gallus presenting himself as both a lover and a soldier: “now insane Love detains me in the arms of hard Mars…” Outside of Ecl. 10, the historical Gallus was in fact a soldier, and in a literal, historicizing reading of these lines Gallus seems at first to suggest that his military service is somehow related to his love for Lycoris, and that it is on this account that he cannot enjoy the pastoral life on offer in Ecl. 10. On a metapoetic reading of these lines, however, Gallus’s mention of military service may allude to the metaphorical militia amoris familiar from later elegy, and as Harrison has recently argued, insanus amor in these lines may be seen as a personification (insanus Amor; cf. saevus Amor, 8.47) and as a symbolic representation of the elegiac genre.

On this reading, Gallus cannot enjoy a pastoral life, even in Ecl. 10, because he is programmatically committed to elegy and to unhappy elegiac love.

On the other hand, if duri Martis is construed with amor instead of armis, Gallus presents himself not as a lover, but only a soldier: “now an insane love of hard Mars detains me in arms…” According to this interpretation Gallus’s military service keeps him from enjoying the pastoral life described in lines 35–43 and, as we learn in lines 46–49, from pursuing Lycoris as she goes north with a different soldier.

tu procul a patria (nec sit mihi credere tantum)
Alpinas, a! dura nives et frigora Rheni
me sine sola vides. a, te ne frigora laedant!
a, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!

---

32 See Coleman and Clausen ad loc.
33 See Harrison 2007a, 66–67, and cf. Ch. 2, p. 64 above.
In his comment on lines 44–45, Coleman rightly points out that on either reading of
*duri Martis*, a literal interpretation that stresses Gallus’s soldiering takes away much
of the point from his lament that Lycoris is going north with a soldier. Coleman takes
this argument as support for reading *duri Martis* with *armis* (“insane love detains me
in the arms of hard Mars...”) as a reference to the *militia amoris* of elegy, but there
is still one more way to read these lines, in which *Mars* and *arma* are metaphorical
but *duri Martis* still depends on *amor* (“insane love of hard Mars detains me in
arms”). Two years before the discovery of the New Gallus, Berg made the interesting
suggestion that *Lycoris* in these lines can be read as the title of a book of Gallan
elegies—just as *Cynthia* seems to have been one title of Propertius’s *Monobiblos*34—and
that by imagining Lycoris as wandering the earth with a soldier, Gallus uses an
erotic conceit to talk about the publication of his elegies, playing on the fact that
soldiers were known to take erotic literature with them on campaign.35 If Berg is right,
then we might see Vergil’s Gallus as alluding here to a possible Gallan *recusatio*, a
device that, as some scholars have argued, Gallus may have introduced into Latin
literature (and might even be seen in the fragmentary New Gallus papyrus).36 If
Gallus in his elegies recused himself from panegyric military epic on the grounds
that he would write such a poem after finishing his current project—as Propertius
does in 2.10 and Vergil probably does in the proem to *Geo.* 3—then, by the logic of

---


35 See Berg 1974, 188, who further notes that, if *Ecl.* 10 were read in this way, so too Prop. 1.8a and
Ov. *Am.* 2.11 (both similar propempticons) could be. As evidence of soldiers having erotic literature
Berg cites only Plut. *Cras.* 32, but two years after Berg made his suggestion, archaeologists discovered
the New Gallus fragment at a military outpost at Qasr Ibrim, Egypt; were it not for the popularity
of Skutsch’s theory that Gallus titled his elegies *Amores*, this discovery might have been seen as
support for Berg’s hypothesis.

36 See above Ch. 2 p. 61.
literary allusion, Vergil’s character Gallus would be writing such a poem in the literary present \( (nunc, \text{Ecl.}~10.44) \), after the publication of his elegiac \textit{Lycoris}.\footnote{Cf. esp. Prop. 2.10.8, \textit{bella canam, quando scripta puella mea est.}} It does not matter whether Gallus ever undertook such a project,\footnote{Compare the similar claim of Innes 1979 that Augustan poets who claim to be planning either to write a gigantomachic poem or to study philosophy are only using these sublime themes as foils for their more humble current projects.} only that he represented himself as intending to do so. In this case, the adjective \textit{durus} would have the same stylistic reference to epic that it has throughout Augustan poetry, and \textit{armis} could be understood as a metonym for martial epic, as it is, e.g., in the first word of Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.1 \( \text{(arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam)} \), where it alludes to the first word of the \textit{Aeneid}.\footnote{On \textit{durus} and \textit{mollis} as stylistic adjectives referring to the qualities of epic and elegy, respectively, see Rothstein 1920–1924 and Fedeli 1980 ad Prop. 1.7.19, Hinds 1987, 21–24, esp. n. 48, and Cairns 1984, who suggests that Gallus introduced this programmatic opposition (based, he argues, on an etymological connection between \textit{militia} and \textit{mollitia}), which becomes a leitmotif in Augustan literature; on the stylistic connotations of \textit{durus} independent of genre, see Ernesti 1797 s.v. and Freudenburg 1993, 150–162 on Hor. \textit{Sat.} 1.4.7–10. On \textit{arma} in \textit{Am.} 1.1 see McKeown ad Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.1.1; on \textit{arma} in the \textit{Fasti} see Hinds 1992a and Hinds 1992b.} On either reading of \textit{duri Martis}—both of which Vergil may have intended—Gallus’s current activity, and his inability to embrace pastoral poetry/life, are based on his own generic self-representation in his elegiac love poetry.

Gallus’s lament in lines 46–49 marks the end of his counterfactual fantasy, and in lines 50–51 he finally reports definite plans about the future.

\begin{verbatim}
ibó et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita versu
carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena.
\end{verbatim}

\( (\text{Ecl.}~10.50–51) \)

Scholars have persistently turned to these lines to determine what kind of verse Gallus wrote, and in what way it combined “Chalcidic” (probably Euphorionic) verse with the music of the “Sicilian shepherd’s pipe,” i.e. pastoral. Do these lines dramatize Gallus’s conversion, as Conte argued, from elegy to pastoral, or do they show, as
Ross argued (following Skutsch), that Gallus wrote pastoral-elegiac poetry? The best reading of these lines may be that of Brian Breed, who argues that Gallus’s words here are probably best understood as referring to the song that he sings within Ecl. 10, a song that, as most scholars agree, almost certainly alludes heavily to Gallus’s own poetry. For present purposes, the precise meaning of Chalcidico versu—a vexed scholarly question—is of no consequence. If Gallus’s song in Ecl. 10 is truly fully of Gallan allusions, then Gallus, as he speaks, is playing poems that he has already written (quae sunt mihi condita... carmina) on “the Sicilian shepherd’s pipe,” i.e. in pastoral. The future tense in these lines is another glance toward poetic immortality, where, thanks to Eclogue 10, Gallus’s elegiac love poetry (sollicitos amores) will live on in the hexameter as well as the elegiac literary tradition. There is, however, no ideological conversion here: Gallus remains committed to elegiac love and elegiac conventions, as the lines that follow show.

Although Gallus is part of the pastoral world of Ecl. 10, he nevertheless in lines 52–54 refuses the idea of pastoral consolation, saying that “it is decided for me to prefer to suffer in the woods and carve my amores on tender trees.”

certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati ternisque meos incidere amores
arboribus: crescent illae, crescentis, amores.

40 Conte 1986, 114; Ross 1975, 88–89.

41 Breed 2007, 129–133. On the extent of Vergilian allusion to Gallus in Ecl. 10 see Ch. 2 n. 28 above.

42 It is striking that Gallus, whom later figures regard as the founder of Roman love elegy, here uses condere, which can also mean “found,” as a technical term for poetic composition; for parallels in this sense see TLL s.v. condos 4.153.74–4.154.29 (of prose as well as poetry). On cross-metrical allusion see Clausen ad Ecl. 3.49, where Vergil translates the phrase numquam hodie effugies from a senarius of Naevius’s Equus Troianus (numquam hodie effugies quin mea moriaris manu, 13 R3); a similar importation is found at Geo. 2.401–402, which adapts a line of Varius Rufus (FRP 157.4–5). Yardley 1980 argues that Ecl. 10 consists of such cross-metrical allusions to Gallan elegy and quotes a lengthy adaptation from the iambic senarii of Terence’s Eunuchus at Hor. Sat. 2.3.259–71. Cf. also the tongue-in-cheek remarks of Ovid’s Elegia at Am. 3.1.37–38 (imparibus tamen es numeris dignata moveri; | in me pugnasti versibus usa meis).
This is a complex passage that I will discuss again in the next section (see p. 152). Although *certum est* is sometimes translated as “I have decided,” vel sim., the impersonal form can also be translated as “it is decided,” or almost even as something like “I have no choice but to...,” which can be seen as pointing again to the literary-historical teleology of this whole passage. Because suffering is the very essence of elegiac love, the phrase *malle pati* can easily be read as expressing Gallus’s generic preference for love poetry and its concomitant suffering. And by carving his *amores* onto trees, Gallus makes himself an Acontius figure, choosing to participate in the narrative that, as I have argued, Vergil uses in the *Eclogues* to represent the genre of love elegy. It was the narrator, in lines 9–30, who cast Gallus as the archetypical pastoral figure, Daphnis; Gallus instead casts himself as the archetypical elegiac figure, Acontius. The fact that Gallus will prefer to suffer “in the woods” can be understood in a number of ways. On one level, this detail belongs to the elegiac Acontius metanarrative, since it was in the woods that Acontius lamented his love for Cydippe and carved her name on trees. On another level, forests in the *Eclogues* are symbolic of Vergilian pastoral, so that this setting (*in silvis*, 52) can be seen as another way that Gallus expresses the hybridization of elegy and pastoral in his song, such a reading is especially attractive because Gallus says he will carve his *amores* (“loves” as well as “love poems”) on the trees. Now not only will Gallus’s elegies be a part of literary history (*certum est*. . . , 52), but so will the pastoral elegy of *Ecl*. 10.

While Gallus is a character in Vergil’s pastoral, he will observe pastoral decorum

---

43 *Certum est* is perfectly normal Latin idiom for expressing a decision (*OLD* 2b), but the word is also used of things that are either immutable (*OLD* 1) or indisputable (*OLD* 4, 5).

44 On *silvae* as symbolic of Vergilian pastoral (as well as its characteristically allusive style) see below p. 137.

by engaging in pastoral activities like hunting, which pastoral seems to conceive of as consolation for erotic suffering.\(^{46}\)

\[
\text{interea mixtis lustrabo Maenala Nymphis aut acris venabor apros. non me ulla vetabunt frigora}^{47} \text{ iam mihi per ruopes videor lucosque sonantis ire, libet Partho torquere Cydonia cornu spicula...}
\]

\((\text{Ecl. 10.55–60})\)

Gallus seems willing to play along for the duration of Eclogue 10 (\textit{interea}...), but in the last two lines of this passage he breaks off his previous thought and specifically rejects the premise that pastoral activities like hunting can offer a remedy for his love.

\[
\ldots—\text{tamquam haec sit nostri medicina furoris aut deus ille malis hominum mitescere discat.}
\]

\((\text{Ecl. 10.60–61})\)

Ross and others have seen Gallus’s phrasing here (\textit{medicina furoris}) as indicative of an allusion to Gallan poetry in these lines,\(^{48}\) but this phrase also looks to the specific

\(^{46}\)On hunting here as part of pastoral consolation see Conte 1986, 114-123; for an argument that these lines derive from a Gallan treatment of the story of Milanion and Atalanta (traces of which are visible in Prop. 1.1), see Ross 1975, 90–91.

\(^{47}\)If Gallus avoided hexameter poetry for stylistic as well as erotic reasons, one might see special stylistic point in Gallus’s repeated references to cold, and especially \textit{frigora}, in the second half of his speech: \textit{Alpinas, a! dura nives et frigora Rhenis | me sine sola vides. a, te ne frigora laedant! a, tibi ne glacies secet aspera plantas!} 47–49; \textit{non me ulla vetabunt | frigora Parthenios canibus circumdare saltus, 56–57. The stylistic vice of “frigidity” (\textit{frigidum, τὸ ψυχρόν}) consists, according to Theophrastus, of “that which transcends expression appropriate to the thought” (\textit{ὁρίζεται δὲ τὸ ψυχρὸν Θεόφραστος οὕτως ψυχρόν ἐστι τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τὴν οἰκείαν ἀπαγγελίαν, Demetr. Eloc. 114). The Roman elegists routinely confess their inability to write in the grand style of hexameter epic because of the insufficient grandness of their inspiration (love): it seems that, to the elegists, writing about love in hexameter \textit{epos} constitutes the very essence of frigidity. References to \textit{frigora} in Gallus’s speech in Ecl. 10 may allude to stylistic motives in Gallus’s own \textit{recusatio} from hexameter poetry; the character Gallus’s dismissal of \textit{frigora} as a worry (56–57) may indicate that he is satisfied that the style of specifically bucolic hexameter is appropriately low to allow it to treat the topic of love without frigidity. On \textit{frigidum/τὸ ψυχρόν} see Van Hook 1917; on literary play with the idea of frigidity see Williams 1987–1988 on Catullus 45, Freudenburg 1993, 191–192 on Horace \textit{Satires} 1.1.80–83, and Freudenburg 1991, 195 n. 18 on \textit{Satires} 2.5.39–41.

wording of Theoc. *Id.* 11.1–3, which programmatically introduces the idea of poetry as a *φάρµακον* for love.\(^{49}\) Since Vergil used Polyphemus from *Id.* 11 as the model of consolable love for Corydon in *Ecl.* 2, Gallus’s rejection of consolation, in these very same terms, must be seen as programmatically significant in the scheme of the *Eclogue* book.\(^{50}\)

As an elegist, Gallus knows Amor to be an implacable god, who does not soften on account of human suffering (*aut deus ille malis hominum mitescere discat*, 61), and who cannot be changed by any human *labores*.

\[
\text{non illum nostri possunt mutare labores,}
\]
\[
\text{nec si frigoribus mediis Hebrumque bibamus}
\]
\[
\text{Sithoniasque nives hiemis subeamus aquosae,}
\]
\[
\text{nec si, cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo,}
\]
\[
\text{Aethiopum versamus ovis sub sidere Cancri.}
\]
\[
\text{omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori.}
\]

(*Ecl.* 10.64–69)

As I argued in Chapter 1, the word *labor* has important metapoetic connotations in the *Georgics*, which are based at least partly on Vergil’s use of it in *Eclogue* 10. Vergil uses *labor* explicitly as a metaphor for poetry at *Ecl.* 10.1 (*extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem*), and although Gallus uses the word here to mean “sufferings,”\(^{51}\) it is also possible to see in this passage as an implicit metapoetic reference to poetic *labores*. Such a reading is entirely coherent with the one I have proposed for *Eclogue*.

\(^{49}\)See above p. 58.

\(^{50}\)Rosen and Farrell 1986 argue that the terms *Maenalus, Parthenius, Cydonius*, and *Parthus* in these lines point to a Gallan version of the story of Milanion, which served as one model for this passage in *Ecl.* 10, Prop. 1.1.9–16, and *Ov. Ars* 2.185–196.

\(^{51}\)In the context of love, *labores* refers to love’s sufferings: cf. ad Prop. 1.16.23 Enk 1946 and Fedeli 1980, as well as Nisbet and Hubbard 1970 ad Hor. c. 1.17.19. Such references in elegy probably also carry a metapoetic allusion to poetry, since as Conte says of Gallus specifically, the elegist’s sufferings are his poems (Conte 1986, 108; cf. James 2003, 108–152 on the *querela*). Ovid uses *labor* of poetry at *Am.* 3.1.68, and Tibullus uses it with allusive reference to the hard work of poetry at *Tib.* 1.1.3 (cf. Maltby ad loc.).
10 so far: Gallus rejects the pastoral premise that poetry \((\text{labores})\) is able, under even the most extreme circumstances, to have any effect on \(\text{Amor}\) (here the god as well as the feeling).

The particular \(\text{labores}\) that Gallus cites deserve comment, because they further indicate that Gallus’s rejection of consolation is aimed specifically at pastoral poetry, as well as at the pastoral world generally. Gallus says that his sufferings could not change Love, even if he were to go north to Thrace and drink from the Hebrus in the winter, or to go south to Ethiopia and pasture sheep in the summer. He is alluding here specifically to Theoc. \textit{Id.} 7, where these sufferings are among those that Simichidas wishes on Pan if the god does not help Simichidas’s friend Aratus in his love affair.\(^52\)

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
εἰς δὲ Ἡδωνῶν μὲν ἐν ὤρεσι χείματι μέσσῳ
"Εβρον πάρ ποταμὸν τετραμμένος ἐγγύθεν Ἀρκτω,
ἐν δὲ θέρει πυμάτοισι παρ’ Ἀθηνόπεσσι νομεύοις
πέτρα ὑπὸ Βλεμύων, ὅθεν οὐκέτι Νεῖοτα ρατός.
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

(Theoc. 7.111–114)

This is an especially relevant note for Gallus to close on if, as I suggested above, Gallus’s song can be understood as his response to Pan’s rebuke in lines 26–30. In the metapoetic context I have outlined, this very specific allusion to Pan’s erotic torments can be understood as an allusion to the \textit{Eclogue} book’s repeated aetiological connection between pastoral song and Pan. Whereas Corydon in \textit{Ecl.} 2 simply referred to pastoral singing when he invited Alexis to “imitate Pan,” Damon’s song in \textit{Ecl.} 8 turned this reference into a tendentiously erotic aetiology for pastoral. By ascribing to Pan the erotic sufferings wished on the god by Simichidas in Theoc. 7, Gallus

\(^{52}\)Cf. Clausen ad \textit{Ecl.} 10.65–68. Hunter 1999 ad Theoc. 7.109–114 points out that, “the torments with which Pan is threatened are a wildly exaggerated version of the sufferings of the lover who endures sleepless nights of cold outside the beloved’s door (122–4) and emotional anguish on a par with ‘sleeping on nettles’…”
seems to say specifically that, even by “imitating Pan” through pastoral song, he cannot hope to change Love (non illum nostri possunt mutare labores, 10.64); this claim corresponds to Corydon’s invitation in Ecl. 2, even though Gallus has again changed what it means to “imitate Pan,” just as Damon had done in Ecl. 8. “Love,” Gallus concludes, “conquers all”—including Pan in Idyll 7—and there is no point in Gallus resisting him now.53

3.1.2 The Pastoral Narrator and the Elegiac Conceit

So far we have found in the main part of Ecl. 10 (9–69) that Vergil’s program of generic hybridization is accomplished by bringing an elegiac character into the pastoral world and involving him in pastoral’s foundational conceit, the fiction of singing shepherds. We will find in this section that the same process is also at work in the poem’s narrative frame (1–8, 70–77), although here the pastoral narrator has cast himself into the foundational conceit of elegy, in which he plays the hapless poet-lover and Gallus plays his unattainable beloved. This conceit, moreover, can be seen as at least partly responsible for the impression that Vergil himself is the narrator of Ecl. 10, since elegiac convention identifies the narrating poet-lover with the historical author.

Just as Gallus in Ecl. 10 is presented as participating in pastoral by playing the pastoral role of Daphnis, so too the narrator is presented as participating in elegy by playing an elegiac role. But whereas the story of Acontius represented elegy in Ecl. 2 and 8 and in the central movement of Ecl. 10, Vergil here draws not on Greek but on Roman elegy, casting the narrator of Ecl. 10 as a figure resembling the archetypal poet-lover from later Roman elegy—who at this stage in literary history can be none other than Gallus. With the discovery of the New Gallus (FRP 145), we learned that Gallan elegy did, in fact, share a number of important features with later

53 For an alternate reading of lines 64–69 see below n. 74.
Roman elegy, including its 1st-person perspective, and its speaker’s subservience to an unkind woman he styles as his “mistress.”\(^{54}\) In the opening lines of *Ecl.* 10 the pastoral narrator characterizes himself as an elegiac poet-lover who is in love with Gallus and competes for his favor by writing poetry, but who knows that his beloved is involved with someone else, namely Lycoris. This characterization resumes the motif, developed in *Eclogue* 2, of using an erotic metaphor to figure the literary influence of elegy onto pastoral, and it brings this influence to its peak by figuring the pastoral narrator not as a character from Callimachean elegy, but rather, as seems likely, as the figure from Roman love elegy, Gallus.

As we found with the figure of Gallus, moreover, we find also with the pastoral narrator that experimental generic hybridization gives way ultimately to generic conservatism, as reflected through a shift in metapoetic alignment. Within the “Woes of Gallus” that the narrator sings (9–69), Gallus is figured as Daphnis only for the first half of the song, which the narrator speaks mostly in the narrative voice (9–30). When Gallus is allowed to speak for himself in the second half of the song (31–69), he rejects the notion of pastoral consolation, and he asserts that he is not a Daphnis, but an Acontius. Likewise, in the second half of the narrative frame (70–77), the narrator’s cross-generic metanarrative alignment has collapsed, and he presents himself instead as a Polyphemus figure, resuming the more generically appropriate role developed in *Ecl.* 2 as the narrative paradigm for the pastoral lover. In both the “Woes of Gallus” section and in its frame, characters retreat from generic experimentation to generic isolation, but *Eclogue* 10 stands as proof that both pastoral and elegy, despite essentializing rules of genre, can accommodate one another in their generically distinct worlds.

In the opening lines of *Ecl.* 10, Vergil—as, for convenience, I will call the pastoral

\(^{54}\)Cf. esp. lines 1 and 7.
narrator—invo}ces the nymph Arethusa for help singing one final song, which he characterizes both as a labor and as a gift to Gallus.\textsuperscript{56}

\begin{quotation}
Extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem:
pauca meo Gallo, sed quae legat ipsa Lycoris,
carmina sunt dicenda; neget quis carmina Gallo?
\end{quotation}

\textit{(Ecl. 10.1–3)}

This is the first of only two times that Vergil uses the word labor in the \textit{Eclogues} (on the other, at 10.64, see above), and it is the only time in his \textit{oeuvre} that he uses the word openly as a metaphor for poetry.\textsuperscript{57} By characterizing his song also as a gift, however, Vergil picks up on a theme that is central to Roman love elegy, one that provides a link between elegy and pastoral in the \textit{Eclogues}.

Elegy is by no means unique in characterizing poetry as a gift, but this motif is a central feature of the elegiac conceit, while it is wholly absent from Theocritean pastoral. Unsurprisingly, such a characterization is common in Roman poetry, since Roman authors routinely dedicate books of both verse and prose to some dedicatee (e.g. Cat. 1, Lucr. \textit{DRN} 1.21–28, Cic. \textit{Tusc.} 1.1). Catullus addresses a number of single poems to his friends, and sometimes explicitly uses the word munus to refer to poetry (14.2, 9; 68.10, 32, 149).\textsuperscript{58} In the erotic conceit of elegy, poems specifically

\textsuperscript{55}I follow Horsfall 1995b in insisting that Vergil’s poetry tells us nothing about his life, but I believe that Vergil, by invoking the elegiac conceit of first-person love poetry, invites us to identify the speaker of \textit{Ecl. 10} with him. Thus we should understand the narrator in \textit{Ecl. 10} as a fictional version of the author designed at least partly to comply with the rules of the elegiac genre, in the same way as we understand Propertius, Tibullus, or Ovid to represent themselves in their poetry, and just as Gallus seems to be represented within \textit{Ecl. 10}. I do not even think we are justified, as commentators have frequently done, in assuming that Vergil and Gallus were friends. They may well have been, since both were important figures in a relatively small literary society, but this is no more relevant to \textit{Ecl. 10} than it is relevant to the interpretation of Ovid’s \textit{Amores} that the poet may sometimes have had romantic affairs with women.

\textsuperscript{56}It is unclear whether Vergil refers here to \textit{Ecl. 10}, of which these are the first words, or to the inset “Woes of Gallus,” which he is about to begin.

\textsuperscript{57}Although cf. the similar use of opus to describe craftsmanship (not poetic) at \textit{Ecl. 3.37}.

\textsuperscript{58}Cf. too the similar explicitness of \textit{Cat. 1}, \textit{cui dona lepidum novum libellum} (although \textit{donum}
constitute gifts to the poet-lover’s beloved, through which he hopes to compete with the munera of his rich rival (the dives amator) and gain romantic access to his beloved.

Although shepherds in Theocritus never directly characterize pastoral songs as gifts, Vergil’s shepherds do so four times (twice explicitly). The most explicit of these is in Ecl. 5, where Mopsus (a character also in Gallan poetry) characterizes the song of Menalcas as a munus (an quicquam nobis tali sit munere maius? 5.53). The other three are in Ecl. 2, 8, and 10, in which I have argued that the influence of Gallan elegy on pastoral is an important theme. Damon in Ecl. 8 refers to his song as “the gift of a dying man” (extremum hoc munus morientis habeto, 8.60), and in Ecl. 2 Corydon, like the elegiac poet-lover, offers Alexis an invitation to song because he cannot compete with his rival in munera (rusticus es, Corydon; nec munera curat Alexis, | nec, si muneribus certes, concedat Iollas, 2.56–57). When Vergil in Ecl. 10 introduces his song as “this final labor” (extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem, 10.1), he uses language very close to what Damon used in calling his own song “this final gift” (extremum hoc munus, 8.60). And in the lines that follow (paucum meo Gallo, sed quae legat ipsa Lycoris, | carmina sunt dicenda; neget quis carmina Gallo?, 10.2–3), Vergil’s situation seems much like that of the elegiac poet lover,

does not, like munus, occur as a metaphor for poetry).

59Theocritean shepherds do, however, routinely exchange gifts, sometimes in exchange for a pastoral song: see Id. 1.23–61 and 7.128–129, and cf. 4.29–30 and 6.43.

60Cf. Ch. 2 n. 107 on the suggestion that Ecl. 5 too may stage an encounter between pastoral and elegy. On Mopsus as a character in Gallan poetry see Servius’s note ad Ecl. 6.72, which claims that Euphorion’s poem about the Grynaean grove—which Gallus rendered into Latin—recounted the contest of Calchas and Mopsus to divine the number of fruits on a certain tree in the grove.

61See Coleman’s argument ad loc. that munus refers to Damon’s song rather than his suicide, as Clausen prefers.

62Compare 2.44 (sordent tibi munera nostra), which may refer only to the material gifts that Corydon offers Alexis in lines 40–57, or may be understood also to include the offer of pastoral song at 31–39, depending on how one understands præterea, which forms a hinge between the two section (præterea duo nec tuta mihi valle reperti | capreoli, sparsis etiam nunc pelibus albo, | bina die siccant ovis ubera; quos tibi servo...).
who responds to a request for gifts by sending poetry, because he does not have the power to refuse (*quis neget carmina Gallo?*), but claims that he does not have the resources to give very much either (*pauca meo Gallo*...)\(^{63}\) It becomes clear in the closing frame, moreover, that Vergil has given these gifts out of his “love for Gallus” (*Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas*..., 10.73) and that, like the elegiac poet-lover, he is concerned about the value they will have in the eyes of his beloved (*Pierides: vos haec facietis maxima Gallo, 72*).\(^{64}\)

Considering *Eclogue* 10 as a gift from Vergil to Gallus is one of the major themes of Perkell’s interpretation of this poem. Perkell considers *Ecl.* 10 to be a generous and selfless gift, however, since it is destined for Lycoris to read (*quae legat ipsa Lycoris, 2*), and since, by emphasizing Gallus’s love for Lycoris, it conduces to Gallus’s erotic benefit rather than Vergil’s own.\(^{65}\) While it is true that Vergil’s song focuses on Gallus’s love for Lycoris, it is only Gallus himself, when he speaks, who defends his love for the far-away Lycoris. Apollo calls Gallus’s pining “insanity” (*Galle, quid insanis? 22*), and Pan points out that the poet’s endless grieving is in vain (*ecquis erit modus*... *Amor non talia curat, 28*); even Gallus himself, as I have argued, defends his disconsolate love only because of the impossibility of an elegiac poet’s living a pastoral life. On a generic level, when Vergil agrees to sing songs that Lycoris herself would read, he is agreeing to write elegiac poetry, one purpose of which is to

---

\(^{63}\)On the feigned poverty of the elegiac poet-lover see James 2003, 71–107. Before the enjambment of *carmina* in line 3, line 2—which lacks a referent in its line—might be read even more as conforming to the elegiac situation of gift-giving: *pauca* might have referred forward to *munera* instead of *carmina*, and *legat* might be understood as “pick” or “choose” rather than “read”; compare the ambiguity of *legentem* at *Ecl.* 8.37–38 (*saepibus in nostris parvam te rosceda mala... vidi cum matre legentem*), where “pick, gather” is the primary meaning but I suggested above (p. 86) that “read” could be understood as a secondary, metapoetic reading.

\(^{64}\)On the possible erotic reading of *amor* at 10.73 see below n. 70. On the variable worth of poetry as an erotic gift, see e.g. *Ov. Ars* 2.273–286 with James 2003, 202–203.

\(^{65}\)Perkell 1996, esp. 133, which contrasts the frame and the song it frames as examples of generous pastoral love and self-centered elegiac love, respectively.
lament unhappy love. Although Vergil is himself a pastoral poet, he accomplishes this apparent impossibility in two ways: (a) by bringing on the elegiac poet Gallus to sing his own love poetry in hexameters, and (b) by himself adopting the posture of an elegiac love poet and using the elegiac conceit to stage the “erotics of influence” between Gallus and himself. Because it is elegiac, Vergil’s love for Gallus is destined to fail, since Gallus, like Lycoris, has another lover. But because Vergil is a pastoral character, his elegiac love finds pastoral consolation in the closing lines of Eclogue 10 (70–77), as Gallus was unable to do in his own song.

It becomes clear during Gallus’s song that Vergil’s own love for Gallus must be hopeless, since the fictional elegist is not only in love with Lycoris, but he refuses to participate in pastoral other than on a superficial level, i.e. by being a shepherd and speaking pastoral hexameters. We find at the end of the poem, however, that in good pastoral fashion, Vergil has been able to console his love for Gallus by singing about it in the “Woes of Gallus.”

Haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco,
Pierides: vos haec facietis maxima Gallo,
Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus.
surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra,
juniperi gravis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae.

(Ecl. 10.70–77)

The basket (fiscella) that Vergil mentions in line 71 serves as a symbol of pastoral consolation, since Corydon in Ecl. 2 and Polyphemus in Id. 11 both turned to basket-weaving to console themselves (cf. Ecl. 2.71–72, Id. 11.73).

Weaving, moreover, is also a metaphor for the composition of poetry, and Vergil’s

---

basket here functions as a symbol for his song, as even Servius notes: he says that the
basket Vergil has woven with slender hibiscus stands allegorically (allegoricos dicit) for the 
Eclogue book (hunc libellum), which Vergil has composed tenuissimo stilo, i.e. in the slender style of Callimachean λεπτότης, to which both pastoral and elegy lay claim.67 Because this passage comes both at the end of the 
Eclogue book and at the end of Eclogue 10, it can be seen equally as a closural gesture for both, and
Vergil’s basket can therefore refer both generally to the Eclogues and specifically to the “Woes of Gallus,” which Vergil has just sung as a gift for Gallus. By styling his song as a basket, Vergil seems to abandon the elegiac conception of love poetry as an erotic enticement and return to the pastoral conception of poetry as consolation.
There are still elements of elegy here, since Vergil’s love for Gallus is growing (crescit in horas, 73), and Vergil still conceives of his song as a gift to Gallus and hopes that the Muses will ensure its value in his eyes, but as Vergil rises from the shade to close the book of Eclogues, the elegiac paradigm of passionate erotic love has retreated behind the tranquility and self-consolation of pastoral. Whether Vergil refers only to 
Eclogue 10 or instead to the entire book, Gallus the elegist would probably approve of Vergil’s gift, since, throughout the Eclogues, Vergil has found in pastoral a genre of hexameter poetry that shares both a theme (love) and a style (Callimachean humility and refinement) with Roman elegy.

There is yet one more possible way to understand the close of Ecl. 10, which stresses even more the poem’s defiantly elegiac character. Vergil is intentionally vague in these lines not only about what song (haec) he is referring to, but also about the identity of the poet who has sung it. He says only that “your poet, o Pierian

67 On weaving as a metaphor for poetic composition see above Ch. 1 n. 54. Cf. Serv. ad 71: allegoricos dicit se composuisse hunc libellum tenuissimo stilo. On the Callimachean style of the Eclogues see Ecl. 1.2 tenui avena, Ecl. 6.5 deductum carmen, and Clausen 1994, 175. On the low style of elegy (as contrasted with the grand style of epic), see, e.g., Prop. 2.10.11–12 with Fedeli 2005 ad loc.
Muses,” has sung these things as he sat weaving a basket: *haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam, | dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco, | Pierides, 70–72). Since these lines immediately follow the end of Gallus’s speech, we can equally well say that “the poet of the Muses” is not Vergil but Gallus, especially since Vergil himself invokes Arethusa, not the Muses, at the beginning of *Ecl.* 10 (*extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem,* 10.1), while Gallus is shown receiving his pipes from the Muses in *Ecl.* 6, his only other appearance in the *Eclogues* (*hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae...*, 6.69). If Gallus is the poet referred to in these lines, then Vergil seems here to hope that Gallus will approve of the speech that Vergil has written for him: even though it is written in pastoral hexameters (thus the basket metaphor?), its style is nonetheless compatible with elegy (in Servius’s words, *tenuissimo stilo*), and its theme is resolutely elegiac. It is this song in particular that Gallus will find useful in his elegiac love-affair with Lycoris since, like elegy, it is a first-person account of his disconsolate suffering. It may therefore be hoped that Gallus’s song might win him access to Lycoris, which may in turn make Vergil’s composition *maxima* in the eyes of Gallus (*vos haec facietis maxima Gallo*, 10.72).

When Vergil refers in line 73 to “love of Gallus,” he introduces another important ambiguity that allows Vergil’s composition to be viewed retrospectively as either pastoral, elegiac, or both, depending on the interpretation of this phrase. If the genitive *cuius* in *Gallo, cuius amor* is read as objective, as Servius and most commentators take it, then *amor* refers to love as an emotion Vergil feels towards Gallus.

---

68 There may also be a stylistic contrast between the slender style of Vergil’s composition (cf. *pauca meo Gallo*, 10.2?) and his wish that it be *maxima* in Gallus’s eyes. *Magnus* is routinely used of the grand style, and as Putnam 1970, 387 n. 42 points out, this is the only time in the *Eclogues* that Vergil uses this word in the superlative; cf. however *paulo maiora canamus* at *Ecl.* 4.1. For *magnus* elsewhere as a stylistic adjective see Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.43–44 *os magna sonaturum*, Verg. *Geo.* 3.294 *nunc, venerande Pales, magno nunc ore sonandum*, Prop. 2.10.12 *magni nunc erit oris opus*, 3.3.5 *parvaque tam magnis admirantur fontibus ora*, and Ov. *Am.* 3.1.63–64 with Thomas 1978.

69 Serv. ad loc.: *amo, inquit, Gallam, sed latenter, sicut arborum crescunt...*
(“... Gallus, love for whom grows in me hourly...”). If this love is elegiac, then it is passionate, distracting, and hopeless. But the paradigmatically pastoral love of Corydon for Alexis and Polyphemus for Galatea was also passionate, distracting, and hopeless at the beginning of Ecl. 2 and Id. 11 (Corydon ardebat Alexin... nec quid speraret habebat, 2.1–2; ἱρατο δ` ου μάλοις οὐδέ θέση οὐδε κικίννως, ἀλλ` ὀρθα`ίοταχιρχυµς μανίαις, 10–11); the difference is that pastoral lovers eventually allow themselves to be consoled. In the opening lines of Ecl. 10 Vergil presented his love in specifically elegiac terms when he said that he was sending poetry as a gift to his beloved. At the end of the poem, however, we find that Vergil, like Corydon and Polyphemus, has allowed his song to work his consolation, which he represents through the basket-weaving to which Corydon and Polyphemus also turned. In these closing lines, then, Vergil presents his love for Gallus not as elegiac but as tranquil and pastoral, like that of Corydon and Polyphemus at the end of their respective songs, and like that of Daphnis and Damoetas in Id. 6, which I have argued (see p. 74 above) constitutes a pastoral paradigm for the relationship between pastoral and elegy in the Eclogues.

If, on the other hand, the genitive cuius in line 73 (Gallo, cuius amor) is read to be read as possessive, as one scholar convincingly argues, then amor in this line can be seen as a metapoetic reference to elegiac love poetry (“Gallus, whose love elegy grows for me hourly...”), as Papanghelis and Harrison have seen the word amor at 8.43

---

70 Commentators sometimes, though not often, acknowledge the possibility that romantic love is meant here: see, e.g., Coleman 1977 ad 10.72–73 and on page 297.

71 If Idyll 6 is indeed one model for Ecl. 10, then Ecl. 2 and 10 show complementary explicitness in their use of this poem as a model: in Ecl. 2 Corydon explicitly claims Damoetas as a model, implying Daphnis as a model for Alexis, while in Ecl. 10 Gallus is explicitly presented as a Daphnis figure, implying the role of Damoetas for Vergil.

72 Dyer 1969 argues for this reading as part of his persuasive demonstration that se subicit in line 74 should be read as a technical agricultural term for suckering (see p. 159 below). Although a possessive cuius may to some seem otiose in combination with mihi (Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas..., 73), one finds a similar combination of possessive and dative in the New Gallus, where critics have also claimed that it is otiose: Fata mihi, Caesar, tum erunt mea dulcia quom tu maxima Romanae pars eri<s> historiae (FRP 145.2–3); see Somerville 2009, 109 for a defense of
(nunc scio quid sit Amor), Ecl. 10.28 (Amor non talia curat), and 10.69 (omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori). Although Vergil never wrote elegy proper, he came close enough in the Eclogues that Propertius includes Vergil first in his catalogue of love poets in poem 2.34 (67–84). The statement that Gallus’s amor grows for Vergil like a tree in the spring can be read as a testament to the influence of Gallan love poetry on Vergil in the Eclogues, and especially in Ecl. 10, particularly in light of the metapoetic symbolism of the trees in Ecl. 10 and throughout the collection, which I will discuss further in the next section. The reading one adopts here turns on the ambiguity of cuius amor in line 73, where a literal interpretation confirms the fundamentally pastoral character of the collection, while a metapoetic reading may yield a frank admission of the influence of Gallan elegy on the Eclogues (more on this in my discussion of shade below).

73 See above 88 and Harrison 2007a, 66.

74 One might even consider a different reading of Ecl. 10’s last 15 lines in which it is not lines 70–77 that form the closing frame of Ecl. 10 but lines 64–77, beginning with non illum nostri possunt mutare labores and including the allusion to Pan’s sufferings in Theoc. Id. 7 (Ecl. 10.65–68) and the important line 69, omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori. Classical Latin had no quotation marks to demarcate the beginning and end of the quotation, and illum in line 64 does not explicitly refer to Amor. One might imagine that the speaker of these lines is again the narrator, reflecting metapoetically here as well on the generic interaction between elegy and pastoral in Ecl. 10. If the pastoral narrator begins speaking at line 64, then the pronoun illum might be read as referring to Gallus instead of Amor, and the sentiment expressed in this line, non illum possunt nostri mutare labores, might reflect Vergil’s realization that even his poetic labores (=Ecl. 10 itself; cf. Ecl. 10.1 extremum laborum) could not change Gallus, i.e. from elegist to contented pastoral singer. The phrase omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori (10.69) would, on this reading, reflect the same realization: Amor (feeling, god, and genre all at once) conquers all, and Vergil too must yield to Amor in the struggle over Gallus’s loyalties. The allusion to Idyll 7 gains point in this scenario, because the narrator of Ecl. 10, like Simichidas the narrator of Idyll 7, is singing a song that tries to advance the love affair of his friend, who in Ecl. 10 is a contemporary poet (Gallus), and in Theoc. 7 at least shares his name with one (Aratus). On this reading, Gallus’s last spoken lines would be Ecl. 10.62–63, iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis | ipsa placent; ipsae rursus concedite silvae, which might be read as accompanying the speaker’s suicide, like Ecl. 8.58, to which Conington compares it (omnia vel fiat mare. vivite silvae…). Gallus’s suicide, then, would be a further point of similarity between Gallus in Ecl. 10 and Daphnis in Id. 1.

