

[Part 2, “Virgil vs Cicero, Lucretius Theocritus, Plato, & Homer: Two Programmatic Plots in the First Bucolic,”

Vergilius 46 (2000) 21-58, by John Van Sickle, e-mail: jvsickle@brooklyn.cuny.edu.

Although the pipe, qua mytheme, consolidates the profile of *Tityrus* as a new foundational figure, Virgil’s Latin again ironizes the claim. To stand for the pipe by metonymy, he employs *avena* (oat). Oats, however had performed no such function in either rural life or literary tradition. In the Latin of Ennius, Cato, and Cicero, *avena* was just a weed, and Servius associated it with straw, which serves, at most, to make a squeak.⁸⁷ What allows such an inappropriate material to stand for the mythic pipe is its placement in a context where the other motifs are more plausibly, if still ironically, bucolic. Together they impose the metonymy with “oat” despite its lack of “authority, age, usage, and even reason.”⁸⁸ Indeed the problematic nature of the metonymy adds to the tentative notes in Virgil’s implicit program. On the positive side, however, *avena* and the others impose Latin alternatives for traditional motifs. As a programmatic trademark, then, the whole context cannot signal what Cairns infers: “‘Italian Doric’ poetry, i.e. Theocritean bucolic transplanted to Italy,”⁸⁹ but rather bucolic myth Latinized, appropriated yet problematized by traces of the tensions of contemporary Rome.

⁸⁷ Cf., e.g., *ubi uidet auenam lolium crescere inter triticum, selegit secernit aufert* (where he sees oats, darnel growing amidst wheat, he selects, separates, and removes: Ennius, *Var.* 31-32 Vahlen); Cato, *De agr.* 37.5, *auenamque destringas* (and strip oats); Cicero, *De fin.* 5.91; Virgil, *B.* 5.37, *G.* 1.154; so, e.g., Clausen 1994 ad loc.: “The wild oat.” On *avena* Servius comments: *CULMO, STIPULA, unde rustici plerumque cantare consuerunt: alibi stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen*. But the passage he cites (*B.* 3.25-27) represents not normal bucolic music but its opposite, the destruction of song; cf. Smith 1970.498-502; also Damon 1961.289, drawing on the “detailed argument that ‘disperdere carmen’ at 3.27 means to ‘waste’ a song by singing in echoless surroundings” of Desport 1952.37.

⁸⁸ Criteria for weighing figurative language articulated by Wills 1996.2. Needless to say, once Virgil used *avena* in this way, other poets followed. One might almost lay down the principle that in Latin literature and its heirs, every use of *avena* in metonymy for Pan-pipe pays implicit homage to Virgil; but that is another study.

⁸⁹ Cairns 1998.291-92. He forgets that Theocritus needed no such transplant, *Idd.* 3, 4, and five being set in

The ironies in this tentative program prompt a retranslation that seeks to give them at least some of their due:

Meliboeus:

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
siluestrem tenui musam meditaris auena.
(Tityrus, you loll beneath a branchy beech's lid
trying for a woodsy muse with just a squeaky oat.)

(B. 1.1-2)

Bucolic poetry seems improbable, even preposterous, from a viewpoint that Virgil now makes explicit. Showing why he shifted from esthetic sweetness to emphatic drama for his approach to Theocritus, he brings the plot of *Meliboeus* to the fore and links it with the crisis of the late republic:

Nos patriae fines et dulcia linquimus arua,
nos patriam fugimus.
(We are leaving our homeland's borders and sweet plowed fields.
We are fleeing our homeland.)

B. 1.3-4

The plural *nos* emphasizes contrast with the singular *tu*; and against the narrow security implied by lying back beneath one tree, Virgil sets vast insecurity. The technique has prompted rhetorical commentary, e.g., *antapodosis ex effectis Meliboei dissimilibus* (contrastive response from the unlike effects of Meliboeus: Ramus), which recalls Plato's ambivalence toward certain kinds of dialogue: ὁ ὧν κωμωδῶν φορῶν κὸν πρᾶγμα...ποιεῖν ἀνᾶποδιδόνᾶ ἄλλήλοιᾶ (“the vulgar way we see on the comic stage, exchanging jibes,” Rowe: *Phaedrus* 236c).

The clash of pronouns itself intensifies the departure from Theocritus. He did not contrast two plots and characters in the compass of one speech. Ensuing themes take the break further. To be sure, “spreading beech” was already more than Theocritean. Virgil, though, goes on to evoke the breakdown of Roman polity and tradition, reaching for a thematic range foreign to Theocritus.⁹⁰ And, if the contrastive form implies an affinity with comedy, the themes suggested tragedy to Fulvio Orsini: Ποῖαν σε φῶμεν γαῖαν ἐκλελοιπῶα | πολυξενοῦθαι, γῆ δέ ᾶ, πᾶρα ᾶ ὄροᾶ; (What sort of land should we say you left behind to seek out frequent refuge? what was your country? what boundary of your fatherland?: Euripides' *Aegeus*). The tragic note overshadows the

southern Italy.

⁹⁰ Cf. “Meliboeus was a *ciuis*”: Coleman 1977.72.

opening image of careless music, with its primary allusion to Theocritus, and reinforces the hints of broader literary scope.

To this amplified range, the theme of *dulcia arua* (sweet plowlands) adds fondness for home as a place of regular work in one's own fields (remarked by Badius). The theme also points beyond Lucretius' critique of pastoral mythology to his praise of the origins of civilization. The latter becomes a major text of reference as Virgil amplifies his new foundation myth. When Lucretius imagined the rise of agriculture, his metaphors described the gentling of crops but metaphoric "driving" or "herding" woods uphill to make room for farming below:

inde aliam atque aliam culturam dulcis agelli⁹¹
 temptabant fructusque feros mansuescere terra
 cernebant indulgendo blandeque colendo.
 inque dies magis in montem succedere siluas⁹²
 cogebant⁹³ infraque locum concedere cultis
 (thence again and again care of the sweet little field
 they attempted and saw earth tame wild fruits
 with cossetting and soothing care.
 And daily they drove the woods to proceed more
 uphill and cede the space below to cared-for plots.)