Against such a reading is the widely held suspicion that omnia vincit Amor is half of a Gallan pentameter, which therefore is a fitting end to Gallus’s speech. I do not, however, suggest that lines 65–69 must be spoken by the narrator, but merely that Vergil has left the speaker of these
3.2 Trees and the Metapoetic Symbolism of the *Eclogues*

In my discussion of the *Eclogues* I have argued that Vergil manipulates the narrative of the collection as one means of commenting indirectly on the changing generic alignment of characters within it. I have also talked about ambiguities in some passages that allow them to be read at the same time as direct metapoetic self-commentary. We can distinguish in such passages among several simultaneous levels of meaning, which constitute different registers, one might say, within Vergilian poetry. In the first place, most of Vergil's lines make perfectly coherent sense when read and interpreted literally and straightforwardly (I will discuss one exception in the next chapter). We can call this level of meaning the narrative register in the *Eclogues* and *Aeneid* or the didactic register in the *Georgics*. Because I have argued, moreover, that the narrative itself has metageneric significance in the *Eclogues*, we can speak next of a metanarrative register in which narrative congruency constitutes a means of allusion to poems, characters, or even whole collections or genres. At a third level we find metapoetic self-annotation, such as Harrison, Papanghelis, and I have all seen operating in passages of the *Eclogues* that discuss *amor*. These statements seem to rely on a vocabulary of metapoetic symbols, like the word *amor*, which Vergil develops and reinforces by exploiting ambiguities in his text, like the syntactical ambiguity in *cuius* at *Ecl.* 10.73, or lexical ambiguities (which I have been calling “literary double meaning”) in words like *amor* or *legere*. Such symbolic statements about poetry and poetics constitute what can be called the symbolic-metapoetic register of Vergilian poetry, or perhaps, more simply, the metapoetic register, since this is what most lines ambiguous and that, as with lines 72–73, a different, non-literal rendering of the line yields interesting new readings that have a coherent metapoetic point.
scholars seem to mean when they talk about metapoetic features in Latin poetry. This metapoetic register, which relies on the literalization of metaphors, operates throughout Vergil’s poetry, and at least in the passages I will discuss in this dissertation, such symbolism is not fleeting, but rather continuous and coherent.\textsuperscript{75} This metapoetic register constitutes a literary—as opposed to historical or biographical—allegory, and represents an important source for our knowledge of Vergilian poetics, since Vergil, compared to some of his contemporaries (Horace, Propertius, Ovid), says little explicitly about his poetics.

For the remainder of this dissertation, i.e. for the remainder of this chapter and the next chapter, I will discuss the metapoetic symbolism of trees, along with the related images of forests and shadows, in the \textit{Eclogues} and \textit{Georgics}. These three symbols come to stand as metapoetic metaphors for books, literary traditions, and literary influence, respectively, as Vergil literalizes the metaphorical uses of words like \textit{liber} (”bark,” “book”) and \textit{silvae} (”forest,” “source material”). They constitute an important group of metapoetic symbols in the \textit{Eclogues}, since trees and forests are the most characteristic feature of the landscape of Vergilian pastoral. This prominence, moreover, is something of a surprise, since (a) the Theocritean landscape has no such dense forestation,\textsuperscript{76} and (b) forests present an obstacle to the pastoral conceit of grazing herd animals. As metapoetic symbols, however, trees, forests, and related images represent the most characteristic aspect of Vergil’s style in both the \textit{Eclogues} and his later works: its heavy allusivity and constant engagement with the literary tradition. Because pastoral poetry relies on the analogy between poets and singing herdsmen,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item While this dissertation focuses on metapoetic tree symbolism the \textit{Eclogues} and \textit{Georgics}, the conclusion cites another scholar’s demonstration that related symbolism appears also in at least one passage in the \textit{Aeneid}.
\item Cf. Clausen 1994, xvi–xxx.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
it has little tolerance for direct and explicit authorial self-expression.\textsuperscript{77} By cultivating trees and forests as metapoetic symbols for literature, and by making forests the imaginative setting of the \textit{Eclogues}, Vergil stays within the bounds of pastoral decorum while nevertheless creating an extremely flexible system for programmatic self-expression.

Vergil’s characteristically dense and complex method of allusivity has every appearance of being the poet’s own stylistic innovation, and he can be seen to programmatize this aspect of his style through the metapoetic symbolism of the \textit{Eclogues}.\textsuperscript{78} Considerations of literary traditions and literary influence occupied Vergil throughout his career, and important passages of the \textit{Eclogues} and \textit{Georgics} not only reveal a “Callimachean” desire to avoid overworked genres and subjects (\textit{Ecl.} 6.3–5, \textit{Geo.} 3.3–9), but also show Vergil’s concern to locate himself and others in the greater narrative of literary history (\textit{Geo.} 2.173–176, \textit{Ecl.} 6.64–73).\textsuperscript{79} In the \textit{Eclogues}, Vergil’s concern with literary history combines with his densely allusive style to produce a narrative that is composed largely of phrases and narratives drawn from earlier literature, and which can be read metapoetically as Vergil’s attempt to situate himself in both the pastoral and elegiac literary traditions.\textsuperscript{80} I will argue that the highly literary

\textsuperscript{77}In all the pastoral \textit{Idylls} and all the \textit{Eclogues} until 10, Theocritus and Vergil both make it clear that their narrator characters are herdsmen (e.g. Simichidas in \textit{Id.} 7 and Tityrus in \textit{Ecl.} 6). Propertius and Ovid, on the other hand, follow Callimachus in the \textit{Aetia} in putting programmatic language into the mouth of a narrator that, by convention, is identified with the poet.

\textsuperscript{78}Compare the remarks of Farrell 1997: “Virgilian intertextuality shows every sign of being the distinct creation and in many ways the artistic signature of classical antiquity’s greatest poetic craftsman” (223).

\textsuperscript{79}Servius (ad \textit{Geo.} 1 proem) characterized Vergil’s three poems according to their respective imitative programs, and Vergil’s concern to define his place in literary history has been a major focus of Vergilian scholarship over the last half-century: especially notable examples include Ross 1975, Thomas 1988, and Farrell 1991.

\textsuperscript{80}The poetic world of the \textit{Eclogues}, unlike most other contemporary genres such as panegyric epic or love elegy, makes little pretense, apart from \textit{Ecl.} 1 and 9, to represent contemporary reality. Instead, this world represents the already-highly-stylized world of Theocritean pastoral; cf. Hunter 2006a, 115–116, who notes that in \textit{Id.} 1 we encounter a world of pastoral mimesis, whereas in \textit{Ecl.} 1
(one might say bookish) and allusive nature of Vergil’s poetry is one of his thematic and metapoetic preoccupations in both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, and that by literalizing literary and literary-critical metaphors, Vergil makes some of the most characteristic features of these poems do metapoetic duty also as self-reflexive discussion of poetic principles and literary history.\(^{81}\) Of these extended metaphors, among the most important to the *Eclogues* are those that associate elements of literature and literary history with trees and related symbols, since these appear at the beginning and end of the collection (*Ecl.* 1.1–5, 10.73–76), in the explicitly programmatic introductions of several poems (*Ecl.* 4, 6, 10), and in the implicitly programmatic openings of others (*Ecl.* 1, 2, 5, 7, 9). The *Eclogues*, moreover, are an especially good place to examine the metapoetics of originality and influence, because the collection closely adapts Theocritus, Callimachus, Gallus and others throughout.\(^{82}\)

Although most critics have always seen Vergil’s allusivity as a stylistic virtue, this has not always been universally true. To the degree that Vergil’s poetry is highly allusive and emulative of its poetic forebears, it can equally be characterized as derivative, unoriginal, even plagiaristic. Vergil’s detractors were fully aware of this potential criticism, and they made full use of it from very early in the reception of his poetry. The Donatan Life cites individual critics on both side of this issue, including Perellius Faustus, who compiled a list of Vergil’s “thefts” (*furta*), and Asconius Pedianus, who countered that, should any of Vergil’s critics himself attempt such a theft, “he would easily understand that it is easier to steal the club of Hercules than it is to lift a

---

\(^{81}\) Although this dissertation focuses on the metapoetics of trees and related symbols, I have detected similar metapoetic symbolism associated with other major thematic elements of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, including herding and farming, which I hope to discuss further in the future.

\(^{82}\) Two recent studies, Breed 2007 and Hubbard 1998, have emphasized the literary (textual and intertextual) nature of the *Eclogues*. 
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line from Homer.”\textsuperscript{83} Judging from his use of metapoetic symbolism in the \textit{Eclogues}, Vergil too seems to have been fully aware that his compositional technique was open to differing evaluations. By representing this aspect of his style through forests and related symbols, he is able to represent the equivocality of his highly allusive style through the equivocal association of pastoral poetry with rusticity and shade.

\subsection*{3.2.1 \textit{Silvae}}

The most basic instance of metapoetic tree symbolism in the \textit{Eclogues} is probably to be found in Vergil’s frequent references to “forests” (\textit{silvae}). \textit{Silvae} is “by far the most frequent scenic term in the \textit{Eclogues}” (Lipka 2001, 67), and, as Clausen notes, the chief difference between the landscape of the \textit{Idylls} and that of the \textit{Eclogues} is that Vergil’s countryside is wooded, and his Muse and song are sylvan (\textit{silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena, Ecl. 1.2; si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae, Ecl. 4.3}).\textsuperscript{84} Vergil’s repeated use of \textit{silvae} in explicitly and implicitly programmatic contexts, moreover, has led a number of scholars to consider its use within the collection as metaphorically representative of the \textit{Eclogues}, the bucolic genre, and the pastoral world of Vergil’s poems.\textsuperscript{85} Such a formulation of the metaphor, however, is difficult


\textsuperscript{84}Clausen 1994, xxvi–xxx.

\textsuperscript{85}See the good discussion of Lipka 2001, 30–31 and \textit{passim} (see index s.v. \textit{silvae}), who cites Schmidt 1972, 243–244; cf. also Harrison 2007a, 70 and Ross 1975, 95–96 n. 4, both on individual uses of the word in \textit{Ecl. 10}, Wright 1983, 109, Van Sickle 1978, 63 (esp. n. 33), and Berg 1974, 145, 166. Lipka 2001, 67 points out that \textit{silvae} in the \textit{Ecl.} always appears in the plural (he sees in this a
to accept fully, because, as I mentioned above, woods are not a typical feature of bucolic poetry before the *Eclogues*, and they seem to present an impediment to the genre’s primary conceit, the grazing of livestock. The most useful approach to this difficulty is that of Lipka (2001, 30–31), who emphasizes Vergil’s self-reflexivity, and shows that, through his emphasis on *silvae*, Vergil defines his version of pastoral through specific deviation from its Theocritean model, as, e.g. at *Ecl.* 5.43–44, which adapts Theoc. 1.120.86

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Δάφνις} & \text{ ἐγὼν ὅδε τὴν ὁ τὰς βόας ὀδε νοµεύων,} \\
\text{Δάφνις} & \text{ ὁ τῶς ταῦρως καὶ πόρτιας ὀδε ποτίδων.}
\end{align*}
\]  
(Theoc. 1.120)

Daphnis ego in silvis, hinc usque ad sidera notus
formosi pecoris custos, formosior ipse.

(*Ecl.* 5.43–44)

As often, pointed variation of an allusion is here an important clue to Vergil’s metapoetic agenda. Although Vergil’s *silvae* do function as a symbol of the pastoral landscape (Ross), a metonym for the pastoral genre (Harrison), and a self-reflexive symbol for Vergilian poetry (Lipka),87 their metapoetic significance goes further. *Silvae* can also be seen to represent a specific aspect of Vergil’s poetic technique in the *Eclogues* and beyond: its heavy reliance on and imitation of existing literary traditions. Throughout the *Eclogues*, Vergil metaphorically represents the most prominent stylistic quality of the collection, their consummate erudition and difficult allusiveness, through the most prominent element of its physical landscape, *silvae*.

possible connection with the scenery of Lucretius’s cosmogony in *DRN* 5).

86 See further on this allusion Lipka 2001, 44–45.

87 See above n. 85.
Silvae is the Latin half of a broadly-recognized bilingual pun, which relies on the double meaning of Greek ὕλη as both “forest” (= Lat. silva) and “raw material, matter” (= Lat. materies). Stephen Hinds and others have argued that the ambiguity of the Greek word activates a similar capacity for double meaning in the Latin word silva, and that through this transferred double meaning silva comes to be used in Latin as a term denoting raw material for literary composition.\[88\] Hinds has discussed Vergil’s use of this pun in a wood-cutting scene in Aeneid 6, which imitates an Ennian prototype preserved by Macrobius (Sat. 6.2.27).\[89\]

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{itur in antiquam silvam, stabula alta ferarum;} \\
&\text{procumbunt piceae, sonat icta securibus ilex} \\
&\text{fraxineaque trabes cuneis et fissile robur} \\
&\text{scinditur, advolvunt ingentes montibus ornos} \\
&\quad(Aen. 6.179–182)
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{incidunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt,} \\
&\text{percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex} \\
&\text{fraximus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,} \\
&\text{pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat} \\
&\text{arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai} \\
&\quad(Enn. Ann. 175–179 Sk.)
\end{align*}\]

Hinds points out that, because of the double meaning transferred from ὕλη to silva, the phrase itur in antiquam silvam can be read as thematizing Vergil’s engagement with Ennius, his predecessor in Roman epic, and as representing Ennius’s Annales.

\[\begin{footnote}
88 OLD s.v. silva, 5b; cf. Quint. Inst. 10.3.17, qui primum decurrere per materiam stilo quam velocissimo volunt et sequentes calorem atque impetus ex tempore scribunt: hanc silvam vocant. The 1st-century BC grammaticus L. Ateius Praetextatus (Philologus) is reported to have compiled an 800-book collection of commentarii, which he called Hyle (Suet. Gram. 10.5; cf. Kaster 1995 ad loc.); the plural Silvae is used by Statius as the title for a poetic miscellany (Silv. 3.praef., 4.praef.; see Coleman 1988, xxii–xxvi), and Gellius attests it as the title of a collection like his own (NA prae. 5–6).
\end{footnote}\]

\[\begin{footnote}
89 Hinds 1998, 11–14; the passages have a common Homeric prototype at Il. 23.114–120, but Vergil owes more to the Ennian passage than to Homer.
\end{footnote}\]
as the raw material for Vergil’s own composition of epic poetry in Latin. It is this relationship to previous literary traditions—as raw material for poetic composition—that best characterizes Vergil’s allusive technique throughout the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid. It is also this relationship, I argue, that Vergil intentionally thematizes through his insistence on silvae as a new, and strikingly inappropriate, aspect of the pastoral world. Metaliterary play between silva and ὑλή has been detected in other Augustan poets as well, although none as early as the Eclogues; it seems likely that, as in the case of other metapoetic conceits that I hope to discuss in the future, Vergil’s broad exploitation of silvae as a metapoetic symbol led to the allusive emulation of this trope among contemporary poets.⁹⁰

Forests are the dominant feature of the programmatic language of the Eclogues, and Vergil uses them both implicitly and explicitly to characterize the highly allusive pastoral of the collection. Vergil uses silva words twice in the opening lines of the First Eclogue, in a passage that serves to introduce the book as well as its first poem.

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena;
nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva.
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.

(Ecl. 1.1–5)

⁹⁰Petrain 2000 argues that this pun pervades Prop. 1.20, which warns Gallus (probably the poet) to guard closely his young boyfriend Hylas (≈ ὑλή, i.e. his poetic material); cf. Cairns 2006, 219–249 (with further references cited) on Prop. 1.20 and Gallus the poet. Keith 1999, 148 sees punning use of silva at Horace Epist. 1.4, which asks a certain Albius (probably the poet Tibullus) whether he is spending his vacation writing or “walking quietly through the salubrious woods,” a potential metaphor for reading good books (Albi, nostrorum sermonum candide iudex, | quid nunc te dicam facere in regione Pedana? | scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat, | an tacitum silvas inter reptare salubris, | curantem quidquid dignum sapiente bonoque est?, 1.4.1–5). Horace Sat. 1.10 uses silva figuratively of literature, where, as often, what is implicitly figurative in Vergil is explicitly so in Horace: in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si | magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas (34–35). Roman 2006, 242–243, in a discussion of lost writing tablets, suggests that the metaphor is sometimes transferred to wood generally.
Here Meliboeus informs us that Tityrus is working out his sylvan Muse with a slender oat, and that Tityrus lazily teaches the forests to echo Amaryllis. A number of scholars have seen programmatic features at several places in this passage, especially in the phrase *tenui avena* (1.2), which anticipates the Callimachean *deductum carmen* of *Ecl.* 6.5.\(^91\) If we consider *silvae* not only as a metonym for pastoral, but also as a metaphor for literature as raw material, then we find further programmatic significance in Vergil’s *silvestris Musa*, which can be seen as a summation of the debt that his poetry owes to the literary tradition. This debt is evident right away from the statement that the woods “echo” *formosa Amaryllis*, since this phrase translates the first words of the paraclausithyron in Theocritus *Idyll* 3 (δ’ χαρίεσσ’ Ἀµαρυλλί, 3.6), which the speaker sings while his companion Tityrus watches his goats. Simultaneously, moreover, this passage can be seen as an adaptation of the story of Acontius, who carves in the bark of the *φηγοί* what he wishes they had a mind and voice to say back to him: “*Κυδίππη καλή.*”\(^92\)

\[\text{ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ δὴ φλοιοίσι κεκοµµένα τόσσα φέροιτε γράµµατα,} \]
\[\text{Κυδίππην ὅσσ’ ἐρέουσι καλὴν} \]
\[\text{(Callim. Act. fr. 73)} \]

\[\text{μόνον δὲ φηγοῖς ὑποκαθήµενος ἦ πτελέαις ὡµᾶλει τοιάδε: “εἴθε, ὃ δένδρα,} \]
\[\text{καὶ νοὸς ὁµίν γενοῦτο καὶ φωνῆ, ὡς ἂν εἴπητε μόνον: ‘Κυδίππη καλή’. ἦ} \]
\[\text{γοῦν τοσαῦτα κατὰ τῶν φλοιῶν ἐγκεκολαµµένα φέροιτε γράµµατα, ὅσα τὴν} \]
\[\text{Κυδίππην ἑπονοµάζει καλὴν. (Aristaen. 1.10.57–61).} \]

Aside from these debts to Theocritus and to Callimachus, much in the opening lines of *Ecl.* 1 is owed also specifically to Lucretius, including the phrases *silvestrem Musam*,


\(^92\)On the connection with *Ecl.* 1 see Wright 1983, 129–130; on the “learned catachresis” of *fagus* for *φηγός*, see above Ch. 2 p. 68.
which appears at DRN 4.589, immediately following Lucretius’s discuss of echo, and *sub tegmine fagi*, which closely resembles *sub tegmine caeli* at DRN 2.669 (cf. also 1.988, 5.1016). Through the textual “echo” of these passages—two of which deal directly with echo (on which see below)—Vergil’s *silvae* and *silvestris Musa* acknowledge the fundamental debt that his poetry owes to the literary tradition.

These lines can also be understood as an expression of the specifically erotic component of Vergil’s generic program in the *Eclogues*. I argued above that we could see the *Eclogues* as a response to Gallus’s programmatic opposition of humble elegy to grand hexameter epic, since in pastoral Vergil found a similarly humble genre of hexameter poetry that included love as one of its primary concerns, and shared a number of features with the Gallan elegy. Here in the first lines of the *Eclogues*, Vergil presents love as one of the primary concerns of pastoral poetry, since Tityrus here sings a love song for the beautiful Amaryllis. But by emphasizing here the connection between love songs and the sylvan setting of the *Eclogues*, Vergil calls attention to an important difference between the *Eclogues* and Roman love elegy: Vergil’s love poetry (with the partial exception of *Ecl.* 10) does not, as elegy does, represent itself as premised on supposedly real love affairs (what Conte calls elegy’s “pretense” to verisimilitude), but rather on love affairs that are already famous from literature, like those of Acontius and Cydippe or Polyphemus and Galatea. In his allusions to Theocritean pastoral, not to mention to Gallan elegy in *Ecl.* 10,

---

93 See Lipka 2001, 66–68.

94 As a song mentioned in the opening poem of a collection, Tityrus’s love song is in a sense comparable to the “Woes of Daphnis” that Thyrsis sings in *Id.* 1, and might likewise be considered paradigmatic.

95 Conte 1986, 113 (see above Ch. 2 n. 53).

96 *Ecl.* 10 falls into both categories, because Gallus’s own poetry presumably presented his love affair with Lycoris as based in real life, but for Vergil this is equally a literary love affair, which he knows through Gallus’s love poetry.
Vergil has found in literature (pastoral and otherwise) the elements of love poetry that the Roman elegists sought to represent as part of their real-life experience, and by citing Amaryllis in the first speech of the book, he draws attention to what is perhaps the single most elegiac element in Theocritus’s *Idylls*, the paraclausithyron of *Id.* 3. By associating this textual echo right away with the *silvae* of his *Eclogue* book, Vergil presents his collection as love poetry that is both densely allusive and resolutely pastoral.

As I claimed earlier, however, Vergil’s characterization of his highly allusive style is not unequivocally positive. Vergil is writing only a generation after Catullus, for whom urbanity was synonymous with literary quality, and rusticity with boorishly bad writing, most explicitly in Cat. 22 (*Suffenus iste*) but also elsewhere. The lines that introduce Tityrus, his Muse, and his song are spoken by Meliboeus, who has lost his lands and is fleeing from his home (*nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva. | nos patriam fugimus. . .*, 1.3–4). And although Meliboeus’s remarks are usually read as a felicitation of Tityrus for enjoying such leisure as he does (cf. *Fortunate senex. . .*, 1.46, 51), they can also be looked at from a perspective that stresses the humble, rustic, and perhaps even lazy (*lentus*; 4; *otia*, 6) qualities of Tityrus and his poetry. Despite Meliboeus’s claim to equanimity (*non equidem invideo, miror magis*, 1.11), his opening remarks can be seen as bitter, as some scholars have suggested: while he (Meliboeus) is fleeing his fatherland, Tityrus sits lazily in the shade (*lentus in umbra*, 4) with a yokel of a Muse (*silvestrem Musam*, 1.2), playing a borrowed song (*formosam Amaryllida*, 1.5) on a flimsy oat straw (*tenui avena*, 1.2).

---

97On literary rusticity (with special attention to Cat. 22), see Watson 1990.

98On the bitterness of Meliboeus’s speech, see Wright 1983, 110–112 (“The harmonious beauty of the language. . . does not disguise the resentment felt by Meliboeus at the good fortune of Tityrus. . .”), Van Sickle 2004, especially on Meliboeus’s reference to Tityrus’s pipe as an *avena*, and cf. Hunter 2006b, 264 on the “particularly bitter power” of Meliboeus’s speech. This sort of antagonism is fully within the spirit of pastoral (cf. Theoc. 4 & 5, *Ecl.* 3) and helps make sense of the
Despite the fact that *tenui avena* in line 2 has associations with Callimachean refinement, the phrase also alludes to the opening lines of Theocritus *Idyll* 5, where “whistling on straw” (*καλάμας αὐλὸν ποππύσδεν*) is clearly an insult, both in its own context and when Vergil uses the passage again in *Ecl.* 3.99

*Lac.* Shoo, lambs, away from that spring! It’s Comatas, Can’t you see?—the one who stole my pipe last week.  
*Com.* What pipe was that? When did Sibyrtas’ slave ever  
Get his hands on a pipe? You should stick to tootling  
Duets with your friend Corydon on whistles of straw.  

(Id. 5.3–7, trans. Verity)

*Men.* Cantando tu illum? aut umquam tibi fistula cera  
iuncta fuit? non tu in triviis, indocte, solebas  
stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?  

(Ecl. 3.25–27)

The equivocality of Meliboeus’s speech continues in the following lines as well, in which Meliboeus says that Tityrus is sitting *lentus in umbra* (see further on shade below). Vergil uses *lentus* frequently in the *Eclogues* of the natural world, prompting translations like Clausen’s “easy in the shade, at one with the natural world,” but he uses it only once elsewhere of people, in *Aeneid* 12, where Juturna rebukes the Rutulians for being unwilling to fight in defense of their lands (*nos patria amissa dominis parere superbis | cogemur, qui nunc lentī consedimus arvis, 12.236–237*).

99 Cf. Clausen’s lengthy note ad *Ecl.* 1.2 on the “musical absurdity” of an oat-straw pipe, and on the connection to *Id.* 5 and *Ecl.* 3 (although in the end Clausen simply calls *avena* “a metrically useful synonym analogous to Lucretius’s *cicuta*”); cf. also Smith 1970.

100 Cf. Paratore 2001 ad *Aen.* 12.237; on the use of the word to describe plants see Clausen ad *Ecl.* 1.4. Servius glosses the word in both passages as *otiosi* and cross-references them. Other
will discuss this passage further when I consider the metapoetic symbolism of shade (see page 162), but I bring it up now to raise the possibility that Vergil is aware of the equivocality with which one can view his allusive compositional technique, and that he represents this equivocality through his own sometimes-equivocal presentation of the woods and countryside. Whether or not one accepts my characterization of Meliboeus’s lines, he does not clearly praise Tityrus—here or elsewhere—for his rusticity and association with the woods. When Meliboeus does clearly felicitate Tityrus, it is not for the woods, but his fields (fortunae senex, ergo tua rura manebunt...). and even here Meliboeus’s compliment manages to be somewhat backhanded, denigrating the quality of Tityrus’s fields, and perhaps even their size (...et tibi magna satis, quamvis lapis omnia nudus | limosoque palus obducat pascua iunco, 46–47).

Rusticity is elsewhere clearly presented as a potential source of embarrassment, both in association with one’s person and with one’s poetry. Corydon in Ecl. 2 worries that his own rusticity will keep Alexis away from him (rusticus es Corydon...), and Damoetas in Ecl. 3 acknowledges that rusticity is a potential reproach against his Muse (Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam...). In connection with poetry, the equivocality of rusticity inheres specifically in its association with silvae, a connection that is defended in the explicitly programmatic openings of Eclogues 4 and 6.

We turn first to Eclogue 4, which is the first place in the collection that Vergil uses silvae in connection with an explicit poetic program. Eclogue 4, moreover, is a good case to consider because it is in many ways an outlier in the collection, and

Augustan poets also use lentus to mean “lazy” or “listless”: cf. Ov. Ars 1.67 lentus spatiare sub umbra, an apparent allusion to Ecl. 1.4 that enjoins the prospective lover to stroll lazily through the shade at the porticus of the Theater of Pompey, Hor. Epist. 2.178 quem tulit ad scaenam ventoso Gloria currur | examinat lentus spectator, sedulus inflat, where it refers to the power of an unresponsive spectator to devastate a dramatic poet, or in elegy Prop. 1.6.12, 1.15.4, or Tib. 1.10.58, where it refers to unresponsiveness, either on the part of the lover, the beloved, or of Love himself.
Vergil here modulates his programmatic reference to *silvae* accordingly.\textsuperscript{101} The poem opens with an invocation of the Sicilian Muses, and with the poet’s stated intention to sing somewhat grander themes. The lines that follow present two specific types of forest, *arbusta* and *myricae*, as “not pleasing to everyone,” for which reason the speaker rejects them as the subjects of poetry in favor of “forests worthy of a consul” (*silvae consule dignae*).

\begin{quote}
Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus!

non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae;

si canimus *silvas*, *silvae* sint consule dignae.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Ecl. 4.1–3)}

The precise significance of line 2 is difficult, because *arbusta* is a near-synonym of *silvae*, as we see in Vergil’s adaptation of the Ennian wood-cutting scene (\textit{incidunt arbusta per alta}, Enn. \textit{Ann.} 175 Sk.; \textit{itur in antiquam silvam}, Verg. \textit{Aen.} 6.179). Tamarisks, however—which are defined here, in their first appearance, by their lowness—do seem to function as a symbol for the low genre of pastoral.\textsuperscript{102} The net effect of these lines is to contrast the previous poems of the collection with the more ambitious poem to come, and to present the *silvae* of those two poems as a potential source of embarrassment.

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Ecl.} 6, for that matter, is an outlier as well, as is (for different reasons, which I have discussed above) \textit{Ecl.} 10, the third poem that uses *silvae* in an explicitly poetological introduction.

\textsuperscript{102} On these lines in the context of the collection see Breed 2006, 346–347 and Van Sickle 1978, 61–63 & 132, who cites Schmidt 1972, 154–157; Van Sickle 1978, 63 n. 32 cites Servius at \textit{Ecl.} 6.9 (\textit{te nostra, Vare, myricae | te nemus omne canet}, 10–11): \textit{per myricas et nemora bucolica significat}. It may be possible to see in *arbusta* and *myricae* specific references to \textit{Ecl.} 2 and 3, respectively: \textit{Ecl.} 2 seems to be set in a vine-grove (\textit{sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis}, 2.13), and Corydon may be the singing \textit{frondator} mentioned by Meliboeus at \textit{Ecl.} 1.56. Tamarisks, which Theocritus associates with pastoral song (1.12–14; cf. Clausen 1994, xxix and at \textit{Ecl.} 4.2), would then seem to refer to \textit{Ecl.} 3, with its traditional exchange of amoebean song.
Many critics have considered Ecl. 2 and 3 to be Vergil’s earliest, based largely on their close imitation of Theocritus relative to other poems in the collection. On my interpretation of silvae, Ecl. 4.3—si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae—expresses the difference between the current poem and those two previous poems: Eclogue 4 will be grander, at least in part, because it draws on grander literary models. As Hubbard notes, the poem “is notable precisely for its lack of Theocritean elements, to the extent that some have doubted whether it was even originally intended for the Eclogues.” Instead, it is set against an eclectic background of prophetic themes from Hesiod, Aratus, and elsewhere, and its biggest intertextual debts are owed to Catullus 64 (especially the prophecy of the Parcae) and, it is likely, to the Sybilline oracles (Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas, 4). Stephen Harrison has recently drawn attention to the issue of genre in connection with the proem to Ecl. 4, pointing out that Vergilian pastoral seems here to take on the characteristics of the poetic genre of oracles, a non-epic variety of hexameter that nevertheless satisfies the specification that Eclogue 4 be “somewhat greater” than the pastoral of the preceding poems. Harrison’s approach sheds much light on this difficult poem, but while his focus is on the enrichment of pastoral through the absorption of other literary traditions, my focus here is on these literary traditions themselves, which constitute the very building blocks of Vergilian pastoral. So while Harrison sees the phrase silvae consule dignae as having reference intrinsic to the Eclogue book and its

---

103 For bibliography see Hubbard 1998, 47 n. 6, and cf. the table of different chronologies given at Coleiro 1979, 93–94. Another criterion for considering them early is that Menalcas cites the incipit of each at Ecl. 5.85–87 as compositions taught to him by his pipes.

104 Hubbard 1998, 76–77; Clausen 1994, one of the doubters Hubbard mentions, points out that the poem “has no distinctly pastoral features, not even... the bucolic diaeresis” (126).

105 On the golden age theme in Ecl. 4 and before, see conveniently Johnston 1980, 15–47; on Ecl. 4 and Cat. 64, see esp. Hubbard 1998, 78–83; on the relationship to Jewish Sybilline oracles see Nisbet 1978.

106 Harrison 2007a, 36–44.
pastoral genre (a significance I do not deny), I see it also as referring extrinsically to the grander literary traditions from which Vergil constructs the fourth *Eclogue*, and which make it “a little bit greater” (*paulo maiora*) than *Eclogues* 2 and 3. These two interpretative angles are, naturally, closely related, and to further distinguish between them, we must turn to the other poems in the collection in which *silvae* constitute part of an explicit poetic program, *Ecl.* 6 and 10.

If Meliboeus’s remarks to Tityrus in *Eclogue* 1 can be read metapoetically as a comment about Vergil’s compositional technique as well as his genre, then Tityrus’s speech in the proem to *Ecl.* 6 can also be read as commenting on these topics, in what constitutes a programmatic apologia for Vergil’s poetry and poetic method. The proems to *Ecl.* 1 and *Ecl.* 6 are commonly read together, because each opens one half of the *Eclogue* book, and they make comparable references both to Tityrus’s rustic Muse (*silvestrem Musam*, 1.2; *agrestem Musam*, 6.8) and to his “slender” pipes (*tenui avena*, 1.2; *tenui harundine*, 6.8). Both passages have visible relevance to the collection’s Theocritean genre and its setting in the woods, but while these concerns are only implicitly programmatic in *Ecl.* 1, they are explicitly so in *Ecl.* 6.107

Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu  
nostra neque erubuit *silvas* habitare Thalea.  
cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem  
vellit et admonuit: “pastorem, Tityre, pinguis  
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen.”  
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,  
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)  
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:  
non iniussa cano....

(*Ecl.* 6.1–9)

107 The clearer programmatic nature of Tityrus’s speech in *Ecl.* 6 is one reason why I focus on this passage as Vergil’s apologia rather than Tityrus’s reply to Meliboeus in *Ecl.* 1 itself. This latter, I believe, can also be read metapoetically as a defense of Vergil’s technique and genre, but it uses a different metaphor (which I cannot discuss in this dissertation) in which the identification of pastoral poets with herdsmen leads poetry to be represented through different herd animals.
Tityrus tells us in the first two lines that his Muse Thalea (in later times, at least, the Muse of comedy and low verse) saw fit to sport in Syracusan (=Theocritean) verse, and that she did not blush to live in the woods. These two lines are generally understood both to refer to the composition of Theocritean pastoral (Syracosio versu), but such a reading may be more difficult than scholars have allowed, since forests were such a minor feature of the Theocritean landscape.108

The lines that follow, which constitute the first extant recusatio in Latin literary history, adapt the prologue to Callimachus’s Aetia in order to counterdistinguish Vergil’s pastoral Eclogues from contemporary panegyric epic (reges et proelia, 3; laudes... et tristia... bella, 6–7).109 But although this passage has clear bearing on the pastoral generic program of the Eclogues, Vergil’s reference in these lines to silvae can also be read not as symbolizing the pastoral genre per se, but rather, like the reference to woods echoing Amaryllis in Eclogue 1, as contrasting poetic composition with a basis in contemporary reality—such as panegyric epic (or love poetry in Ecl. 1)—with poetic composition based fundamentally not on life but on literature. In the lines of Callimachus that immediately follow Apollo’s instruction that the poet “feed his sacrifice as fat as possible, but keep his Muse lean” (fr. 1.23–24, cf. Ecl. 6.3–5), the god exhorts the poet to originality, telling him not to drive his wagon through the tracks of others (fr. 1.25–28). We might in one sense see Vergil responding to this exhortation when he talks about his Muse’s relationship with “the woods,” since Vergil’s own approach to originality is not to seek out new paths, as Apollo advises Callimachus, but rather to recast and recontextualize the phrases, verses, and narratives of other poets. The association of poetry with silvae in Ecl. 6 is at any rate

---

108 This passage features frequently in arguments that silvae specifically represent the pastoral genre: see Lipka 2001, 30–31; Van Sickle 1978, 63; Ross 1975, 95–96 n. 4.

109 On elements of panegyric in the Eclogues see Nauta 2006, esp. 319 (with n. 61) on this passage.
clearly a source of potential reproach, since Tityrus informs us that his Muse Thalea “did not blush to live in the woods” (6.2). And while on one level Thalea’s potential embarrassment alludes to the low style of pastoral verse, Vergil established in the proem to Ecl. 4 that forests in the Eclogues are not inherently or necessarily low. Here again, as in Ecl. 4, not only refer to the collection’s low style and pastoral genre, but also allude to the metaphorical silvae of literary criticism, a symbol that Vergil uses to cast literature, and especially Theocritean pastoral, as the raw material for his own poetic composition.

**Echoes**

In the passages I have discussed so far, silvae have seemed to symbolize both the pastoral genre and Vergil’s dense allusivity, a finding that is unsurprising given that intertextuality with Theocritus is the defining feature of Vergilian pastoral. In order to distinguish between these two aspects of the symbolism of silvae, it will be helpful to ask not only what forests represent in the Eclogues, but also what they do.

The most important thing that forests do in the Eclogues is echo, and the sylvan echoes that characterize both the landscape and the text of the collection are another aspect of Vergilian pastoral that is noticeably absent from Theocritus. Alongside his discussion of Vergil’s itur in antiquam silvam (Aen. 6.179, see above), Hinds showed that Ovid, when he tells the story of Echo and Narcissus in Metamorphoses 3, uses a textual echo-effect as a trope for his allusion to Vergil and Catullus in this

---

110 Rosenmeyer 1969, 148–150 points out this absence, although Breed 2007, 75 n. 4 notes that echo occurs in the post-Theocritean pastoral tradition at [Moschus] Epitaph. Bion. 30–31, 54. On echoes within the text of the Eclogues see Boyle 1977, and Clausen 1994 at Ecl. 1.5 and 6.84 on the echo-effect observed in such phrases as Amaryllida silvas; related to this, a fading effect is accomplished with correction in repeated phrases such as “formosa, valē, valē,” inquit, “Iolla,” (3.79) and litus “Hyā, Hyā” omne sonaret (6.44): see Breed 2007, 89 and Clausen 1994 on 3.79, and compare the farewell of Echo at Ov. Met. 3.500–501.
passage. More recently, Brian Breed has shown that echo tropes allusion in the *Eclogues* as well, perhaps nowhere more than in the opening lines of the collection, where Breed shows that echo is integral to the program of this poem, which introduces the highly allusive genre of pastoral to Latin literature. It is conspicuous here not only that the forests are the vector of the echo *formosa Amaryllis*, but that the phrase *silvestris Musa* (*Ecl.* 1.2), with which Meliboeus characterizes Tityrus’s music, alludes to Lucretius’s discussion of echo as the natural force responsible for mankind’s invention of Pan and other woodland singers at *DRN* 4.567–592. In short, echoing forests are inseparable from the Latin pastoral tradition, not only in its first full manifestation as a literary genre (*Ecl.* 1.1–5), but also in its imaginative prehistory in Lucretius, to which Vergil prominently alludes by characterizing Tityrus’s song as a *silvestris Musa*.

Throughout the *Eclogues*, where echoes are explicitly mentioned (I exclude textual echo-effects, on which see above n. 110), they are almost always attributed to the forests and trees, and Vergil’s prominent allusion to Lucretius on echo suggests that this link is both intentional and meaningful. Here one begins to see more fully the flexibility of *silvae* as a metaphor for literature: just as the echoes within

---

111Hinds 1998, 5–8, who cites the discussion of Hollander 1981 about echo troping allusion in Renaissance and post-Renaissance literature.

112Breed 2007 Ch. 5–6, 74–116 deals with echo in *Ecl.* 1 and 6; on the opening of *Ecl.* 1 see 95–101. To Breed’s discussion of echo (Lat. *imago*, cf. Serv. ad *Geo.* 4.50) as an image should be added *Ecl.* 2.27, *si numquam fallit imago*, which not only refers to Corydon’s reflection in *Ecl.* 2, but also tropes as an echo (*imago*) the passage’s imitation of reflection-gazing by Polyphemus at *Theoc.* 6.37.

113See Breed 2007, 98, which points not to Lucretius’s use of *silvestris musa* at *DRN* 4.589, but rather of the related phrase *agrestis musa* (*Ecl.* 6.8 < *DRN* 5.1398), which appears as part of his explanation for the origins of pastoral music (5.1379–1411). For a nuanced treatment of these allusions see Lipka 2001, 66–67.

114Here I include *silvae* (1.5, 10.8), *arbusta* (2.13, 5.64), and *luci* (10.58), and the mention of echoing beehives in a sacred oak (7.13); at 5.28 and 1.39, voices, though not explicitly echoes, are attributed to *silvae* and *arbusta*, respectively. The two mentions of echo that do not involve trees both occur in *Ecl.* 6, and attribute the phenomenon to the seashore (6.44) and to valleys (6.84).
the *Eclogues* come from the forests and trees, the allusive echoes that pervade the collection originate in the literary traditions that Vergil adapts. This relationship between echoic allusion and literary forests features prominently at the end as well as the beginning of the collection, when in *Ecl.* 10 Vergil undertakes to sing for Gallus a pastoral song that adapts the new genre of Gallan love elegy (*Extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem: | pauc... Lycoris, | carmina sunt dicenda...*, 10.1–3). Having established a composite literary background for this poem with references to Arethusa (pastoral) and Lycoris (elegy), Vergil informs us to expect heavy echoes from the woods: *non canimus surdis, respondent omnia silvae* (10.8). He then proceeds with a song that in the narrative voice uses dense allusion to Theocritus *Id.* 1 to cast Gallus as a pastoral Daphnis figure, and that in Gallus’s own speech may allude just as heavily to Gallus’s own poetry in rejecting the offer of pastoral consolation.\(^{115}\) As he does throughout the *Eclogues*, Vergil here uses the very setting of the collection to trope his revolutionary, highly allusive compositional method, and expresses through the dense, echoing forests of the *Eclogues*—another innovation on the Theocritean landscape—the importance of intertextuality for his own and later Roman poetry.

### 3.2.2 *Arbores*

Trees are another important metapoetic symbol in the *Eclogues*. Unlike what we saw with *silvae*, however, the metapoetic symbolism of *arbores* does not rely directly on the literalization of its use as a literary-critical metaphor. Instead, the symbolism of trees relies in part on the analogical extension of the symbolism of forests—that is, if forests represent the literary tradition, then individual trees can represent individual books—and partly on the literalization of a term drawn from a particular part of the

---

\(^{115}\)On the extent of Gallan allusion in Gallus’s song see Ch. 2 n. 28.
tree—its bark, *liber*, which is also (by metaphorical derivation) the technical term for “book.”  

Aside from these two factors, the symbolism of trees in *Ecl. 10* is supported also by extension of the metapoetic analogy between Gallus and Acontius (based on Vergil’s use of the Acontius narrative to represent elegy), since both Acontius and Gallus can be said to have written their *amores* onto *libri* (barks, books).

Analogy is one important means by which Vergil creates, reinforces, and extends metapoetic symbolism in the *Eclogues*. As Gutzwiller has shown in her study of Theocritus, analogy is the major structuring principle that Theocritean pastoral uses to create meaning, by suggesting relationships both within the text and between the text and people or circumstances external to it.  

Vergil in the *Eclogues* follows Theocritus in using analogy to structure relationships within the text, and he extends, I believe, the use of analogy to create relationships between the text and contemporary poetic society. By making Gallus, moreover, the central character of *Eclogue* 10, Vergil intentionally muddies the distinction between what is internal and external to the text, creating a powerful tool for unobtrusive poetological commentary within the text.

On one hand, the association between trees and books can also be seen as an analogical extension of the association between forests and the literary tradition:

```
forests : literary traditions :: trees : books
```

By permutation of this analogy, moreover, we see that just as forests are constituted...
from individual trees, literary traditions are made up of individual books of poetry:

\[
\text{forests} : \text{trees} :: \text{literary traditions} : \text{books}
\]

By this principle of analogical extension, the metapoetic symbolism of \textit{silvae} gives rise to several related, but logically subordinate metapoetic symbols, like trees, which systematically exploit the association of forests with the literary tradition to provide an apparatus for poetological self-expression that does not violate the conventions of Theocritean pastoral through overt self-reference.

On the other hand, the association of trees and books can also be seen as an extension of the metanarrative analogy between Gallus and Acontius. Like other species of allusion, metanarrative alignment can be understood as a type of analogy, which, by creating an allusive link between a character and a literary exemplar, allows one to form reasoned expectations about the character and his future actions, and to form literary interpretations based on his adherence to or deviation from the model. Vergil, as I have argued above, uses the story of Acontius as a metanarrative pattern for elegiac love poetry in the \textit{Eclogues}, since elegy and Acontius share an attitude towards love, and, more specifically, towards the use of writing in pursuit of love. When Gallus in \textit{Eclogue} 10 expresses his desire to be an Acontius figure, he reinforces the link between Acontius and Roman (i.e. Gallan) elegy, and he puts the analogy between himself and Acontius in the most explicit terms it appears anywhere in the collection.

\begin{align*}
\text{certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum} \\
\text{malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores} \\
\text{arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis amores.}
\end{align*}

(Verg. \textit{Ecl.} 10.52–54)

As I argued in the last section, one can see metapoetic generic reference in Gallus’s preference for suffering (the substance of elegiac \textit{querelae}), but these lines put special
emphasis on writing as the point of comparison between Gallus and his metanarrative exemplar: specifically, both Gallus and Acontius are known for writing in connection with their amores, an ambiguous word that can refer here both to inscribing one’s lover’s name on trees, as Acontius did in the Aetia, and to inscribing love poetry on them, as Mopsus in Ecl. 5 inscribed his poetry in viridi... cortice fagi (5.13).

The close similarity between Gallus and Acontius in this passage invites us to form a metanarrative analogy between Acontius’s amores for Cydippe and Gallus’s own amores for Lycoris. Because outside of the text, moreover, Gallus wrote poetry that can also be called amores, his circumstances within and outside of the pastoral world can be expressed in nearly the same terms. This passage of Ecl. 10 seems to invite us to conceive of an analogy between Gallus and Acontius in these terms: as Acontius carved his love for Cydippe (amores) on trees, so Gallus writes his love poetry (amores) for Lycoris in/on books of poetry (cf. Serv. ad Ecl. 10.1, Gallus... amorum suorum de Cytheride scripsit libros quattuor). Arranged symbolically, the analogy looks like this:

Acontius : trees :: Gallus : poetry books

Permutation of the same analogy, moreover, generates a different association that uses the established parallelism of these two characters to create a metaphorical and metapoetic association between trees and poetry books:

Acontius : Gallus :: trees : poetry books

The analogy between trees and poetry books is supported by the ambiguity of amores and incidere, as well as that of the adjective tener, which on one hand means that

---

119Rosen and Farrell 1986 argue that Vergil alludes to Acontius also in his reference to Cydonia spicula in lines 59–60, since spicula can be seen as an etymological gloss on Acontius’s name, which means “archer” or “spearman” (> ἄκων) and Cydonia may allude to the quince (Cydonia mala) that Acontius threw to Cydippe. 
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the trees are young, and so easy to carve in, but on the other hand seems to allude to the programmatic stylistic “softness” of Roman elegiac poetry, which Ovid routinely expresses with tener.120

While the metapoetic alignment of trees and poetry books is based partly on the analogies listed above, it is reinforced by a number of metaphorical wordplays, such as those on the words amores and tener. There is another metaphorical wordplay that is important to this passage, but does not appear explicitly in these lines: I believe that Vergil here is making a suppressed reference to the word liber—which can mean both “bark” and “book”—with the word arboribus in line 54 (. . . tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis amores, 10.53–54).121 Greek and Latin poets are generally explicit about tree-writing, giving the content of the inscription, and specifically stating that it is carved on the bark of the tree, rather than, as here, simply “on trees;”122 even Vergil himself is more explicit elsewhere in the Eclogues, when at Ecl. 5.13–14 Mopsus is said to have written carmina (which he proceeds to sing at 20–44) in cortice fagi.123 Readers and commentators of Eclogue 10 seem to have had little trouble metonymically substituting “bark(s) of the trees” for “trees,” but it may be legitimate to ask why Vergil would thus conclude a sentence

120See Ov. Am. 2.1.4 (with McKeown 1987–<1998> ad loc.), 3.1.69, 3.8.2; cf. Lucke 1982 ad Rem. 757 and Syndikus 1984, 201–202. Compare the related use of mollis at Prop. 1.7.19 (with Fedeli 1980 ad loc.) and 3.3.18. Lyne 1978 notes at Ciris 169 that, when applied to feet, as here in line 49, tener is actively elegiac to its near exclusion from other genres (see below n. 133 for more on the metapoetic significance of tener, as it is used specifically with reference to feet). On the metapoetic resonance of tener in Ecl. 10 cf. Harrison 2007a, 70.

121On suppression in Hellenistic and Augustan poets see Ch. 1 nn. 32 and 34 above.

122So Callimachus specifies that Acontius writes “Cydippe is beautiful” on the “barks” of trees (Callim. fr. 73, ἀλλ’ ἐν δὴ φλοιοῖσι σκεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε | γράμματα, Κοδίππην ὅσσ᾿ ἐρέουσι καλήν), and Propertius, in his own imitation of Acontius (and Ecl. 10), wrote “Cynthia” on trees’ barks (Prop. 1.18.22, scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus). Cf. Theocritus in his epithalamium of Helen (Id. 18.47–48): γράμματα δ’ ἐν φλοιῷ γεγράψεται, ὡς παριῶν τίς | ἀννείμη Δωριστί· “σέβευ μ’· Ἐλένας φυτὸν εἶμι.”

123Although it is not explicitly stated that the bark Mopsus carved his songs on was still attached to the beech tree rather than detached, this is the reading of Clausen and Coleman, inter alia.
that cultivates double meaning as actively as this sentence had done in the preceding line.

In my view a suppressed wordplay underlies the word *arboribus*. If the metonymy of “tree” for “bark” prompts a mental substitution of “bark” for “tree,” it does not however prejudice the outcome by supplying a particular word for “bark.” When Gallus’s speech does produce a word for “bark,” 13 lines later, it is not the more common and usual word *cortex*, but its suggestive synonym, *liber*.¹²⁴

\begin{quote}
non illum possunt nostri mutare labores,
 nec si frigoribus mediis Hebrumque bibamus
Sithoniaque nives hiemis subeamus aquosae,
 nec si, cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo,
Aethiopum versemus ovis sub sidere Cancri.
\end{quote}

\section*{(Ecl. 10.64–68)}

Gallus’s mention of dying tree bark in the desert has caused some confusion, and even prompted an emendation,¹²⁵ but we may instead see *liber* as glossing a suppressed pun in *teneris arboribus*, retrospectively completing both the narrative and metapoetic sense of lines 52–53 with the phrase *teneris libris*: Gallus the character will carve his love for Lycoris (*amores*) on the tender barks of trees, while Gallus the poet will inscribe his love poetry (*amores*) in tender books of elegy. Both Ovid and,

¹²⁴The normal word for bark is *cortex*, which refers specifically to the outer layer; *liber* is properly the cambium, or inner bark of the tree, although this distinction is not always observed (see Mynors 1990 on Geo. 2.77, *TLL* s.v. *liber* 1.1). Vergil uses *liber* for “bark” only twice elsewhere, in both cases apparently referring to the inner bark (Geo. 2.77, Aen. 11.554). Servius felt the need to gloss the word at Aen. 11.554, where he explicates the connection between books and bark thus: *liber dicitur interior corticis pars, quae ligno cohaeret: alibi “alta liber aret in ulmo”. unde et liber dicitur in quo scribimus, quia ante usum chartae vel membranae de libris arborum volumina fiebant, id est conpaginabantur.*

¹²⁵Conington 1865–1875 ad loc. conjectured *aret Liber* and remarked, “the elm and the vine together would not be more inappropriate in Aethiopia than the elm alone, if Virg. means any thing more by the clause than to mark the time;” cf. Clausen ad loc. Berg 1974, 188 suggested that both *liber* in line 67 and *versemus* in line 68 might be literary puns on *liber* (“book”) and *versus* (“verse”) respectively. On Vergil’s extensive metapoetic wordplay with *versus* in the *Georgics*, see below p. 253.
perhaps, Propertius make metaliterary puns like this, which use programmatic terms for elegiac softness to play on the double meaning of *liber*. And while Ovid puns overtly with the word *liber* in the story of Daphne and Apollo (*mollia cinguntur praecordia libro, Met. 1.549*), Propertius may have suppressed his pun in a manner analogous to *Ecl. 10.52–54*: if the transposition of Koppiers is correct, Propertius too, while himself adapting the story of Acontius in 1.18, uses the adjective *tener* and a suppressed pun on *liber* (=*cortex*) to highlight a metapoetic pun on the subject (and perhaps title) of his own elegiac book, Cynthia: *scribitur et teneris Cynthia corticibus* (1.18.22).

The enjambment of *arboribus* at *Ecl. 10.54* does much to preserve the pastoral decorum of this very elegiac *Eclogue* by suppressing a particularly overt metaliterary pun, which would perhaps read more easily as poetic self-reference than it would as narrative. At the same time, however, it helps to reinforce the metaphorical association between trees and poetry books. When the narrative and metapoetic registers converge in line 53, the suggestive ambiguity of that line might encourage the expectation of the one similarly ambiguous word that could complete both literal and metapoetic senses of this line—namely *liber*, which means both “bark” and “book.” This expectation is pointedly frustrated by the enjambment of *arboribus* in line 54, and the semantic range of *liber* seems to be mapped onto *arbor*. The resulting syllepsis creates (1) a metonymic association between “tree” and “bark” on the narrative level, and (2) a metaphorical association between “tree” and “book” on the metapoetic

---

126 See Farrell 1999, 133–135; Martindale 2005, 208. On *mollis* and elegiac softness see above n. 120.

127 The pun was noted by Kennedy 1993, 51, and more recently by Pincus 2004, 183, who compares *Ecl. 10*. Lowrie 1997, 171 discusses a similar pun in Horace *Odes 1.38* with *philylea* (the inner bark of the linden-tree, also used for writing) at the end of the first *liber* of *Odes*. On the text of Prop. 1.18.19–22 see Heyworth 2007, 81–82; elsewhere I follow the manuscript reading of lines 21–22, *a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras, | scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus*, over Koppiers’s conjecture of *vestras... umbras |... teneris... corticibus*. 
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level. As a result of the metaphorization of *arbor*, the rest of line 54 can be read in the metapoetic register as a desire for renown through poetry: *crescent illae [arbores]*, *crescetis, amores*.\(^\text{128}\) Even the adjective *tener*, which had already suggested the characteristic softness of elegy, is redeployed as part of this metaphor to allow the youth of these trees to figure the newness of the genre, and perhaps to suggest Gallus’s ambition as its founder. It is possible, moreover, that this metaphor may reflect the language that Gallus used in his own poetry to describe his poetic inspiration: Duncan Kennedy has argued that Hamadryads served as surrogate Muses in Gallan elegy, and Hamadryads, of course, are nymphs who coexist with trees.\(^\text{129}\) Within the *Eclogues*, however, the association of trees with poetry books provides the basis for a broad system of metaphors that Vergil uses to talk about poetry, poetic tradition, and poetic influence.

I have already discussed Vergil’s metapoetic reference, in the closing frame of *Eclogue* 10, to his *amor Galli*, which continued the metapoetic use of *amor* and *amores* from Gallus’s speech, and especially from his reference to carving his *amores* on trees (*tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus, Ecl. 10.53–54*). Another feature that closely binds these passages is that both use growing trees as a metapoetic symbol for poetry. After wishing that the Pierides will make his poem great in Gallus’s eyes (*maxima Gallo*, 10.72), Vergil picks up the tree metaphor from Gallus’s speech, comparing the growth of his own *amor Galli* to the growth of an alder in the spring.

Galco, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus.

\(^{128}\) Such a desire for poetic renown is conventional, and is argued for by Cairns 2006, 97–100 and Index II s.v. *nomen*, who cites as evidence the persistent association of Gallus and Gallan topics in Augustan poetry with an etymological complex of words for renown and notoriety (*notus, noscere*, etc.).

\(^{129}\) See Kennedy 1982, 377–389, who argues persuasively that references to Hamadryads in Vergil, Propertius, and the *Culex* point to literary links with Gallus.
Furthermore, the precise wording of Vergil’s description of the alder tree here is significant and introduces another metaphor to represent Vergil’s poetic relationship to Gallus. Although readers since Servius have understood the phrase *se subicit* generally, as meaning “cast itself upwards” (*sursum iacit*), i.e. “grow quickly,” one scholar has argued persuasively that we should understand this phrase in its technical horticultural sense, “reproduce by suckering,” i.e. “cast down (*subter iacit*) scions, which then grow up from the root.”

Vergil himself clearly intends this second, horticultural meaning when he uses the phrase at *Geo.* 2.19 (*parva sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra*, on which see Ch. 4), and his specification of the *alnus viridis* is probably meant to distinguish the white alder, which reproduces in this way, from the more common black alder, which does not. In the metapoetic register, the analogy of a parent tree sending out scions from its roots is an attractive way to view Vergil’s imitation of Gallan elegy in *Eclogue* 10 (as well as, to a more limited extent, throughout the collection): Gallan love poetry (*amor Galli*) has sent out a scion of itself in *Ecl.* 10, which, under Vergil’s cultivation, grows like an alder in spring (*Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas | quantum vere novo viridis*).

---

130 See Dyer 1969, which discusses Servius’s note ad loc.: ‘*vere novo*’ vel generaliter, vel *sibi novo*. ‘*viridis*’ autem pro *tenera*. et hoc dicit: amo, inquit, Gallum, sed latenter, *sicut arbores crescunt* – nam comparatio ista hoc significat – , *scilicet propter Caesarem*. ‘*subicit*’ vero vel *sursum iacit*, vel *subter iacit*. Although Servius cites both senses, *sursum iacit* and *subter iacit*, for *subicit*, his interpretation of line 74, *sicut arbores crescent*, does seem, as Dyer claims, to favor the former meaning (*subter iacit*). Dyer may, however, exaggerate in claiming that Servius deliberately rules out the technical horticultural sense of *se subicit*: *latenter* does seem to suggest scions growing unperceived from the base of a parent tree, and it makes clear, besides, that Servius understood that the point of this comparison was not only speed (as, e.g., Conington read this line), but also manner.

131 As Dyer 1969 points out, there is also a third species of alder that grows commonly in Europe: the bushy mountain alder, which today bears the scientific name *alnus viridis*. But the modern scientific name bears no necessary relationship to ancient usage.
Besides specifying a species, moreover, viridis may also be, as Servius suggested, a calque for tener, through which Vergil can be seen to use pastoral language to attribute elegiac softness to Ecl. 10, just as Gallus carved his amores specifically on teneris arboribus. The suckering alder can be seen on several levels as an analogy for Vergil’s literary-historical relationship to his literary models, since the scion, to its detriment, grows up in the shadow of older, more established trees—a problem that Vergil discusses at Geo. 2.19, which I will discuss in Chapter 4. As a scion of both Gallan love poetry and Theocritean pastoral, Vergil’s Eclogues likewise stand in the shadow of “greater” poems, a shadow that both protects them and, ultimately, stunts their further development. Both this shadow and other shadows are important to the metapoetic symbolism in the Eclogues, and they form the subject of this chapter’s final section.

132Cf. Kennedy 1983, as well as Breed 2007, 132 (with somewhat different emphasis: “that tree is a reflection of the textuality of Eclogue 10; it stands in for the page on which Vergil’s poem is written, just like the trees on which Gallus pledges to inscribe his loves”).

133On elegiac softness see above n. 120, especially Lyne’s suggestion that tener (at least in connection with feet) belonged specifically to elegiac diction. Although Vergil uses tener frequently in the Eclogues, many of these instances may carry a metapoetic reference to Vergil’s project of blending hexameter and elegiac love poetry. In Ecl. 10 specifically, Vergil uses tener only at lines 6–7, where it is predicated of bushes—a low-style analogue of forests/trees—and it seems to reflect metapoetically on the pastoral-elegiac song that he is about to sing: sollicitos Galli dicamus amores, dum tenera attendent simae virgulta capellae. Vergil’s Gallus uses the word twice: once of the trees on which he inscribes his amores (53–54), and once of Lycoris’s feet, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas (49), where plantas is probably a suppressed wordplay between the metrical and anatomical senses of pedes (I hope to discuss this wordplay further in a published version of Henkel 2009a). Since, as Lyne points out, reference to tender feet belongs particularly to elegiac diction, we might note a difference in diction, at least with respect to tener, between lines spoken by Vergil and those spoken by Gallus, as well as between lines spoken by Vergil in the closing pastoral frame and those spoken by him in what I have argued is an elegiac opening frame. When Vergil in the closing frame wishes to describe the tree that represents Ecl. 10 as tender, he uses viridis instead of tener. For a comparable example of Vergil “pastoralizing” an elegiac topos, see Ecl. 1.57, where palumbs, which Servius censures as not being Latin, stand for the columbae (Venus’s bird), which seem to have been important in Gallan elegy (cf. Cairns 2006, 126–127): cf. Serv. ad Aen. 5.213, COLUMBA ubique de his domestecis ‘columbas’ Vergilius dicit... nam agrestes ‘palumbs’ vocantur. Ecl. 1.57 is also the most famous example of the parenthetic apposition that Skutsch 1956, 198 called the “schema Corneliamum” and attributed to Gallus (cf. contra Solodow 1986, with further analysis of the figure’s history).
3.2.3 Umbrae

Shadows are a pervasive element of the landscape of the Eclogues, and they are widely considered fundamental to the pastoral locus amoenus, and thus a prerequisite for pastoral singing. Like the forests of the Eclogues, however, they owe their prevalence less to Theocritus than to Vergil, who refers to shade nearly twice as often as Theocritus (in fewer total lines, as well).¹³⁴ Like the forests and trees of the Eclogues, moreover, the shadows of the collection also constitute a metapoetic literary symbol, which Vergil uses to talk about the “shadow” of influence that past literature has had on his own literary composition in the Eclogues.

Like the silvae of Vergil’s landscape, umbrae too have been considered by others to be symbolically representative either of Vergil’s pastoral project in the Eclogues or of something central to it. Reference to these shadows dominates the opening and closing of the book, and both of these passages have seemed metapoetically reflexive to readers since Servius. In his address to Tityrus in the opening of Eclogue 1, Meliboeus twice mentions the shade in which Tityrus plies his “sylvan Muse.”

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena;
nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva.
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.

(Ecl. 1.1–5)

In the expanded form of the Servian commentaries, Tityrus is here identified with Vergil, and the shade is identified with the protection of Augustus’s patronage—an

¹³⁴Theoc.: Id. 4.19, 5.48, 7.8, 7.138, 12.8, 18.44, 18.46, 22.76, and cf. 16.81 (of the crest of a helmet); Verg.: Ecl. 1.4, 1.83, 2.3, 2.8, 2.67, 5.5, 5.40, 5.70, 7.10, 7.46, 7.58, 8.14, 9.20, and 10.75–76 (three times).
association that, as Annabel Patterson has discussed, persists throughout later European pastoral. But despite the general prominence of the shade motif in the Eclogues, Vergil nowhere uses it in connection with patrons or patronage. Nevertheless, it is clear from this passage, and from corresponding references to shade both in the closing line of Ecl. 1 and in the closing lines of the Eclogue book, that shadows do represent something fundamental to Vergilian pastoral.

In the closing line of Eclogue 1, the end of the poem coincides with the end of the herding day, and the growing shadows (maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae, 1.83) constitute a closural gesture for this poem, which opened with Tityrus singing under the pleasant shade of a beech. At the end of Ecl. 10, however, the speaker declares his intention to rise and leave the shadows, which are now seen as harmful rather than pleasant.

Haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetae,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco,
Pierides: vos haece facietis maxima Gallo,
Gallo cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus.
surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra,
juniperi gravis umbra, nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, it capellae.

(Ecl. 10.70–77)

---

135 See Patterson 1987, 25, 49–57 and cf. DServ. (here in Thilo’s apparatus criticus) on Ecl. 1.1, sub persona Tityri Virgilius intelligitur (cf. the main text of Servius here: et hoc loco Tityri sub persona Vergilium debemus accipere), and on Ecl. 1.4 in umbra allegorice sub tutela Imp. Aug. Compare also Hunter 2006a, 130, who connects patronage not with the umbra that Meliboeus mentions in these lines, but rather with otium, which Tityrus mentions in the first line of his reply (O Meliboeae, deus nobis haec otia fecit, 1.6).

136 Ecl. 4, 6, and 8 address various patrons directly. Although Octavian is generally understood to be the divine iuvenis of Ecl. 1, his name is nowhere mentioned in the collection, and attributions of divinity are elsewhere reserved for gods (10.26, 10.61; cf. 4.63, 8.75) and craftsmen/singers/poets (3.37, 5.45, 5.64, 6.67, 10.17). For the argument that Octavian is the unnamed patron of Ecl. 8 see Clausen 1994, 233–237; cf. contra Thibodeau 2006.

137 On dusk as a closural motif in the Eclogues, as well as in Homer, Apollonius, and Theocritus, see Van Sickle 1984.
Servius understood the reference to weaving a basket at the beginning of this passage as a metapoetic reflection on Vergil’s composition of the Eclogue book. A number of readers since Servius, moreover, have associated the singer’s abandonment of pastoral shade with Vergil’s abandonment of pastoral after the end of the Eclogues. There is clear finality in the last three lines: the concept of pastoral song relies on herding and shady repose, and the end of the Eclogues here coincides with the end of the herding day, as did the end of Ecl. 1. For the same reason, however, it is surprising to find pastoral shade repudiated as harmful—even noxious—at the end of a collection in which shade seemed to have positive connotations throughout.

As I argued at the beginning of this section, however, Vergil’s deployment of umbra in fact shows ambivalence from the very beginning of the Eclogues. When Meliboeus remarks in Ecl. 1 that Tityrus is sitting in the shade teaching the woods to echo Amaryllis (1.1–5; see above), the equivocality of his comment inheres especially in the phrase lentus in umbra (1.4), since as I have argued, the adjective lentus (“lazy,” or “pliant”) is potentially unflattering when applied to people instead of to plants (as elsewhere in the Eclogues). Shade is itself, moreover, a potentially negative term, especially if viewed in the context of Republican agricultural and military values, which customarily associated shade with sloth (desidia, segnitia) and contrasted these with such positive values as toughness, hardiness, and military

---

138 Serv. ad Ecl. 10.71 GRACILI FISCCellAM TEXIT HIBISCO... allegoricos autem significat se composuisse hunc libellum tenuissimo stilo.

139 Although scholars frequently use Vergil’s abandonment of the shade as a metaphor in their own writing (e.g. Ross 1975, 105; Hubbard 1998, 138–139), few claim explicitly that Vergil meant it as such. But as Harrison 2007a, 73 points out, the reference to crops (nocent et frugibus umbrae, 10.76) invites one to read these lines as a self-conscious reflection on Vergil’s generic ascent (surgamus) from pastoral in the Eclogues (umbrae) to agricultural didactic in the Georgics (fruges). (Ovid too, if the best manuscripts are right, alluded to the Georgics with the single word fruges at Am. 1.15.25: cf. Cairns 1999a.)


service. Livy and Columella both oppose the vita militaris to the vita umbratilis (Liv. 5.6.5, Col. 1.praef.17), and Cicero, in his defense of Murena, says that leisure and shade should yield to military life and the sun (Quod si ita est, cedat, opinor, Sulpici, forum castris, otium militiae, stilus gladio, umbra soli, Mur. 30). Ovid plays on the negative associations of shade in his ironic self-presentation in the Amores (Ipse ego segnis eram discinctaque in otia natus; | mollierant animos lectus et umbra meos, Am. 1.9.41–42), and Seneca uses shade in an insulting reference to Epicureans, calling them an “effeminate and shade-loving throng” (delicata et umbratica turba, Ben. 4.2.1).142

When Tityrus replies to Meliboeus’s opening in Ecl. 1, he addresses the substance of Meliboeus’s remarks only briefly before changing the subject, but his reply shows that he sees his shady repose in a different way from Meliboeus.

O Meliboeoe, deus nobis haec otia fecit.

namque erit ille mihi semper deus...

(Ecl. 1.6–7)

By re-characterizing as a felicitation what Meliboeus may have meant as a taunt, Tityrus adopts an evaluation of shade that runs contrary to the agricultural and military values of the Republic. With the word otium, moreover, and with allusions to Lucretius both here and at the end of Eclogue 10, Vergil programmatically aligns this valuation of shade with the unorthodox values of Epicureanism, as well as the two proto-pastoral passages of Lucretius’s Epicurean DRN.143 One scholar has argued that

142 See the discussion of Smith 1965, esp. 301–302, from which I have drawn my examples; Smith also cites the book-length studies of the symbolism of shade by Hölzer 1955; Nováková 1964, with another list of references at Hölzer 1955, 101–104.

Vergil’s use of shade is therefore tied to Epicureanism throughout the *Eclogues*. This interpretation of the motif, however, is inconsistent with its thematic deployment to delimit the book, unless the metapoetic plot of the *Eclogues* involves Vergil’s acceptance and subsequent rejection of Epicurean tenets.\(^{144}\) Other scholars have seen the shadows of the *Eclogues*, like its forests, as emblematically representing either the *Eclogue* book or the pastoral genre, from which Vergil rises (to the *Georgics*) as he rises from the shade at the end of *Ecl.* 10 (*surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra*, 10.75).\(^{145}\) As with *silvae*, however, here again it is not just Vergil’s pastoral genre that these shadows represent, but also the same quality that inheres in his generic symbolism throughout the metapoetic program of the *Eclogues*: the heavy reliance of Vergilian pastoral on influence by, and imitation of, the previous literary tradition.

From this perspective, Vergil’s shadows can be seen as another elaboration of the metapoetic symbolism of *silvae*, which represents the literary tradition as the raw material of Vergilian poetry, and which further associates trees (*arbores*), especially in *Ecl.* 10, with individual books of poetry. By extension of this metaphor, the shadows cast by these trees can be seen to represent the influence that they exert, for both good and bad, on their literary successors. Although not extant as early as Vergil, this metaphorical sense of *umbra* is attested from the first century AD: Seneca, e.g., speaks of a certain well-spoken Caecina, “who would at some point have had a name in eloquence, except that the shadow of Cicero suppressed him” (*facundum virum et qui habuisset aliquando in eloquencia nomen, nisi illum Ciceronis*).

\(^{144}\)This seems to be what Smith 1965, 303 suggests. This view relies on the temporal and developmental finality of *Ecl.* 10, implied to many by the phrase *extremus labor* (10.1); against this interpretation stand those who emphasize the coherence and design of the *Eclogues* as a book (cf. e.g. Clausen 1994, xxv n. 35 on *extremus labor*).

\(^{145}\)See, e.g., Harrison 2007a, 72–74 and Kennedy 1983.
umbra pressisset, Nat. 2.56.1). Quintilian too uses this metaphor when he speaks of contemporary Atticists, who, “because they cannot bear the too-bright strength of eloquence, as if it were the sun, hide themselves in the shadow of a great name [viz., Atticism]” (qui, quia clariorem vim eloquentiae velut solem ferre non possunt, umbra magni nominis delitescunt, Inst. 12.10.15). The first of these examples, moreover, shows how naturally this metaphor can be applied to literature and the influence of one’s predecessor. Vergil’s metapoetic use of umbra in the Eclogues can be seen both as an extension of his metapoetic use of silvae and arbores, and, if umbra was used metaphorically already in the first century BC, as a literalization of this metaphor. The equivocality of umbra, moreover, carries over into its metapoetic use in the Eclogues: just as shadows both protect and obscure a person, so too the metaphorical shadow of literary influence can be seen both to foster literary talent, since it provides a template for imitation, and to suppress it, since mere imitation can often seem slavish. It is this natural ambivalence of poetic imitatio—perhaps the central paradox of his poetic career—that Vergil represents in the metaphor of shade, which opens and closes his book of Eclogues.

As Duncan Kennedy suggested in a brief 1983 article, the shadow from which Vergil rises in Eclogue 10 can be seen to represent the influence of Gallan love poetry. Vergil had specifically dedicated the poem to Gallus (pauca meo Gallo, 10.2), and, as I have argued in the first two sections of this chapter, the poem represents Vergil’s attempt to write elegiac love poetry in pastoral hexameters. When Vergil at the end of this poem compares the growth of his amor Galli to that of an alder in spring,

146Cf. further OLD s.v. umbra 3b, “(fig.) the shadow cast by a person or thing of greater importance, achievement, etc.,” which cites further examples in Sen. Ep. 33.8, Ben. 3.32.5, and Sil. 14.283.

147This metaphor continues to be used in modern English, as can be seen in the titles of two modern works that treat literary influence in relation to Vergil, Hunter’s In the Shadow of Callimachus (Hunter 2006a), and Hubbard’s chapter on post-Vergilian pastoral, “In Vergil’s Shadow” (Ch. 3 in Hubbard 1998).
amor Galli can therefore be seen to represent the genre of Gallan love elegy, and
the shade from which Vergil subsequently rises can be seen as the shadow of Gallus’s
literary influence.\textsuperscript{148}

Gallo cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus.
surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra,
juniperi gravis umbra, nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum satureae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae.

(Ecl. 10.73–77)

When Vergil says in these lines that shade is harmful specifically to singers (\textit{solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra}, 10.75), we are surprised because shade has been the
locus of song both in Theocritus and throughout the \textit{Eclogues}. Like literary influence,
however, shadows are eventually harmful to those who linger in them for too long;
Kennedy puts this succinctly: “it is harmful for one singer to linger too long in the
shadow of another.”\textsuperscript{149} These lines close both \textit{Ecl.} 10 and the entire \textit{Eclogue} book,
throughout which Vergil has been laboring in the shadows of Theocritus, Gallus,
Callimachus, Lucretius, and others.\textsuperscript{150}

Poetic influence is a fact of Vergil’s compositional method, and he does not es-
cape it permanently at the end of the \textit{Eclogues}. Literary influence is a problem
that Vergil grapples with throughout his literary career, and one which he addresses
particularly—again using the metaphor of shadow—in the beginning of \textit{Georgics} 2,

\textsuperscript{148} Although there is no explicit link between lines 73–74 on Vergil’s \textit{amor Galli} and lines 75–76 on Vergil rising from the shade, the logic of pastoral relies routinely on implicit comparison, and these
lines are naturally linked by their appearance in sequence.

\textsuperscript{149} Kennedy 1983, 124.

\textsuperscript{150} This multiple influence, moreover, may be what Vergil alludes to at the end of \textit{Ecl.} 2, when he
refers to “doubling the growing shadows” (\textit{et sol crescentis decedens duplicat umbras}, 2.67) at the
end of a poem that blends large-scale adaptation of Theocritean lines with narrative patterns drawn
from Theocritus (Polyphemus in \textit{Id.} 11), Callimachus (Acontius in \textit{Aet.} 3), and probably Gallan
elegy (from which Vergil may have drawn the \textit{dives amator} figure).
where he uses a discussion of tree propagation to reflect metapoetically on poetic composition. This discussion, which continues much of the metapoetic symbolism of the *Eclogues*, will be the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter 4

The Metapoetics of Arboriculture

in *Georgics* 2

The second book of the *Georgics* deals with arboriculture, as broadly defined by Theophrastus to include viticulture as well as the cultivation of olive and fruit trees. Since, as I have argued in the previous chapters, Vergil develops forests, trees, and related concepts as metapoetic symbols in the *Eclogues*, the discussion of arboriculture in *Georgics* 2 offers an opportunity for the poet not only to expand this metaphor, but to develop a systematic discussion of poetry and poetic composition through this systematic discussion of trees and arboriculture. Whereas in the *Eclogues* Vergil uses narrative intertexts, such as the story of Acontius from Callimachus and the story of Daphnis from Theocritus, to organize *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10 into a metapoetic narrative, in *Georgics* 2 he uses a didactic intertext, Theophrastus’s treatment of arboriculture, to organize passages in *Georgics* 2 into metapoetic didactic. Through a system of literalized metaphors and allusions to metapoetic symbols from the *Eclogues*, Vergil structures his discussion of the proper cultivation of different types of tree as a metapoetic discussion of the proper style and content of different genres of poetry.
In his discussion of grafting, moreover, Vergil metapoetically figures the characteristically Roman and Vergilian techniques of intertextuality and genre-blending through the fantastical splicing and grafting of different types of trees.

As in the *Eclogues*, the metapoetic program of the *Georgics* is concerned partly with situating this poem within the literary tradition(s) to which it belongs. But whereas in the *Eclogues* Vergil was concerned to straddle both the pastoral and elegiac traditions at once, his concern in the *Georgics*—or at least in Geo. 2—is to situate his poem within the traditions of both Greek and Latin didactic, as a successor to both the agricultural didactic of Hesiod and, somewhat paradoxically, the natural philosophical didactic of Lucretius. In the Latin didactic tradition Lucretius seems to have been preeminent, and the influence of Lucretian didactic on Vergil is evident throughout the *Georgics*.\(^1\) It is clear that Vergil admired the natural philosophical mode of Lucretian didactic, since he puts natural philosophical songs into the mouths of both Silenus in *Ecl.* 6 (31–73, esp. 31–42) and Iopas in *Aen.* 1 (741–746). Vergil himself confesses this admiration bluntly towards the end of Geo. 2, where, in the style of a *recusatio*, he asks the Muses to teach him natural philosophical poetry (475–482), but maintains that his poetic powers may be insufficient for such a poem (483–489).\(^2\) This passage culminates in the famous double *makarismos* in which Vergil felicitates two figures, one “who was able to recognize the causes of things,” and another “who knows the rustic gods.”

---

\(^{1}\) On the history of Latin didactic see Gale 2005, esp. 104–105 on its early history and development. Although Lucretius was not the first Latin poet to write didactic (this was Ennius), his original verse composition in the *DRN* was an important step away from contemporary didactic poetry, which consisted largely of the translation of Greek didactic poets (Cicero’s *Aratea*, and probably Sallustius’s *Emпедoclea*); the *De Rerum Natura* of Egnatius probably postdates that of Lucretius, but its importance is at any rate limited by the apparent fact that it was not well-known (it is only through Macrobius 6.5.1–2, 12; cf. Hollis FRP 43–43A). On the influence of Lucretius on the *Georgics* see esp. Farrell 1991, 169–206 and Gale 2000.

\(^{2}\) On the comparison of this passage with other Augustan *recusationes* see Hardie 1986, 43–51 and Gale 2000, 42–43.
felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas
atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum
subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari:
fortunatus et ille deos qui novit agrestis
Panaque Silvanumque senem Nymphasque sorores.

(Geo. 2.490–494)

The interpretation of these lines is controversial, but most scholars agree that felix qui... in lines 490–492 (along with the reference to natural philosophy above at 475–482) refers at least to Lucretius, if also to other poets in the natural philosophical tradition (Aratus, Empedocles), and that, both here and above (475–489), Vergil contrasts this type of poetry with his own project of agricultural didactic in the Georgics.³ Despite his admiration for Lucretius and natural philosophical didactic, Vergil chose instead to cast his own didactic poem after the agricultural model of Hesiod’s Works and Days, a decision that he reports explicitly in the climax of his “Praises of Italy,” the only passage in the Georgics in which he names a generic predecessor.⁴

salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
magna virum: tibi res antiquae laudis et artem

³On the likely reference to Lucretius, see esp. Gale 2000, 8–11, 42–43, who notes the resemblance of Geo. 2.490 (rerum cognoscere causas) to DRN 3.1068–1072 (naturam primum studeat cognoscere rerum, 1072) and 5.1183–1186 (nec poterant quibus id fieret cognoscere causis, 1185), and that of Geo. 2.491–492 (atque metus omnis inexorabile fatum | subiecit pedibus strepitemque Acherontis avari) to DRN 1.78–79 (quae religio pedibus subiecta vicissim | obteritus) and 3.35–40 (et metus ille foras praeceps Acherontis agendaus, 37). On the influence of Empedocles and Aratus on these lines see Hardie 1986, 43–48 and Nelis 2004. Thomas (ad Geo. 2.475–494, 477–482) argues that Vergil’s references in these lines to natural philosophy allude to his own ambitions for the Georgics, but we should compare the practice of other Augustan poets, who use promises of future philosophical study as a foil for their own present poetic project (see Innes 1979).

⁴Cf. Serv. praef., in Geo., Vergilius in operibus suis diversos secutus est poetas: Homerum in Aeneide, quem licet longo intervallo, secutus est tamen; Theocritum in bucolicis, a quo non longe abest; Hesiodum in his libris, quem penitus reliquit. See also Farrell 1991, 27–60, who argues that Vergil’s claim to Hesiodic inspiration at Geo. 2.176 in fact marks the end of Hesiod’s direct influence on the Georgics, since Vergil and Horace both name their models only at points of departure from them. This does not, however, gainsay Hesiod’s importance as a generic model for all four books of Georgics, just as the reference to Theocritus at rather un-Theocritean passages of the Eclogues (4.1–3, 6.1–3) does not negate his importance as a model for the entire collection.
By calling the Georgics a *carmen Ascraeum*, Vergil asserts his imitation of Hesiod, the ultimate founder of the didactic literary tradition. Lucretius, however, is nevertheless Vergil’s preeminent generic predecessor in Latin didactic, and one of Vergil’s chief metapoetic concerns in *Georgics* 2 is to distinguish his own didactic project from that of Lucretius, whose influence is particularly strong in this book.