DRN 5.1367-1371

Sweetness and the diminutive of field implied the agricultural traditionalism that was basic to Rome's idea of its past. Virgil's "leaving" marks a break with that cultural identity. Yet departure as a trope of literary relationship is ambiguous. It functions like the trope of literary demurral (*recusatio*), which actually incorporates and exemplifies the thematic and stylistic material ostensibly renounced. Thus Virgil does bring agricultural tradition (and its literary scope) into his programmatic reach.

The motif of "sweet plowlands" sharpens Virgil's departure from Theocritus in another respect. "Sweetness," after all, was the leading theme in Theocritus' vision of art in harmony with secure natural settings;⁹⁴ and it reappeared in Lucretius' pastoral vignette (*dulcisque querellas*, 4.584). Virgil preferred "thinness" (*B.* 1.2), with its roots in

⁹¹ Only here in Lucretius, cf. *B.* 9.3: only there in Virgil, as Clausen 1994.256, where the diminutive expresses pathos; but Coleman adduced Varro, *RR* 3.16, where only small size was expressed.

⁹² Woods, the typical bucolic locus, cf. Ramus (above, n. 66).

⁹³ Cf. *Tityre, coge pecus*, *B.* 3.20, *cogite ouis, pueri*, 3.98; *cogere donec ouis stabulis* 6.85.

⁹⁴ Cf. above n. 7.

Callimachus, Homer, and Lucretian physics. Yet now he brings back “sweetness,” but doubly transposed. He continues its association with agricultural property as in Lucretius’ “sweet little field,” but reduces it from a source of traditional pleasure in nature, art, and work to an index of nostalgia for tradition broken, work interrupted, and property lost. As a trope of literary relationship, these transfers of “sweetness” position Virgil poignantly against both Lucretius and Theocritus.

The motif of losing “fatherland” and “sweet plowlands” opened further horizons for Orsini: *notum est Homericum illud in Odyssea* [9.34], ὃ οὐδὲν γλύκτιον ἢ πατρίδος (that nothing is sweeter than one’s fatherland).⁹⁵ This was *Odysseus* introducing himself to the *Phaeaceans*; but Orsini noted, too, that Cicero applied the motif to the agonies of the Roman republic, reminding the Roman senate of his own exile after his return: *quod uertit M. Tullius in Orat. post redit. in Senat.* [1.1], *Qui patriam, qua nihil potest esse iucundius &c.* Virgil thus positions himself with respect both to contemporary Roman history and to the same Homeric plot that was the major reference text for the seventh idyll. Only here the link to *Odysseus* is *Meliboeus*’ nostalgia rather than the repose of *Simichidas* and *Tityrus*.

The impact of contemporary Rome becomes still more specific in the next line, where the motif of exile caps *Meliboeus*’ self-portrait and becomes the defining action of his plot. Exile means that you are forced out, wrote Landino, so *fugimus* (we are going into exile) is more than merely leaving (*linquimus*), which could be voluntary. The language struck Orsini as another trace of Greek, φεύγειν πατρίδα, *pro eo, quod* exulare *est* (flee the fatherland, for go into exile); and Guellius saw a tragic juxtaposition: Δίαν δὲ ληιοῦσαι χθόνα σύγχροτον Συρία φεύγομεν (Leaving the godlike earth near Syria we go into exile: Aeschylus, *Supp.* 4-5). Exile gives Virgil’s project the weight of tragedy and suffered history in the system of literary relationships. It positions *Meliboeus* with greater gravity against Theocritean exits caused by love,⁹⁶ but also against *Odysseus*, pitting the theme of revolutionary crisis against legendary but individual plight.

By contrast, now, with the adventure plot, Virgil returns to develop the mythemes of *Tityrus*’ posture, place, and, most emphatically, art:

⁹⁵ Cf. πολλά δ’ ἐπιλοκάμου πολιτῆ’ ἀλδ’ ἐν πελάγεσσι | θεσσάμενοι γλυκερὸν νόσφον (much amidst the stretches of fair-haired hoary sea praying for sweet homecoming: Archilochus 8 West), itself an epic juxtaposition, cf. *Od.* 1.4-5, πολλά...νόσφον.

⁹⁶ E.g., *Daphnis* (*Id.* 1.140), nameless goatherd (*Id.* 3.53). Cf. above, n. 80. Hubbard falls far short of seeing that erotic succession is only one of the defining tropes in Virgil’s metapoetics.

tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
 formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.
 (you, Tityrus, pliant in shade
 teach woods to echo ‘shapely Amaryllis’.

B. 1.4-5

Here *recubans* gets interpreted as *lentus*, coloring the specific action (lolling) with a more generic quality (pliant), which hints at assimilation to natural surroundings: “at one with nature. Elsewhere in the *E. lentus* is applied to plants.”⁹⁷ Where the abstract noun of instrument, *tegmen* (cover), evoked Latin epic, the concrete “shadow, shade” (*umbra*) imports ambivalent cultural values. Shade implied sloth from the viewpoint of the Roman forum and military camp; however, in the philosophical tradition of the *Phaedrus* and Lucretius, shade protected constructive discourse or simple life,⁹⁸ to say nothing of shady groves in Homer,⁹⁹ or valued shade in Theocritus,¹⁰⁰ or in epigrams.¹⁰¹

Responding to the weighted syllables of *siluestrem* and its connotations both of wildness and of fiction, the equally prominent *formosam* introduces the contrasting idea of visible and perfected shape. It served in the language of husbandry to describe animals that could be seen to be well formed, well made,¹⁰² a usage that resonates in the present country setting. A matter-of-fact tone would match well with the following *resonare* (echo), which is “transitive here for the first time,”¹⁰³ a usage that confers a colloquial tone.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁷ Clausen 1994.37; on the attempt by mythopoeia “to turn what is cultural, and therefore relative and transient, into something natural in the Newtonian sense, something absolute and permanent,” see Carl A. Rubino, “Journeys, Maps, and Territories; Charting Uncertain Terrain in Science and Literature,”

Intertext 1 (1997) 119.

⁹⁸ Cf. Smith 1965.301; Putnam 1975.170-71.

⁹⁹ ἐν νέμεϊ σκιερῷ (in a shady grove: *Il.* 11.480); ἄλλοσ' ὑπὸ σκιερὸν ἕκατ' ἠβόλου Ἀπόλλωνο' (beneath a shady grove of far-darting Apollo: *Od.* 20.278), cf. *B.* 6.73, *lucus...Apollo.*

¹⁰⁰ *Id.* 5.48-49, καὶ ἄ σκιὰ οὐδὲν ὅμοια | ἴσ' παρὰ ἴν; *Id.* 7.138, ποῖ σκιαραὶ ὀροδαμνίσιν; cf. *Id.* 12.8.

¹⁰¹ E.g., Meleager and Myrinus, cited above, nn. 54 and 56, among others.

¹⁰² *Mercari uisus mihi sum formosam capram* (I supposed I was trading a well-formed she-goat: Plautus, *Merc.* 229), *ipse ecus, non formosus, gradarius, optimus uector* (itself the horse, not well formed, steady,

excellent carrier: Lucilius 476 Marx): cited by Marchetta 1994.91.

¹⁰³ Clausen 1994.36.

¹⁰⁴ Marchetta 1994.51-52.

The verb, then, spells out what *siluestrem musam* implied, that Virgil's project would make a virtue of echo and thus correct Lucretius for debunking bucolic mythology as echoic fiction.¹⁰⁵ "You teach" (*doces*, 5) corroborates the corrective and interprets echoic poetry as a positive force, which is more than the tentative exercise implied by "you practice, work up" (*meditaris*, 2). The idea of teaching woods also counters Lucretius' account of cultural origins, specifically the notion that nature taught music to primitive man:

At specimen sationis et insitionis origo
 ipsa fuit rerum primum natura creatrix...
 et zephyri, caua per calamorum, sibila primum
 agrestis docuere causas inflare cicutas.
 (But an example of sowing and the origin of grafting
 was nature herself the first creator of things...
 and the breezes, through the hollows of reeds, first taught
 country folk to blow through hollow hemlock stalks.)

DRN 5.1361-62, 1382-1383

Against the image of nature's primal teaching, Virgil's "you teach" casts poetry in the originative and didactic role. Orsini compared Moschus' *Epitaph for Bion*: Ἀχὼ δ' ἐν πέτρῃσιν ὀδυρεῖται, ὄτι σιωπῇ | κοῦκέτι μιμεῖται ἅσὰ χεῖλα (But Echo weeps among the rocks, that you are still and she no longer mimics your lips: 30-31).¹⁰⁶

The picture of a lover teaching trees creates, too, a dynamic of succession with Callimachus.¹⁰⁷ He represented *Acontius* seated beneath oaks or elms and saying something that was reported by Aristanetus as εἶθε, ὦ δένδρα, καὶ νοῦ ὑμῖν γένοιτο καὶ φωνή, ὅπως ἂν εὔπηρε μόνον. "Κυδίππη καλή" (O trees, would that mind, too, might be yours, so that you could say only, 'Cydippe is fair': fr. 73 Pf.). By contrast *Tityrus* appears more contented in love, less hyperbolic, more *lentus* (sc. laid back, cf. "at one with nature").¹⁰⁸ The differences imply Virgil's advantage in the literary relationship: his hero satisfied in love and in harmony with the woods that are the basic setting and material of bucolic art.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Damon (above, n. 69); Putnam 1975.163: "from mental pondering to physical voicing."

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Theocritus, *Epig.* 4.9-12.

¹⁰⁷ For relevant bibliography, see Clausen 1994.65, s.v. fagos.

¹⁰⁸ Clausen 1994 ad loc. and Putnam 1975.164: "verbally reflecting his bifold setting."

¹⁰⁹ Cf. above, nn. 92 and 66.

Finally, the name of *Tityrus*' beloved evokes the Theocritean context on which Hubbard focused. The third idyll opens with a goatherd setting out to serenade his beloved and entrusting his goats to *Tityros*:

Κωμάσδω ποῖ ἄν Ἀμαρυλλίδα, αἶ δέ μοι αἶγε
 βόσκον αἶ κα' ὄρο', καὶ ὁ Τί'υρο' αὐ' ἄ' ἐλαύνει.
 Τί'υρ', ἐμὶν ὁ καλὸν πεφιλημένε, βόσκε ἄ' αἶγα',
 καὶ ποῖ ἄν κράναν ἄγε, Τί'υρε· καὶ ὄν ἐνορχαν,
 ὄν Λιβυκὸν κνάκωνα, φυλάσσεο μή ὕ κορούψη.

(I shall go serenade chez Amaryllis, but my goats
 are grazing on the hill, and Tityros drives them.

Tityros, my very well loved, graze the goats,
 and get them, Tityros, to the spring; and the well-hung one,
 the tawny Libyan, look out he don't butt you.)

Id. 3.1-5

Theocritus portrays the enamored goatherd as acting like a lover in the city, a comast,¹¹⁰ distracted from normal bucolic work, which gets described in detail. The place is generic (“on the hill”), the caretaker gets named three times, and the chores are specified in an expansive tricolon: graze, get to, avoid. The third and fullest phrase features metonymy and synecdoche, with color and male equipment standing for the goat.

The artful exuberance makes one suspect some underlying point; and the curious epithet “Libyan” brings to mind a gloss attributed to Probus on Virgil's *Tityrus*: *hircus libyca lingua tityrus appellatur* (a billy goat is called tityrus in the Libyan tongue).¹¹¹ Theocritus, then, may be sending an etymological signal about the meaning of the name. The comast might be imagined assigning chores to a preferred billy (like some Cyclops confiding in his ram).¹¹² More likely, given the warning as if to a stranger, *Tityros* must be imagined as a substitute herder (*mercenarius* some scholiasts called it), a hired hand with a nickname from the stock, like “Billy” or “Buck.”¹¹³ In either case, the etymology would involve an animal, leaving Virgil to imply the etymology “reed” in

¹¹⁰ Cf. Hunter 1999.107-08.

¹¹¹ Herman Hagen, *Appendix Serviana* (Hildesheim 1961) 329. But Iunius Philargyrius gives: *hircum Siculi tityrum vocant* (Sicilians call a billy goat tityrus: op. cit. 15).

¹¹² Cf. Hunter 1999.111.