Vergil’s concern with genre in *Georgics* 2 begins to emerge from the first line of the book, where, by retrospectively characterizing the contents of *Georgics* 1 as *arvorum cultus et sidera caeli*, Vergil acknowledges his debt to Hesiod and the Greek didactic tradition. As Mynors points out in his note ad loc., the phrases *arvorum cultus* and *sidera caeli* can be seen to characterize the two halves of *Geo*. 1 in terms of the two halves of Hesiod’s didactic poem: “Works” (*arvorum cultus*) and “Days” (*sidera caeli*). But although the first half of *Geo*. 1 corresponds closely to Hesiod’s “Works” (*WD* 383–617 ≈ *Geo*. 1.43–203), the 200+ lines of Hesiodic “Days” are represented by only 11 lines in the *Georgics* (*WD* 618–828 ≈ *Geo*. 1.276–286), and these immediately precede the elaborate metapoetic vignette (*Geo*. 1.291–296: see Chapter 1) that alludes to Vergil’s other major model in *Geo*. 1, Aratus. It is probably best to see Vergil’s phrase *sidera caeli* as acknowledging both Hesiod and Aratus as models for *Geo*. 1, since the first half of Aratus’s *Phaenomena* treats astronomy (*sidera caeli*) and since, as Farrell has shown, the structural congruency

---

5 Compare Vergil’s generic fundamentalism also in the *Eclogues*, in which he largely ignores the later pastoral tradition and looks directly to the genre’s founder, Theocritus, for a model.

6 Cf. Servius’s remarks on the first line of *Geo*. 1.1–2 (*quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram | vertere): *Hesiodus... scripsit ad fratrem suum Persen librum, quem appellavit ἔργα καὶ ἡµέρας, id est opera et dies. hic autem liber continet, quemadmodum agri et quibus temporibus sint colendi. cuius titulum transferre noluit... tamen eum per periphrasin primo exprimit versu, dicens: indicabo, quo opere et quibus temporibus ager colendus sit* (praeuf. in *Geo*.).
of Geo. 1 with the *Phaenomena* is the same as its congruency with the *Works and Days*: Vergil imitates the first half of Hesiod’s poem in the first half of his own, then follows the second half of Aratus’s in the second half.\(^7\) Already in Geo. 1 we see how Vergil’s Hesiodic exemplar influences the way that he imitates other poets, since by focusing on Aratus’s weather signs (*Phaen.* 758–1154 \(\approx\) Geo. 351–463) instead of his astronomy, Vergil highlights the part of the *Phaenomena* that links the poem with Hesiodic agricultural didactic rather with Lucretian natural-philosophical didactic.\(^8\) Such selective—or, to use Hinds’ term, tendentious—allusion is characteristic of Vergil’s method, as we saw in considering the metapoetics of the *Eclogues* in Chapters 2–3.\(^9\) We will find likewise in Geo. 2 that the tension between Vergil’s Hesiodic genre and his current imitative program—which in this book is Lucretian—is highly productive of metapoetic symbolism.

### 4.1 Second Proem

The importance of literary genre in Geo. 2 is evident from the book’s two proems, which both discuss poetry in terms that may be understood as relating to genre. At the end of the first proem (Geo. 2.1–8), Bacchus is invoked to be the divine patron of Geo. 2, since the book will deal, among other things, with the cultivation of grapes for wine. The specific terms of this invocation, however, acknowledge that the god’s

---

\(^7\)Farrell 1991, 159.

\(^8\)Aratus’s influence in Geo. 2 is also refracted through the prism of the poem’s Hesiodic-agricultural genre: the hymnic invocation of Bacchus at Geo. 2.4–5 (*huc, pater o Lenaee; tuis hic omnia plena | muneribus*) alludes both to *Ecl.* 3.60 and to the hymn to Zeus that opens the *Phaenomena* (*Phaen.* 1–16, esp. 1–4), where Zeus is praised for the signs he gives to farmers (*Phaen.* 5–13); the allusions to Aratus’s \(\Delta\kappa\eta\) at 2.460 (*iustissima tellus*) and 2.473–474 (*extrema per illos | Iustitia excedens terris vestigia fecit*) focus on a passage that shares its themes with Hesiod (*\(\Delta\kappa\eta\): WD* 220–262, Myth of the Ages: *WD* 109–155).

\(^9\)On tendentious allusion see Hinds 1998, 99–144, cited above Ch. 3 n. 21.
patronage of Geo. 2 is complicated by considerations of genre: *huc, pater o Lenaee, veni nudataque musto | tinge novo mecum dereptis crura coturnis*, 7–8. Before aiding Vergil in the composition of this didactic poem, Bacchus must first remove his buskins (*dereptis coturnis*), the characteristic symbol of the genre he usually patronizes, tragedy. The second proem to *Georgics* 2 evokes Vergil’s two addressees, the farmers of Italy (35–38) and Maecenas (39–46). Both sections share the same concerns about genre as were evident in the invocation to Bacchus, but while the address to Maecenas is explicit about this concern, the address to Italian farmers, I shall argue, approaches the issue of genres and literary traditions through the metaphorical analogy of the propagation of trees. This proem bridges the gap between Vergil’s explicit and metapoetic discussions of poetry by creating an equivalence between the work of the farmer, who is exhorted to learn cultivation according to “genre” (*genus*) of tree, and that of the poet, whose work is described with the poem’s most ethically-charged agricultural phrase, “toil” (*labor*).\(^{10}\)

The address to Maecenas is the first explicitly programmatic passage in the *Georgics*. In it Vergil directly addresses the literary issues he hinted at in the first proem, through the metaphorical language of his invocation of Bacchus. These issues include questions of genre and tradition, and Vergil addresses them with both non-metaphorical language and with openly programmatic metaphors, first styling his poem a *labor*, then comparing it to a journey at sea, using a complex and elaborate metaphor that interacts with related imagery in *Geo.* 1 and 4.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{10}\)On the similarity of the poet’s *labor* and the farmer’s *labor* cf. Gale 2000, 185.

tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem, 
o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae, 
Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti. 
non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto, 
non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum, 
ferrea vox. ades et primi lege litoris oram; 
in manibus terrae. non hic te carmine facto 
atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo.

(2.39–46)

While the programmatic image of the sea-voyage owes much to Pindar, many critics have seen the influence of Callimachus in the *recusatio* of lines 42–46, and have consequently read this passage as eschewing epic for didactic poetry.  
Most obviously, Vergil’s profession of modesty in lines 42–44 is a conspicuous adaptation of Homer’s famous invocation of the Muses before the catalogue of ships, which he claimed he could not sing alone even with ten tongues, ten mouths, an unbreakable voice, and a bronze heart. The many-tongues/many-mouths *topos* was a well-known property of epic not only from the *Iliad*, but also from Latin adaptations in Ennius’s *Annales* and Hostius’s *Bellum Histicum*. Aside from this allusion, Vergil’s image of the open sea has been thought to represent epic poetry by alluding to an apparent literary-crITICAL commonplace, whereby ancient critics metaphorically likened Homer to the ocean. Thus Thomas sees Vergil attenuating his epic ambition into a more orthodox

---

12 See Thomas ad *Geo.* 2.41–45.

13 *Il.* 2.488–492, πληθὺν δ᾿ οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ᾿ ὀνοµήνω, | οὐδ᾿ εἰ μοι δέκα μὲν γλώσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ᾿ εἶν, | φωνὴ δ᾿ ἀρρητός, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἣτορ ἐνείη, | εἰ μὴ Ὄλυμπιάδες Μοῦπιλον χαῖδοι | ἡγατέρες μνησαίθ᾿ ὅσοι ὑπὸ ῾Ιλιον ἔλθον.

14 Ennius fr. 469–470 Sk.: *non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint | in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum*; Hostius fr. 3 Blänsdorf (= 3 Courtney): *non si mihi linguae | centum atque ora sient totidem vocesque liquatae*. On the literary history of this *topos* see Farrell 1991, 232–234 (with the secondary material cited in his notes) and Hinds 1998, 34–47. Vergil later reworked the line at *Aen.* 6.625–627, prompting, perhaps, Persius’s later jibe, *Vatibus hic mos est, centum sibi poscere uoces, | centum ora et linguas optare in carmina centum* (5.1–2).

15 See Thomas 1985, 69 and Williams 1978 ad Callim. *Hymn* 2.105–113. More recently, Morgan 1999b (esp. 17–49) has used this symbolism in a metapoetic reading of *Geo.* 4, and Harrison 2007b
Callimachean project, and others have seen Vergil expressing his choice of didactic over epic.

While references to Homer in these lines point toward epic, other details suggest that Vergil may be situating his project within the genre of didactic poetry either instead of or in addition to counterposing it to heroic epic. Specifically, Lucretius’s poem seems to be Vergil’s target, since Lucretius has already emerged as an important model for Geo. 2, and since Vergil’s rendering of the Homeric many-mouths/tongues passage begins with a line that Servius attributes to Lucretius: non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto. In fact, Servius seems to claim that Vergil, changing only one word, borrows the entire Homeric-epic quotation from Lucretius. While these lines are not transmitted anywhere in our DRN and may be improperly attributed by Servius, the general importance of Lucretius to Geo. 2 urges that we consider whether Vergil might here be comparing himself to Lucretius as well as to Homer.

has used it to read several texts, including Hor. Carm. 1.3 on Vergil’s sea-voyage.

16 Thomas 1988 ad 2.4–5, Thomas 1985, 69–70.

17 Muecke 1974, 91–92, who argues against this view, cites Kroll 1924, 189. Farrell 1991, on the other hand, reads this recusatio in terms rather of scope and style than of genre or poetic tradition (233, 246), although he does note that the program expressed here “is entirely in line with Vergil’s treatment of heroic sources in the earlier books of the Georgics” (246).

18 So, e.g., Muecke 1974 (though based on negative evidence).

19 Farrell 1991, 194 points out that, of the first six paragraphs in Geo. 2, five open Lucretian reminiscences; two of these precede the address to Maecenas (Geo. 2.9 ≈ DRN 5.186, 1345; Geo. 2.35–36 ≈ DRN 5.1367–69), while three of them follow it (Geo. 2.73, 83, 109). On Vergil’s program of Lucretian imitation in Geo. 2 see generally Farrell 1991, 189–200, and see further my arguments below.

20 Servius’s note appears at the lemma for line 42, but seems to cover the entire sentence that runs from 42–44: NON EGO CUNCTA MEIS Lucretii versus; sed ille “aerea vox” ait, non “ferrea”. Cf. the similar note at Aen. 6.625: NON MIHI SI LINGUAE CENTUM SINT Lucretii versus sublatus de Homero, sed “aerea vox” dixit.

21 Lachmann suggested that the passage fell out of the lacuna before DRN 6.840, although he thought Servius misplaced his note at Geo. 2.42, and that the quotation consisted only of Geo. 2.43–44 (= Aen. 6.625–626). Jocelyn 1965 is highly skeptical of all scholiastic notes of this type and points out a conflict between Servius’s notes at Geo. 2.42 and Aen. 6.625 makes it impossible to isolate a Lucretian fragment here. The issue is discussed most fully by Giancotti 1976.
Vergil’s most explicit disclaimer in these lines is from trying “to embrace everything with his verses” (cuncta meis amplecti versibus), a claim that specifically contrasts with (and perhaps echoes) Lucretius’s frequent characterization of his poem on the nature of the universe. Vergil’s two other non-metaphorical disclaimers, moreover, can also be read with reference to didactic poetry. In line 45, when the poet eschews a carmen fictum, which might refer to heroic epic, he might be alluding to Hesiod’s Muses, who famously claimed they could speak either true-seeming fictions, or, if they wished, the truth (non-fiction?). And while the long preludes that Vergil disowns in line 46 (ambages et longa exorsa) might be those of the epic cycle, they might also be those that prominently characterize the didactic verse of Hesiod, Empedocles, Parmenides, and Lucretius. Regardless of whether Geo. 2.42–44 come from Lucretius, sublatus de Homero, Vergil may here be making a point about some similarity between Lucretius and Homer, and his own difference from this shared

---

22E.g. DRN 1.498–499, sed quia vera tamen ratio naturaque rerum | cogit, ades, paucis dum versibus expediamus; 1.948–950, si tibi forte animum tali ratione tenere | versibus in nostris possem, dum perspicis omnem | naturam rerum; 4.45–45, sed quoniam docui cunctarum exordia rerum | qualia sint et quam varis distantia formis | sponte sua volent aeterno percita motu | quoque modo possit res ex his quaque creari, and elsewhere throughout the poem.

23Muecke 1974, 92 suggests that Vergil means us to think specifically of cyclic epic.

24Theog. 27–28, ἵδεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύµοισιν ὁµο´ιοταχιρχυµα, ἵδεν δ᾿ εύπολοι ἐθέλουµεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι (cited by Thomas ad Geo. 2.45–46). An allusion to Hesiod’s encounter the Muses would pair well with the allusion to Homer’s (and others’) invocation of the Muses. That Hesiod’s encounter with the Muses occurs in the proem to the Theogony rather than the Works & Days should probably not count against this suggestion, since the proem to the Theogony is Hesiod’s major programmatic consideration of poetry.


26While the self-reflexive proem to the Theogony runs to 115 lines, the Works & Days does not begin its agricultural didactic until nearly halfway through the poem (line 383). On the proems of Empedocles and Lucretius (and their relationship) see Sedley 1998, 1–34; on that of Parmenides see Slaveva-Griffin 2003. All of Lucretius’s six books have proems of at least 25 lines, and the technical material of Book 1 is delayed by nearly 150 lines. By contrast, Vergil has significant proems only at the beginning and middle of the Georgics (1.1–42, 3.1–48), while the agricultural material of this book and Book 4 are delayed by fewer than ten lines each, postponing further introduction until later in the books (2.35–46, 4.116–119).
characteristic. If Servius is right about the attribution of that fragment, then such
a comparison is made stronger by Vergil’s double allusion to Lucretius and Homer;
even if Servius is wrong, the same line of comparison can be drawn from Lucretius’s
own self-positioning as a hexameter poet in the proem to *DRN* 1, where, in his only
explicit mention of his poetic predecessors, he styles himself a successor of and rival
to Ennius and Homer.  

In the proem to *DRN* 1 Lucretius alludes to Ennius’s dream encounter with
Homer in order to align himself with two hexameter poets that he represents as
discussing the *rerum natura*, but to distinguish his own poem from theirs on the basis
of philosophical accuracy. Based on Lucretius’s own literary historical alignment,
Vergil might be seen in his address to Maecenas to counterdistinguish his own didactic
project against a Lucretian-Homeric tradition of natural-philosophical epic. When
Vergil makes his most explicit generic claim about the *Georgics*, in the climax to the
*Laudes Italic* in this book, he styles it a Hesiodic poem based on its content and
its style (*res antiquae laudis et artem* | *ingredior… Ascraeumque cano Romana per
oppida carmen*, 2.174–176); it is in these two categories that Lucretius and Homer
have the most in common, and in which the *Georgics* is especially distinct from both.  

While Lucretius adopted the grand poetic style of Ennius and Homer, and was called
*sublimis* by Ovid and others, scholars have long held that Vergil adopted the middle

---

27 See especially *DRN* 1.117–126, with the comments of Gale 1994, 107–109, which forms part of a
larger argument (99–128) that the *DRN* should be read in the tradition of epic. Cf. further Harrison
2002 on Lucretius’s use of Ennius in the *DRN* proem.

28 For *res* as a reference to poetic content cf. *Enn. Ann.* 206–207, *scripsere alii rem* | *vorsibus quos
olim Faunei vatesque canebant*, where *rem* refers to the 2nd Punic War, treated in Saturnians in
Naevius’s *Bellum Punicum*.

29 *carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti*, | *exitio terras cum dabit una dies*, Ov. *Am.* 3.15.23–
24; cf. McKeown 1987–<1998> ad loc., who cites Fronto (*sublimis Lucretius*, *Ant.* 1 p. 131 van den
Hout), along with similar judgments by Statius (*docti furo arduus Lucreti*, *Silv.* 2.7.76) and Quintilian
(*Macer et Lucretius… alter humiliis, alter difficilis*, *Inst.* 10.1.87). See also Gale’s discussion
of Lucretius’s literary background (Gale 1994, 99–128), including 106–114 on Lucretius’s references
to Homer and Ennius, 114–117 on his use of epic literary devices, 117–122 on his metaphorical use
style in the *Georgics*, and some have argued that this choice reflects a contemporary consensus that the *Works & Days* were an excellent example of the middle style.\(^{30}\)

In content, too, Vergil shares his agricultural subject with Hesiod, while, according to some ancient readings of Homer, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* share—at an allegorical level—Lucretius’s natural-philosophical concern with the *rerum natura*.\(^{31}\)

I suggest that here, in his explicitly programmatic address to Maecenas, Vergil begins to elaborate his generic program in terms of an opposition between his own agricultural didactic project, which follows Hesiod as its model, and a project of natural philosophical didactic, which would follow Lucretius and (according to Lucretius) Homer. The distinction between Hesiodic and Lucretian/Homeric didactic is particularly important in the second book of the *Georgics* because Vergil is here at a turning point in his imitative program: the first book has openly imitated Hesiod and Aratus, while the third and fourth books imitate Lucretius and Homer, respectively. It seems that here, in his address to Maecenas in the second proem to *Geo.* 2, Vergil is beginning to articulate the generic principles that he will follow throughout *Geo.* 2, which reject, at least for now, the grand and “totalizing” natural-philosophical didactic of Lucretius and of Homeric allegoresis (*non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto*, 2.42) in favor of the middle style and agricultural subject matter of Hesiodic didactic (*res antiquae laudis et artem | ingredior... | Ascrauemque cano Romana per oppida carmen*, 2.174–176).

While Vergil invokes both Bacchus (2.1–8) and Maecenas (2.39–46) in a clearly

---

\(^{30}\)Commentators since at least Donatus have claimed that Vergil’s three poems corresponded to the three Greek χαρακτήρες λέξεως: see Vit. Don. 58–59 Diehl and Serv. *praef. in Buc.*, pp. 1–2 Thilo, with discussion and parallels in Jocelyn 1979, 72–73. On the association of Hesiod with the middle style see Jocelyn 1979, 125 n. 81.

\(^{31}\)Farrell 1991, 207–272 demonstrates the power of these allegorical readings of Homer to explain Vergil’s choice of Homer as a didactic model for *Geo.* 4, which is otherwise difficult to explain.
literary capacity, it is less apparent how these invocations are related either to the address to farmers (2.35–38) that immediately precedes the invocation of Maecenas or, for that matter, to the intervening 26 lines, which present an introduction to the techniques of propagating trees. Not only do these thirty lines interrupt the continuity of Vergil’s literary proem (compare the longer proems of *Geo.* 1 and 3), but in so doing, they may even be said to violate the principle of brevity that Vergil enunciates to Maecenas (*non hic te. . . per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo*, 2.45–46).32 In order for us better to understand the movement of Vergil’s thought in these lines, some connection must be sought between the address to farmers and the address to Maecenas, beyond the merely formal consideration of grouping these two apostrophes.33

I have discussed the invocation of Maecenas first, even though it follows the invocation of the Italian farmers, because it is an explicitly self-reflexive programmatic passage, which begins to articulate a set of literary principles for the *Georgics* (or at least for *Geo.* 2) that follow in part from his choice to write agricultural didactic in emulation of Hesiod. I wish to argue now that the invocation of Italian farmers, as well as the technical passage that motivates it, can be read as metaphorically pertinent to the same issues of genre, tradition, and originality that recur in such programmatic passages as the address to Maecenas (2.39–46) or Vergil’s later claim to originality in

32 On the meaning of “long proems,” Servius says, *longa autem exorsa dicit prooemia longe repetita, quae constat esse vitiosa*. Whether Servius means any irony here or not, Thomas notes the irony of Vergil’s remark: “this book contains three passages which have been characterized by critics as ‘digressions’, and there is only one other book in V.’s corpus (*Georgics* 3) which is still involved in its prelude as late as line 46.” On brevity as a stylistic criterion in Augustan poetry, see Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.9–10 and *Ars* 25, 335 with Brink ad 25–26; cf. also Muecke 1974, 92.

33 Thomas ad *Geo.* 2.39 cites the double invocation of the 12 gods and of Octavian in the proem to *Geo.* 1 as a parallel for the double invocation of farmers and Maecenas here. In the former case, however, the common motif of propitiating godheads unites the two invocations, and all the addressees are invoked to favor the composition of a new poem. In *Geo.* 2, the same criteria would seem to unite the invocation of Maecenas with that of Bacchus, not the Italian farmers.
writing an *Ascreum carmen* (2.175–176). My claim here is very similar to my claim that Vergil appropriates narratives from Theocritus and Callimachus as metanarratives for the *Eclogues*, since in both cases Vergil structures his allusions to external texts in such a way as to exploit them as the coherent framework for a metaphorical discussion about poetry. The major difference between these two cases is that the *Eclogues* draw their structuring metaphor from narrative poetry, while this section of *Georgics* 2 draws its structuring metaphor from the technical agricultural prose of Theophrastus. So while the metaphorical structure that underlies the *Eclogues* is a narrative about Vergil and Gallus, that of *Georgics* 2 is technical and didactic, and uses a taxonomy of trees as a metaphorical analogy for a generic taxonomy of poems. This bold metaphor, moreover, which uses trees as an agricultural analogy for poetry, draws on and elaborates Vergil’s use of trees as a metapoetic symbol for poetry in the *Eclogues*.

Vergil’s address to Italian farmers follows directly and is motivated by 26 lines of technical material on the propagation of trees, which separate the first and second proems of *Geo.* 2. This alternation of introductory and technical material forms part of a larger pattern in which four 26-line technical passages alternate with shorter passages of 8 to 12 lines for the first 132 lines of Book 2. Because the second technical passage repeats and expands on the material of the first, an interlocking pattern emerges in the first 72 lines: two prooemia (1–8, 35–46) alternate with two discussions of tree propagation (9–34, 47–72); both proems bear at least partly on the poetic project at hand, while both 26-line didactic passages adapt Theophrastus’s discourse on tree propagation. Vergil’s address to Italian farmers in lines 35–38 seems out of place in this scheme because, although it forms half of the second proem, it makes no explicit, or even transparently metaphorical, reference to poetry or poetics.

---

34See Thomas ad *Geo.* 2.1–135.
instead it simply urges that farmers learn the rules of tree propagation. Because we have seen, however, that trees and forests were a powerful metapoetic symbol in the *Eclogues*, Vergil may have seen a discourse on tree propagation as an attractive way to structure a metapoetic discourse on the genres and traditions of poetry.

After outlining the several natural and artificial techniques for propagating trees (9–34), Vergil urges farmers to learn the proper cultivation appropriate to each *genus* of tree.

Quare agite o proprios generatim discite cultus, agricolae, fructusque ferōs mollite colendo, neu segnes iacent terrae. iuvat Ismara Baccho conserere atque olea magnum vestire Taburnum.

*(Geo. 2.35–38)*

For the first line of this passage (2.35), Vergil’s message is entirely ambiguous and could refer equally either to farmers or to poets. The *genera* that Vergil alludes to with the word *generatim* are literally the different varieties of trees, but *generatim* can also be seen as a literalized metaphor, as can a number of words in this section. In addition to “kinds” of plants, animals et al., the word *genus* is used both of stylistic registers (i.e., “kinds” of style, the χαραχτήρες λέξεως, or *genera dicendi*: ἄδρός/gravis/grandis/sublimis, μέσος/medius/modicus, and ἰσχνός/adtenuata/subtilis/humilis) and of genres (i.e., “kinds” of poems/poets, *genera poematum* or *poetarum*), both of which, I have argued, are issues raised in the address to Maecenas that follows. The references to *cultus* in line 35 can likewise be seen as metapoetic, since this word for “cultivation” or “care” can refer to “rhetorical ornament, stylistic elegance, polish” when applied to oratory. The adjective *proprios*, moreover, may

---

35 On the *genera dicendi* in Latin see Leeman 1963, index s.v.

36 For *genus* in this sense see *TLL* 6.1900.32–66 (cf. also 6.1898.34–6.1900.31, *passim*).

37 *OLD* s.v. *cultus* 7; cf. *TLL* 3.1338.46–1339.12, which lists as synonyms and juxtaposed words
be seen to strengthen the metapoetic allusion to genre and style by connecting these to the doctrine of literary decorum, which maintained that there were certain formal characteristics appropriate to each genre, notably content and style.\textsuperscript{38} Starting in the ambiguous line 35, a coherent metapoetic message emerges that is consistent with the stylistic program of the invocation of Maecenas: poets should adopt different stylistic \textit{cultus} as appropriate to the \textit{genus} of poetry they are writing. In Vergil’s case, that means a Hesiodic style (middle) for a Hesiodic subject (agriculture), a choice he defends explicitly in his boast of Hesiodic content and style (\textit{res antiquae laudis et artem} | \textit{ingredior}, 2.174–175) and implicitly in his epic-style refusal to sing Lucretian natural philosophy (\textit{non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto}, 2.42). If line 36 began with a word like \textit{poetae} rather than \textit{agricolae}, every word in line 35 (\textit{quare agite o proprios generatim discite cultus}) would make sense as an address to poets about learning the rules of literature; to the degree that line 35 creates ambiguity through literalized literary-critical metaphors, the enjambment of \textit{agricolae} in line 36 collapses agricultural and poetological meaning into one, and presents farmers and farming as a metaphorical analogy for poets and poetry.\textsuperscript{39}

In the rest of Vergil’s address to the farmers, a number of other terms are also implicated in the metapoetic equivalence between farmer and poet. Inasmuch as Vergil’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{ornatus, nitor, decor, tumor, color, vigor, impetus, vis, sublimitas, compositio}. Although the verb \textit{colo} (\textit{colendo}, 2.36) is not used as a stylistic term in extant Latin, its participle \textit{cultus} can mean “elegant, polished,” and is so used at least as early as Ovid, who praises Tibullus as \textit{culte Tibulle}: see Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.15.28 and 3.9.66, with parallels listed at McKeown 1987–1998 on the former. Cf. \textit{OLD} s.v. \textit{cultus} 4b and \textit{TLL} 3.1692.35–60.
\item \textsuperscript{38} On Greek and Roman literary theory, particularly as it bears on the Augustan period, see Harrison 2007a, 2–10. The first certain evidence for generic theory in Latin is a well-known fragment of Accius’s \textit{Didascalia, nam quam varia sunt genera poematorum, Baebi, | quamque longe distincta alia ab alis, <sis>, nosce} (carm. fr. 15). On generic decorum in the Augustan period cf. Hor. \textit{Ars} 73–98, Ov. \textit{Rem.} 371–386 (cited above in Ch. 2), as well as other passages cited by Harrison.
\item \textsuperscript{39} This use of enjambment to facilitate the ambiguity is characteristic of Vergil: I have discussed this topic orally (Henkel 2006) and plan to discuss it at greater length elsewhere. Cf. above p. 158 on the similar enjambment of \textit{arboribus} at \textit{Ecl.} 10.54. On the parallelism of farmer’s \textit{labor} with poet’s \textit{labor} at \textit{Geo.} 2.35–44 and throughout the \textit{Georgics} cf. Gale 2000, 185–186.
\end{itemize}
farmers are advised to domesticate fruit trees by “softening their wild fruits through cultivation” (*fructusque feros mollite colendo*, 2.36), their task of arboricultural refinement is analogous to the stylistic refinement that Augustan poets undertook in their modernist renovation of Latin literature. Specifically, Vergil’s injunction finds close parallel in Horace’s roughly contemporary remarks about poetry in *Satires* 1 (*Sat. 1: 35 BC, Geo.: 29 BC*). In *Satires* 1.4 and 1.10, Horace talks about his generic predecessor in verse satire, Lucilius, who followed the Old Comic poets in his frankness, keen observation, and wit, but whose hexameters were harsh (*durus*, 1.4.8; *rudis*, 1.10.66) and turgid (*lutulentus*, 1.4.11), and lacked the refinement of modern verse.

At dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem
plura quidem tollenda relinquendis. age, quaesos,
tu nihil in magno doctus reprehendis Homero?
nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Acci?
non ridet versus Enni gravitate minores,
cum de se loquitur non ut maiore reprensis?
quid vetat et nosmet Lucili scripta legentis
quaerere, num illius, num rerum *dura* negarit
versiculos natura magis factos et euntis
*mollius*, ac si quis pedibus quid claudere senis,
hoc tantum contentus, amet scripsisse ducentos
ante cibum versus, totidem cenatus...

... fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
comis et urbanus, fuerit limatior idem
quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor,
quamque poetae seniorum turba: sed ille,
si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in aevum,
detereret sibi multa, recideret omne quod ultra
perfectum traheretur, et in versu faciendo
saepe caput scaberet vivos et roderet unguis.

---

40 *hinc* [from Old Comedy] *omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus* | *mutatis tantum pedibus nume-
risque*; *facetus*, | *enunctae naris*..., *Sat. 1.4.6–8*; cf. 1.10.3–4, 7–8, 16–17, 48, 64–65.

41 Cf. 1.4.8–11, ... *durus componere versus*; *nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos*, | *ut
magnum, versus dictabit stans pede in uno*; *cum fuerit lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles*; cf. also
1.10.1–3 and 9–10.
But I did say his stream runs muddy, and often carries more that you would rather remove than leave behind. Come, pray, do you, a scholar, criticize nothing in the great Homer? Does your genial Lucilius find nothing to change in the tragedies of Accius? Does he not laugh at the verses of Ennius as lacking in dignity, though he speaks of himself as no greater than those he has blamed? And as we read the writings of Lucilius, what forbids us, too, to raise the question whether it was his own harsh nature or that of his themes that denied him verses more finished and softer in their flow than if one were to put his thoughts into six feet and, content with this alone, were proud of having written two hundred lines before and two hundred after supping?... Grant, I say, that Lucilius was genial and witty: grant that he was also more polished than you would expect one to be who was creating a new style quite untouched by the Greeks, and more polished than the crowd of older poets: yet, had he fallen by fate upon this our day, he would smooth away much of his work, would prune off all that trailed beyond the proper limit, and as he wrought his verse he would oft scratch his head and gnaw his nails to the quick. (trans. Fairclough, adapted)

Elsewhere, moreover, Horace tells us that Lucilius was too chatty and lazy (piger to bear the toil (labor) of writing correctly (i.e. briefly): garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem, | scribendi recte, 1.4.12–13. According to Horace in these passages, a major task of a modern poet is to improve upon and modernize the language of his generic predecessor(s), bringing it into line with modern stylistic canons. For a poet in the late first century BC, this meant laboring for concision (labor, 1.4.12; cf. brevis esse laboro, Ars 25) and refinement (contrast incomposito pede, 1.10.1, rudis, 1.10.66), and softening (mollius, 1.10.59) the harsh language (durus, 1.4.8, 1.10.57) of his predecessor. The program of arboricultural refinement that Vergil urges on

42 Analogous to Horace’s stylistic self-comparison to Lucilius in terms of hardness (lack of refinement) and softness (refinement), one might note the contrast between Properitus’s frequent characterization of his work as mollis (e.g., 1.7.19, 2.1.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.18) and the general frequency with which the adjective appears in Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid, and Quintilian’s statement that Gallus is durior than his successors in the genre (Inst. 10.1.93); on mollis cf. Fedeli 2005, 45 ad Prop. 2.1.1–2, which contrasts the versus durus of epic.
farmers—with its reference to “softening” the fruit of a particular *genus*—is highly analogous to the program of literary refinement that Horace enjoins on modern poets in *Sat*. 1.4 and 1.10, and this resemblance suggests that Vergil, in his address to the Italian farmers, has created an implicit metaphor for the programmatic poetic values that Horace expresses explicitly in *Satires* 1.

In Horace’s *Epistle* to Augustus (12 BC or later), further resemblances to *Geo*. 2 not only point toward shared poetic values, but even suggest that Horace is alluding to the implicit literary metaphors in *Georgics* 2. In *Epistles* 2.1 Horace presents a selective and modernist history of Roman poetry and its debt to Greek influence, which he begins with the “ancient farmers” of Italy (*agricolae prisci*), whom he credits with inventing Fescinnine verse. A number of factors suggest that Horace has here literalized Vergil’s metapoetic discourse in *Geo*. 2 by turning the metaphorical farmer-poets of the *Georgics* into real farmers that were really, according to Horace, the first historical poets in Italy.

```
agricolae prisci, fortes parvoque beati,
condita post frumenta levantes tempore festo
corpus et ipse animum... 
Tellurem porco, Silvanum lacte piabant,
floribus et vino Genium memorem brevis aevi.
Fescinnina per hunc inventa licentia morem
versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit.
libertasque recurrentis accepta per annos
lusit amabiliter, donec iam saevus apertam
in rabiem coepit verti iocus et per honestas
ire domos impune minax. doluere cruento
dente lacessiti; fuit intactis quoque cura
condicione super communi; quin etiam lex
poenaque lata, malo quae nollet carmine quemquam
describi: vertere modum formidine fustis
ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti.
```

43Horace refers to satire as a *genus scribendi* at *Sat*. 1.4.24 (*sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat*) and 1.4.64–65 (*quaeram, meritone tibi sit | suspectam genus hoc scribendi*).
Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis
intulit agresti Latio sic horridus ille
defluxit numerus Saturnius, et grave virus
munditiae pepulere; sed in longum tamen aevum
manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris.

(Hor. Epist. 2.1.139–141, 143–160)

The farmers of old, a sturdy folk with simple wealth, when, after harvesting the grain, they sought relief at holiday time for the body, as well as for the soul... used to propitiate Earth with swine, Silvanus with milk, and with flowers and wine the Genius who is ever mindful of the shortness of life. Through this custom came into use the Fescennine license, which in alternate verse poured forth rustic taunts; and the freedom, welcomed each returning year, was innocently gay, till jest, now growing cruel, turned to open frenzy, and stalked amid the homes of honest folk, fearless in its threatening. Stung to the quick were they who were bitten by a tooth that drew blood; even those untouched felt concern for the common cause, and at last a law was carried with a penalty, forbidding the portrayal of any in abusive strain. Men changed their tune, and terror of the cudgel led them back to goodly and gracious forms of speech. Greece, the captive, made her savage victor captive, and brought the arts into rustic Latium. Thus the stream of the rude Saturnian measure ran dry and good taste banished the offensive poison; yet for many a year lived on, and still live on, traces of our rustic past. (trans. Fairclough)

Throughout this passage, Horace emphasizes the rustic character of early Italian poetry (rustica, 146; agresti, 157; vestigia ruris, 160), which he ties to the fact that Italy’s first poets were farmers. Literary rusticity, of course, was the shibboleth of Latin poetry in the first-century BC, and Horace’s connection of Latin literature to farmers can be seen on one hand as an aetiological explanation of the rustic style of poets like Ennius and Lucilius (cf. the passage from Sat. 1.10 above). On the other hand, however, rusticity is also a theme that found extensive metapoetic treatment in the Eclogues, and that Vergil further develops through the metapoetic farmers of the Georgics. Specifically, by claiming that Saturnian verse was coarse (horridus) and that pre-Greek Rome was wild (ferus), Horace casts the Hellenization of Latin
literature as a process of domestication and refinement, parallel to the domestication of wild fruit (*fructusque feros mollite colendo*; cf. also *Sat.* 1.10.69–70, *recederet omne quod ultra | perfectum traheretur*) that Vergil urges on Italian farmers in *Geo.* 2.44. Furthermore, Horace proceeds to apply this modernist paradigm by genre (cf. *generat-im, Geo.* 2.35), discussing in subsequent lines the lack of refinement in early Roman attempts at tragedy (161–167) and comedy (168–176). At the end of *Epistles* 2, by contrast, Horace favorably compares refined Latin verse to unrefined Greek verse in his discussion of panegyric: whereas Choerilus wrote unpolished verses for the money he received from Alexander (*Choerilus, incultis qui versibus et male natis | retuit acceptos, regale nomisma, Philippos, 233–234*), Augustus’s literary judgment is vindicated by the good poetry he commissioned from Vergil and Varius (*at neque dedecorant tua de se iudicia atque | munera, quae multa dantis cum laude tulerunt, | dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae, 244–246*). When such outright praise of Vergil is considered alongside the resemblances noted above, it seems quite possible that Horace was consciously adapting *Geo.* 2 in his *Epistle* to Augustus.47 Whether

44Horace’s clearest antecedent in calling Rome an intellectually “wild” race is not Vergil, but L. Porcius Licinius, in his verse history of Roman literature: *Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu | intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram*, (fr. 1 Courtney). On the question of whether *numerus Saturnius* refers to the meter we now call Saturnian, or more generally to all archaic Italian verse, see Brink ad loc. Horace’s characterization *horridus*, along with the comment of Ps.-Acro (*horridum est, idest non bene compositum*... *illud metrum inomptum*) connects this passage both with Vergil’s passage on early Italian dramatic festivals, *colonii | versibus incomptis ludunt* (*Geo.* 2.385–386; Serv.: *id est carminibus Saturnio metro compositis*) and with Ennius’s famous denigration of Naevius’s *Bellum Punicum* in Saturnians, *scripsere alii rem | versibus quos olim Faunei vatesque caneant* (*Ann.* 206–207 Sk.).

45Brink ad loc. notes the agricultural metaphor in *incultis.*

46It is unclear which poems of Vergil and which of Varius Horace has in mind here. Both the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* of Vergil contain praise of Augustus, but although Varius is noted for epic (Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.43–44, *Carm.* 1.6.1–2) and may have written a *Panegyricus Augusti* (see on fr. 152 Hollis), he is most famous for his tragedy, *Thyestes*, for which Augustus is said to have paid him one million sesterces (see the testimonia at 254–255 Hollis), and which was produced for the celebrations after the battle of Actium—around the same time that Vergil read the *Georgics* to Augustus (*VD* 27 Brugnoli).

47On wonders if allusions to some poem or play of Varius—perhaps during Horace’s discussion of
or not this is the case, clear similarities emerge between Vergil’s discussion of farming and Horace’s discussion of poetry in both *Satires* 1 and *Epistles* 2.1, such as their shared regard for “cultivation” and “softness” (Horace praises the *Eclogues* as *molle atque facetum*, 1.10.44–45), and further such similarities will emerge as my discussion of *Georgics* 2 continues.

*Georgics* 2 also shares with Horace a common interest in the prominence of Italy. Horace’s interest in Italy in *Epistles* 2.1 is explicitly literary-critical, while Vergil’s is the dominant strain of a more general ethnographic interest in the lands (*terrae*) of the earth and the trees they produce. But because Vergil deploys ethnography as an organizing principle for the metapoetic structure of *Geo.* 2, the two are more comparable than they may first appear. It is in the second proem to *Geo.* 2, moreover, that Vergil first clearly shows his interest in the ethnography of trees, through his metapoetic address to Italian farmers.

*neu segnes iacent *terrae*. iuvat Ismara Baccho
conserere atque olea magnum vestire Taburnum.*

(*Geo.* 2.37–38)

In the first half of *Geo.* 2 (9–258), Vergil ties the variety of plants and their propagation to the variety of the earth’s lands, and in the *laudes Italiae* (136–176) he praises Italy for its extraordinary fertility and the culture that it has supported (*salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus, | magna virum*, 173–174). He spends the second half of the book on the apparently lop-sided comparison of the olive and vine, which he introduced in the second proem as representative products of Greece (Ismara in Thrace) and Italy (Taburnus near Naples), respectively (*iuvat Ismara Baccho, | conserere atque olea magnum vestire Taburnum*, 2.37–38). But although he gives 161 lines to the Italian vine (259–419) and only six to the Greek olive (420–425), the early Roman tragedy and comedy—may likewise prefigure Horace’s praise of him.
comparison of the vine to other trees (420–457, including fruit trees and others) favors the olive for its easy “cultivation” (contra non ulla est oleis cultura, 420),\(^{48}\) and even unproductive trees for their lack of intoxicating madness (454–457, the surprising vituperatio vitis). On a metapoetic level, these passages reveal Vergil’s deep interest in the developing literature of Italy, but also show that, like Horace, Vergil is aware that, as of the late 30s/early 20s BC, Latin letters lag far behind Greek in many areas. Throughout the ethnographic passages of Book 2, Vergil assimilates agriculture to poetry using both metaphor and intertextuality: when he begins to treat the respective powers of each type of soil, for example, he speaks of their “talents” (nunc locus arvorum ingenii..., 177);\(^{49}\) and when he claims that not all lands can bear equally (nec vero terrae ferre omnes omnia possunt, Geo. 2.109), he not only contrasts the current age with the golden age,\(^{50}\) but he also alludes to two poetic invocations in the Eclogues that specifically emphasize the limits of poetic ability (Ecl. 7.21-24: Nymphae noster amor Libethrides, aut mihi carmen, | quale meo Codro, concedite... aut, si non possumus omnes...; Ecl. 8.62–63: Haec Damon; vos, quae responderit Alphesiboeus, | dicite, Pierides: non omnia possumus omnes). In the second proem Vergil expands the developing metapoetic structure of the book by bringing terrae—in the sense both of “soils” and of “countries”—into the implicit metaphor that casts genus, cultus, and the “mollification of wild fruit” as both poetic and agricultural concepts.