¹¹³ “Sobriquet, plutôt que nom véritable”: Jacques Perret, *Les bucoliques* (Paris 1970) ad loc.

metonymy for “pipe” should he choose.¹¹⁴ Hunter also raises the specter of *double entendre*, noting that “ἐλάσσει is a not uncommon vulgarism with sexual sense” and that either a goat or a herdsman might be cast in this role. He adds that “Such an earthy opening would stand in obvious counterpoint to the pathetic emotion and frustrated desires of the rest of the poem.”¹¹⁵ The air of low comedy in Theocritus would widen the contrast, too, with Virgil’s tragic overtones, as sensed by Renaissance readers.

Theocritus makes the goatherd expostulate outside the cave of the elusive *Amaryllis* until a twitch triggers thought of singing, which Theocritus represents in a pastiche of poetics shared with the first and seventh idylls: ἀσεῦμαι ποῖ ἄν πίῦν ὦδ’ ἀπιοκλιθεῖ (here turned aside I shall sing by the pine: 3.38).¹¹⁶ The goatherd’s song, notes Hunter, “is formally distinguished from what has gone before both by its stylistic pretension (epicisms, Homeric phrases, etc.) and mythological subject matter.”¹¹⁷ An echo of the initial ambition marks the despairing close: οὐκέ’ αἰίδω (I’m not going to

¹¹⁴ Cf. Hunter 1999.111: “Among later explanations are that ἵψορ means κάλαμος ‘reed’, ‘pipe’, and that it is a dialect term either for satyr (or *silenos*), cf. Aelian, *VH* 3.40, or for a he-goat. The first would suit 7.72 (a singing Tityros, cf. n. ad loc.) and Eclogue 1 (*Tityros...avena* frame the opening couplet)”; the latter also features in the etymological argument of Cairns 1999.

¹¹⁵ Idem 111-12. In Hunter’s *double entendre* other ramifications of *Tityrus* would come into play: cf. Ernst Wüst, “Tityroi,” *RE* 6A (1937) 1609, who relates the root *tit-* to an old and widespread metaphoric system, “tit- (ursprünglich ‘Vogel’, dann metaphorisch ‘Phallos’).”

¹¹⁶ Raise the stylistic register and produce a more elaborate performance”: Hunter 1999.121; cf. *Iliad*. 1.1, αἰδε. In idyll 7 *Tityros* was to sing his song with foundational myths and epic juxtapositions (7.72) while *Lykidas* reclined (7.66); *Lykidas* would turn aside (7.130) and *Simichidas* recline (7.133); in idyll 1 the pine made music (1.2) and the musicians sat (1.12, 21), cf. ἐσδόμενοι, 6.4. Hunter overrides the distinctions, lumping all together as “the sitting posture of the bucolic-erotic poet”; thus, too, he fails to differentiate *Tityrus* reclining (*recubans*, *B.* 1.2) from singers sitting (3.55, omitting 5.3, 7.1) and Damon leaning on a staff (*incumbens*, 8.16). On the latter he misrepresents Clausen, who calls the posture unusual and compares (rightly, I think) the goatherd erect, leaning, at *Id.* 3.38.

¹¹⁷ Idem 122.

sing any more, *Id.* 3.52).¹¹⁸

In response to all this, Hubbard fixed too simply on the shift in erotic status. To be sure, Virgil does promote the hireling (perhaps about to satisfy sexual desires with goats) to the lot of contented lover.¹¹⁹ But even more drastically he also identifies and contrasts the goatherd figures. Both express closing despair at ever singing again; and the motif of singing positions both of them both in and against Homeric tradition:¹²⁰ we have just quoted Hunter on the “epicisms, Homeric phrases, etc.) and mythological subject matter” that mark Theocritus’ goatherd; and we have seen that not only epic but tragic and other literary traces mark *Meliboeus*, as well as, above all, the subject matter not of myth but of history. Roman history rather than love provides the dominant cause in *Meliboeus*’ plot, marking a powerful dynamic of literary succession and *démarche* in literary position.

All together, the traits of *Meliboeus* represent the cultural matrix from and against which Virgil approached his poetic career. In *Meliboeus*, we have discovered him outlining, and in the process bidding to outdo, a far-ranging and complex literary ecosystem.¹²¹ We have seen him weave together traces from Greek and Latin, evoking epic, tragedy, philosophy, rhetoric and poetics, above all the heritage of republican Rome, of Cicero, Lucretius, older Latin epic, and Varro.¹²² We have noted, too, the paradox that Virgil represents the move from this legacy towards a new literary domain not as chosen but compelled. He imagines *Meliboeus*, like *Aeneas*, as forced to flee the old. By coloring change with the pain of exile caused by revolution at Rome, with all the attendant immediacy and gravity, Virgil gives his project the literary advantage of historical disadvantage over against the traditions from which he comes. Exile and revolution provide a master trope for a literary move involving more than simply bucolic aims. The themes of nostalgia for property expropriated and of exile overshadow Theocritus’ musical enclaves and erotic death even as they eclipse the

¹¹⁸ Idem 128: “The present tense indicates, ‘no more singing for me’, but ἀεισῶ deserves at least a place in the apparatus,” a suggestion that would have drawn comfort from *carmina nulla canam*, the final despair of another departing goatherd (*B.* 1.77, a line left unremarked by the commentaries: but we are getting ahead of our story).

¹¹⁹ But cf. *quisquis amores | aut metuet dulces aut experietur amarus* (*B.* 3.109-10).

¹²⁰ Cf. above, nn. 28 and 116.

¹²¹ Cf. Farrell’s “call into being a tradition,” above, n. 5.