\(^{48}\)See above on the metapoetic resonance of cultus, cultura, etc. The phrasing, “there is no cultura to olives,” suggests that this comparison may not be as straightforward as it seems.

\(^{49}\)This line and the next also speak of color, which can refer to shades of diction or style (OLD 5b), and natura, which Horace connects with style in Satires 1.10 (num rerum duar negarit | versiculos natura magis factos et euntis | mollius, Sat. 1.10.57–59).

\(^{50}\)Thomas ad loc. notes the contrast with Ecl. 4.39, omnis feret omnia tellus, and Geo. 1.127–128, ipsaque tellus | omnia liberius nullo poscente ferebat.
4.2 Natural and Artificial Propagation

The two sections (9–34, 47–82) that surround the second proem to *Georgics* 2 focus on natural and artificial methods for growing trees. The didactic material of these two sections is drawn mostly from Book 2 of Theophrastus’s *Historia Plantarum*, and the structure of Vergil’s introductory section bears a striking resemblance to that of *HP* 2.1.1. Since Vergil’s dependence on Theophrastus here is not in doubt, I will try to suggest what Vergil accomplishes by this close imitation of technical agricultural material on the propagation of trees. In the last chapter I tried to show that Vergil, in the *Eclogues*, used Theocritean and Callimachean metanarratives to structure a metapoetic narrative about himself and Gallus, in which erotic love represented the potential literary influence between pastoral and elegy. Metapoetic symbolism attached to trees and related images, moreover, created a durable and flexible link between trees and poetry books, which in turn gave metapoetic resonance to the entire sylvan landscape of the *Eclogues*, including forests, shrubs, echoes, et al. Vergil’s adaptation of Theophrastus in *Georgics* 2, I believe, can be regarded as broadly analogous to his structural allusions to Callimachus in the *Eclogues*, because the poet uses a major intertext as the structure for self-reflexive metaphorical commentary on poetry. By choosing as this intertext a treatise on tree propagation, moreover, Vergil builds on the metapoetic tree symbolism that he established in the *Eclogues*.

The present section on tree propagation is important to the agricultural program of the *Georgics* because fruit trees are an important part of the business of farming. The section is important also, however, to the metapoetic program of the poem, because Vergil creates a metaphorical equivalency between growing trees and composing

---

51 Vergil’s dependence on Theophrastus was established by Jahn 1903 and Mitsdörffer 1938, and was discussed further recently by Thomas 1987, 253–260. See also conveniently Thomas 1988 ad *Geo.* 2.9–34.
poetry. This analogy depends in part on the metapoetic symbolism of the *Eclogues*, and the language of Vergil’s introductory line somewhat resembles the most suggestively metapoetic line of the *Eclogues*, where Gallus and Acontius are most closely identified, and where trees and poetry (*amores*) are explicitly aligned (see above Chapter 2). Both passages are prominently concerned with “growing trees” (*crescent illae*, *Ecl*. 10.54; *arboribus... creandis*, *Geo*. 2.9), and although Vergil uses the intransitive verb *crescere* in *Ecl*. 10 and the transitive verb *creare* in *Geo*. 10, the two words are a cognate pair.\(^{52}\)

```
certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
*arboribus*: *crescent* illae, *crescetis*, amores.

(Ecl. 10.52–54)
```

```
principio *arboribus* varia est natura *creandis*.

(Geo. 2.9)
```

In this passage of the *Eclogues*, Vergil’s character Gallus linked the growth of his *amores*—which referred both his love for Lycoris and to his love poetry about the same—to the growth of the trees on which he carved these *amores* (*crescent illae, crescetis amores*, *Ecl*. 10.54); here in *Geo*. 2, Vergil uses the verb *creo* (etymologically linked with *cresco*) to announce that “growing trees” will be precisely the subject of this book (*arboribus creandis*, *Geo*. 2.9). For a reader who connects *Georgics* 2 with the metapoetic symbolism of the *Eclogues*, there is clear metapoetic potential in a treatise on tree propagation. These lines hold out the hope that Vergil will instruct his metaphorical poet-farmers how to achieve what Gallus hoped for through the metapoetic symbolism of *Ecl*. 10—fame through poetry (*crescetis amores*).

\(^{52}\)Cf. *OLD* s.v. *cresco*; note also Vergil’s nearby use of *crescere* at *Geo*. 2.3 (*virgulta et prolem tarde crescentis olivae*) and below at 2.56 (*crescentique adimunt fetus uruntque ferentem*).
The metapoetic symbolism of these lines, however, does not depend on an understanding of Ecl. 10. *Georgics* 2 is itself full of literalized metaphors, and the analogy between growing trees and writing poetry emerges on its own over the course of this passage. When Vergil lays out the methods of natural and artificial propagation in part one of his discussion (9–34), he adopts the typological organization of Theophrastus’s handbook, dividing the nine methods he mentions into those that nature provided (*hos natura modos primum dedit*, 20)\(^{53}\) and those that man’s experience discovered (*quos ipse via sibi repperit usus*, 22).\(^{54}\) But by reorganizing these methods for part two (47–82), Vergil presents the artificial methods as answers to the inherent problems of natural tree reproduction, emphasizing the necessity of *labor* (*scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus*, 61), and culminating his discussion with an extensive treatment of the most radical artificial method, grafting (69–82). The opposition of natural to artificial propagation finds its metapoetic analogue in the opposition of *ingenium* (or *natura*) to *ars* in contemporary literary criticism, and Vergil’s insistence on the importance of *labor* finds precise parallel in his friend Horace’s constant call to hard work in the composition of poetry. If these two discourses are in fact metaphorically equivalent, then the artificial propagation of one tree from another should represent the very Roman practice of using one literary text as the basis for producing another. The phenomenon of grafting, moreover, on which Vergil spends more time than any other method of propagation, seems to represent that compositional practice that is perhaps most characteristic of Vergil and his contemporaries,

---

\(^{53}\)I.e., spontaneous growth (10–13), growth from seed (14–16), and growth from the root (17–19). Cf. Theophr. *HP* 2.1.1, Αἱ γενέσεις τῶν δέντρων καὶ δῶς τῶν φυτῶν ἡ αὐτόμαται ἡ ἀπὸ σπέρματος ἢ ἀπὸ βίζες...  

\(^{54}\)I.e. growth from suckers (23–24), stocks (24–25), layers (26–27), cuttings (28–29), trunk pieces (30–31), and grafting (32–34). Cf. again Theophr. *HP* 2.1.1, ... ἦ ἀπὸ παρασπάδος ἢ ἀπὸ ἀκρεμώνος ἢ ἀπὸ κλωνὸς ἢ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ στελέχους εἰσὶ, ἢ ἐν τὸ τοῦ κισύλου κατακοπέντος εἰς μικρὰ καὶ γάρ οὕτως εἷναι φύεται.
Christopher Nappa suggested very briefly in his recent book that grafting was “a possible metaphor for Vergilian intertextuality,” and Chris Cudabac made the same suggestion at greater length in an unpublished paper in 2006.\textsuperscript{55} I want to expand this suggestion by treating grafting as part of the broader metapoetic treatment of tree propagation in \textit{Georgics} 2. Although Vergil’s discussion of grafting is notoriously problematic (from an agricultural standpoint all of his grafts are either impossible or useless), I hope that a metapoetic reading of this section will provide a new and fruitful approach to this difficult problem, and will shed light more generally on a Roman poet’s approach to composing poetry.

\subsection{4.2.1 \textit{Ingenium} and \textit{Ars}}

In trying to determine the nature of poetry, a number of ancient philosophers and poets sought to determine whether good poets produced good poetry by virtue of a certain inborn genius (\textit{φύσις}, \textit{natura}, \textit{ingenium}) or by the skillful practice of some craft (\textit{τέχνη}, \textit{ars}). The idea that poetry is a craft is inherent in the Greek words \textit{ποιητής}, “maker, or poet,” and \textit{ποίηµα}, “made thing, or poem,” as well as other words for poetry that metaphorically figure the poet as a craftsman (e.g., \textit{ῥαψ´οµεγαιοταδός}, “stitcher of songs”),\textsuperscript{56} while the idea of poetic genius is closely tied to the Platonic-Democritean idea that poetry is the result of divine inspiration (\textit{ἐνθουσιασµός}), beyond the control or understanding of the poet.\textsuperscript{57} The opposition between these terms

\textsuperscript{55}Nappa 2005, 73; Cudabac 2006. I am indebted especially to Chris Cudabac, with whom I discussed \textit{Geo.} 2 on several occasions. His paper dropped a seed that I have transplanted and cultivated into the present chapter.

\textsuperscript{56}On the development of the terms \textit{ποιητής} and \textit{ποίηµα} see Ford 2002, 131–157.

appears in literary criticism as early as Aristotle, and a number of first-century BC Roman poets and critics take a partisan interest in one side or the other. Cicero seems to have followed the Platonic-Democritean doctrine of ἐνθουσιασµός, and to have considered the poetry of ars inferior to that of ingenium. Horace, likewise, in *Satires* 1.4, distinguishes (if ironically) between true poetry, which requires ingenium, and mere versification, in which category he places Old Comedy and his own satires. Later in his career, Horace addresses the issue of ars and ingenium explicitly in the *Ars Poetica*, where he follows Neoptolemus of Parium (preserved in Philodemus) in declaring that both ingenium and ars are necessary components of good poetry. It is clear that the relative importance of these two criteria was a question both well-established and current in the Augustan period, and more than likely of some interest to Vergil since it is seen to have occupied two of his friends, Horace and Philodemus.

From very early in *Georgics* 2, Vergil distinguishes between natural and artificial in discussing the various methods of tree propagation. And although he draws this

---


59 On Cicero’s poetics see generally Malcovati 1943. More recently, D’Anna 2000 sees evidence of Cicero’s poetics in his remarks on divination (which Plato also treats as analogous to poetry at *Phaed.* 244 d–e): in *De Divinatione* Cicero distinguishes between divinatio naturalis and divinatio artificialis (connected to natura/ingenium and ars, respectively), the latter of which, including the Sybilline books, is inferior (Non esse autem illud carmen furentis... ipsum poëma declarat (est enim magis artis et diligentiae quam incitationis et motus), 2.111).

60 See Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.39–62, esp. 39–48, primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetis, | excerptam numero: neque enim concludere versum | dixeris esse satis neque, si qui scribat uti nos | sermoni proprius, putes hunc esse poetan. | ingenium cui sit, cui mens divinior atque os | magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem. | idcirco quidam comoedia necne poema | esset, quaesivere, quod acer spiritus ac vis | nec verbis nec rebus inest, nisi quod pede certo | differt sermoni, sermo merus. Horace seems to refer only to high poetry here (epic, tragedy) when he says poema or poeta, a sleight of language shared also by Cicero (see D’Anna 2000).

61 Hor. *Ars* 408–411, natura fieret laudabile carmen an arte, | quaesitum est: ego nec studium sine divite vena | nec rude quid prosit video ingenium: alterius sic | altera poscit open res et conjurat amice. See Brink ad 295–298 and 408–418.
organizing principle from his didactic source, Theophrastus, more than one commentator has seen this distinction as important to the thematic structure of the poem. When Theophrastus introduces tree propagation in HP 2, his typology distinguishes between natural methods (φυσικός) and artificial ones, which belong to τέχνη. This distinction parallels the literary distinction between natura/ingenium and ars, and on a closer rendering of these lines, Vergil’s typology too would have duplicated the terms of this distinction. But although the terms of Vergil’s opposition (natura vs. usus) are not the very same as those of the literary debate, Vergil’s term usus is no less freighted with reference to literary theory than ars, since both Lucretius and Vergil himself assign it a central role in the development of the arts. By preferring usus to ars here, Vergil avoids overtly opposing natura to ars, but alludes instead to the role that usus plays, both in the DRN and in Georgics 1, in the development of civilization and the arts.

Both Farrell and Gale have drawn attention to the strong Lucretian influence on this part of Book 2, from the Lucretian theme of variety to the Lucretian “mottoes” that open four of the six paragraphs between the first proem and the laudes Italiae

---

62See e.g. Ross 1987, 95–104 and Thomas ad loc., who comments that, “much of V.’s concern in Book 2, as throughout the poem, is to observe and comment upon the struggle of the world of usus, which in mythical terms is the world of Jupiter…, against the natural world, that of Saturn” (ad 2.9). Wilhelm 1976 has a good discussion of Book 2, which draws conclusions very similar to mine (see below, passim), but focuses primarily on the civic and political resonance of the language of ars, natura, and cultus.

63Theophr. HP 2.1.1, τούτων [i.e. of the aforementioned techniques] δὲ ἢ μὲν αὐτόματος πρώτη τις, αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ σπέρματος καὶ ῥίζης φυσικώταται δόξαιεν ἄν· ὥσπερ αὐτόμαται καὶ αὐταί· δι᾿ ὃ καὶ τοιοῦτοι ἁγρίως ὑπάρχουσιν· αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι τέχνης ἢ δὴ προαιρέσεως.

64Compare the juxtaposition of τέχνη and φύσις at Arist. Poet. 1451 a 22–24 (above n. 58). Brink remarks at Hor. Ars 408–18 that, at least in Rome, the pair natura-ars becomes standardized in references to an ars (see Brink for examples, including Cic. Arch. 1 and 15). On the mythological associations of this agricultural distinction in the Georgics see Thomas ad Geo. 2.9.

65Compare the opposition of ars to natura in Varro’s agricultural treatise (RR 3.1), although that passage owes no specific debt to the present lines of Theophrastus.
Gale, in particular, has argued that Vergil’s movement from *natura* to *usus* in lines 9–34 generally recalls the rationalistic culture-history of *DRN* 5, and more specifically alludes to Lucretius’s account of the invention of agriculture (sowing and grafting) at 5.1361–1378. When Vergil attributes agricultural propagation to the discoveries of *usus* (*quos ipse via sibi repperit usus*, *Geo*. 2.22), he is probably alluding to the closing paragraph of *DRN* 5, where Lucretius attributes the discovery of almost everything to *usus* and *impigrae experientia mentis* (*DRN* 5.1452–1453). Vergil’s only previous mention of *usus* in the *Georgics* is in the aetiology of *labor*, where there is a clear and striking resemblance to these lines from Lucretius, and where variety is also an important theme.

Navigia atque agri culturas moenia leges
arma vias vestes et cetera de genere horum,
praemia, delicias quoque vitae funditus omnis,
carmina, picturas et daedala signa polita
usus et impigrae simul experientia mentis
paulatim docuit pedetemptim progredientis.
sic unum quicquid paulatim protrahit aetas
in medium ratioque in luminis erigit oras;
namque alid ex alio clarescere corde videbant,
artibus ad summum donec venere cacumen.

(Lucr. *DRN* 5.1448–1457)

ILLE MALUM VIRUS SERPENTIBUS ADDIDIT ATRIS
praedarique lupos iussit pontumque moveri,
mellaque decussit foliis ignemque removit
et passim rivis currentia vina repessit,
UT VARIAS USUS MEDITANDO EXTUNDERET ARTIS
paulatim, et sulcis frumenti quaeueret herbam,
UT SILICIS VENIS ABSTRUSUM EXCLUDERET IGNEM.

... tunc variae venere artes. labor omnia vicit

---

66 On these “mottoes” see Farrell 1991, 194–197.

67 Gale 2000, 208–211.
improbus et duris urgens in rebus egestas.

(Verg. Geo. 1.129–135, 145–146)

In the aetiology of labor Vergil credits usus with the gradual development (meditando extenderet artis | paulatim, Geo. 1.133–134) of mankind’s variae artes (1.133, 145), alluding to the role that usus likewise played in the gradual development of man’s artes in DRN 5 (paulatim... pedetemptim progredientis, DRN 5.1453), where Lucretius enumerates these artes in a list that culminates in the fine arts of poetry, painting, and sculpture (and ultimately the sumnum cacumen).68 Between the invention of agriculture at DRN 5.1361–1378 and this culminating catalogue of the artes, Lucretius presents a culture-history of music (5.1379–1411), which I have already discussed in connection with its role as an intertext for the opening lines of the Eclogues.69

One gets a sense toward the end of DRN 5 that poetry and music are structurally important to Lucretius’s argument. After the culture history of music (1379–1411), Lucretius goes on to compare these natural pleasures to the vain and harmful pleasures of wealth (1412–1435). At 1440–1447 he names the invention of poetry as the terminus ante quem non for historical enquiry, since poets were the earliest transmitters of history. From here, he moves immediately into the catalogue of man’s cultural artes (1448–1457), which culminates in poetry and the fine arts (1451–1453, see above) before coming to the artibus sumnum cacumen in the last line of the book (1457). Although this final line anticipates the mention of Athens and Epicurus at the beginning of DRN 6, there is no mention of these two in Book 5 and nothing to suggest that the sumnum cacumen of the arts is other than the fine arts of poetry, painting, and sculpture that in line 1451 constituted the climax of the catalogue of

---

68Cf. Gale 2000, 63 n. 21.
69See Ch. 3 p. 150.
This section of DRN 5—from the invention of music through the development of the fine arts—seems to have been important to how Vergil conceived of music and poetry in both the Eclogues and Georgics. Just as Vergil alludes programatically to Lucretius’s anthropology of music and poetry in the beginning of the Eclogues, his references to usus in the aetiology of labor tie usus and labor to music and poetry in the Georgics as well. And when Vergil opposes natura to usus in his typology of methods of tree propagation, he is not simply mirroring the opposition of ars to ingenium in contemporary literary theory, but doing so, it seems, through the prism of the culture-history of DRN 5, which moves from the invention of farming, to an anthropology of natural music, to poetry and the fine arts.

4.2.2 Personification and Natura Creatrix

When Horace treats the question of ars vs. ingenium in the Ars Poetica, his answer shows balanced support for the necessity of both, but his literary criticism elsewhere in his corpus reveals him as a vocal partisan for the importance of ars and labor in composing poetry. Vergil’s treatment of tree propagation reveals a similar bias towards artificial methods, which emerges not only in the explicit comparison of natural and artificial methods in part 2 (47–82), but also in the personification he uses in the terminology of part 1 (9–34). Here he figures the trees themselves as propagators, likening them to the propagating farmers of part 2. Properly speaking, natural

70Note further Vergil’s echoing use of meditor in Ecl. 1.1–2 (Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi | silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena) and Geo. 1.133–134 (ut varias usus meditando extunderet artis | paulatim.

71See Horace’s criticism of Lucilius at Sat. 1.4.1–13 (garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem | scribendi recte, 12–13), 1.10.1–19 (est brevitate opus, 9), 1.10.50–71 (at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, 50). Compare also his verdict on early Roman tragedians at Épist. 2.1.161–167 (natura sublimis et acer... sed turpem putat insite metuque lituram, 165–167), with Brink’s comments ad loc. This bias is evident also in the Ars Poetica at 285–294, 379–389, and 438–452.
propagation is of no concern to farmers because it results in degenerate fruits.\textsuperscript{72} By literary analogy, too, inasmuch as \textit{ars} is important to composing poetry, as Horace insists it is, poems requiring no effort are outside of its purview. Little surprise, then, that one finds little or no literary double meaning in Vergil’s treatment of natural methods of tree propagation.

In lines 10–21 Vergil uses personification to figure the trees themselves as farmers, thereby tightening the thematic unity of lines 9–34 (part 1), where Vergil announces that his concern is not with tree reproduction generally, but with how to propagate trees actively (\textit{arboribus... creandis}). But by prefiguring artificial propagation through the personification of trees involved in natural propagation, Vergil also illustrates the key claim of an important Lucretian intertext both of this passage and of the aetiology of \textit{labor} (\textit{DRN} 5.1361–1378 on the origin of agriculture), namely that \textit{natura creatrix} (1362) provided the first examples of agricultural sowing and grafting.\textsuperscript{73}

At specimen sationis et insitionis origo
ipsa fuit rerum primum natura creatrix,
arboribus quoniam baca glandesque caducae
tempestiva dabant pullorum examina subter;
unde etiam libitumst stirpis committere ramis
et nova defodere in terram virgulta per agros.

(\textit{DRN} 5.1361–1366)

Although it is not pronounced, Vergil’s personification begins right away, when he translates Theophrastus’s \textit{αὐτόµαται} by imputing to the trees a willful decision to come occupy the fields and river banks: \textit{namque aliae nullis hominum cogentibus ipsae}
\textit{sponte sua veniunt camposque et flumina late | curva tenant...} (10–12). Vergil’s \textit{ipsae} \textit{[arbores]} (10) here seems to echo Lucretius’s phrase \textit{ipsa... natura creatrix} (\textit{DRN

\textsuperscript{72}See \textit{Geo}. 2.57–60, and cf. Theophr. \textit{HP} 2.2.4–6.

\textsuperscript{73}[[cross-ref to citation of Gale. Or maybe move main citation to here]]
5.1362), and to contrast the active role assumed here by the natural world (the trees) with the lack of human agency in the process (*nullis hominum cogentibus, Geo. 2.10*).

In line 11, *sponte sua* is unambiguous in attributing volition to these trees, and while most commentators see in *sponte sua* a reference to the spontaneous generation discussed by philosophers, the words also recall golden-age spontaneity (cf. Thomas ad loc.) and this Lucretian phrase would have reminded readers that Lucretius objected strenuously to the idea of spontaneous generation of anything.\(^7^4\)

The same program of personification continues throughout the treatment of natural propagation, and understanding Vergil’s language as personification helps to explain its otherwise difficult wording. In his description of growth from seed, *pars autem posito surgunt de semine...* (2.14, cf. Theophrastus’s ἀπὸ σπέρµατος), Vergil’s phrase *posito de semine* in line 14 must refer to growth from a naturally fallen seed, as must the analogous phrase *seminibus iactis* (2.57) in part 2. Both phrases, however, seem to involve human agency in the process of planting, as other comparable uses of *ponere* and *iacere* certainly do (*Ecl. 1.73, Geo. 2.317, 354*).\(^7^5\) The apparent human agency in these phrases, however, can be understood as an effect of Vergil’s personification, which figures the parent tree as sowing the seeds of its offspring, casting these trees in the role of propagator outlined in line 9 (*arboribus creandis*), and vividly

\(^7^4\)The first didactic precept of the *DRN* is *nullam rem e nilo gigni divinitus umquam* (1.150, with proofs following at 159–214). Cf. Gale 2000, 206–207 on a similar line in the proem to *Geo. 1* (*quique novas alitis non ullo semine fruges, 22*). Mynors, in discussing *sponte sua* in line 11, points to LaCerda’s dictum, “numquam Vergilius eadem bis dicit,” to support the premise that these lines refer to the spontaneous generation discussed by the philosophers. But when Columella quotes lines 10–11 at *RR* 3.1.1, he makes no reference to spontaneous generation, but rather uses the passage simply to juxtapose natural and artificial propagation. On my reading of these lines, which still does not violate LaCerda’s dictum, *ipsae [arbores] and nullis hominum cogentibus* in line 10 contrast the active role of the trees with the lack of human agency, while *sponte sua* in line 11 further the personification of these trees by translating αὐτόµαται with reference to will and intention (*LSJ 1*) rather than natural or automatic happening (*LSJ 2–4*).

\(^7^5\)Cf. Thomas’s note ad loc.: “‘from fallen seed’; at first sight this looks as if it means the opposite (referring to man’s involvement), like the parallel phrase at 57 *seminibus iactis.*”
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illustrating the central claim of Vergil’s Lucretian intertext, that nature provided a specimen sationis to mankind (DRN 5.1361 above). The third method of propagation in this section is suckering, which Vergil used at Ecl. 10.73–74 as an analogy for his own imitation of Gallus. This passage involves the most explicit personification, first figuring the propagating tree as a mother animal, then explicitly calling her a mater.\textsuperscript{76}

\begin{flushright}
pullulat ab radice aliis densissima Silva, 
\textit{ut} cerasis ulmisque; etiam Parnasia laurus 
parva sub ingenti\textit{ matris} se subicit umbra.
\end{flushright}

\textit{(Geo. 2.17–19)}

In treating reproduction from the root of the parent tree (Theophrastus’s \textit{ἀπὸ πι-ζης}), Veril here uses the verb \textit{pullulare}, which derives from a word for baby animals, \textit{pullus}.\textsuperscript{77} This unusual word alludes again to Lucretius’s account of the invention of agriculture, where he says that swarms of \textit{pulli} growing under a tree first gave mankind the idea for sowing and grafting (5.1364–1365 above). This appropriation of Lucretius foreshadows the explicit personification of the laurel in lines 15–16 in terms of mother and child (\textit{etiam Parnasia laurus} | \textit{parva sub ingenti matris} se subicit umbra), and it adds intertextual momentum to Vergil’s movement toward discussing artificial propagation in lines 22–34. This final reference to the laurel shooting up under its mother’s huge shadow, moreover, looks ahead to the discussion of shade in lines 53–60, which carries the explicit personification to a third generation (\textit{nepotibus}, 58) and uses shade and familial personification as metaphors for talking about poetic influence.

\textsuperscript{76}Thomas, on line 19, claims that \textit{mater} is the first instance of personification in Geo. 2, but does call attention to its constant presence throughout the rest of the poem: “Plants are presented through the image of a familial bond (esp. that between mother and child), threatened by the will of the efficient man operating under the principles of labor.”

\textsuperscript{77}On \textit{pullus} and its history see \textit{TLL} s.v.
4.2.3 Metrical Feet on the Road of Poetry: Literary Double Meaning in Terms for Artificial Propagation

When in line 22 Vergil shifts his attention to propagation by man, he changes literary strategy as well, subordinating the personification of trees to a program of literary double meaning, which highlights the metaphorical analogy between the farmer’s work in propagating trees and the poet’s work in composing poetry:

\[
\text{sunt alii, quos ipse via sibi reperit usus} \quad (\text{Geo. 2.22})
\]

The second half of Vergil’s line is nearly a paraphrase of Lucretius’s lines on *usu*s in his anthropology (*usu*s *et impigrae experientia mentis | paulatim docuit pedetemptim progressit, DRN 5.1452–1453). The movement from natural methods of propagation to those developed through experience (*usu*s, OLD 6a), moreover, mirrors Lucretius’s movement from *natura creatrix*, who provided man with an example (DRN 5.1361–1366), to *usu*s and *experientia*, which little by little taught him agriculture and all the other *artes* (DRN 5.1449–1453). This passage of the *DRN* is an important intertext not only of Vergil’s treatment of arboriculture, but also of the aetiology of *labor* in *Geo*. 1, which likewise credits *usu*s with the development of the various *artes* (*ut varias usus meditando extunderet artis | paulatim, Geo. 1.133–134*). And while these *artes* explicitly include poetry and the fine arts in Lucretius (*carmina picturas et daedala signa polita*, 5.1451), the *variae artes* at *Geo*. 1.133 (cf. also 1.145) preserve the inclusiveness of their Lucretian intertext only metapoetically, through the literary double meaning of the passage. So while *usu*s has no literary double meaning *per se*, it acquires in *Geo*. 1 a close association with the literary double meaning in *artes*, reinforced by the explicitly literary character of the passage’s Lucretian intertext. All three passages, moreover, share the notion that experience and practice bring
improvement over time, which is central also to Horace’s defense of modern Roman poetry in the *Epistle to Augustus* and throughout his literary criticism. The idea of progress, in other words, applies in poetry just as it does in the practical sciences like agriculture.\(^{78}\)

It is clear from the language of *DRN* 5 that Lucretius conceived of progress as a slow and incremental process, which he figured, accordingly, as a journey between one place and another (*usus et impigrae experientia mentis | paulatim docuit pedetemptim progredientis*, 5.1452–1453). Vergil seems also to have the same conception in mind at *Geo.* 2.22, where he renders Lucretius’s journey language with the word *via*. Roads and journeys, however, also constitute a well-known metaphor for poetry, by which poets as early as Homer figure poems as “paths of song” (*οἴµη*, *Od.* 8.74, 481; 22.347) along which poets make progress.\(^{79}\) When Vergil uses this metaphor to figure his own poetic movement from the beginning to the end of the *Georgics*, he casts his progress as a sea journey. In *Geo.* 1 he asks Octavian’s protection at embarkation, in the beginning of *Geo.* 2 he orders Maecenas to give sail to the wind, and in *Geo.* 4 he finally trims sail and turns his prow to land.\(^{80}\) A separate strain of this metaphor figures poetry specifically as a chariot ride, in order to cast the challenge of poetic originality as analogous to driving outside the wheel-ruts of a well-travelled road.

\(^{78}\) See e.g. Hor., *Epist.* 2.1.92, *quod si tam Graecis novitas invisa fuisse* | *quam nobis, quid nunc esset vetus? | aut quid haberet | *quod legeret teretertque viritim publicus usus?* It is not clear that this *usus* is the same as that of Vergil and Lucretius (Brink sees legal overtones here), but it is still notable that Horace connects the word directly with his defense of literary progressivism. See also Brink on *Ars* 71, where *usus*, used of diction to mean “current usage,” may be comparable to Lucretius’s and Vergil’s “practice.”

\(^{79}\) On this well-studied metaphor see conveniently Volk 2002, 20–22, with references at 21 n. 31.

\(^{80}\) To Octavian at *Geo.* 1.40–42: *da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis, | ignarosque viae mecum miseratus agrestis | ingredere et votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari; to Maecenas at *Geo.* 2.39–45: *tuque, ades inceptumque una decurre laborem, | ... | Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti. | ... ades et primi lege litoris oram; | in manibus terrae; to himself at *Geo.* 4.116–117: *atque equidem, extremo ni iam sub fine laborum | vela traham et terris festinem advertere proram;* cf. Farrell 1991, 245; Gale 2000, 24 n. 15; and Volk 2002, 133. Note the characterization of poetry also as *labor* at *Geo.* 2.39 and 4.116.
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Pindar uses this image to contrast himself with Homer in a fragmentary hymn to Apollo (Pa. 7b.11–14), but our best evidence for this strain of the road/journey metaphor comes from the Aetia prologue, where Apollo first tells Callimachus to cultivate a slender Muse, then warns him rather emphatically to avoid the well-travelled path, either by foot or by chariot.

πρὸς δέ σε καὶ τόδ᾿ ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἁμαξαί
tὰ στείβειν, ἑτέρων ἱχναι μὴ καθ’ ὁµά
dιήρον ἐληµον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους ἄτριπτοι, εἰ καὶ στείβειν ἑλάσεις.

(Callim. Aet. fr. 1.25–28 Pf.)

Lucretius seems to have had Callimachus in mind when he adapted this metaphor in DRN 1 and again in the proem to DRN 4, and Vergil, in turn, had both poets in mind when he adapted the chariot metaphor to talk about his own poetic originality in the two proems of Georgics 3.

et simul incussit suavem mi in pectus amorem
Musarum, quo nunc instinctus mente vigenti
avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante
trita solo. iuvat integros accedere fontis
atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores
insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam
unde prius nulli velarint tempora Musae. . .

(Lucr. DRN 1.924–930)

81On Lucretius’s adaptation of Callimachus in these lines and elsewhere see first Kenney 1970 (p. 370 on this passage), followed by Brown 1982 and King 1985. Knox 1999 discusses the philosophical background of the road metaphor before and outside of Callimachus, sounding a cautionary note about conclusions about Lucretius’s “Callimacheanism.”

82Although Thomas’s comments at Geo. 3.292–293 downplay the influence of Lucretius relative to Callimachus in that passage, Vergil’s ambiguous reference to amor (of sweet Parnassus? or should one construe that phrase with deserta per ardua?) points to the context of Lucretius’s adaptation of Callimachus in DRN 1, where reference to untrodden paths is immediately preceded by a similar reference to love of the Muses (924–926); for a similar case in which intertextuality depends on construing a word in an unlikely construction, see Chapter 1, p. 33, and cf. p. 114. Other Latin adaptations of Callimachus’s metaphor include Prop. 3.3.26 and Hor. Epist. 1.19.21–22.

83DRN 1.926–950 = 4.1–25
This metaphorical chariot ride, which Vergil casts in clearly Callimachean-Lucretian terms in the second proem, he combines in the first proem with Ennian language for poetic fame, and he connects the whole complex squarely to the metaphor of the poetic road when he declares, \textit{temptanda via est} . . . (3.8). It is this context, along with the anthropology of DRN 5, that Vergil recalls at Geo. 2.22 when he introduces the methods of propagation that \textit{usus} invented along the way (\textit{via}).

While the introduction to artificial propagation in line 22 recalls, with \textit{usus} and \textit{via}, the end of DRN 5 and Vergil’s metapoetic adaptation of it in the aetiology of labor in Georyics 1, the first line of actual didaxis (23) introduces a potent literary double meaning almost right away in the word \textit{plantae}, which will establish artificial propagation as a metaphorical vehicle for talking about poetic technique and, in particular, intertextuality.

\begin{quote}
\textit{hic plantas tenero abscindens de corpore matrum deposuit sulcis . . . } \\
\textit{(Geo. 2.23–24)}
\end{quote}

It is well-known that Latin poets—especially those of the Augustan period—make humorous use of the literary double meaning of Latin \textit{pes}, which can refer to anatomical or metrical feet.\textsuperscript{84} To my knowledge, scholars have not shown Vergil to have engaged

\textsuperscript{84}Cf. Hinds 1985, 18–19, “Latin poets are always ready for any wordplay involving human and metrical feet,” and Hinds 1987, 16–18, “Few word plays are more familiar in Latin poetry than
in such wordplay with the word *pes*, but Vergil seems to have found his own subtle approach to the literary double meaning of “foot” through the word *planta*, which can refer either to a transplantable “slip” or “shoot” (syn.: *stolo*), as it does throughout the *Georgics*, or to “the sole of the foot” (syn.: *solum*), as it does throughout the *Eclogues* and the *Aeneid*.

Punning between anatomical and literary feet is known in Greek from as early as Pindar and in Latin at least as early as Catullus. The double meaning of *ποὺς* and *pes* allows Greek and Latin easily to create and exploit a metaphorical identity between the metrics of a poem and the physical characteristics either of the speaker or of some other character. Callimachus and Catullus take such license in their choliambic poetry, exploiting the “limp” of these iambics with references to the speaker’s gout or fatigue, sometimes placing these references in the limping last foot of the meter. Aside from the iambic poets, Latin elegiac poets make considerable use of the metaphorical analogy between metrical and anatomical feet as part of a broader metaphorical strategy of figuring the stylistic qualities of elegiac poetry as the physical characteristics of the elegiac love object. In one respect their use of this metaphor mirrors that of the iambic poets, when they play on the uneven alternation of hexameter and pentameter lines with images of stumbling and limping. The most

---

the one between the bodily and metrical senses of the word *pes*.” Barchiesi 1994, 135–137 has a catalogue of such Greek and Latin foot puns as he considers secure. Among the most secure by any account are Cat. 14.21–23, *malum pedem attulistis... pessimi poetae*, Hor. AP 80, *hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque coturni*, and Ov. Am. 3.1.8, *pes illi longior alter erat*. Cf. also Fedeli 1985 at Prop 3.1.6.

85Ecl. 10.49; Aen. 4.259, 7.811, 8.458, 11.573, 11.718.

86Pind. *Ol.* 3.5, Δεσµός φωνὰν ἐναρµόξαι πεδίλ’οµεγαιοτα ἀγλαόκωµον, Cat. 14.21–23, *malum pedem attulis... pessimi poetae*; see further the catalogue of Barchiesi 1994, 135–137.

87Callim. fr. 191.41, where δεσµός (in the last foot) may mean “gout” or “arthritis,” and Cat. 31, which expresses the speaker’s exhaustion; see further Morgan 1999a 102–104, esp. 103 n. 23 on Callimachus’s *Iambi*.

famous passage of this type is in Ovid’s description of Elegia in the opening poem of *Amores* 3: he gives her all the qualities of an elegiac *puella*, and says particularly that her limp was the reason for her beauty (*pes illi longior alter erat, 8; et pedibus vitium causa decoris erat, 10*).\(^89\) In another respect, however, the elegists differ from the iambic poets in that they use this metaphor not only to play self-mockingly on a perceived flaw in their meter, but to further their programmatic claim to write soft, tender poetry.\(^90\) So Latin love elegy has a number of references either to smooth and graceful walking or to the *puella*’s tender feet.\(^91\) In elegy’s many references to feet we may see the traces of intergeneric polemic, which probably likened the uneven alternation of elegy’s two lines to existing polemic about the limping gait of the defective choliamb. In reply, the elegists seem to assert a different picture, figuring the refined metrical style of their verse in the smooth, barefoot gait of the elegiac *puella*. As we have seen in earlier chapters, Vergil too seems to be in on this exchange of polemic, because this is precisely the image he puts into Gallus’s mouth at *Ecl.* 10.49, as Gallus laments that his Lycoris will endure the cold frosts of the Alps, apparently shoeless.

---

\(^89\)See Wyke 1989b, 119–120, who points out additionally that references to Elegy’s shortened feet coincide with the abbreviated pentameter lines. Keith 1999, 48–49 discusses the stumble of Tibullus’s narrator at 1.3.20 in similarly metapoetic terms. I have argued orally that Tibullus broadly exploits metapoetic wordplay with feet (Henkel 2009a), and I hope to discuss this point more fully elsewhere.

\(^90\)Propertius and Ovid, at least, make frequent and polemical claims to write poetry that is *mollis* and *tener*, in apparent contradistinction to the “hard” verse of epic. On *mollis* see Prop. 1.7.19, 2.1.2, Ov. *Trist.* 2.3.49, *Pont.* 3.4.85–86, and Fedeli 2005 on Prop. 2.1.1–2; compare also the epigram of Domitian Marsus on the death of Tibullus fr. 180.3 (= Marsus fr. 7.3 Blänsdorf) Hollis, *ne foret aut elegis molles qui funebre amoeres*. Wyke 1987, 56 compares Horace on improving the metrics of Lucilius, *versiculos . . . magis factos et euntis | mollius* (*Sat.* 1.10.58–59). On *tener*, which is used programatically only by Ovid, see Am. 2.1.4, 3.1.69, 3.8.2, and McKeown 1987–<1998> ad *Am.* 2.1.4.

\(^91\)On representing metrical fluency through the smooth motion of the elegiac lovers see Wyke 1989b, 56 on Prop. 2.12.24 and Keith 1999, 48–49 on Tib. 1.2.35, 1.3.92, 1.5.24, 1.7.62. In addition to their notice of metapoetic significance in smooth motion of the feet, I will argue in my paper (n. 89 above) that similar self-referential significance can be found in references to “tender feet” (*teneri pedes*): Prop. 1.8.7, Tib. 1.7.46, 1.9.30, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.44, *Ars* 1.62, 2.535, and *Her.* 16.66; cf. also references to bare feet at Tib. 1.5.24, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.82, *Ars* 1.530, and 2.698. Lyne 1978 notes at *Ciris* 169 that this phrase becomes actively elegiac in tone, such that Ovid considers it inappropriate for the *Metamorphoses* and uses it only once in the *Fasti*. 209
tu procul a patria (nec sit mihi credere tantum)
me sine sola vides. a, te ne frigora laeant!
a tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!

(Ecl. 10.47–49)

Although Vergil’s metrical joke is more subtle than Ovid’s, the pattern is nonetheless the same—he relies on the metaphorical equivalence of metrical and anatomical feet to attribute the stylistic qualities of elegiac poetry to the love object of an elegiac poet. By preferring *plantae* to the less subtle *pedes*, however, Vergil opens up a further range of metaphorical analogy based on the further double meaning of *plantae*. In other words, Vergil is able in the *Georgics* to map a familiar metapoetic discourse about metrical feet onto an entirely new semantic range—arboriculture—by connecting the double meaning of *pedes* (metrical foot, anatomical foot) to the double meaning of *plantae* (sole of the anatomical foot, transplantable scion).