¹²² On the merit of casting wider webs in pursuit of Virgilian intertexts, see Meban 2000.5.

philosophical order of Lucretius. Forced exile from the homeland in an historic crisis outweighs the stagy withdrawals from the city of a *Socrates* or a *Simichidas*, or even the tragic tones of *Daphnis*. *Meliboeus*' exile may fall short of Cicero's final flight, yet foreshadow narrative to outmatch the toils and turnings of *Odysseus*.¹²³

The evolution of *Amaryllis*, too, yields signs of literary succession. Some Latin commentaries read her as a reference to Rome, although Servius rejected the political allegory and insisted on the plot of love.¹²⁴ Twice Theocritus made her the object of an apostrophe: ὦ χαρίεσσ' Ἀμαρυλλί (o charming *Amaryllis*). Both situations, however, belied the etymological force of the phrase. The name derives from the verb ἀμαρύσσειν (to sparkle, to dart glances, LSJ);¹²⁵ and the epithet characterizes attractive appearance in things, then in persons.¹²⁶ The etymologies thus complement each other in suggesting

¹²³ On the importance of *Meliboeus* as also signalling Virgil's designs, see Michelazzo 1987.459a, with partial prior bibliography; also Perkell 1990.52, seconded by Van Sickle 1990.56-57; cf. the treatment of multiple tropes of succession, involving both the aging of *Tityrus* and the displacement of *Meliboeus*, by Van Sickle 1978.119-123; also the independently formed opinion of Christopher M. Kuipers, *BMCR* (00.10.01) 5: "Vergil, then, inhabits the voices of both Tityrus and Meliboeus--just as any author must inhabit all of his or her characters. If anything, Meliboeus comes out the "winner" in the reader's sympathies, and this name, in appropriately revisionary fashion, is not found, as Tityrus is, in the Theocritean canon of shepherd names. Thus when Vergil closes the Georgics by repeating Eclogue 1.1 with the change "I sang you, Tityrus," this seems best read not as "I sang as you, Tityrus" but "I sang of you (as Meliboeus)."

¹²⁴ Servius ad loc.; but cf. *AMOR, AMARE*.

¹²⁵ Gow 1952 ad loc. also notes that the form is diminutive; cf. Hunter 1999.111: "'to glitter', 'to sparkle', 'to flash'...frequently connected with female beauty..., and the Hesiodic formula Χαρίων ἀμαρύγμα"

ἔχουσα (fr. 70.38, 196.6 M-W) gives special point to χαρίεσσ' Ἀμαρυλλί in 6 (cf. 4.38). There is probably a particular reference to the brightness of the eyes from which desire radiates, cf. Asclepiades, *Anth. Pal.*

5.153.4 (=HE 823) γλυκεροῦ βλέμμα' ο' ἀσ'εροπαί, *Arg.* 3.288, 1018"; for sight in love, cf. above, n. 54.

¹²⁶ Cf. the first meaning of χάρις, "in the objective sense, *outward grace* or *favour, beauty*, prop. of persons or their portraits" (LSJ), underlined as "grâce extérieure, beauté" by P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1980), s.v.

visibly effective charm. Yet any visual impact of *Amaryllis* was negated by Theocritus in the situations he invented. In the third idyll he secluded her in a grotto where her looks could hardly sparkle and fascinate, as her formulary would require. Indeed, he specified her unwillingness even to peep out (οὐκ ἐτί οὐδ' ὀκνήσασσεν ἄνθρωπον | παρκύπτουσα, *Id.* 3.6-7), which belied her etymology. Similarly, in the fourth idyll, she could not be seen: dead but not forgotten (4.38-40), a valiant boxer once caught and gave her a bull.

Against this background, Virgil reconciles etymology and character. He not only makes *Amaryllis* available to *Tityrus* but endows her with an attribute that emphasizes visible beauty and thus restores the force of Theocritus' Greek. We noted that *formosam* in the Italian countryside referred to how animals looked, yet could also ascribe fine looks or shape to persons and things.¹²⁷ By thus reuniting etymology and situation, indeed emphasizing the visual, Virgil positions himself not only vis-à-vis Theocritus but also with respect to other horizons. The link between love and sight will recur in the *Bucolics*.¹²⁸ It had also informed Meleager,¹²⁹ other Theocritean contexts,¹³⁰ and, above all, the *Phaedrus*. The ideas implicit in *formosam Amaryllida* -- "full of form" and "sparkling, striking the eye" -- recall Plato's views of love and cognition. Indeed the name Φαιδρόν (bright, beaming) overlaps the semantic field of *Amaryllis*.¹³¹ In the

¹²⁷ E.g. *quanto nunc formosior uidere mihi quam dudum* (how much more shapely you seem to me now than before: Terence, *Eu.* 730), but also Cicero in a critique of Platonism: *admirabor eorum tarditatem qui animantem immortalem et eundem beatum rutundum esse uelint, quod ea forma neget esse pulchriorem Plato: at mihi uel cylindri uel quadrati uel conii uel pyramidis uidetur esse formosior* (I shall marvel at the slowness of those who want an immortal and even blessed creature to be round, because Plato denies that anything is fairer than that shape: but to me the shape of a cylinder, a cone, a pyramid seems more shapely: *DND*

1.10.24).

¹²⁸ *B.* 8.37-41.

¹²⁹ Cf. above, n. 54.

¹³⁰ *Idd.* 11.25-27, 2.82, 3.41-42, traced also by Hunter 1999.42, to the *Iliad* 14.293-94 (Hera's seduction of Zeus).

¹³¹ Intuited, but without adequate reference to the full sweep of Virgil's contexts, by Van Sickle 1978.120, n. 43 *AMARYLLIS*: "Plato's similarly appropriate name for a lover, *Phaidros*, in the dialogue which exalts sight as the chief erotic sense. Since the adjective which Virgil attaches to *Amaryllis* has visual connotations, he may intend it to complement or explicate the Greek root."

resulting dynamics of literary succession, Theocritus occupies an intermediate position. The *Amaryllis* of the third idyll never responds to the epical-comical remonstrances of the goatherd, imagined as bringing an urban erotic genre to a rural setting. She remains invisible, elusive, unresponsive, and unperceived in her cave,¹³² unlike the two beaming objects of love, Plato's *Phaidros* (bringing city discourse to be corrected in the country) and Virgil's available *Amaryllis* encoding by metathesis in Latin the names of the city and of love.¹³³

By now we have a context against which to measure the response:

Tityrus:

O Meliboee, deus nobis haec otia fecit,
 namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram
 saepe tener nostris ab ouilibus imbuet agnus.
 Ille meas errare boues, ut cernis, et ipsum,
 ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti.
 (O Meliboeus, a god created this repose for us,
 for he will always be a god to me, his altar often
 tender lamb from our sheep pens will stain.
 He let my cattle roam, as you observe, and me
 myself whatever I wanted play with country reed.)

B. 1.6-10

The interjection and vocative serve to heighten the drama and give the protagonist a name. The remainder begins to address the implicit question posed by *Meliboeus*: since his plot rules out the possibility of repose, what explains the position occupied by *Tityrus*. In programmatic terms, what etiology, what force, enables bucolic poetry in Rome at such a time?

The interjection works in retrospect, amplifying the dramatic force that marked departure from Theocritus. The vocative assigns the initial voice a name that pointedly

¹³² For ἄνθρωπος, cf. *Id.* 7.149, 11.44; *Epigr.* 3.5 (Daphnis' shelter), 5.5. In *Id.* 8.72 a maiden does look out from her cave and call the herder "lovely, lovely"; LSJ call ἄνθρωπος a poetic word, Homer, "only in *Od.*, as 9.216, al." and they also cite Hesiod, *Theogony* 483, Pindar, *Pythian* 1.17, etc.

¹³³ In *Bucolics* 2, the erotic permutation and etymological elaboration will make *Corydon* fail to sway *formosum...Alexin*.

is not Theocritean.¹³⁴ In keeping with the portrait of *Meliboeus* as a singer no longer able to sing,¹³⁵ the name recalls with irony μελιβόα (sweet singer).¹³⁶ Also, in keeping with the epic and tragic echoes just noted in *Meliboeus*' language, traces of both genres mark the name. According to Politian, the shepherd that found and nurtured *Oedipus* was called *Meliboeus*.¹³⁷ Also, Meliboea was the home in Thessaly of *Philoctetes*. Legend had him fortify or found a city in Italy that Virgil would cite as a potential threat to *Aeneas* the precursor of Rome.¹³⁸ At issue are alternative ways of transferring heroic tradition to Italy, by claiming either Greek or Trojan roots. There was local identification with Greek heroes like *Philoctetes* or with Trojans like *Antenor* and *Aeneas*. Thus a trace of Greek myth, as opposed to Trojan, attaches to *Meliboeus*. The Trojan alternative, of course, includes the mythic linkage between *Aeneas*, *Romulus*, Rome, and the Julian line. That mythology would help position the *Aeneid* against Greek epic; and it enters Virgil's service already here in the figure of *Tityrus*' god, which is generally taken to represent the young Caesar (Octavian) of the Julian line.

In Virgil's poetic equation, the god serves to secure a new literary domain against the heritage represented by *Meliboeus*' flight. The phrase *haec otia* (this repose) describes the new domain in language drawn from the domain lost. *Otia dia* (bright

¹³⁴ The choice signals innovation, differentiation from Theocritus, writes Michelazzo 1987.460a, comparing *Moeris* (*B.* 9), as also not in Theocritus but like *Meliboeus* among the most significant expressions of Virgil's humanity. Both, of course, are voices of protest at revolutionary crisis with implicit criticism of the Caesarian faction. Both are portrayed as goatherds and seers (*B.* 1.16-17, 9.12-16, 33-34, *uatem*; and cf. 8.95-99). Each also serves as a vehicle for appropriation and revision of the seventh idyll, first to define but then definitively dismantle the Italo-Roman moment in bucolic tradition.

¹³⁵ Cf. above, nn. 116 and 118.

¹³⁶ G. Costa, "Virgilio e Meliboeo," *Atene e Roma* 9 (1906) 243-252, cited by Michelazzo 1987.460b-c; also Van Sickle 1978.119, citing Euripides fr. 773.34 (LSJ). Servius, undeterred by the fact that Virgil assigns *Meliboeus* goats (*B.* 1.12, 74, 77; cf. 7.7, 9), reports the etymology as "caring for cattle." To this Conington preferred an association with μέλι (honey): John Conington and Henry Nettleship, *The Works of Virgil with a Commentary*, Vol. 1 revised by F. Haverfield (1898⁵) ad loc. Both μέλι and μέλει occur in the goatherd's closing lament (*Id.* 3.52, 54).

¹³⁷ Cf. Michelazzo 1987.459b.

¹³⁸ *Aen.* 3.401-02, *ducis Meliboei...Philoctetae*. Michelazzo 1987.460d.

repose, *DRN* 5.1387) had summed up Lucretius' picture of the first rural culture,¹³⁹ which has been featuring among Virgil's reference texts for the portrait of *Tityrus*. But Lucretius argued that nature had created the original rural idyll. Now Virgil credits the idyll of *Tityrus* to his new, Julian god.

What is more, Virgil presents the god in terms that recall Lucretius' praise of Epicurus, *deus, ille fuit deus* (a god, he was a god, 5.8), thus creating yet another dynamic of succession. Lucretius deified the philosopher who gained a vision of nature's laws through a heroic journey, returned to share the insight, and counseled retreat from active life. Virgil's god is an active public figure dignified by mythic links to Roman and epic tradition. For Virgil, the contrast and programmatic advantage are palpable.¹⁴⁰ The new god enables the literary endeavor that seemed impossible from *Meliboeus'* republican Roman point of view. The new figure of protecting power opens a contrast, too, with the seventh idyll, where a harsh master imprisoned *Komatas*, that other foil and source for the mythic traits of *Tityrus*.

Virgil frames his account of the god in language that suggests the forms of ritual and prayer: *ille...illius...ille* (he...his...he).¹⁴¹ The style well suits the ritual patterns assigned to *Tityrus*, as we shall see in a moment. Developing the hint of ritual, Virgil imagines *Tityrus* as pledged to offer frequent sacrifice: often tender lamb from our pens will stain the god's altar. The detail led Orsini to recall Theocritus' first epigram, which makes an initial offering of roses and thyme to the *Muses*, then laurels to *Pythian Apollo*: and a horned white goat that munches the topmost boughs of the turpentine tree will bloody his altar. The relationship provokes programmatic inference: one sacrifice versus the pledge of frequent repetition, a rangy goat versus a tender, penned lamb, *Apollo* versus his Roman devotee.¹⁴² In other epigrams, sacrifice, including a penned lamb, would be offered for erotic satisfaction not in dutiful gratitude for political

¹³⁹ Cf., e.g., Putnam 1975.172, also, *Tuscolani requiem atque otium*, Cicero, *de orat.* 1.224; *quae nos libri docent in umbra atque otio*, idem, *pro Balbo* 15.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Benjamin Farrington, "Vergil and Lucretius," *Acta Classica* 1 (1958) 45; cited as imitation, without underlining programmatic difference, by Wright 1983.120.