Whereas the double meaning of *plantae* at *Geo*. 2.23 helps activate a broad metaphorical equivalence between the farmer and the poet, the rest of the passage is sprinkled with further literary double meaning that supports and affirms this analogy.

(hic *plantas* tenero abscindens de corpore matrum
deposuit sulcis, hic stirpes obruit arvo,
quadridfasque sudes et acuto robore vallos.
silvarumque aliae pressos propaginis arcus
exspectant et viva sua plantaria terra;
nil radicis egent aliae summumque putator
haud dubitat terrae referens mandare cacumen.
quin et *candidibus* sectis (mirabile dictu)
truditur et sicco radix oleagina ligno;
et saepe alterius ramos impune videmus
vertere in alterius, *mutatam*que insita mala
ferre pirum et prunis lapidosa rubescere corna.

(Geo. 2.23–34)

We have already seen *silvae* (26) used as a literary symbol in the *Eclogues*, connoting precisely this notion that poetry is the source material for new poetry, since it
translates the literary double meaning of Greek ὕλη (“forest,” or, “source material”). *Plantaria* (“cuttings,” 27), which is not found before Vergil, may be a symbolic multiplication of planta, representing a new poem or poems as a collection of metrical feet. In line 30, Vergil’s reference to *caudices secti* has clearer metapoetic overtones, since, as Servius tells us in his comment on this line, caudex is another spelling of codex (pro “codicibus,” sicut “caulem” pro “colem,” “sauricem” pro “soricem” dicens, ad 2.30), a word that can either refer to the trunk of a tree (*OLD* s.v. caudex 1) or to a bound—as opposed to rolled—book (*OLD* s.v. 2), usually made from wooden tablets. Although it is later that the codex overtakes the roll as the dominant model for books, the word codex refers in Cicero and Catullus to a bound set of wax tablets (there is also some evidence for papyrus and parchment codices even in the first century BC), and a passage of Isidore (attributed to Suetonius by Reifferscheid) tells us that codices were so called precisely because of their metaphorical resemblance to tree-trunks. Finally, when Vergil mentions grafting in lines 33–34, vertere and mutare (33) may both be metapoetic, since both are known as technical terms for rendering a passage in translation.

---

92 The adjective plantaris (neut. pl. plantaria) derives from planta = “sole of the foot,” although it is not found before Statius.

93 Isid. *Orig.* 6.13.1 (= Suet. *DV* 104, p 134 Reifferscheid), *codex multorum librorum est: liber unius voluminis. et dictus codex per translationem a caudicibus arborum seu vitium, quod in se multititudinem librorum quasi ramorum continet*. Although codex refers in Cicero to a bound set of wax tablets (cf. *codicilli* in Catullus 42) used for keeping accounts or recording text in court, there is epigraphic evidence in Priene of municipal codices of both papyrus and vellum (James 1910, 238), and the testimony of Varro makes it seem that codices were by his time no longer uniformly made of tablets: *quod antiqui pluris tabulas coniunctas codices dicebant* (fr. 99 Riposati = Non. p. 535 M.). But the first unmistakable evidence of codices in parchment, at least, comes from Martial, who promotes the concept as an apparent novelty (1.2). Among the *Apophoreta* he lists codex editions (*in membranis* or *in pugillaribus membraneis: he never uses the word codex*) of Homer (184), Vergil (186), Cicero (188), Livy (192), and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (192). In the case of Homer, Vergil, and Ovid, these were certainly complete editions, and this is even likely in the case of Livy (see Roberts and Skeat 1987, 24–29).
The collective weight of these literary double meanings supports Vergil’s nascent metaphorical link between arboriculture and poetic composition, so that details of Vergil’s discussion of arboriculture can be understood symbolically to represent aspects of poetic composition. Such detailed correspondence between two apparently unlike subjects is essentially similar to Vergil’s use of epic simile in the *Aeneid*, where the broad equivalence of the comparanda, established by explicit comparison of single details, allows details of one image implicitly to suggest details of the other that are nowhere mentioned explicitly in the text. Thus certain details of Vergil’s discussion of arboriculture emerge as particularly suggestive in the analogy with poetic composition. In the introduction of suckering (23–24), Vergil connects this section to the last by picking up on the personification that he used when discussing natural propagation: farmers are said to cut *plantas* from the tender body of mother trees and set them into furrows. This line, as Thomas points out in his comment, introduces a connection between arboriculture and violence that remains throughout the book, and this moral ambiguity is not without parallel in the analogy to poetic composition. By the very nature of allusive composition, one does violence to an intertext by cutting passages or phrases (“feet”) from their context, a practice that, as we saw in Chapter 3, is morally highly ambiguous. One need only recall the story that Perellius Fuscus made a list of Vergilian *furta* and Q. Octavius Avitus compiled eight books of *῾Οµοιότητες*, giving Vergil’s passages next to the originals (*VSD* 44–45), to realize that what Vergil considered fair use constituted plagiarism to a

---

94 See West 1969 on multiple-correspondence similes, especially 41–42 on unilateral correspondences. Comparable to the literary double meaning I have been discussing is West’s discussion on page 48 of “transfusion of metaphor,” as he calls it when either the narrative or simile uses a metaphor related to the terms of the other.

95 Note that the adjective *tener*, even though it describes a different word, is here associated with *plantae* just as in *Ecl*. 10.49.
number of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{96} As in the \textit{Eclogues} (see Chapter 3), Vergil seems to be aware in the \textit{Georgics} of the moral equivocality of his compositional practice, and it is probably this awareness that motivates his defense of arboriculture in part 2 of this discussion.\textsuperscript{97}

It is probably unwise to look for exact poetic correlates for every type of arboriculture in this section, but further patterns do emerge as metapoetically suggestive. Among the first four methods Vergil mentions, we find a repeated opposition of rooted to rootless propagation: the farmer has the choice of transplanting a rooted shoot from the base of the tree (\textit{plantae}, 23–24; cf. 17), or planting a piece of trunk (\textit{stirpes}, 24–25),\textsuperscript{98} and the trees are either those that await their own offspring through layering (26–27) or that have no need of root and may be transplanted as men please (28–29).\textsuperscript{99} It seems that Vergil here maps the bottom and top of a tree to the beginning and end, respectively, of a poem or book of poetry. In lines 28–29 Vergil says that the pruner does not hesitate to entrust even the \textit{summum cacumen} (“highest treetop”) of some trees to the ground, since they have no need of the root: \textit{nil radicis egent aliae, summumque putator | haud dubitat terrae referens mandare cacumen}. Vergil’s phrase \textit{summum cacumen} can be seen as an allusion to Lucretius’s use of this phrase in the climax of his anthropology, since Vergil has alluded to this passage repeatedly throughout the beginning of \textit{Geo. 2}. By cutting a phrase out of the last line of \textit{DRN}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{96}See above p. 136.
  \item \textsuperscript{97}For a particularly interesting claim that Vergil plays with this moral ambiguity also in the \textit{Eclogues}, see Farrell 1997, 231 on the opening exchange of \textit{Ecl. 3}. Farrell suggests that opening exchange over whose cows Damoetas is pasturing may bear special relevance to Vergil’s imitation of Theocritus, and that Menalcas’s comment, \textit{Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? an Meliboeci?} (3.1), may be “a sardonic commentary on the suspect position of the imitative poet who, as if by definition, stands accused of living off another’s property.”
  \item \textsuperscript{98}Note that, since \textit{stirpes} also means “ancestral stock,” it might be said also to continue the personification of the last section.
  \item \textsuperscript{99}Mynors (ad loc.) is helpful on the details of each of these procedures.
\end{itemize}
5 (cacumen is in fact the last word) and setting it in the beginning of Geo. 2, Vergil has shown us precisely what he means about committing even the very top of a tree to new ground.\textsuperscript{100}

\subsection*{4.3 The Problem of Shade}

In the second part of his discussion of arboriculture, Vergil reorganizes the methods of propagation that he introduced above and deploys them as \textit{exempla} to show how man’s \textit{labor} can solve the problems associated with natural tree propagation. Two motifs emerge from this second discussion of the three natural methods of propagation listed above (spontaneous generation, suckering, and seed) and the respective remedies for the problems of each (47–52, 53–56, 57–60). First, since arboriculture is concerned specifically with the reproduction of trees, Vergil resumes the personification he began in part 1 and conceives here of “generations” of trees, casting the problems of natural arboriculture as an intergenerational struggle. Spontaneous trees necessarily represent a first and only generation, and although they grow luxuriant and strong, they are “barren” (\textit{infecunda quidem, sed laeta et fortia surgunt}, 48).\textsuperscript{101} On the other hand, trees that reproduce successfully are presented as a second generation (\textit{rami matris opacant}\.\.\., 55), and as potential begetters of a third (\.\.\textit{crescentique adimunt fetus}, 56; \textit{seris}\.\.\textit{nepotibus}, 58). There is clear intergenerational conflict in the case of the suckering tree, since the leaves and boughs of its mother occlude the passage of light and “deprive it of offspring while it is growing, \footnote{\textsuperscript{100}Vergil maintains the metapoetic correspondence between places on a tree and \textit{loci} in poems when he adapts this passage in \textit{Aen.} 12: see below p. 252. On the intertextual correspondence of \textit{Georgics} 2 with \textit{DRN} 5 see Farrell 1991, 189, who also connects \textit{Georgics} 3 with \textit{DRN} 6. Since Farrell 1991, 187–206 has shown that \textit{Georgics} 2 and 3 imitate \textit{DRN} 5 and 6, respectively, we might even see some reference to this division of books in the phrase \textit{caudicibus (=} \textit{codicibus} \textit{sectis}, “split-up trunks (books?)” of the next line; on \textit{codices} cf. above n. 93.}
and burns them when it does bear” (nunc altae frondes et rami matris opacant | crescentique adimunt fetus uruntque ferentem, 55–56). The same problem should afflict trees that reproduce from fallen seed, but Vergil tells us here that shade will affect the third generation, if not the second (iam quae seminibus iactis se sustulit arbos, | tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram, 57–58). The contrast between seminibus iactis (57) and posito de semine above (14) reminds one that seeded trees sometimes avoid this problem through dissemination, but there are intergenerational problems here nonetheless, since trees and vines grow slowly from seed, and their fruit is of inferior quality (tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram, | pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores | et turpis avibus praedam fert uva racemos, 58–60).

The second dominant motif of this section is the availability or lack of light to each generation, based on the method of propagation. This theme is most obvious in the discussion of suckering trees, where in both part 1 and part 2 Vergil emphasizes the harmful shadow cast by the mother tree (etiam Parnasia laurus | parva sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra, 18–19; nunc altae frondes et rami matris opacant | crescentique adimunt fetus uruntque ferentem, 55–56). This observation, however, contrasts directly with observations Vergil makes about spontaneous trees and seed-grown trees, relative to the first and third generations, respectively. Spontaneous trees, though barren themselves, benefit from having no progenitor to block their own access to sunlight: “they rise of their own accord into the realm of the light” (sponte sua quae se tollunt in luminis oras, 47).\(^{102}\) This last phrase is well-known from both Ennius and Lucretius, where it is traditionally used of birth, but Vergil here revitalizes this dead metaphor by applying it not to men or animals, but to

\(^{102}\)Although luminis auras is the reading of the Carolingean manuscripts here, most modern editions print luminis oras as at Aen. 7.660 (see Mynors ad loc.).
trees, whose vital growth depends largely on the availability of sunlight. In the case of seed-grown plants, dissemination has prevented the occlusion of sunlight that enfeebled the second generation of suckering trees, but these trees are said to make shade for “late-born grandchildren” (seris nepotibus, 58). This statement is usually read as a positive claim that the farmer’s grandchildren will enjoy the shade of these trees (cf. the nepotes who will benefit from the trees of Ecl. 9.50). Such a reading, however, is not clearly superior, and in fact does not sit well with every detail of its context, since Vergil recommends against planting from seed because of slow growth and degenerate fruit. This phrase, I believe, is intentionally ambiguous, and this ambiguity contributes to the metapoetic analogy I will discuss below.

4.3.1 On Not Being Lucretius: Spontaneous Trees

I have already suggested that Vergil’s address to Maecenas in the second proem of this book can be read as a recusatio from writing Lucretian-style didactic about natural-philosophical topics (non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto, 2.42), an interpretation that finds support in Vergil’s two explicitly programmatic passages later in this book, in which he uses Lucretian programmatic language first to proclaim his poem Hesiodic (ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis, | Ascræumque cano Romana per oppida carmen, 175–176), and to felicitate Lucretius in an apparent recusatio from Lucretian didactic (me vero primum dulces ante omnia Musae, | quaram sacra fero ingenti percussus amore, | accipient, caelique vias et sidera monstrant. . ., 475–477; felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas | atque metus omni et inexorabile fatum | subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari, 490–492). In this section I will

---

103 On use of in luminis oras to refer generally to birth, see Skutsch ad Enn. 109.

104 In these passages Vergil remakes the programmatic imagery of DRN 1.922–930 by generalizing Lucretius’s sacral imagery (inspired priest of the Muses: 922–925) to include fountains (a source of poetic inspiration at DRN 1.927–928) among the sacred objects to be revealed on initiation into
argue that the didactic material immediately succeeding the second proem of Book 2 uses the metaphorical analogy between tree propagation and poetic composition to continue and elaborate Vergil’s refusal to write didactic in the Lucretian mode. Vergil clearly has great admiration for the *De Rerum Natura*, as he makes clear both implicitly, by alluding extensively to Lucretius in *Geo.* 2 and 3, and explicitly, by casting his poetic aspirations in clearly Lucretian terms at 2.475–82 and 490–492. Nevertheless, the analogy of tree propagation shows that he considers it impossible to write Lucretian didactic under the shadow of such a predecessor.

In lines 47–52 Vergil describes the spontaneous reproduction of wild trees, which produces trees that are luxuriant and strong, but unable to reproduce themselves. Both the terms and the language of this description suggest a literary analogy with Lucretian natural-philosophical didactic, and with Lucretius’s claims to poetic originality by composing this type of poetry. In composing the *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius is not only the first Roman poet to versify Epicurean doctrine, but he is also, as far as we can tell, a generic innovator in the same sense later claimed by the Augustan poets, since he introduced into Latin the Empedoclean genre of natural philosophical poetry.\(^{105}\) Not only does Lucretius borrow Callimachus’s “untrodden road” metaphor (*avía Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante | trita solo, 925–927*)\(^{106}\) in

---

\(^{105}\) Sedley 1998, 1–34 argues that this is the program Lucretius introduces in the proem to *DRN* 1, which he intends to be recognized as an imitation of the proem to Empedocles’ poem on natural philosophy. Whether or not the *Empedoelea* of Sallustius may predate the *DRN* (they seem roughly contemporaneous at Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* 2.9.3), Lucretius’s poem stands apart from this and other contemporary didactic poems also in being an original composition in Latin rather than a translation of a Greek original: Cicero and Varro both translated Aratus, just as we assume Sallustius to have translated Empedocles; Aemilius Macer (*FRP* 47–70, q.v.) translated Nicander (*Theriaca*, perhaps also *Alexipharmaca*) and another Hellenistic poet called either Boeus or Boeo (*Ornithogonia*).

\(^{106}\) See Kenney 1970, 369–370, and now more cautiously Knox 1999. Volk 2002, 114–115 observes that Lucretius’s uses the same metaphor here to express his originality as he does at 3.3–4 to express his indebtedness to Epicurus (*te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc | ficta pedum pono*)
his apology for poetry, but elsewhere he makes for himself the same claim to originality that he makes for Ennius in the proem to Book 1 (Ennius... qui primus amoeno
| detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam | per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret, 1.117–119; cf. denique natura haec rerum ratioque repertast | nuper, et hanc primus cum primis ipse repertus | nunc ego sum in patrias qui possim vertere voces. 5.335–337).107 And when he remarks on the difficulty of his task, Lucretius seeks to claim the reward of Memmius’s friendship not only for having translated Greek philosophy into Latin, but specifically for having turned it into Latin verse.

As elsewhere, Lucretius notes the relative inadequacy of the Latin lexicon for expressing technical Greek philosophical terms,108 but the allusion in these lines to Aratus (laborem, 141; vigilare, 142)—which Vergil adapted at Geo. 1.291–296 (see Ch. 1 above)—underscores the distinction that Lucretius himself draws between translating Greek philosophy (quaerentem dictis quibus... ) and casting prose into hexameter

pressis vestigia signis).

107 On Lucretius’s use of this primus motif, see Volk 2002, 114–115 (with bibliography).

108 Cf. DRN 1.830–833 and 3.258–261, along with Cic. De Fin. 3.1.3.
verse (... et quo carmine demum), since Aratus’s nighttime labor was solely the latter.  

So although it was Lucretius’s language about Ennian literary pioneering that influenced Vergil’s most prominent claim to literary originality (primus ego..., Geo. 3.10–11), Lucretius’s own parallel claim to pioneering also had an important influence on Vergil.

When he resumes the didactic program of Book 2 after the second proem, Vergil expands on his advice that farmers learn cultivation generatim, introducing three types of trees (spontaneous, suckering, and seeding) along with the various ways they respond to artificial cultivation. Through the introduction of spontaneous trees in lines 47–52, Vergil, we shall see, uses literary analogy to imply that, while the De Rerum Natura is generically pioneering—i.e., it sprang into existence, not born from any predecessor within its genus—it is consequently impossible to imitate its author’s achievement.

The premise that anything can arise through its own machinations directly contradicts the central thesis of Epicurean physics, which Lucretius argues for over 100 lines at the didactic opening of DRN 1 (146–264). But by densely alluding to the language and specific lines of the poem, Vergil juxtaposes the theoretical impossibility of self-generation with the apparent fact of Lucretius’s literary self-generation. The specific contradiction of Lucretius on this point is quite precise, since Vergil takes over a line on spontaneous generation from DRN 5 (sponte sua nequeant liquidas existere in auras, 5.212) and adapts it to affirm precisely what it denies, namely that any plant can ever arise of its own accord.  

---

109 Sedley 1998, 43–46 also draws such a distinction in discussing Lucretius’s sense of pioneering, though his emphasis is the opposite of mine: “It is not simply that no one had previously written philosophical verse in Latin (although that is undoubtedly the point made in the proem to book I). It is also that the versification of Epicureanism, a philosophy with a highly developed technical vocabulary, makes new demands on the poet quite unlike any faced even by the founder of the genre, Empedocles.”

110 Commentators note the resemblance between these lines, but the context of Lucretius’s line
Sponte sua quae se tollunt in luminis oras,
infecunda quidem, sed laeta et forti surgunt;
quippe solo natura subest....

(geo. 2.47–49)

By substituting another well-known Lucretian phrase, \textit{in luminis oras},\textsuperscript{111} for \textit{existere in auras}, Vergil ties poetic originality, represented by the spontaneity of these wild trees, to the chief determining factor in the success of a new tree, the availability of sunlight.\textsuperscript{112}

Of the types of trees that Vergil discusses, only spontaneous trees grow lush and strong (\textit{laeta et forti surgunt}) without the help of artificial propagation, because they are overshadowed by no parent tree and have easy access to sunlight (contrast the suckering trees at 53–56). Read metapoetically, like so many other details in this passage, this would suggest that poems that pioneer a genre are free from the oppressive shadow of their generic predecessors. These poems, like the spontaneous trees, succeed by virtue of natural genius, \textit{ingenium} (\textit{quippe solo natura subest, 49}),\textsuperscript{113} while in all other cases \textit{natura} requires the adjunct help of \textit{ars}.\textsuperscript{114} But the analogy of spontaneous trees also makes clear that generic originality is not an imitable feat: trees that come spontaneously into being spawn neither seeds nor suckers, just as they grew from neither themselves. So while originality is the most straightforward path to

deserves fuller quotation. In arguing against divine creation of the earth, Lucretius cites the natural unproductiveness of the earth, most of which is useless because of heat, cold, or water, and all of which is naturally wild: \textit{si non fecundas vertentes vomere glebas | terraque solum subigentes cimus ad ortus, | sponte sua nequeant liquidas existere in auras}.... (5.210–212).

\textsuperscript{111}The phrase occurs nine times in the \textit{DRN}: see Bailey 1947 ad \textit{DRN} 1.23.

\textsuperscript{112}On the phrase \textit{in luminis oras} here, see above p. 215.

\textsuperscript{113}Another Lucretian line: cf. \textit{DRN} 3.273 (Heyne).

\textsuperscript{114}Horace does not allow even this exception to the dual necessity of \textit{natura/ingenium} and \textit{ars}: \textit{natura fieret laudabile carmen an arte | quaesitum est: ego nec studium sine divite vena | nec rude quid prosit video ingenium; alterius sic | altera poscit opem res et coniurat amice, AP 408–411.}
success for trees and poets, since no predecessor casts an oppressive shadow, it is for the same reason ultimately a dead end, and practicing poets learn little about their craft from studying generic innovation, just as farmers learn little about arboriculture by observing the strong but barren growth of spontaneous trees.

In the lines that follow, Vergil makes a horticulturally dubious statement that spontaneous wild trees can be made productive by grafting, or even by simple transplanting.

\[
\ldots \text{tamen haec quoque, si quis inserat aut scrobibus mandet mutata subactis,}
\text{exuerint silvestrem animum, cultuque frequenti}
\text{in quascumque voles artis haud tarda sequentur.}
\]

\textit{(Geo. 2.49–52)}

Although Vergil says that these trees will shed their wild character by grafting or transplanting, these statements find no support even in the precepts of his own book. Out of the four spontaneous trees that Vergil lists in part one of this discussion—\textit{siler} (unknown), broom, poplar, and willow (10–13)—none is listed anywhere in Book 2 as part of any graft, realistic or not.\textsuperscript{115} And while it is true that the ancients “had great faith in the results of transplanting” (Mynors ad loc.), the passages adduced by commentators attest only to a change between wild cultivated forms of the same species; there is no evidence that Theophrastus or any other agricultural writer thought that fruitless trees could be made to bear fruit by transplanting.\textsuperscript{116} Vergil’s

\textsuperscript{115} Of these trees (excluding the unknown \textit{siler}), moreover, only the broom shares a family with other productive plants (in this case legumes), making it capable in theory of accepting a graft; see Ross 1980.

\textsuperscript{116} E.g. Theophr. \textit{HP} 2.2.5, 2.2.11–12, \textit{CP} 3.24.4, and Hippoc. \textit{Aer.} 12. Commentators have further disagreed whether \textit{inserat aut scrobibus mandet mutata subactis} offers a truly disjunctive choice between grafting and transplanting or if the latter must necessarily presuppose the former (see Richter 1957 ad loc.); while neither Thomas nor Mynors has any problem with the sense “transplanted” for \textit{mutata}, Page, e.g., objects, “will simple transplanting affect the \textit{character} of a tree?” (emphasis original).
claims here about domesticating spontaneous wild trees are untrue, but because of the metapoetic analogy between poetry and arboriculture, they suggest the poetic treatment that Lucretius’s poem receives from Vergil in *Georgics* 2.

It seems that Vergil introduces grafting and transplanting here not as specific remedies for the barrenness of spontaneous trees, but as two representative categories that subsume all the methods of artificial propagation he has introduced in the first part of his discussion.\(^\text{117}\) They seem by analogy, moreover, to represent two compositional techniques that together constitute a sort of Vergilian *ars poetica* for dealing with poetic belatedness through technical innovation. Both techniques use the metaphorical analogy between trees and poetry books to figure the composition of a new book of poetry as a process that depends fundamentally on existing poetry, either to provide the intellectual germ for new growth, or to provide phrases and lines for a poet to graft into his developing book—or, as in this case, for both purposes.\(^\text{118}\) Both of these techniques, I believe, reflect Vergil’s present engagement with Lucretius in *Georgics* 2, where Vergil has clearly grafted a number of Lucretian lines and phrases into his own text, especially in passages where he reflects implicitly or explicitly on his engagement with the older didactic poet. But *Georgics* 2—and the *Georgics* in general—likewise grow from a transplanted scion of Lucretian didactic. Although Vergil found it impossible to write Latin didactic in the natural philosophical mode

\(^{117}\) Note that the introduction of these methods in 49–52 carries on directly into their application to suckering trees (53–54), displacing the exposition of their problem with shade into the lines that follow (55–56). This long section on transplanting and grafting (49–54) is in fact the only part of this passage that introduces remedies to the problems of natural propagation: although the slowness and degeneration of reproduction by seed is discussed at 57–60, no remedy is offered other than the generalizing conclusion that everyone must engage in labor and all trees must be tamed and forced into a furrow (61–62). The section that follows (63–72) this is simply a list of trees according to methods for dealing with them, all of which can be categorized either as grafting onto a full-grown tree, or as propagating a new tree in new soil from a piece of the old tree (see below).

\(^{118}\) I emphasize that this metaphor functions at the level of the book, as well as (perhaps more than) at the level of the whole poem. Certainly Vergil’s intertextual program can best be understood at this level: see generally Farrell 1991.
pioneered by Lucretius, the idea of writing original didactic must owe a great deal to Lucretius’s example, and by composing didactic in the agricultural mode rather than the natural philosophical mode, Vergil has transplanted the shoot of Lucretian didactic into soil that is more fertile since it is occupied by no Latin predecessor. These two techniques, which are fundamental to Vergil’s practice of poetry, he here represents as the fundamental techniques of his arboricultural poetics, a metaphor that he will develop at length in the rest of this passage.

In the notion of domestication Vergil has captured the essence of his and Horace’s relationship to the great Latin poets of the past. When Horace discusses the development of Latin poetry in the Epistle to Augustus, he characterizes the persistent influence of archaic Latin literature as “rusticity” (vestigia ruris, 2.1.160), casting the distinction between archaic and modern literature in terms very similar to Vergil’s distinction between cultivated and uncultivated trees.\(^\text{119}\) And while Horace is here talking about the introduction of the hexameter to supplant the uncouth native Saturnian meter (horridus ille... numerus Saturnius, 157–158), the references by Augustan poets to their literary forebears consistently distinguish between archaic “roughness” and the modern stylistic niceties achieved through attention to ars.\(^\text{120}\)

This roughness of style is visible not only in archaic poets like Ennius and Lucilius, but also in Lucretius, whose poetic style has clear and well-known affinities with that of Ennius.\(^\text{121}\) Vergil’s relationship to Lucretius in Georgics 2 is comparable to Horace’s relationship with Lucilius in Satires 1: because Lucretius was the primus inventor of modern Latin didactic verse, Vergil had to engage with him directly and extensively to place himself within the didactic tradition, but through powerful and

\(^{119}\)On rusticity in early verse cf. also Tib. 2.1.51–52, agricola adsiduo primum satiatus aratro | cantavit certo rustica verba pede.

\(^{120}\)Cf. generally Horace on Lucilius in Sat. 1.4 and 1.10, as well as Epist. 2.1.156–167 and elsewhere.

\(^{121}\)See, e.g., Kenney 2007, 96.
tendentious allusion (one might even say “misprision”), Vergil has not only adapted
the words and phrases of Lucretius to his own more modern style, but he has even
succeeded in using these words and phrases to affirm the very things that Lucretius
himself had denied. Vergil’s otherwise perplexing lines on domesticating wild trees
(\textit{exuerint silvestrem animum}..., 51) can now be read metapoetically: not only will
intertextual grafts or transplants put off the roughness of their style, but with enough
work they can even be made to shed their original literary context (\textit{silvestris} here
draws on the literary metaphor in \textit{silva}) and conform to whatever context you choose
(... \textit{cultuque frequenti} | \textit{in quascumque voles artis haud tarda sequentur} 51–52).

It has long been known that these lines on domesticating fruitless trees offer useless
advice for the farmer. They function metapoetically, however, as the introduction
to an \textit{ars} of intertextuality that Vergil will develop at greater length in discussing
suckering and seeded trees below. They also substantially repeat Vergil’s advice to
farmers in the second proem, which can now be seen as a coherent statement of
Vergil’s program of literary adaptation. The importance of learning cultivation by
\textit{genus} (\textit{quare agite o proprios generatim discite cultus}, | \textit{agricolae}..., 35–36) consists
in knowing one’s generic forebears in order both to modernize (soften) the style of an
archaic or archaizing genre (... \textit{fructusque feros mollite colendo}..., 36), or to expand
its scope to include relevant topics that have not yet been treated at length in Latin
(... \textit{ne segnes iaceant terrae}..., 37). This is precisely what Vergil has done with
Lucretian didactic in the \textit{Georgics}: through heavy allusion and free adaptation, he
has adapted Lucretius’s archaizing style to his own modern tastes, and by writing
about agriculture instead of natural philosophy, he has expanded Latin didactic into

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{122}Compare Horace’s direct adaptation in \textit{Sat.} 1.5 of Lucilius Book 4, which Horace shortens
significantly, in apparent illustration of his own insistence of brevity (\textit{est brevitate opus}, \textit{Sat.} 1.10.9).
On the notion of “misprision,” or strong misreading, in an author’s creation of literary history see
allusion see Hinds 1998 cited at Ch. 3 n. 21.
an area properly treated by didactic (witness Hesiod) but not yet colonized by Latin poets.

4.3.2 Generic Imitation: Shoots and Shade

When Vergil moves on to discuss suckering trees and the associated problem of shade, he resumes and develops a literary metaphor that he had used prominently to characterize his literary activity in *Eclogue* 10. In my discussion of shade in Chapter 3 (see p. 162), I argued that, after Gallus compares the growth of his amores (both “loves” and “love poetry”) to the growth of the trees on which he carves them (*crescent illae, crescentis amores*, *Ecl.* 10.54), Vergil too uses growing trees to characterize metaphorically his own amor Galli, which refers both to his love for Gallus and to his own attempt at love poetry in the *Eclogues*, and especially in the very last lines of *Ecl.* 10, which are also the very last lines of the collection.

\[
\text{Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas} \\
\text{quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus.} \\
\text{surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra,} \\
\text{iuniperi gravis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.} \\
\text{ite domum satura, venit Hesperus, ite capellae.} \\
\]

(*Ecl.* 10.73–77)

While Gallus simply compared his amores to growing trees, Vergil compares his amor Galli to the shoot of a suckering alder, a comparison that implies not only speedy and vigorous growth (*quantum vere novo.* . . . , 74), but also the problem of overshadowing that necessarily accompanies reproduction by suckering. Unlike the speedy growth mentioned in line 74, the problem of overshadowing is not explicitly highlighted by the terms of Vergil’s comparison, but it is suggested by the immediately subsequent two lines, in which shade is now presented not, as elsewhere in the *Eclogues*, as part of the locus amoenus and a virtual prerequisite for pastoral song, but as a danger to both
singers and crops. Throughout the *Eclogues*, but especially in this context, shade can be seen to represent the shadow of literary influence, which is both protective and, ultimately, enfeebling.

In many ways the discussion of arboriculture in the beginning of *Georgics* 2 functions to expand and contextualize the metaphor that Vergil uses at the end of *Eclogue* 1. When he introduces suckering trees in lines 17–19, he uses the same technical language for suckering (*se subicit*), and he again focuses on shade as the inherent problem with reproduction by offshoot.

\[
\text{pullulat ab radice aliis densissima silva,}
\]
\[
\text{ut cerasis ulmisque; etiam Parnasia laurus}
\]
\[
\text{parva sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra.}
\]

\((\text{Geo. 17–19})\)

It is possible that the first of these lines, which portrays a dense forest growing up around the parent tree, looks back to the predicament of writing elegy, which Vergil first compared to growth by offshoot, and suggests the large number of poets that seem to have taken up love elegy after Gallus’s example.\(^{123}\) And in introducing the problem of shade, Vergil might also be seen to hint at the literary analogy of this problem by calling the shade *ingens*, which was seen to have an etymological connection with *ingenium* that Vergil exploits elsewhere in the *Georgics* and in the *Aeneid*.\(^{124}\) At this point, however, there are only hints of literary undertones; when Vergil revisits suckering trees in lines 53–56 below, he develops these hints into a rich metaphor for literary imitation and originality.

\(^{123}\)E.g., Propertius, Tibullus, Sulpicia, Lygdamus, Ovid, and Varro of Atax.

\(^{124}\)See Ross 1987, 115, who discusses the paradoxical *ingens arbos* (a lemon tree) at Geo. 2.131. See also the survey of *ingens* in Vergil by Mackail (1912), which draws attention to etymological links with both *ingenium* and *gens*. For discussion and references on etymological uses of *ingens* in Vergil see further O’Hara 1996, 189 (*Aen. 7.376*), 234 (*Aen. 12.224–226*), 269 (*Geo. 2.131*), and 282 (*Geo. 4.20*).
Vergil's return to the topic of suckering trees is by way of the remedies for barrenness in spontaneous wild trees. Just as wild trees, he says, can be domesticated and made to follow *in quascumque voles artis* (52), so too can such a change be brought about by transplanting the offshoots of suckering trees, even though these trees grow up *sterilis* from the roots of their parent. As it is now, the sterility of these trees is owed to the oppressive shade of their parent, which robs the trees of offspring and blights them (*urunt*, “burns”) when they bear fruit.

\[\text{nec non et, sterilis quae stirpibus exit ab imis,}
\text{hoc faciat, vacuos si sit digesta per agros;}
\text{nunc altae frondes et rami matris opacant}
\text{crescentique adimunt fetus uruntque ferentem.}
\]

(*Geo. 2.53–56*)

On a metapoetic level, these lines continue to develop Vergil's metaphorical *recusatio* from writing Lucretian didactic. In these suckering trees Vergil represents his own dilemma as a late-comer to the didactic genre, which is also the dilemma he faced as a late-comer to the elegiac genre in the *Eclogues* (again, especially *Ecl.* 10). If Vergil were to pursue didactic poetry in the explicitly natural philosophical mode, his poem would be a generic offshoot of the *DRN*, and his efforts would be stunted by the looming shadow of Lucretius. As a Latin didactic epic, however, the *Georgics* are nevertheless an offshoot of the *DRN*, but by casting his own poem after the model of Hesiod rather than Lucretius, Vergil has cut a scion from the originary tree of Latin didactic and transplanted it to a field yet unoccupied by any Latin poet.

In the simple process of transplanting the offshoots of a tree, Vergil has found a remarkably expressive metaphor that shows a path to literary originality to poets working within an established genre. This metaphor seems to characterize not only

---

125 Martial uses the word *sterilis* as a metaphor for unproductive literary effort (1.107.7–8) in a poem about patronage that contrasts his own lack of leisure to the *otium* that Maecenas made possible for Vergil and Horace; cf. also below n. 163.
his method in the Georgics, but also in the *Eclogues*, where he transplanted the
conventions of love elegy from the city to the country and made an elaborate generic
hybrid from the elements of both genres. Both of these works reflect on their own
generic predicament through the analogy of a suckering tree, which the *Eclogues*
introduces in its metaphorically programmatic closing, and around which the *Georgics*
centers its discussion of tree propagation. And although I know of no such self-
annotative remarks about suckering in the *Aeneid*, the same transplanting metaphor
can also be seen to describe what Vergil does with Latin historical epic in the *Aeneid*,
preserving Ennius’s focus on Roman history while pushing the genre back to its
ultimate progenitor, Homer.

### 4.3.3 Problems with Growing from Seed: Shadow and Belatedness

When Vergil reintroduces propagation from seed in line 57, he introduces a strange
paradox into his treatment of arboriculture. In lines 47–56 he had paired each nat-
ural method of propagation with one or more artificial remedies, even in the case of
spontaneous—and therefore necessarily barren—wild trees. In lines 57–60, however,
Vergil presents reproduction from seed as unremediably useless from an agricultural
perspective: the exhortation to *labor* that follows these lines (61–62) is a generalizing
summation of the entire section rather than a specific remedy for the problems of
growth from seed.\(^\text{126}\) Trees that are propagated by seed are slow to grow, and they
fail to produce fruit that is true to type.

\[
\text{iam quae seminibus iactis se sustulit arbos,}
\text{tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram,}
\]

\(^{126}\text{Cf. Thomas ad 61–62: “This couplet applies both to spontaneous and natural growth (which}
\text{has preceded) and to man’s methods (which follow), and it contains thought central to the book}
\text{and the poem.”}\)
pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores
et turpis avibus praedam fert uva racemos.
scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus et omnes
cogendae in sulcum ac multa mercede domandae.

(Geo. 2.57–62)

The only thing these trees are apparently good for is the shade they will one day provide to “late-born grandchildren” (seris nepotibus), and even this will come too late, it seems, for the farmer himself to profit from.\textsuperscript{127} The tone of these lines is generally representative of the corresponding section in Theophrastus (HP 2.2.4–6), which notes that almost all trees degenerate when allowed to reproduce from seed. But Theophrastus does not discuss shade in this context, and its introduction in these lines is best attributed to Vergil’s persistent attention to light and shade as they bear on the propagation and vitality of trees.

In his treatment of natural propagation Vergil has developed two central motifs: the availability of light and, through personification, the familial relationship between the several generations of trees. Although seris nepotibus in line 58 can be read to refer to humans, it also makes perfect sense, in a way that allows for a richer reading of this passage, if we read nepotes as referring not to the farmer’s grandchildren but to a third generation of trees; this line would then give a sense that is consistent with the development of themes throughout the above passage. Like the suckering tree in lines 53–56, the tree that grows from fallen seeds (quae seminibus iactis se sustulit arbos, 57) also suffers because of the shade of its parent, but while the emphasis above was on sterility, here it falls on retardation of growth: such trees are slow to grow because they have no access to light, and although they are not sterile, they will in turn cast a shadow that retards the growth of their own late-born offspring, the third generation of trees (tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram, 58). This reading continues the

\textsuperscript{127}Cf. Mynors ad loc: “shade is all it will produce, and you will not live to enjoy even that.”
central motifs of this passage and is consistent with the degeneration of fruit that Vergil discusses in the following two lines. The consensus of modern commentators, however, favors understanding nepotibus as the grandchildren of Vergil’s farmer addressee, despite acknowledging that seminibus iactis, like posito... de semine above (14), personifies the tree in the role of farmer.\textsuperscript{128}

The consensus among commentators, however, has not always been so unanimous as it seems to be now. In his 16th-century edition of Greek comparanda for the works of Vergil, Fulvio Orsini took exception to this consensus, pointing out Vergil’s personifying reference to mothers in the lines before these.

\textit{seris nepotibus umbram}: video ceteros interpretet, quos ego quidem legerim, ita hunc locum explicare, ut vocem, nepotibus, ad versum illum,

—carpent tua poma nepotes, [\textit{Ecl.} 9.50]

referendam putent: qui mihi non satis Virgiliani carminis sensum videntur assecuti. dixit enim poëtice Virgilius, nepotes, quos Theophrastus παρα-βλαστάδας [sic] & ράβδους, Cato autem pullos, dixerunt. quo modo alibi etiam videtur locutus, cum cecinit,

—etiam Parnassia laurus
Parva sub ingenti matris se subjicit umbra. [\textit{Geo.} 2.18–19] &

Hic plantas tenero abscondens de corpore matrum. [23] &

nunc aliae frondes, et rami matris opacant. [55]

Mecum autem facit perantiquus meus liber, cuius ego bonitatem nunquam tantopere probavi, quam cum in eo animadverti glossema aeque antiquo charactere, quod verbum illud, nepotibus, exponeret, radicibus, ut ex eo versu hic sensus eliciatur: satas semine arbores, non modo ipsas, tardas

\textsuperscript{128}Cf. Thomas on 2.57: “‘from seeds put out [by the mother tree]’; cf. 14 \textit{posito}... de semine, and n.,” and on 14: “‘from fallen seed’; at first sight this looks as if it means the opposite (referring to man’s involvement), like the parallel phrase at 57 seminibus iactis (47–82n.); but man comes on the scene only with the word \textit{usus} (22). The two phrases are reworked later in the book, there referring strictly to man’s planting...”
venire, utar autem Catonis & Virgilii verbis, verum etiam, ab ea arbore abs terra pulli qui nascuntur, sero crescere. hanc ego huius loci veram sententiam puto.\textsuperscript{129}

Despite Orsini’s sensitivity and his reasoned argument, subsequent editors have delighted in denouncing his suggestion that \textit{nepotibus} refers poetically (\textit{dixit enim poetice Virgilius}) not to generations of men, but of trees.\textsuperscript{130} These refutations rely not only on the passage from \textit{Ecl.} 9 that Orsini mentions, but also on Vergil’s highly allusive description of the oak tree used as a prop for vines in the vineyard (\textit{Geo.} 2.291–297), where \textit{nepotes} is again used without specific reference to refer to the long life of the tree (\textit{immota manet multosque nepotes, | multa virum volvens durando saecula vincit, 294–295}).\textsuperscript{131} There is no extensive personification in these later lines, but neither is there any guarantee that \textit{nepotes} refers to human generations any more here than in line 58 above.\textsuperscript{132} And if, as I argue, Vergil uses personification to develop his discussion of trees and arboriculture in \textit{Geo.} 2 as a metaphorical analogy for poems and poetry, he may also be developing this metaphor in his elaborate picture of the \textit{aesculus}, which not only waits on \textit{multos nepotes} and conquers many \textit{saecula virum}, but by stretching out its huge branches, it casts a huge (\textit{ingens}) shadow (\textit{tum fortis late ramos et bracchia tendens | huc illuc media ipsa ingentem sustinet umbram,})

\textsuperscript{129}Orsini 1568, 120–121 (emphases in text mine).