¹⁴¹ The so-called *er-stil*, signalled in this context by Fedeli 1972.276-77, also comparing Catullus 51.1-2,

ille...ille..., following Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Berlin 1913) 163-66.

¹⁴² For customs and degrees of sacrifice, Octavian's link to Apollo, and further bibliography, see Leach 1974.126; also Hunter 1999.149.

authorization to sing.¹⁴³ As an emblem of Virgil's bucolic domain, "tender lamb" may be more substantial than "tenuous oat" but it also is more taxed.¹⁴⁴ Also, by supplying *Tityrus* with sheep and pens, Virgil creates a figure better endowed with bucolic possessions than either Theocritean *Tityros* and in this way, too, emblematic of literary progression.

In the climactic third member of the tricolon, Virgil gives *Tityrus* still greater mythic aura. More than sheep, cattle were the most prestigious bucolic property, which indeed gave the genre its name, as we noted above in remarking the links between the founding hero, the cowherd *Daphnis*, and the emblematic *Simichidas*.¹⁴⁵ Thus "my cattle" relates *Tityrus* to *Daphnis* and *Simichidas*, confirming the other hints that Virgil intended to create a new foundational figure.¹⁴⁶ Virgil also augments the space allotted *Tityrus* to more than the initial single beech. "Roaming" (*errare*) brings out what was already implicit in *silvas*: "not dense woods but partly open hillside with grazing among the trees."¹⁴⁷

Finally, as the crowning element, Virgil returns to music and the pipe. They featured already, as we saw, among the mythic traits assigned to *Tityrus*: the pipe evoking Theocritus' founding hero and behind him its inventor, *Pan*.¹⁴⁸ Yet Virgil now reinterprets these mythemes in terms that contrast with *Meliboeus*' language. Against *meditaris* (toil) he sets *ludere quae uellem* (play what I wish);¹⁴⁹ and against the anomalous "squeaky oat" he sets the normal metonymy for an instrument, "rustic reed," which pursues Virgil's dialogue with the reference text of Lucretius on cultural origin:

et zephyri, caua per calamorum, sibila primum
agrestis docuere cauas inflare cicutas...
tum ioca, tum sermo, tum dulces esse cachinni
consuerant; agrestis enim tum musa uigebat...

¹⁴³ Cf. ἄρνα...σακίῳ, *Epigr.* 4.17-18.

¹⁴⁴ Lamb sacrifice would be a drain on resources, yet a welcome feast, thus it might well serve as a trope for a version of bucolic poetry enabled by yet indebted to quasi-mythic power.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. above, nn. 65 and 39. *Simichidas* claimed poetic instruction by the nymphs on an earlier foray from the city: *Id.* 7.91-92, scrutinized by Hunter 1999.178-79.

¹⁴⁶ Yet *Tityrus* is only a "shepherd" for Wright 1983.110.

¹⁴⁷ Clausen 1994.38. Making a weak caesura, *errare* recalls yet claims more actual presence than *resonare*.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. above nn. 85 and 86.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. *ubi uult*, above, n. 36.

et supera calamos unco percurrere labro.¹⁵⁰
 (and the breezes, through the hollows of reeds, first taught
 country folk to blow through hollow hemlock stalks...
 then jests, then talk, then sweet laughter were wont
 to happen; for rustic music then was going strong...
 and run with curving lip along above the reeds.)

DRN 5.1382-1383, 1407

For Lucretius, the “breezes” blowing on “reeds” were “first” to teach “rustics” music, and “rustic music” then flourished in a symposial setting.¹⁵¹ Since “first” and “taught” are characteristic motifs in stories of poetic and cultural origin,¹⁵² Lucretius in effect supplied a story of naturalistic origin for pastoral music. He thus occupied the space left vacant by his own earlier critique of pastoral mythology as an echoic fiction, where he dismissed *Pan*’s music and, by implication, the god’s traditional role as inventor of the pipe. In Lucretius’ new etiology, the “breezes” supplant *Pan* as the inventive source and rustics imitate nature to make the first pipes.

Virgil has already begun to counter Lucretius by reviving pastoral mythology and making echo a positive force. Now he presses his corrective further by reclaiming crucial elements from Lucretius’ naturalism, both “rustic” and “reed,” which he uses to supplant his own “squeaky oat” and thus solidify his appropriation of the pipe of *Daphnis* and *Pan*. Assigning *Tityrus* a “rustic reed” as opposed to a “squeaky oat,” Virgil reinforces the signs of originative and foundational authority ascribed to his new bucolic domain.¹⁵³ In the drama, therefore, *Tityrus*’ terms of art contradict and correct *Meliboeus*, as if to retort, “What squeaky oat? This is a bona fide reed pipe of the sort that Pan first made.”¹⁵⁴

Since *calamus* accords with one of the ancient etymologies of *Tityrus*, as Orsini noted,¹⁵⁵ Virgil may also be correcting the association of *Tityrus* with goat that seemed implicit in the third idyll.¹⁵⁶ If so, the etymological corrective would parallel the treatment of *Amaryllis*, restored to behavior fitting the etymology of her name. Grasp of

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Lucretius 4.588 of *Pan* piping: there Lucretius dissolved the myth, but here he reabsorbs its elements in his naturalistic account of origins.

¹⁵¹ Cf. above, n. 41.

¹⁵² Cf. above, n. 83, and *primus* at the etiological center of *B.* 1: 44.

¹⁵³ On the naturalizing (and mystifying) force of mythic language, cf. Rubino (above, n. 97).

¹⁵⁴ For the importance of *Pan* for Virgil, see above n. 83.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Cairns 1999. 290-91, but already Wright 1983.108.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. above, n. 114.

the true force of names would be a further sign of prophetic power reaching beyond Theocritus.

These last correctives propel us in two directions. We need to look back to consolidate. We want to pursue the further drama of riposte and thrust to see how it fulfills the program implied. Space here allows only a brief outline of the major dramatic turns and how they further position Virgil in, against, and beyond tradition:

11-18. *Meliboeus* on his own present and past: entire countryside in turmoil; self reduced to scarcely herding goats; failure to read portents from heaven.