\textsuperscript{130}E.g., Forbiger ad loc.: “Ursinus satis mire \textit{nepotes} de ipsius arboris pullis... intelligit; quam explicationem quomodo Manso probare potuerit, non perspicio.”


\textsuperscript{132}In line 295 \textit{virum} should be taken with \textit{saecula}, after the Lucretian habit of using \textit{saecla} to refer to generations of men or animals: \textit{vitalia saecla}, 1.202; \textit{saecla hominum}, 1.467; \textit{saecla animantium}, 2.71; \textit{saecla ferarum}, 2.995, et al. Such specification in line 295 may support reading \textit{nepotes} in line 294 with some other reference.
296–297) over the vineyard.\textsuperscript{133}

If we are willing to see trees and arboriculture as metaphors for poems and poetry, then it is possible to see in Vergil’s reference to “shade and late-born grandchildren” (\textit{tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram}, 2.58) a rich metaphorical statement about the problems of influence and belatedness, which Vergil confronts most explicitly in the proem to \textit{Georgics} 3. Although he has paid close attention to light and shadow throughout this section, Vergil has not used the word \textit{umbra}, with its ties to the \textit{Eclogues} and its metaphorical program, until line 57, which serves as a climax to Vergil’s treatment of this theme: \textit{tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram}.\textsuperscript{134}

If \textit{nepotibus} can refer to generations of trees, then this line twice emphasizes the retarding effect that shade has on trees (\textit{tarda venit, seris nepotibus}), and by showing the repetition of this problem not just in the second generation (\textit{tarda venit}) but in its offspring as well, it establishes shade and retardation as a pernicious generational cycle, which the trees are unable to break without man’s intervention.

If trees stand metapoetically for poetry books, then the enfeebling shadow cast by one onto the next represents poetic influence as a similarly oppressive phenomenon, which has stood in the way of original poetic achievement for all poets since Homer, who stands alone at the beginning of literary history like the spontaneous tree in lines 47–49. Remarkably, the metaphorical terms that Vergil uses to present this problem

\textsuperscript{133}On the connection between \textit{ingens} and \textit{ingenium} see above at n. 124. As Mynors notes at 290–292 and Thomas notes at 291–297, the huge shadow of the \textit{aesculus} makes it a very poor choice as a prop for vines, although Pliny says that the Transpadanes sometimes used the \textit{quercus} in this capacity (\textit{NH} 17.201, after a list of five other trees used more successfully elsewhere). For Mynors the solution is to exclude reference to vineyards from lines 291–297 (“V. has probably given way to his feeling for big trees.”); for Thomas the allusion to Homer (see n. 131) trumps considerations of practicality.

\textsuperscript{134}Explicit mention of \textit{umbra} likewise occupies the climactic final position (19) in Vergil’s first introduction of natural methods (9–21). After line 57, Vergil does not mention \textit{umbra} again until 2.297, where mention of \textit{ingens umbra} (cf. 2.19) again constitutes the climax of a section—here of the Vergil’s consideration of the \textit{aesculus} as a prop tree, on which see above n. 133).
not only resemble the terms in which Horace talks about the same problem (see below), but they also correspond exactly to the metaphorical terms used in modern literary-critical idiom. So Harold Bloom, throughout *The Anxiety of Influence*, speaks of the “shadow” of poetic influence that afflicts poets who are “latecomers” to a literary tradition. And in the preface to the book’s second edition, Bloom makes the same observation, I believe, as Vergil makes in his reflection on the cycle of shadow stunting the growth of late-born generations: “Belatedness seems to me not a historical condition at all, but one that belongs to the literary situation as such.”

Such is the conclusion, I believe, of Vergil’s extended consideration of light and shadow in lines 47–60, which anticipates the explicitly programmatic proem to Book 3, where Vergil demonstrates that literary influence is a cyclical phenomenon. Vergil would agree with Bloom’s pronouncement.

In the proem to *Geo.* 3, Vergil moves immediately from the invocation of Pales and Apollo Nomius (3.1–2) to programmatic remarks about literary originality, which allude prominently to similarly programmatic remarks by Callimachus in one of his epigrams (*σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δηµόσια*, *Epig.* 28.4 Pf.).

\begin{align*}
\text{cetera, quae vacuas tenuissent carmine mentes,} \\
\text{omnia iam vulgata: quis aut Eurysthea durum} \\
\text{aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras?} \\
\text{cui non dictus Hylas puer et Latonia Delos} \\
\text{Hippodameque umeroque Pelops insignis eburno,} \\
\text{acer equis? temptanda via est, qua me quoque possim} \\
\text{tollere humo victorque virum volitare per ora.}
\end{align*}

\[(Geo. 3.3–9)\]

But while Callimachus deplores, among other things, the well-worn path of cyclic epic (ʼΕχθαίρω τὸ ποίηµα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ | χαῖρω, τίς πολλοὺς ώδε καὶ ώδε

\[135\] Bloom 1997, xxv. Appropriately enough, the back flap of the second edition says of Bloom’s book that it “has cast its long shadow of influence since it was first published in 1973.”
φέρει, Epig. 28.1–2 Pf.), the themes that Vergil deprecates are precisely those that Callimachus and the Alexandrians preferred to the topics of traditional epic. These lines form part of an audacious proem that seems to look forward to the Aeneid as a Caesarian epic, but their significance is both literary and political, since they open for Vergil a path to epic, despite his being neither Homer nor Ennius. By turning the modernist posture of Callimacheanism against its own favorite topics, Vergil exposes Callimacheanism for the cliche that it had become, and through this paradox of literary criticism Vergil expresses the dilemma of his generation, who find themselves as epigonoi to generations of epigonoi. In this sophisticated irony we see a cyclical view of literary history, which recognizes that it is not only the shadow of Homer that obstructs poetic originality, but that each succeeding generation must deal with the shadow of the previous generation as well. It is because of this cycle of poetic overshadowing that Vergil’s own poetic achievement, like the seed-grown tree, is slow to mature (tarda venit), although it too will loom large one day and cast an equally stifling shadow over its late-born descendants.

136 Busiris featured in the now lost end of Callim. Aet. 2 (fr. 44 Pf.), Hylas in both the Argonautica (1.1207–1357) and Theocritus 13, and Delos in Callimachus Hymn 4; Hylas also appears prominently in Prop. 1.20, which is addressed to a Gallus that may be the poet (see further Petrain 2000). References to Hercules and Pelops, respective founders of the Nemean and Olympian Games, further allude to the theme of game-foundation, which Callimachus takes up in the opening of Aet. 3. See Thomas ad 3.3–8 and Kraggerud 1998, 3–7.

137 Cf. the title of Hunter 2006a, The Shadow of Callimachus.

138 Cf. VSD 22 on Vergil’s slow and deliberate method in writing the Georgics: cum Georgica scribere, traditur cotidie meditatos mane plurimos versus dictare solitus ac per totum diem retractando ad paucissimos redigere, non absurde carmen se more ursae parere dicens et lambendo demum effingere; mind, however, the caution of Horsfall 2000, 15–16 that both haste and slowness are traditional motifs in talking about poetic composition.

139 Hinds 2001, 52–63 discusses the cyclical repetition of literary history from a critical perspective, noting all the major Roman poets from Livius Andronicus to Vergil make analogous claims to be the first to import Greek sophistication: so Vergil in the proem to Geo. 3, immediately following the lines I quote above, primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit | Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas... (10–11).
The belatedness of Latin literature is, of course, a common trope in literary histories, since Latin literature is from its very beginnings concerned both with imitating Greek literature and distinguishing itself from it. The first recorded dramas in Latin literature were translations from Greek presented by Livius Andronicus in 240 BC, and the first epic was his *Odusia*, the first line of which follows its Homeric model even in minor details of diction, while consciously Latinizing Homer’s Muse as one of the local water nymphs, the Camenae: *Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum* (fr. 1). Romans of the first century BC dated the beginning of their literary history to this period around the Punic Wars, and when they reflected on the comparatively late date of this beginning, they characterized their coming as “late,” *serus*. Early in the first book of his *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero compares the respective timelines of Greek and Roman literature, pointing out that the floruits of both Homer and Hesiod predate Rome’s very foundation and that Archilochus lived during the reign of Romulus, while the Romans, on the other hand, had received poetry much later (*serius*), more than 500 years after Rome’s foundation. When Horace treats Latin literary history in his *Epistle to Augustus*, he likewise stresses the lateness of Rome’s

---

140 By rendering Homer’s *πολύτροπον* as *versutum*, Livius may even be consciously reflecting on his own role as an imitator of Greek literature, since the word’s root, *vertere*, means not only “turn” (hence “of many turns”), but also “translate”: see Hinds 2001, 58–62, who cites the observation by Goldberg (1995, 64) that Livius’s *insece* is “a rare Latin word of similar meaning, sound and accent to Homer’s own uncommon *ἔννεπε*.”

141 Porcius Licinius (see above n. 44) dated the beginnings of Latin literature to the Second Punic War, Varro (in *De Poetis*) to the First. Both are cited at Gellius 17.21.45, where Gellius says, *Porcius autem Licinius serius poeticam Romae coepisse dicit...*

142 Cicero (*T.D.* 1.3) was arguing that Romans have had an easy time surpassing Greeks in all fields, even literature, because the Greeks, whose best poets were its first, were not fighting back: *Doctrina Graecia nos et omni litterarum genere superabat; in quo erat facile vincere non repugnantes. nam cum apud Graecos antiquissimum e doctis genus sit poētarum, siquidem Homerus fuit et Hesiodus ante Romanam conditam, Archilochus regnante Romulo, serius poēticam nos accepimus. annis fere CCCCCX post Romanam conditam Livius fabulam dedit C. Claudio, Caeci filio, M. Tuditano consulis, anno ante natum Ennium.* He goes on to say that Romans were late (*sero*) to recognize or accept poetry as a profession.
entry onto the literary stage, but his term is no longer comparative: Roman litera-
ture, which consists here in the imitation of Greek models, is now simply “late” or
“belated”: *serus enim Graecisadmovitarumina chartis* (Epist. 2.1.161). This use of
*serus* is one of a number of resemblances between Horace’s explicit literary history
in the *Epistle* and the metaphorical terms in which Vergil presents literary history in
the *Georgics*. It also provides a link to Propertius’s discussion of literary immortality
in his Book 3.

In the programmatic elegy that opens his third book of poems, Propertius draws
heavily on the explicitly programmatic language of the *Georgics* (published 5–10 years
earlier) to recuse himself from writing epic on recent history, since his own path to po-
etic immortality will be won instead by following Callimachus and Philetas. A flurry
of programmatic metaphors assaults the reader immediately: successive pictures of
Propertius as the priest of a pure spring (3.1.3–4), then a triumphing general flying
through the air (9–12) but simultaneously competing as a charioteer (13–14). These
metaphors appear throughout Greek and Latin literary history, but they are all used
by Vergil in the *Georgics*, either to chart his own poetic progress, or to make claims
about his originality and future poetic immortality.¹⁴³ The second half of Prop. 3.1
(21–38), develops a lengthy comparison between the posthumous fame that Proper-
tius will enjoy because of his poetry and the fame that Troy and Homer enjoy on
account of the *Iliad*.¹⁴⁴ Like Troy, evidently, Propertius will enjoy fame *post cineres*,

¹⁴³Cf. esp. Geo. 2.173–176 and 3.8–39. To Propertius’s image of chariot racing (*quid frustra in-
misssis certatis habenis*, 13) I would compare not only the chariot imagery in the two proems to
Geo. 3 (1–48, 284–294), but also the chariot race image at the end of Geo. 1 (512–514), which Vergil
compares explicitly to the civil war, but which I believe has some programmatic significance as well.

¹⁴⁴It is striking that the comparison Propertius draws is primarily not between himself and Homer
but between himself and Troy. By doing this he seems to invoke a metonymy between poem and
subject, which guarantees his own lasting fame not so much by virtue of being the author of his own
poetry, but rather its subject (*Troy : the Iliad :: Propertius : his Elegies*).
and Rome will praise him *inter seros nepotes*.\(^{145}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{exiguo sermone fores nunc, Ilion, et tu,} \\
\text{Troia bis Oetaei numine capta dei.} \\
\text{nec non ille tui casus memorator Homerus} \\
\text{posterateum sumum crescere sensit opus;} \\
\text{meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes:} \\
\text{illum post cineres auguror ipse diem.}
\end{align*}
\]

(Prop. 3.1.31–36)

There is little doubt that Propertius’s phrase *inter seros nepotes* originates in *Georgics* 2.57, where slow-growing trees cast shade on *seris nepotibus*.\(^{146}\) The context of these lines, moreover, which reflect on originality and poetic fame, and which compares Propertius’s elegies to the *Iliad*, makes it likely that Propertius adapted Vergil’s phrase in full knowledge of its metaphorical reference to poetic influence and belatedness. In claiming that his elegies will win him the praise of future generations, as Homer’s *Iliad* did for Troy, Propertius casts himself as an elegiac Homer, who, like Homer, will be the reason that these future generations are “late.” After Propertius uses this phrase, moreover, it becomes a fixture of the programmatic language of immortality, in which capacity it appears in Ovid, Silius, and Statius.\(^{147}\) Of these poets, only Ovid found himself among the late-born elegiac successors that Propertius hoped for, but none of them could avoid the long shadow cast by Vergil, who rendered the

\(^{145}\)To *post cineres* (36) compare the lines that introduce the comparison to Troy (23–25): *omnia post obtum fingit maiora vetustas; | maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora venit. | nam quis equo pulsas abieguno nosceret arces…*

\(^{146}\)Vergil’s line in turn depends partly on a reference in *Eclogue* 9 to Daphnis grafting pears that his *nepotes* will one day enjoy: *insere, Daphni, piros: carpent tua poma nepotes* (*Ecl.* 9.50); I will discuss the metaliterary significance of grafting in detail in the next section (p. 240).

\(^{147}\)See Ov. *Pont.* 3.2.35, of the late generations that will praise Ovid’s still-loyal supporters after reading his poetry, Sil. 4.399, of the late generations his poems will live to see, and Stat. *Theb.* 1.185, of the late generations that Cadmus will send augury down to. A second use by Ovid at *Met.* 6.137–138 deserves mention as poetic as well, since he describes the punishment of Arachne, whose story “offers key insights into the poem’s conceptions of art” (Feeney 1991, 190), as a *lex… poenae… | dicta tuo generi [=genre?] serisque nepotibus* (6.137–138).
whole of subsequent Latin literature his late-born successors.

Returning now to *Georgics* 2: the lines that follow immediately on Vergil’s warning about shade and “belated descendants” describe the degeneration of fruit in these trees, and the consequent necessity that we labor to avoid such an outcome.

\[
\begin{align*}
pomaque & \text{ degenerant sucos oblita priores} \\
eturpis & \text{ avibus praedam fert uva racemos.} \\
scilicet & \text{ omnibus est labor impendendus, et omnes} \\
cogendae & \text{ in sulcum ac multa mercede domandae.}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{(Geo. 2.59–62)}

I have already remarked above that the quality of a tree’s fruit seems to be a measure of the stylistic development within a genre. These two concepts are conjoined at the beginning of the second proem, when Vergil addresses farmers and urges them to learn the cultivation of tree according to \textit{genus} in order to domesticate their wild fruits and put all the world’s lands to use (\textit{quare agite o proprios \textit{generatim} discite cultus agricolae, fructusque feros mollite colendo, | neu segnes iaceant terrae}, 35–37). In lines 59–60, although Vergil has not yet taken up the suitability of different trees to different lands, we see the undoing of the first half of this program—domestication—on account of the oppression of generational shade.\textsuperscript{148}

Whereas Vergil’s exhortation at the beginning of this section represented a program of generic development and refinement analogous to Horace’s laborious program of refining the Lucilian genre of satire (cf. above pp. 184–190), the warning in these lines represents the opposite phenomenon, brought on by the long shadow of poetic

\textsuperscript{148}Vergil treats the last part of this program starting in line 83, where he considers the variety of trees (83–108) in conjunction with the variety of lands (109–135). This last section leads to the \textit{laudes Italae} (136–176), which Stephen Harrison has recently argued constitutes metapoetic praise for Italian literature (Harrison 2007a, 138–149). The lines that follow this treat the qualities of different types of soil (176–225) and how to recognize them (226–258). I plan to discuss Vergil’s metaphorical treatment of soil in these sections at a later date.
influence and the failure to labor against it. The fruit of these belated trees degenerates (*pomaque degenerant*, 59), i.e. it fails over time to exhibit the properties of its genre (*genus*), since it is so far removed from its original source (*sucos oblita priores*). One example of such literary “degeneration” might be the pastoral poets, including Moschus and Bion, that intervened between the Theocritean foundation of the genre and Vergil’s renewal of it in the heavily Theocritean *Eclogues*; another might be the mostly nameless Roman epic poets that followed the Ennian model of historical epic before Vergil’s renewal of Homeric epic in the *Aeneid*.149 These poems were all late-comers to stagnating genres, in which the shadow of poetic influence encroached from one generation onto the next, causing poetry’s fruit trees to bear untrue to type (*sucos oblita priores*, *Geo*. 2.59), and its grape vines to bear only rotten clusters, a spoil for the birds (*et turpis avibus praedam fert uva racemos*, 60).150 All men, Vergil says, must labor against this possibility (*scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus*, 61) by forcing their crops into the furrow (*omnes | cogendae in sulcum*, 61–62)—a metaphor for verse composition that I shall outline briefly in my conclusion—and by working hard to tame and refine (*ac multa mercede domandae*, 62) the *genus* on which they spend their *labor*.

149 We know enough about one of these poets, the Archias that Cicero defends in the *Pro Archia*, to conclude that he seems the very opposite of Horatian and Vergilian poetic refinement. Compare, e.g., Cicero’s praise of Archias’s ability to extemporize (18) to Horace’s jibe that Lucilius thought it an impressive feat that he could compose two hundred lines in an hour, standing on one foot. Generalizing about historical epic in this period, White 1993, 79 says that “the genre evidently stayed stuck in the category of second-rate.”

150 I wonder whether Vergil’s phrase *avibus praedam* may allude, like *Cat*. 64.152–153 (*pro quo dilaceranda feris dabor alitibusque | praeda*), the Zenodotean reading of *Il*. 1.4–5, *αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεὗχε κόνεσαν | οἰωνοίοι τε δαῖτα*; on the Catullan allusion see Zetzel 1978, with the cautionary note of Thomas 1979b.
4.4 Intertextual Grafting

When Vergil introduces the second part of his treatment of artificial arboriculture in lines 47–52, he cites grafting and transplanting as remedies for the natural barrenness of spontaneous wild trees, but in the subsequent lines on suckering and reproduction by seed (53–60), he focuses his attention on the problem of shade, which is remedied by transplanting, not grafting. Discussion of grafting is postponed until lines 73–82, where it constitutes the second major focus of Vergil’s discussion of arboricultural techniques and represents a second major technique important for the composition of poetry. The lines between these two sections (63–72) list species of tree according to how they are best propagated, first listing those trees that reproduce spontaneously (nascentur . . . nascitur) or that can be reproduced from some type of cutting (63–68), then moving on to list trees that are best grafted (69–72). While it is possible that this catalogue contains specific metaphorical assertions about certain poems, authors, or genres, our fragmentary knowledge both of Vergil’s metaphorical vocabulary, and of the details of Latin literary history discourages me, at least for now, from seeking specific metaphorical associations. The subsequent discussion of grafting technique is, however, rich in metapoetic symbolism, and it allows for a general discussion of grafting as a metaphor for literary allusion.

Grafting is a radically artificial solution to the barrenness associated with spontaneous wild trees, and like its less radical counterpart, transplanting, it here represents an artful path to poetic vitality for those not lucky enough to stand self-generated at the beginning of a literary genre. But while transplanting seemed to represent either the transferral of a genre to a subject it had not yet treated (or perhaps the importation of a genre from Greece to Italy), grafting represents an altogether more radical approach, in which pieces of text are cut from a predecessor and sown (inserere) into the book at hand. The Latin word inserere shows both the conceptual similarity and
difference between grafting and transplanting, since it figures grafting as equivalent
to sowing (serere) a seed or slip, but the grafted scion is not sown (saturn) into the
ground, but rather sown into (insitum) the flesh of an already grown tree. I will dis-
cuss sowing briefly in my conclusion as part of a literary metaphor that uses plowing
(terrum vertere) as a trope for composing poetic verse (versus), but even aside from
its connection to this metaphor, any discussion about grafting in Latin has a natural
capacity for ambiguity and double meaning because the Latin words for “grafting”
(inserere) and “inserting” or “including (in a book, speech, etc.)” (inserere) are iden-
tical in the present system. In literary terms, the difference between transplanting
and grafting is the difference between using another text as the germ for new poetic
growth and visibly appropriating part of another text as part of your own (mira-
tastque novas frondes et non sua poma, 82). By troping literary allusion as grafting,
Vergil expresses not only the violence it works on other texts by dislocating passages
from their contexts (resecuntur... alte | finditur... immituntur, 78–80; cf. Thomas
ad loc.), but also the moral ambiguity that inheres in a practice that some would
call plagiarism rather than allusion (saepe alterius ramos impune videmus | vertere
in alterius, 32–33).

Entirely independent of Vergil’s metaphorical program in the Georgics, literary
critics have also sometimes seized on grafting as a suitable metaphor for allusion and
intertextuality. Prominent among these is Derrida, who, like Vergil, founded his use
of the metaphor on both etymological similarities and on the analogical similarity

---

151 Compare OLD insero, ~erere, ~ēvi, itum to insero, ~erere, uī, tum; “to insert, include (in
a book, speech, etc.) is OLD insero 2, 3b. Servius warns against just this ambiguity in his note
at Vergil’s first mention of grafting (ad 2.32): inpune videmus sine damno sui. et loquitur de
insitione. sane “insitas” arbores dicimus, “insertas” vero causas aut fabulas [emphasis added]. We
can see this ambiguity (fortuitously, in light of Vergil’s use of the metaphor) in Servius’s note on the
opening of Ecl. 4: paulo maiora canamus bene “paulo”: nam licet haec ecloga discedat a bucolico
carmine, tamen inserit ei aliqua apta operi: ergo non “maiora,” sed “paulo maiora.”
between textual and arboricultural grafting. One passage deserves to be quoted at length from Derrida’s discussion of Mallarmé’s *Mimique* [underlining added]:

... *Mimique* is also haunted by the ghost or grafted onto the arborescence of another text.... [This text] is thus, for *Mimique*, both a sort of epigraph, an hors d’œuvre, and a seed, a seminal infiltration: indeed both at once, which only the operation of the *graft* can no doubt represent.

One ought to explore systematically not only what appears to be a simple etymological coincidence uniting the graft and the graph [Fr.: greffet, graphe] (both from *graphion*: writing implement, stylus), but also the analogy between the forms of textual grafting and so-called vegetal grafting, or even, more and more commonly today, animal grafting. It would not be enough to compose an encyclopedic catalogue of grafts (approach grafting, detached scion grafting; whip grafts, splice grafts, saddle grafts, cleft grafts, bark grafts; bridge grafting, inarching, repair grafting, bracing; T-budding, shield budding, etc.); one must elaborate a systematic treatise on the textual graft. Among other things, this would help us understand the functioning of footnotes, for example, or epigraphs, and in what way, to the one who knows how to read, these are sometimes more important than the so-called principal or capital text.... (Derrida 1981, 202–203, trans. B. Johnson)

In his treatment of artificial propagation, Vergil fulfills both of Derrida’s desiderata, although he generalizes to include methods of transplanting as well: at *Geo.* 2.22–34, he presents a technical catalogue of the methods of transplanting and grafting current in his (or Theophrastus’s) day, and he follows this with a systematic elaboration of this metaphor that does, in fact, give us insight into how he conceived not only of the operation of textual allusion, but also of important issues of literary originality.

I do not mean to suggest that Derrida had the *Georgics* in mind when he penned these remarks about *Mimique*, but rather that he and Vergil both independently realized that grafting is a rich—and systematically coherent—metaphor for the textual operations of allusion or intertextuality.

---

152 Also deserving of mention is Allan Pasco, who titled a 1994 study of allusion, *Allusion: A Literary Graft*; see his explanation of this choice at Pasco 1994, 12.
Grafting has also sometimes presented itself to scholars, either as a fortuitous or an intentional trope for figuring Vergilian intertextuality. Thomas Hubbard provides an example of the former: in his reading of Ecl. 9.50, *insere, Daphni, piros: carpent tua poma nepotes*, Hubbard points to an intertextual link with Meliboeus’s bitter remark at 1.72–73 (*his nos consevimus agros! | insere nunc, Meliboe, piros, pone ordine vites*), and remarks on what he seems to consider a fortuitous coincidence, “This line itself is a ‘graft’ of sorts, implanted into the context otherwise concerned with Caesar.”153 Other interpreters of Vergil have seen intentional significance in Vergil’s discussion of grafting in *Georgics* 2. In his recent book on the *Georgics*, Christopher Nappa claims that grafting may here be seen as a trope for Vergilian intertextuality, but since the primary focus of his book is the political education of Octavian, he prefers to see grafting somewhat more broadly as a metaphor for the combination of Greek and Roman that makes up Roman culture generally.154

In my opinion, however, the most perceptive and suggestive reading of this section of *Georgics* 2 is the one advanced by Christopher Cudabac in 2006 in an unpublished paper, which he has kindly shared with me.155 Cudabac argues that if Vergil can use *silva* to trope the literary tradition, as Hinds argues he does in *Aen*. 6.179, *itur in antiquam silvam*. . . , then grafting is the most natural way to trope man’s intervention in that tradition through intertextuality.156 Despite the brevity of his discussion, Cudabac suggested further that we might see the farmer as a poetic thaumaturge (in Gale’s formulation),157 “who makes sterile genres fruitful through clever additions

153 Hubbard 1998, 123.

154 Nappa 2005, 73. In this approach Nappa follows Wilhelm 1976, an interesting article that reads *Georgics* 2 as a metaphor for “the sowing of a Republic” (Wilhelm’s title).

155 Cudabac 2006.


157 Cf. Gale 2001, 225 on the grafts at Geo. 2.32–34 as *thaumata*.
from other genres.” I think that this reading is precisely what Vergil’s program of
metaphor and literary double meaning points to. I will limit my further remarks
on grafting to the observation of several patterns of literary double meaning that
reinforce Cudabac’s conclusion and fit it into the program of metaphor and double
meaning that Vergil has developed earlier in this book.

Vergil’s discussion of grafting technique falls into two halves, each of which uses
a prominent literary double meaning to develop the metaphorical analogy between
grafting and intertextuality.158 In his description of budding (74–77), Vergil again
exploits an etymological ambiguity between “book,” liber, and “bark,” either liber
or cortex, familiar from the Eclogues. I argued in my discussion of Eclogue 10 that
Vergil used this double meaning to create a metaphorical link between writing poetry
books and writing on the trunks of trees, and that this double meaning was present
both in explicit references to bark-writing, as when Mopsus characterizes himself in
strikingly modern terms at Ecl. 5.13–14, immo haec, in viridi nuper quae cortice
fagi | carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notavi, and in implicit references, as
when Gallus laments at Ecl. 10.52–54 that he has decided to suffer in the woods and
write his amores on [the barks of] trees, certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum |
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus. The punning in these two
examples is subtle, and alludes to the literary double meaning of liber either through a
synonym (cortex) or through an implicit reference to bark (incidere . . . arboribus).159

In Georgics 2 Vergil is more explicit about his wordplay, using both liber and two
synonyms to figure budding as a process of splicing foreign material into a young

158 Mynors ad 2.37–82 makes the point that Vergil’s list of two symmetrical alternatives is in fact
reductive, since most authorities know of three types, and one even of four.

159 In Ecl. 10 Vergil glosses his implicit wordplay (incidere . . . arboribus, 53–54) with an otherwise
odd reference 12 lines later to “dying bark” (cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo, 67): see above
p. 157.
book.

nam qua se medio trudunt de cortex gemmae
et tenuis rumpunt tunicas, angustus in ipso
fit nodo sinus; huc aliena ex arbores germin
includunt udoque docent inolescere libro.

(Geo. 2.74–77)

Although Vergil uses cortex and tunica for “bark” in lines 74 and 75, he annotates the metaphorical equivalence between “bark” and “book” in the last word of the passage, liber, which reveals an etymological equivalence to match the metaphorical one.

The delicate operation that Vergil describes in this line seems to stand for an equally delicate textual operation, where a small incision (angustus in ipso | fit nodo sinus, 75–76) makes room to include “the germ of someone else’s tree” (huc aliena ex arbores germin | includunt, 76–77). Because these textual grafts are applied to new poetic growth (note the buds and the thin bark in 74–75), they are readily incorporated by the nascent book (includunt udoque docent inolescere libro, 77), and in contrast to the second grafting technique, there is no sign that these textual grafts are permanently recognizable as such. As an example of this type of textual grafting one might consider any case in which Vergil alludes to a poet writing in a meter other than the hexameter, since in these cases the textual scion must clearly be made to adapt itself to its new home (udoque docent inolescere libro). We see one example of such grafting in Ecl. 10, where Vergil probably alludes broadly to Gallus’s elegiac love poetry.160 In this case, however, more than half of Gallus’s lines—all of his hexameters and the first half of all his pentameters—would have fit naturally into Vergil’s hexameters. A more striking example may be seen at Geo. 2.401–402, where Vergil describes the need for the farmer to repeat annually his labor in the vineyard, redit agricolis labor actus in orbem, | atque in se sua per vestigia volvitur

----

160See above Ch. 2 n. 28.
annus. In this passage Vergil has grafted in an anapestic passage from a drama of his friend Varius Rufus, *ad quos mundi resonat canor in | sua se vestigia volventis* (FRP 157.4–5).

In the second part of his discussion of grafting technique (78–82), Vergil describes a much more violent procedure we now call “crown grafting” (Mynors ad loc.), in which trees with no buds of new growth (*enodes*) are cut back drastically, and the scions are attached to solid wood. These lines exploit an ambiguity in the word *planta* between “shoots” and “soles [of the feet]” that allows ingrafted shoots to stand metaphorically for metrical feet that have been grafted into place in a new poem (see above on *plantae*). Again, Vergil’s punning here is subtle, and relies on the synonymic association of *plantae* “soles” with *pedes* “feet” to activate, in turn, the well-known literary double meaning of *pedes*, which can refer either to anatomical or to metrical feet. But again too, Vergil has used this double meaning in *Eclogue* 10, where his reference to the tender feet of Lycoris seems to stand as a remark on the tender elegiac style of Gallus’s love poetry (*amores*), *a, tibi ne teneras glacios secet aspera plantas!* (*Ecl.* 10.49). Vergil has also already used this pun in *Georgics* 2, when he characterized the first method of artificial propagation as cutting *plantas* from the tender body of mother trees and depositing them in a furrow, *hic plantas tenero abscindens de corpore matrum | deposuit sulcis* (*Geo.* 2.23–24).

In this second type of grafting, then, fruitful *plantae* are sent into a deep cleft cut in the tree.

| aut rursum enodes trunci resecantur, et alae  
| finditur in solidum cuneis via, deinde *feraces* |

---

161 In his note on this fragment, Hollis notes that it is possible (though unlikely) that Varius is the imitator, but the feat of cross-metrical allusion remains the same in either case.

162 Note again the coincident use of the stylistic adjective *tener* (on which see above Ch. 3 n. 31 and at n. 120) in both passages. On Vergil’s use of plowed furrows as a metaphor for poetic verse, see below p. 253.
These fruitful shoots (*plantae*) are the metrical feet (*pedes*) that remedy the barrenness of style in this poetic tree.\textsuperscript{163}

The metaphor in this graft is further illuminated by Vergil’s use here of several terms that he uses elsewhere in explicitly programmatic metaphors. The *via* cleft into this tree, for example, evokes the “road of poetry” metaphor, which Vergil alludes to several times in figuring his poem as a journey (see above pp. 205–207). Vergil’s claim that the tree is *ingens* (which in literal terms *should* take place after a *longum tempus*) may allude again to the etymological link between *ingens* and *ingenium* (see above p. 226), and in the phrase *felicibus ramis* Vergil may refer not only to the fertility, but also to felicity of the sort that Vergil claims for Lucretius in *Geo.* 2.491–492 (*felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas | atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum*. . .). Finally, it is conspicuous too that this poetic tree, now grafted with fertile feet, makes its way to the sky (*ad caelum*), a phrase that Catullus and Lucretius used to describe poetic immortality—which Vergil too hopes for in the preem to *Georgics* 3, *temptanda via est, qua me quoque possim | tollere humo victorque virum volitare per ora* (*Geo.* 3.8–9).\textsuperscript{164}

While textual bud grafts seem not to be obtrusively visible as such, since they “grow into” the young book (*udo . . inolescere libro*, 77), the contrary seems to be true of textual crown grafts. In a striking personification, which Servius (ad loc.) calls an *ingens phantasia*, Vergil says not only that the *ingens arbos* resulting from this graft

\textsuperscript{163}See Henderson 1955 s.v. *sterilis*: “sterile, barren, dry—of an excessively plain style, or of complete stylelessness.” Cf. also above n. 125.

\textsuperscript{164}Cf. Cat. 6.16–17, *volo te ac tus amores | ad caelum lepido vocare versu*, and Lucr. *DRN* 6.7–8, *cuius et extincti propter divina reperta | divolgata vetus iam ad caelum gloria fertur.*
departs for the sky with felicitous boughs, but that it marvels at its new leaves and the
fruit that is not its own (*mirastastque novas frondes et non sua poma*, 82). These
trees, it seems, are notable precisely for resembling different trees, a resemblance
that makes them particularly apt as an analogy for conspicuous intertextuality. As
an example of such conspicuous allusion, one might consider Geo. 1.377, *aut arguta
lacus circumvolitavit harundo*, where Vergil has taken over an entire line unaltered (a
thing he seldom does) from Varro of Atax. Vergil’s famously perplexing allusion to
Catullus 66 in Aen. 6—where Aeneas speaks to Dido using words previously spoken
by a lock of hair (*invitus, o regina, tuo de litore cessi*, Aen. 6.460; cf. *invita, o regina,
tuo de vertice cessi*, Cat. 66.39)—is a better-known, but slightly less precise example.
Allusions of this type may fairly be considered textual *mirabilia* (cf. *mirastast*, 82),
because whole or nearly whole lines have been severed entirely from their original
contexts and grafted intact into an entirely new one, which may even be antithetical to
the original (as when Aeneas speaks to Dido in words formerly spoken by a personified
lock of hair). This sort of close adaptation, of course, is liable to be considered
plagiarism, and we may sometimes express our surprise when Vergil takes over whole
lines either unaltered or nearly so. But in cases such as Vergil’s allusion to Catullus

---

165 There may be a literary pun also in frondes on the double meaning of folia, which, at least by
Pliny’s time, refers to leaves of papyrus. Isidore *Orig.* 6.14.6—immediately before explaining the
metaphorical connection between “verse,” *versus*, and “plow,” *terram vertere*—explains that the
folia of books are so called either because of there resemblance to the leaves of trees or because
they are made out of “leaves” of leather (as they were by his day): *Foliae autem librorum appellatae
sive ex similitudine foliorum arborum, seu quia ex follibus fiunt, id est ex pellibus, qui de occisis
pecudibus detrahi solent; cuius partes paginae dicuntur, eo quod sibi invicem conpingantur.*

166 *Geo.* 1.377 = *FRP* 121.4; cf. Thomas’s remark on the passage of Vergil and Hollis’s on the
passage of Varro. *FRP* 121 is the longest extant fragment of Varro, and is preserved by DServ. in
his note on *Geo.* 1.375.

167 As, e.g., Thomas expresses his surprise in his comment on *Geo.* 1.377. Cf. also Hollis’s note
at *FRP* 121.4; Jocelyn 1965, 139–144 (cited by Hollis) urges skepticism in dealing with passages
where Vergil is alleged to have borrowed lines unchanged from other authors, but his research does
provide useful quantitative data about alleged Vergilian borrowings: “Of the 28 or so pieces which
Macrobius’ source seems to have classed as *versus ab alis ex integro translatos* not one is taken word
for word from the earlier poet. Most have phrases $3\frac{1}{2}$ or $2\frac{1}{2}$ dactylic feet long copied exactly; only
66, we are shocked not so much by the resemblance as by the fact that Vergil has
effected such a drastic change of context without damaging the sense of his own verse.
Perhaps this is what Vergil meant when he remarked that we often (!) see the boughs
of one tree change into another impune (et saepe alterius ramos impune videmus |
vertere in alterius, mutatamque insita mala | ferre pirum et prunis lapidosa rubescere
corna, Geo. 2.32–34), or as Servius glosses the word in his note ad loc., sine damno
sui.

one has as many as 4½ continuous feet, and these from probably the best known verse of Ennius’
Annales— unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem [Ann. 363 Sk.]” (140).
Chapter 5

Connections and Conclusion

In the concluding chapter of this dissertation, I would like to look briefly at three topics that I have not treated in detail, that help to contextualize Vergil’s use of trees and related images as metapoetic symbols in the Eclogues and Georgics. In my first section I relate the findings of another scholar, who has uncovered metapoetic symbolism in the Aeneid to match what I have discussed in the Eclogues and Georgics. In the second section I show that Vergil’s use of metapoetic symbolism drawn from agriculture extends also to plowing, which is an important metapoetic symbol in Georgics 1 and 2, and particularly in the Aetiology of labor (Geo. 1.118–146). In my third section I discuss the reception of Vergilian metapoetic symbolism by other Augustan poets and briefly suggest that different genres developed different systems of metapoetic symbolism.

5.1 Transplanting and Intertextuality in the Aeneid

Up to this point I have considered how trees and related images function in the metapoetics of the Eclogues and Georgics, where this symbolic program is especially important because of the prominent role that trees play in both the pastoral and agricultural worlds. Vergil’s use of tree symbolism, however, is not confined to these
two works. In an unpublished paper given at the 2008 meeting of the American Philological Association, M. Christine Marquis argues that, in the oath that Latinus swears on his scepter in *Aeneid* 12 (206–211), Vergil alludes both the the oath that Achilles swears on the scepter in the assembly in *Iliad* 1 (233–244) and, more subtly, to his own treatment of transplanting in *Georgics* 2. The allusion in this passage to the oath of Achilles is well known; Marquis argues that the further allusion to the discussion of transplanting in *Geo.* 2 can be seen to figure the scepter-oath of Latinus as the transplanted intertextual scion of the scepter-oath of Achilles in *Iliad* 1.\(^1\) Although Marquis developed this argument without considering *Georgics* 2 itself to be metapoetic, her observations are consistent with my own observations about *Georgics* 2, and they support my argument by showing that trees and arboriculture play a metapoetic role in the *Aeneid* as well as in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*.

When Latinus meets with Aeneas in *Aen.* 12 to arrange the dual between Turnus and Aeneas, he swears an oath (12.195–215) that no Italian will break the peace of this truce, as surely as his scepter, which was once a tree but is now encased in bronze, will never again sprout or give shade.

> "ut sceptrum hoc" (dextra sceptrum nam forte gerebat)
> "numquam fronde levi fundet virgulta nec umbras,
> cum semel in silvis imo de stirpe recisum
> matre caret posuitque comas et bracchia ferro,
> olim arbos, nunc artificis manus aere decoro
> inclusit patribusque dedit gestare Latinis."

(*Aen.* 12.206–211)

Commentators since Servius have noted that Latinus’s oath is an adaptation of the oath of Achilles at *Iliad* 1, but Marquis notes a number of features that point not to the *Iliad* but rather to Vergil’s discussion of arboriculture in *Georgics* 2. The

\(^1\)Marquis 2008.
strongest point of resemblance is the phrase *imo de stirpe recisum* (12.208), which tells us that Latinus’s scepter, like the transplanted sucker of *Geo* 2 (*stirpibus... ab imis, Geo. 2.53), was cut from the root of the tree—a statement that jars with the king’s implication that it once gave shade (*numquam... fundet... umbras*, 207). When Latinus refers, moreover, to the “mother” that his scepter now lacks (*ma-tre caret, Aen. 12.209), these lines allude to the repeated personification of trees in the first sixty lines of *Geo*. 2, where Vergil refers three times to the “mother” of a tree that reproduces by suckering (*Geo*. 2.19, 23, 55). Marquis also notes, following Hinds’s remarks on the *antiqua silva* of *Aen*. 6.179, that the phrase *in silvis* in line 208 connects this passage with the notion of literature as raw material for poetic composition.\(^2\) Marquis concludes that this double allusion, to *Iliad* 1 and *Georgics* 2, figures Vergil’s allusion to Homer in these lines as a textual transplant, like the arboricultural transplants of *Georgics* 2, and that by calling attention to the *artifex* and *patres Latini* in lines 210–211, Vergil calls attention to his own role as a textual *artifex* who has taken the scepter of Achilles from *Iliad* 1 and given it to Latinus to bear (*patribusque dedit gestare Latinis*, 211).

Marquis’s observations about *Aeneid* 12 support my argument about metapoetic trees in *Georgics* 2. Her conclusions can also, I believe, be refined somewhat by comparing how Vergil treats his Homeric intertext in this passage with how he treats his Lucretian intertext in *Geo*. 2. As in *Georgics* 2, it seems that Vergil has here too mapped the bottom and top of a tree onto the beginning and end of a poem: by representing a scepter somewhat problematically as a shoot cut specifically from the base of its parent, he not only emphasizes that his Homeric intertext, the oath of Achilles, is a transplanted sucker in the *Aeneid*, but he also draws attention to the fact that the Homeric passage occurs in the very first book of the *Iliad* (=base of the

\(^2\)Hinds 1998, 11–14; see further my discussion of metapoetic *silvae* starting on p. 137.
tree), while the Vergilian passage occurs in the last book of the *Aeneid*. In another sense, moreover, this scene can also be described as an intertextual graft, since the scepter-oath from *Iliad* 1 is grafted onto a truce-breaking scene based generally on the broken truce of *Iliad* 4. When Vergil describes how the scepter was transformed from a shaggy branch (*posuitque comas et bracchia*, 209) to a refined piece of artistry (*nunc artificis manus aere decoro*, 210), he recalls the process of stylistic refinement that both Horace and, as I have argued, Vergil himself represent as central to the progress of literature from archaic to modern. Although Vergil in *Georgics* 2 criticizes stylistic archaism only implicitly, through the allegory of domesticating wild trees, Horace is often explicit in his denunciation of archaic poetry for its loose style; and while he focuses most of his criticism on Lucilius (esp. *Sat.* 1.4, 1.10), he makes clear that even Homer is not above the occasional stylistic lapse: *indignor quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus (Ars* 359).

### 5.2 Metapoetic Plowing in the *Georgics*

For much of this dissertation, I have discussed a group of metapoetic symbols associated with trees, forests, shade, etc. There are also other important groups of symbols that Vergil uses to develop metapoetic allegory through the natural world of the *Eclogues* and the agricultural world of the *Georgics*. In the *Georgics*, for example,

---

3Cf. above at p. 213 on mapping the topography of a tree to the beginning and end of a poem.


5On stylistic refinement and the domestication of wild trees see above at p. 184. There may even be a hint in the fact that Latinus’s scepter “lacks a mother” (*matre caret*, 209), that Homer, like Lucretius in *Geo.* 2, stands alone at the beginning of his genre. Although these lines literally describe the scepter as lacking *its* mother, the allusion to *Geo.* 2 may bring to mind the spontaneous trees of *Geo.* 2, which grew verdantly but were unable, because of their shade, to give birth to fertile offspring.
Vergil broadly equates farming—in particular plowing—with poetic composition, by playing on the etymology of the word *versus*. Without fully exploring the implications of this metaphor, which I have discussed in one oral conference paper and hope to develop further later,⁶ I briefly lay out here the evidence that Vergil uses plowing as an important metapoetic symbol in the *Georgics*.

The Latin word for “verse,” *versus*, is probably derived metaphorically from plowing, the Latin term for which is either *arare*, “to plow,” or, more suggestively, *terram vertere*, “to turn the soil.” The word *versus*, in fact, can refer, inter alia, both to a line of writing or verse (*OLD* s.v. 4, 5) and to “the ground traversed by a plow before it is turned round, [i.e.] a furrow,” (*OLD* s.v. 2). Isidore of Seville, writing in the 7th c. AD, is the first extant source to draw an explicit etymological link between writing and plowing, but he preserves evidence that such a connection was made in the 1st c. BC as well. In a passage that Reifferscheid thought was a fragment of Suetonius, Isidore says that “verse” (*versus*) is so called because the ancients used to write like they plowed, i.e. back and forth.

> *versus* autem vulgo vocati quia sic scribebant antiqui sicut aratur terra. A sinistra enim ad dexteram primum deducebant stilum, deinde convertebantur ab inferiore, et rursus ad dexteram *versus*; quos et hodieque rustici *versus* vocant. (Isid. *Orig.* 6.14.7 [= Suet. fr. 104 Re])

This back-and-forth style of writing that Isidore describes—which the Greeks called *βουστροφηδόν*, also after the back-and-forth turning (*στρέφειν*) of a plow-ox (*βοῦς*)—is best known from Greek inscriptions, but is attested in early Latin inscriptions as well, including the archaic forum inscription known as the Lapis Niger.⁷

Just a few paragraphs before the etymology of *versus*, Isidore records a quotation from the comic poet Quinctius Atta (d. 77 BC), which shows that Atta’s 1st-century

---

⁶Henkel 2009b.

⁷*CIL* 6.36840; cf. also *CIL* 1²: 4.2833, a dedication to Castor and Pollux.
BC audience also saw a link between writing and plowing. The Greeks and Etruscans, as Isidore says, once used iron styluses to write on wax tablets, but the Romans later prohibited this practice and ordered that scribes use bone styluses instead. As evidence for this claim, Isidore quotes a fragment from Atta’s *Satura*: “Let us turn the plowshare in wax, and let us plow with a point made of bone.”


\[
\text{Vertamus vomerem} \\
\text{in cera mucroneque aremus osseo.}
\]

(Isid. *Orig.* 6.9.2)

This fragment of Atta does not, as one might hope, give a reason for the institution of bone styluses at Rome,\(^8\) but in distinguishing between metal plowshares and bone styluses, it plays on the metaphorical equivalence between plowing a field with a plowshare (*vertere vomerem*), and plowing a wax tablet, so to speak, with a stylus (*mucrone aremus osseo*).\(^9\) E. R. Curtius, in remarking on this passage in Isidore, notes that medieval writers use plowing as a metaphor for writing, but although the comparison is at least as old as Plato, he can cite no other instance of Roman literature using plowshare as a metaphor for “stylus.”\(^10\) Ovid and others use compounds of *arare* to mean “write,” but as Curtius says, these terms seem to be felt as technical, rather than figurative, language.\(^11\) Vergil in the *Georgics*, however, seems both to have

---

\(^8\)On the prohibition of iron styluses at Rome see Plin. *NH* 34.139, who reports that this was a condition of the Roman treaty with Lars Porsenna after the expulsion of the kings: *in foedere, quod expulsis regibus populo Romano dedid Forsina, nominatim comprehensum invenimus, ne ferro nisi in agri cultu uteretur. et tum stilo <osseo> scribere institutum vetustissimi auctores prodiderunt.*

\(^9\)Cf. the figurative use of *arare* at Titin. *com.* 160, *velim ego osse arare campum cereum.*


\(^11\)Three forms of *arare* are used as technical terms for writing: *arare* (*OLD* s.v. 3b), *exarare* (*OLD* s.v. 210), and *arare* (*OLD* s.v. 212).
known the etymological connection between versus and terram vertere, and to have exploited it to metapoetic effect.

Vergil uses vertere and its derivatives of both plowing and poetry in the Georgics, and he seems to prefer forms of vertere over forms of arare as a verb for talking about plowing; Cato in the De Agri Cultura and Varro in the Res Rusticae, by contrast, never use vertere of plowing. When he discusses plowing and planting in the first half of Georgics 1, Vergil uses forms of vertere five times (1.1–2, 1.65, 1.98, 1.118–119, 1.147–148), while he uses arare only once, at Geo. 1.299 (nudus ara, sere nudus), where its succinctness helps sharpen an allusion to Hesiod. 12 Terram vertere or terram versare, moreover, is the form that Vergil uses in two of the most thematically important passages of the poem: its opening two lines (quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram | vertere, . . ., 1.1–2), 13 and surrounding the Aetiology of labor in Georgics 1 (nec tamen haec cum sint hominumque boumque labores | versando terram experti. . ., 1.118–119; prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram | instituit, 1.147–148), to which I will return below. Throughout the Georgics Vergil uses arare for plowing only four times, compared with nine times for forms of vertere; 14 the other three instances of arare all occur within the space of forty lines in Geo. 2 (2.204, 224, 239), while forms of vertere are associated with plowing in all four books of the poem.

s.v. 4), and perare (OLD s.v. b). For arare see Mart. 4.86.11; for exarare see Cic. Att. 12.1.1, 16.6.4, Ov. Pont. 3.2.90, Phaed. 3. praef.29, Quint. Inst. 9.4.90, Plin. Ep. 7.4.5, Suet. Otho 1.2; for perarare see Ov. Am. 1.11.7, Ars 3.485, 1.455, Met. 9.564.

12 Cf. Hes. WD 391, γυµνὸν σπείρειν, γυµνὸν δὲ βοωτε΄ιοταχιρµν.

13 Cf. above p. 22 on the pun here on Aratus’s name.

14 arare: 1.299, 2.204, 2.224, 2.239; vertere: 1.1–2 (terram vertere, 1.67 (invertere), 1.98 (versus = “turned,” of a plow), 1.119 (terram versare), 1.147 (terram vertere), 2.208 (evertere), 2.141 (invertere), 3.161 (invertere), 3.506 (invertere), 4.144 (versus = “furrow”); cf. also 1.179 (vertere) and 2.399 (versus, of a hoe).
Vergil uses the noun *versus* in the *Georgics* to mean both “verse”\(^1\) and “furrow”\(^2\) and his discussion of farming frequently exploits the metaphorical crossover between these meanings by using well-known literary-critical terms to describe soil. Thus, as Thomas points out (ad *Geo.* 2.180), the proper agricultural opposite of *pinguis* “fat, rich, fertile” is *macer* “lean, thin,” but in *Georgics* 2 Vergil talks instead of soils being either *pinguis* or *tenuis*, reproducing the stylistic opposition of παχύς and λεπτός in Callimachean poetics.

\[\text{Nunc locus arvorum ingeniis, quae robora cuique, quis color et quae sit rebus natura ferendis. difficiles primum terrae collesque maligni, tenuis ubi argilla et dumosis calculus arvis, Palladia gaudent silva vivacis olivae: indicio est tractu surgens oleaster eodem plurimus et strati bacis silvestribus agri. at quae pinguis humus dulcique uligine laeta, quiique frequens herbis et fertilib usubere campus qualem saepe cava montis convalle solemus despicere (huc summis liquuntur rupibus felicemque trahunt limum), quiique editus Austro et silicem curvis invisam pascit aratris: hic tibi praevalidas olim multoque fluentis sufficient Baccho vitis...}^{\text{\(\text{Geo. 2.177--191}\)}}\]

Elsewhere in the poem, moreover, Vergil finds other ways to juxtapose *pinguis* and *tenuis* without violating agricultural or poetic decorum, by pairing—although not directly opposing—things that are naturally described as “rich” and “slender,” respectively. He matches three such pairs in the space of 31 lines at *Geo.* 1.63–93, pairing the “rich earth” (*pingue solum*, 63) with a “slender furrow” (*tenui sulco*, 68),

---

\(^1\) *Geo.* 2.42, *non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto; 2.385–386, nec non Ausonii, Troia gens missa, coloni versibus incompliti ludunt risuque soluto; 3.339, quid tibi pastores Libyae, quid Pascua versu | prosequear...\)

“rich manure” (fimo pingui, 80) with the “offspring of the slender vetch” (tenuis fetus viciae, 75), and “rich fodder” (pabula pinguia, 86) with “slender rains” (tenues pluviae, 92).

... ergo age, terrae pingue solum primis extemplo a mensibus anni fortis invertant tauri, glaebasque iacentis pulverulenta coquat maturis solibus aestas; at si non fuerit tellus fecunda, sub ipsum Arcturum tenui sat erit suspendere sulco: illic, officiant laetis ne frugibus herbae, hic, sterilem exiguus ne deserat umor harenam. Alternis idem tonsas cessare novalis et segnem patiere situ dulescere campum; aut ibi flava seres mutato sidere farra, unde prius laetum siliqua quassante legumen aut tenuis fetus uiciae tristisque lupini sustuleris fragilis calamos silvamque sonantem. urit enim lini campum seges, urit avenae, urunt Lethaco perfusa papavera somno; sed tamen alternis facilis labor, arida tantum ne saturare fimo pingui pudet sola neve effetos cinerem immundum iactare per agros. sic quoque mutatis requiescunt fetibus arva, nec nulla interea est inaratae gratia terrae. saepe etiam sterilis incendere profuit agros atque levem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis: sive inde occultas viris et pabula terrae pinguia concipiunt, sive illis omne per ignem excoquitur vitium atque exsudat inutilis umor, seu pluris calor ille vias et caeca relaxat spiramenta, novas veniat qua sucus in herbas, seu durat magis et venas astringit hiantis, ne tenues pluviae rapidive potentia solis acrior aut Boreae penetrabile frigus adurat.

(Geo. 1.63–93)

We see the same phenomenon in the catalogue of wines in Geo. 2, where Vergil opposes “rich lands” (pinguibis terris, 2.92) to “lighter” ones (levioribus, 92), but immediately juxtaposes them with an unknown type of white wine described as tenuis (tenuisque
lageos, 93), a word that both Servius and modern commentators have struggled to make sense of in context.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{quote}
Sunt Thasiae vites, sunt et Mareotides albae,
pingubus hae terris habiles, levioribus illae,
et passo psithia utilior tenuisque lageos
temptatura pedes olim vincturaque linguam
\end{quote}

\textit{(Geo. 2.91–94)}

David Ross has argued that the term \textit{pinguis} is important throughout the \textit{Georgics} for the way that it participates in the poem’s fluid opposition of natural elements;\textsuperscript{18} it seems that some of these elemental oppositions may have metapoetic significance as well, reflecting the Callimachean program of \textit{λεπτότης} that was important to Vergil throughout his career. And while \textit{pinguis} is not a desirable quality in poetic style, it is perfectly appropriate for the “rich earth,” just as it is for “fat sheep” in Apollo’s speech to Tityrus in Ecl. 6 (\textit{pastorem, Tityre, pinguis | pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen}, Ecl. 6.4–5).

This point could be developed further by viewing the Aetiology of \textit{labor} in \textit{Georgics} 1 (\textit{Geo.} 1.118–146) metapoetically as recounting the origin of poetic \textit{labor} in Italy. \textit{Labor} is a well-known metaphor for poetic refinement, which Vergil himself uses prominently in the opening line of \textit{Eclogue} 10 (\textit{Ecl.} 10.1), in the second proem of \textit{Georgics} 2 (2.39–41), and in introducing the mysterious Corycian gardener in \textit{Georgics} 4 (4.116–117). When Vergil says in \textit{Georgics} 1 that \textit{pater ipse} was the first to plow the fields \textit{per artem} (\textit{pater ipse colendi | haud facilem esse viam voluit, primusque per artem | movit agros, Geo.} 1.121–123), he is literally talking about Jupiter, who

\textsuperscript{17}Serv. ad loc.: “\textit{tenuis” autem penetrabilis, quae cito descendit ad venas; cf. the notes of Thomas and Mynors ad loc., which point out that \textit{tenuis} looks like it should mean “light,” “subtle,” vel sim., but that this wine can hardly be called “light,” considering that it “tests the feet and overcomes the tongue” in line 94.\textsuperscript{18}Ross 1987, 32–54.
brought an end to the reign of Saturn in Italy, but the phrase *pater ipse* can also be seen as a metapoetic reference to “Father Ennius”—whom Propertius calls *pater* (Prop. 3.3.6) and Horace calls *ipse pater* (Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.7)—since it was Ennius who replaced Italy’s native Saturnian meter with the more refined but less flexible Greek hexameter.

### 5.3 Metapoetic Symbolism in Other Augustan Poets

Finally, I would like briefly to consider the impact that Vergil’s use of metapoetic symbolism had on Augustan poetry. This discussion is by no means meant to treat this subject exhaustively, but rather only to suggest one specific and one general way in which Vergil’s use of this technique in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* was received by contemporary poets. First, I will show that Augustan poets respond in like terms to Vergil’s development of trees, forests, and shade as metapoetic symbols in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Second, I will suggest that metapoetic symbolism constitutes an important means through which Augustan poets respond to one another’s poetry, by offering rival literalizations for important literary-critical metaphors.

In the course of Chapters 1–4, I have already mentioned a number of passages from later Augustan poetry that allude back to various metapoetic passages in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Among the most concerted of these allusions is the one found in Propertius 1.18, where the poet pictures himself as an Acontius figure, alone in the woods lamenting his love for Cynthia and carving her name into trees. In Chapter 2 I discussed this poem as a part of the traditional argument that Gallus, like Callimachus before him and Vergil and Propertius after him, treated the story of Acontius and Cydippe in his poetry. I went on to argue that Vergil uses the story of Acontius as a
metanarrative representation of the new Gallan genre of Roman love elegy. Propertius conspicuously takes over this symbolism in poem 1.18, and by presenting himself as an Acontius figure, depicts himself as an elegiac poet following in a tradition of elegiac poets, including Callimachus, Gallus, and, somewhat tendentiously, Vergil in *Ecl.* 10. In lines that are very close to *Ecl.* 10.52–54, Propertius calls on the trees to witness that his words have often echoed beneath their shade and that Cynthia’s name has often been written in their bark.

\[
\text{vos eritis testes, si quos habet arbor amores,} \\
\quad \text{fagus et Arcadio pinus amica deo.} \\
\text{a quotiens teneras\textsuperscript{19} resonant mea verba sub umbras,} \\
\quad \text{scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus!}
\]

(Prop. 1.18.19–22)

He goes on with his lament, complaining of the cruelty he has learned to put up with, all in vain (23–30), then closes the poem with a wish that, regardless of Cynthia’s character, the woods and deserted rocks should echo her name.

\[
\text{sed qualiscumque es, resonent mihi “Cynthia” silvae,} \\
\quad \text{nec deserta tuo nomine saxa vacent.}
\]

(Prop. 1.18.31–32)

In addition to taking over the metanarrative symbolism of the *Eclogues*, these richly allusive lines also deploy the same metapoetic tree symbolism that Vergil developed in his pastoral collection.

Cairns first showed the extent of this poem’s debt to Callimachus, and Ross and Pincus have discussed Propertius’s adaptation of both *Ecl.* 10 and the love elegies of

\textsuperscript{19}I follow the manuscript consensus in printing *teneras*... *umbras* in line 21 and *vestris*... *corticibus* in line 22 instead of the transposition proposed by Koppiers (*vestras*... *umbras; teneris*... *corticibus*). On Koppiers’s transposition cf. above Ch. 3 n. 127.
Gallus. When Propertius says that his words echo “beneath the tender shade” (te-neras resonant mea verba sub umbras, 21), the word umbra has the same metapoetic force as in the Eclogues, alluding here to the many-layered shadows of literary influence that fall on this poem, which adapts a story that had been treated by Callimachus, Vergil, and, as is likely, Gallus. Since tener, moreover, is a programmatic term for the “tender” style of Roman elegy, Propertius can be seen to characterize these influences as elegiac. Although the Eclogues are formally hexameter pastoral, Propertius’s characterization of Ecl. 10 as elegiac is consistent both with Vergil’s own metapoetic self-characterization in the Eclogues, where he figures the hybridization of pastoral and elegy, and with Propertius’s characterization of Vergil in poem 2.34, where, by virtue of the Eclogues, Vergil leads the catalogue of Roman love poets (Prop. 2.34.67–84). In Prop. 1.18, just as Gallus’s amores in Ecl. 10 are carved into trees (tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus Ecl. 10.53–54) and echo from the forests (sollicitos Galli dicamus amores. . . non canimus surdis, respondent omnia sil-vis, Ecl. 10.6–8), so Propertius says he has carved Cynthia’s name into the barks of trees (scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus, Prop. 1.18.22), and that her name will echo from the forests (resonent mihi “Cynthia” silvae, 1.18.31). As Kennedy and Pincus have observed, Propertius’s cortices can be seen, like the arbores on which Gallus carves his amores in Ecl. 10, to suppress a pun between “books” (libri) and “barks” (libri or cortices), and like the forests that echo Gallus’s amores in Ecl. 10, the silvae that echo “Cynthia” in Prop. 1.18 can be seen to symbolize the literary traditions—elegiac and pastoral—that are the source of the textual echoes of Propertius’s sylvan lament for Cynthia.


21See above Ch. 3 nn. 120 and 133.

22See references above, Ch. 3 n. 127.
Elsewhere, Horace and Ovid can also be seen to allude to the tree-based metapoetic symbolism that Vergil develops in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. These allusions are less thoroughgoing than the one in Prop. 1.18, but they are more representative of the subtle way that Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism insinuates itself into later Augustan poetry. In Horace *Satires* 1.10, for example, the poet reports his decision to write satire as a revelation from the god Quirinus, a humorous adaptation of Apollo’s literary advice to Callimachus in the *Aetia* prologue and to Tityrus in *Ecl.* 6. As Horace was considering whether to write *Graecos versiculos*, Quirinus tells him in a dream that he would no more sanely carry wood into the forest than further swell the ranks of Greek poets.

> Atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra, versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus, post mediam noctem visus, cum somnia vera: “In silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas.”

(Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.31–35)

This piece of advice is often paraphrased with reference to the phrase “carrying coals to Newcastle,” but aside from expressing the pointlessness of writing more Greek poetry, the specific terms of Quirinus’s advice are significant because they explicitly compare the Greek literary tradition to a forest. As elsewhere when Horace adapts Vergil’s metapoetic symbolism, he has taken a symbol that Vergil uses of poetry only implicitly—i.e. metapoetically—and used it as explicitly figurative language for talking about literature.

Ovid, by contrast, maintains the metapoetic tenor of Vergil’s symbolism when he adapts Vergilian *silvae* in *Amores* 3.1. In this programmatic opening to the third book of the *Amores*, Ovid is at his most unabashedly metapoetic as he imagines

---

23On the relationship between Horace *Sat.* 1 and the *Eclogues* see Zetzel 2002, esp. 38–40 on Horace’s dream encounter with Quirinus.
the genres of elegy and tragedy personified as women and fighting over his poetic attention.\textsuperscript{24} In the opening lines of this poem, Ovid’s speaker is wandering through a landscape consisting of literalized metaphors for poetic inspiration, including an ancient wood, a divine presence, a fountain, and a cave.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Stat vetus et multos incaedua silva per annos;}
\textit{credibile est illi numen inesse loco.}
\textit{fons sacer in medio speluncaque pumice pendens,}
\textit{et latere ex omni dulce queruntur aves.}
\textit{hic ego dum spatior tectus nemoralibus umbris}
\textit{quod mea quaerebam Musa moveret opus.}
\end{quote}

(Ov. Am. 3.1.1–6)

These lines describe the setting of Ovid’s encounter with Elegia and Tragoedia, which begins in the next line and continues to the end of the poem (7–70). As in Vergil’s metapoetic encounter with Ennius in the “ancient wood” of \textit{Aen. 6 (itur in antiquam silvam, Aen. 6.179)}, Ovid here meets his interlocutors in an ancient forest (\textit{stat vetus... silva, Am. 3.1.1}), which can likewise be seen as symbolic of literary tradition. As Ovid walks through this metapoetic landscape, moreover, he is sheltered by the “shadows” of this grove (\textit{tectus nemoralibus umbris, 5}), another Vergilian symbol of poetic influence. These Vergilian symbols occur at the beginning and end of the passage I have quoted, which sets the scene for the most overtly metapoetic poem in Ovid’s \textit{corpus} (and probably in all of Augustan literature).

Aside from allusions such as these to established Vergilian metapoetic symbols, Augustan poets also appropriate the technique of metapoetic symbolism while proposing their own, alternative literalizations of metaphors. A number of Greek and Latin

\textsuperscript{24}See Wyke 1989b on the metapoetics of genre in this poem.

\textsuperscript{25}For a fountain and cave as symbols of poetic inspiration see Prop. 3.1.1–6. On \textit{pumice (Am. 3.1.3)} cf. Cat. 1.2 with Batstone 1998.
literary-critical metaphors can be analyzed in more than one way and seen as relating to more than one conceptual domain. To take a well-known but important example, Roman poets sometimes treat the Callimachean program-word λεπτός as a metaphor drawn from weaving, as when Horace characterizes carefully composed poems as “a fine-spun thread” (tenui deducta poemata filo, Epist. 2.1.224–225), but they sometimes treat the metaphor as referring to physical fatness or slenderness, as when Apollo in Ecl. 6 tells Tityrus to feed his sheep fat but keep his poem thin (pastorem, Tityre, pinguis | pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen, Ecl. 6.4–5). In Ecl. 6, of course, Vergil is following Callimachus in the Aetia prologue, where Apollo tells the poet to feed his sacrifice fat but keep his Muse slender (ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον | [θρέψαι, τὴ ν. Μοῦσαν δ’ ὁγαθὲ λεπταλέην, Callim. Aet. fr. 1.23–24), but as I showed in Chapter 1, there is precedent in Homer for seeing λεπτός as pertaining specifically to weaving. Because earlier literature presents metaphors like these in differing contexts, they become subject in Augustan poetry to rival literalizations, especially by poets with competing literary programs. Thus, competing groups of metapoetic symbols emerge particularly from the elegiac poets, whose rivalry with hexameter epic is well-known, and who tend to literalize metaphors in terms of erotic relationships rather than agriculture or the natural world.26 In a similar manner, as Freudenburg has shown, Horace can be seen as constructing his moral discourse in the Satires in such a way that it reflects Callimachean aesthetic principles as well.27 Further investigation of other genres might reveal other thematically coherent groups of metapoetic symbols.

26See, e.g., Wyke 1987, 1989a,b.
I would like to look at a few specific metaphors that find rival metapoetic treatment in non-erotic and erotic literary contexts. I have already mentioned that Callimachean λεπτότης is treated by Latin poets sometimes as a metaphor from weaving and sometimes as a metaphor from physical girth. The translation of λεπτός into Latin, however, opens up still more possibilities for literalizing this Callimachean metaphor. Aside from the metaphor of spinning, Vergil himself points the way in the Eclogues to seeing deductum carmen as connoting a magical ability for song to “draw things down” (deducere) in one form or another. After introducing the word as a stylistic metaphor in the introduction to Ecl. 6 (deductum carmen, 6.5), Vergil uses it prominently to describe the Orphic powers of Hesiod’s pipe, which Gallus receives from Linus and the Muses in the climax of the poem.28

... “hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae,
Ascraco quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos...”

(Ecl. 6.69–71)

In one sense, this passage helps explain Vergil’s fascination with Orpheus, since he regards the Orphic power to “lead down” rocks and trees as a potential metapoetic literalization of Callimachean λεπτότης—but one that depends specifically on its Latin translation, deductum. Vergil uses the same image of “leading down” to talk about his own career in the proem to Geo. 3, where he envisions a future epic project by saying he will “lead down” the Muses from Helicon.

primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit,
Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas;
primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam...

(Geo. 3.10–13)

28Cf. Ross 1975, 26–27, who notes the important correspondence between deductum carmen at Ecl. 6.5 and deducere at 6.71.
This passage adapts Lucretius’s praise for Ennius in *DRN* 1 (*Ennius... detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam, DRN* 1.117–118), but as Thomas points out, the shift to *deducere* from Lucretius’s *deferre* brings in important connotations of Callimachean stylistics.29 Horace uses the same image in the poem that concludes *Odes* 1–3, where he boasts that he will be called the first to have “led down” Greek lyric to the Italian meters.

\[
\text{dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aupidus} \\
\text{et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium} \\
\text{regnavit populum, ex humili potens} \\
\text{princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos} \\
\text{*deduxisse* modos.}
\]

(Hor. *Odes* 3.30.10–14)

As Ross has observed, this poem cannot be read in isolation from Vergil’s *deductum carmen* and the Callimacheanism of *Ecl.* 6.30

In *Ecl.* 8, however, Vergil literalizes *deducere* not as Orphic power to draw down trees, or as a poetic triumph, but as the magic power of a witch to draw down the moon from the sky. In the song of Alphesiboeus, the speaker hopes that his own *carmina* (here “spells”) will be able to lead her lover Daphnis home from the city (*ducite ab urbe domum*, 8.68), just as spells are able, among other things, to draw down the moon from the sky.31

\[
\text{ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin.} \\
\text{carmina vel caelo possunt *deducere* lunam,} \\
\text{carminibus Circe socios mutavit Ulxi,} \\
\text{frigidus in pratis cantando rumpitur anguis.}
\]

(Ecl. 8.68–71)

29See Thomas ad loc. further on the details of Vergil’s adaptation here.

30Ross 1975, 133–137.

31The *Scholia Bernensia* ad loc. connect this passage with Pan’s seduction of Luna: *dicitur enim Pan de caelo Lunam carminibus deduxisse.*
I argued in Chapter 2 that the magical properties of this song are meant to represent the magical properties that the elegists sometimes impute to their poetry. It is unsurprising, therefore, to find that this literalization of *deducere* finds special favor with the elegiac poets: witches appear frequently in the elegiac world, and one of their favorite activities is “drawing down” the moon from the sky.\(^{32}\)

\[
\text{at vos, deductae quibus est fallacia lunae}
\]
\[
\text{et labor in magicis sacra piare focis. . .}
\]

(Prop. 1.1.19–20)

\[
\text{Nec tamen huic credet coniunx tuus, ut mihi verax}
\]
\[
\text{Pollicita est magico saga ministerio.}
\]
\[
\text{Hanc ego de caelo ducentem sidera vidi,}
\]
\[
\text{Fluminis haec rapidi carmine vertit iter . . .}
\]

(Tib. 1.2.43–46)

\[
\text{Cantus vicinis fruges traducit ab agris,}
\]
\[
\text{Cantus et iratae detinet anguis iter,}
\]
\[
\text{Cantus et e curru Lunam *deducere* temptat}
\]
\[
\text{Et faceret, si non aera repulsa sonent.}
\]

(Tib. 1.18.19–22)

\[
\text{carmina sanguineae *deducunt* cornua lunae,}
\]
\[
\text{et revocant niveos solis euntis equos;}
\]

(Ov. *Am.* 2.1.23–24)

\[
\text{illa reluctantem cursu *deducere* lunam}
\]
\[
\text{nititur et tenebris abdere solis equos;}
\]

(Ov. *Her.* 6.85–86

---

\(^{32}\)On non-Augustan precedents for this practice and on its ritual significance see Fedeli 1980 ad Prop. 1.11.19 and Maltby 2002 ad Tib. 1.8.21–22.
Aside from Ecl. 8, the use of *deducere* with specific connection to witchcraft is virtually confined to the elegists in the Augustan period.\(^{33}\) Since the elegists often associate witches with love magic, it is attractive to see the elegiac fascination with “drawing down the moon” as their answer to non-erotic literalizations of *deductum* in Vergil, Horace, and perhaps elsewhere.\(^{34}\)

Similar situations abound, in which a metaphor is literalized one way in non-erotic poetry and a different way in elegy. Richard Thomas has argued that, before Callimachus praised Aratus in *Epig.* 27 for his “wakefulness,” the word ἀγρυπνίη was primarily a term for the agitated sleeplessness of erotic infatuation, but that after this, largely because of the importance of *Epig.* 27 to Roman literature, “the concept is fixed with the new poetic significance bestowed on it by Callimachus.”\(^{35}\) In Chapter 1 I discussed how Lucretius and Vergil both trope this metaphor in directions that suit their respective programs; Thomas himself discusses how Catullus and Propertius trope the metaphor back in the direction of erotic sleeplessness—Catullus by sexualizing his poetic relationship with Calvus (Cat. 50.7–17), Propertius by using voyeurism as a metaphor for his literary relationship with Gallus (Prop. 1.10.1–10).\(^{36}\)

As Lyne notes in his commentary on the *Ciris*, the elegists routinely equivocate

\(^{33}\) Horace uses *deripere lunam* at *Epod.* 5.46 and 17.78; *deducere lunam* appears outside of elegy only in Ecl. 8 and at Ovid *Met.* 12.263 (*Orio | mater erat Mycale, quam deduxisse canendo | saepe reluctanti constabat cornua lunae, Met.* 12.262–264).

\(^{34}\) Note, however, that the elegists themselves use *deducere* in other ways as well: see, e.g., Tib. 1.3.85, 1.4.80 (of a parade), and Prop. 1.6.15 (of launching a ship). Cf. also the well-known Callimachean paradox in Ov. *Met.* 1.3–4, where the poet asks for help in his efforts to *deducere* a perpetuum carmen (contrast the ἑν ἄεισµα διηνεκές that Callimachus does not sing at *Aet.* fr. 1.3); see references at O’Hara 2004/2005, 150 n. 5.

\(^{35}\) Quote from Thomas 1979a, 200; see further above Ch. 1 n. 13.

\(^{36}\) Thomas 1979a, 201–205.
between sexual and poetic wakefulness. The very conceit of the *exclusus amator* keeping vigil outside his beloved’s door may owe part of its prominence to this metaphorical use of ἀγρυπνίη and forms of vigilare. In other Augustan poetry, the trope goes in still other directions. Horace, for instance, follows his usual practice of humorously troping metapoetic symbolism back in the direction of literature. In *Satires* 2.1, e.g., Horace responds to advice that he stop writing poetry by saying that he only does so because he cannot sleep: *peream male, si non* | *optimum erat; verum nequeo dormire* (*Sat.* 2.1.6–7). Even more provocatively, in the *Ars Poetica*, Horace characterizes Homer’s sometimes stylistic lapses as “nodding off”—the very opposite of the stylistic “wakefulness” praised by Callimachus and others: *quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus, | verum operi longo fas est obrepere somnum* (*AP* 359–360).

Finally, *labor*, the central theme of the *Georgics*, is one of several rival literalizations of the important metaphor that equates poetry with πόνος in Greek and *labor* in Latin. As an explicitly poetological metaphor, *labor* occurs both on its own (e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.73, *AP* 241, *AP* 289) and in connection with other familiar metaphors, as when Horace links it with the Callimachean “fine-spun” metaphor.

\begin{quote}
*cum lamentamur non apparere labores nostros et tenui deducta poemata filo;*

*(Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.224–225)*
\end{quote}

Sometimes the metaphor implies painstaking craftsmanship, as in the case just mentioned, or when Horace talks of poetic polish as “the labor of the file.”

\begin{itemize}
\item[37] Lyne 1978 ad *Ciris* 46.
\item[38] See Chapter 1 on the connection between *vigilare* (and its cognates) and poetic ἀγρυπνίη. The elegiac *amator*’s vigil (either outside his beloved’s door or elsewhere) is frequently referred to with the same term, e.g. Tib. 1.2.78, 1.8.64, and Prop. 1.9.28; cf. the similar *excubiae* at Ov. *Am.* 1.6.7.
\item[39] Cf. above Ch. 1 n. 35.
\item[40] See above Ch. 1 n. 17.
\end{itemize}
Sometimes it implies physical toil and suffering, as when Horace talks about the deceptive appearance of simplicity in his own poetry, which another poet will sweat and toil in vain to imitate.

ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi quivis speret idem, sudet multum frustraque laboret ausus idem...

(Hor. AP 240–242)

It is this aspect of labor—physical toil and suffering—that Augustan poets tend to emphasize in their metapoetic literalizations. Although we saw in Chapter 1 how metapoetic labor could be linked to craftsmanship through weaving, the literal point of that section of Geo. 1 was that farmers must toil incessantly, even at night; in the Aetiology of labor, poetry is symbolized through the physical hard work of plowing, which Italians had not known during the reign of Saturn. In the elegists, poetic labor is often figured through the emotional suffering caused by love. Propertius programmatically establishes the importance of these emotional labores in the first poem of the Monobiblos, when he adapts the story of Milanion, which probably figured in the elegiac poetry of Gallus.

Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores saevitiam durae contudit Iasidos.

(Prop. 1.1.9–10)

Because elegy presents itself simultaneously as lamentation (querelae) and flattery/enticement (blanditiae), erotic and poetic labores are metapoetically equivalent, since
both serve the end of gaining the lover admission to his beloved’s bed. Elsewhere in
elegy, *labor* is troped in other directions, including military and agricultural forms.
In one especially rich passage of Prop. 1.1, *labor* is the magical work of witches.

\[
\text{in me tardus Amor non \[n\]ullas cogitat artis,} \\
\text{nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire vias.} \\
\text{at vos, deductae quibus est fallacia lunae} \\
\text{et labor in magicis sacra piare focis,} \\
\text{en agedum dominae mentem convertite nostrae,} \\
\text{et facite illa meo palleat ore magis!} \\
\text{tunc ego crediderim vobis et sidera et amnis} \\
\text{posse \dagger cythalinis \dagger ducere carminibus.}
\]

(Prop. 1.1.17–24)

Here, as in Horace *Epist.* 2.1.224–225 (see above), metapoetic *labor* is linked with
other literalized metaphors, including untrodden paths (*nec... notas... vias*, 18)
and the “drawn down” (*deductae*, 19) moon.

### 5.4 Conclusion

Although we know a good deal about how Augustan poets viewed their poetic en-
terprises from Horace and from the explicit comments of poets like Propertius and
Ovid, there is much that these poets do not tell us explicitly, and there is much more
that we do not know about other poets who are either more obscure or more taciturn,
like Vergil or Tibullus. We gain important insight into Augustan poetry by recogniz-
ing that these poems are often richly symbolic—even allegorical—and that the very

---

41 Cf. Prop. 1.6.23–24, *et tibi non umquam nostras puer iste labores| afferat et lacrimis omnia nota meis!*, and Ov. *Am.* 1.11.5–6, *saepe venire ad me dubitantem hortata Corinnam, | saepe laboranti fida reperta mihi*. On the use of *labor* in this erotic sense, see Enk 1946 ad Prop. 1.6.23 and Nisbet and Hubbard 1970 ad *Odes* 1.17.19–20.

42 Cf. e.g. Tib.1.1.1–4 (with Maltby 2002 ad loc.), *Divitias alius fulvo sibi congregat auro | et teneat culti iugera multa soli, | quem labor adsiduus vicino terreat hoste, | Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent...*
landscape of a poem can sometimes tell us much about its author’s literary program and technique. We cannot know for certain whether Vergil is responsible for the development of the rich metapoetic symbolism we find in the *Eclogues* and throughout subsequent Augustan poetry. Catullus and Lucretius both tend toward metapoetic expression on occasion, and the *Eclogues* clearly owe much to the example of Gallus. (Latin literature, for that matter, is self-conscious from its very beginnings.) Nevertheless, Vergil seems to have done much to develop this technique in the *Eclogues*, and to refine it in the *Georgics*. My reading of these poems has been necessarily selective, but I believe that there is much fertile ground for further analysis, and that a metapoetic study of each poem would bear rich fruit. I once intended this dissertation to be such a study of the *Georgics*—and there is still much that could be said on this topic—but I hope that by studying the detailed and coherent way that Vergil develops one group of related symbols across both the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, I have shown that complex and ambitious metapoetic allegory is an important part of Vergilian poetry, and that Vergil’s development of this technique was important to Augustan poetry in general.
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