[Program: reinforces Virgil's command of themes (georgic and civic) that range beyond the merely bucolic; yet also completes his reprise of bucolic tradition, which included goat herding (e.g. *Lykidas*, *Komatas*, and the *Tityros* of *Id.* 3), complementing the sheep and cattle already assigned to *Tityrus*.

Motifs of difficult birth (contrasts with goatherds of *Idd.* 1, 3, 5, 7) imply the difficulty of Virgil's new venture. Motif of failed divination links this singer with defeated *Moeris*, failed *uates*.¹⁵⁷

19-45. *Tityrus* on his own past with the two plots behind his present repose: escape from wasting to sustaining love (from *Galatea* to *Amaryllis*); journey to Rome for freedom, encounter with authority, and receipt of "first" authorizing oracle:¹⁵⁸ "herd cattle as before, boys, bring up bulls."

[Program: plot of succession in love
positions Virgil against Theocritus (cf. *Idd.* 3, 6, 11);
plot of succession in journey-encounter-that-defines-poetics
positions Virgil against
Theocritus (*Simichidas* meeting the Apolline goatherd *Lykidas* between city and country),¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Cf. above, n. 134. For a convenient, but dismissive and reductive, report of *uates* in Ennius and Varro, see Clausen 1994.277-78, cf. the account of its implicit as well as overt and ironized presence as a subtext throughout the *Bucolics* Van Sickle 1992.

¹⁵⁸ On "first" as a motif in honorific inscriptions as well as poetics, see Meban 2000.4, n. 5; as a motif in poetic etiology, see above, nn. 152 and 83.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Hunter 1999.148-49 on the Apolline characteristics of *Lykidas*.

Callimachus (*Branchos*, shepherd made prophet by *Apollo* in woods),¹⁶⁰
 Hesiod (shepherd made poet by *Muses*' with laurel on Helicon), and
 Homer (*Odysseus* meeting the malevolent goatherd *Melantheus* between
 country and city).¹⁶¹

All told, a new foundational myth for bucolic, "as before but more,"
 draws authority from city, from Roman but still Apolline myth; new
 bucolic figure in Callimachean mold portrayed as *Apollo's* prophet
 (scilicet *uates*); in role of *uates* adumbrates renewed foundational myth
 for Rome.]

46-58. *Meliboeus* on *Tityrus*' present and future happiness: apostrophes, *fortunate senex* (fortunate old man).¹⁶²

[Program: against apostrophe to *Komatas*, replaces contrary-to-fact by future represented as seamless with past (e.g. *manebunt, quae semper, B. 1.46, 53, will remain...as ever*);¹⁶³ amplifies mythic profile of *Tityrus* with motifs not only from *Tityros* (*Komatas*) but from the final festival of *Simichidas* and from *Branchos*.]

59-63. *Tityrus* on his future loyalty to his god.

[Program: vatic voice, future tenses reinforce new foundational mythology for poetry and for Rome.]

63-73. *Meliboeus* on his future exile, past agriculture and citizenship, displaced by barbaric soldiery.

[Program: exile to ends of earth recalls *Simichidas*' threats to *Pan* of unnatural hardships herding (*Id. 7.109-114*); memory of farming fills out georgic and civic range of Virgil's project, introduces an agent of change (*impius barbarus miles*) in implicit symmetry and antithesis to the agency of *Tityrus*' god.]¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ For this too often neglected typology see Wright 1983.135-36; cf. the stationary Callimachus getting

"first" his poetic rule from Apollo, fr. 1.21-24 Pf.

¹⁶¹ Hunter 1999.147-48: "T. acknowledges the 'bucolic' inspiration of the archaic epic."

¹⁶² Cf. Cicero, *Pro Archia poeta* 10.24: (Alexander the Great before the tomb of Achilles) '*o fortunate, inquit,*

'adulescens, qui tuae uirtutis Homerum praeconem inueneris!'

¹⁶³ Cf. above, n. 108.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Van Sickle 1984b.126.

74-78. *Meliboeus* on his past herding, stretched out in a grotto (*in antro*, 1.75), and past singing, future silence: *carmina nulla canam* (no more songs will I sing, 1.77).

[Program: returns to emphasize *Meliboeus*' emblematic role within bucolic tradition as goatherd-singer, mythic posture reclining as in idyll 7; unlike the goatherd of *Id.* 3, who never penetrated *Amaryllis*' grotto (ἄντρον, *Id.* 3.6) but would likewise sing no more.¹⁶⁵]

79-83. *Tityrus* on conditional present of the two characters in repose (*mecum poteras*), looking across countryside described in terms that approach the range of *Meliboeus* but with order like that made by the god.

[Program: momentary synthesis of the contrasting currents in Virgil's project, with emphasis on the solidity and growing reach of his new bucolic domain, well positioned against the multiple traditions evoked, emphasized by gesture of co-opting, absorbing, the range of *Meliboeus* while mystifying the pain.]

Even this bare sketch confirms and develops what we found in our empirical study of the opening couplets: that Virgil appropriates and refashions the myths of poetic foundation from the first and seventh idylls. Through *Meliboeus* Virgil proceeded beyond the foundational motifs of *Komatas* and *Tityros*' song to assign to *Tityrus* also motifs from *Simichidas*' final repose. Virgil casts this crowning appropriation in the form of an apostrophe, recalling the apostrophe to *Komatas*, which, as we saw, was crucial to Theocritus' foundational poetics: ὦ μακαριστὲ Κομάτα (7.83), *fortunate senex...fortunate senex* (1.46, 51).

We note, too, that *Simichidas*' journey and defining encounter, which positioned Theocritus in and against epic tradition,¹⁶⁶ serve a similar function in Virgil, who recasts them as a foundational myth (etiology) for his new literary domain. We see that the new myth positions Virgil against crucial encounters in the literary ecosystem with their links to *Apollo* (even to his laurel which the Muses granted Hesiod on Helicon and which *Branchos* planted in the earth).¹⁶⁷

As a final invitation to further study, we remark, too, that both *Meliboeus* and *Tityrus* have associations with prophecy. This joins the other motifs that fashion *Tityrus*'

¹⁶⁵ Cf. above, n. 118.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. above, n. 15.

¹⁶⁷ Planted = πηξά', cf. πάζαμι, *Id.* 7.156, which Hunter 1999.199 relates to the end of *Odysseus*' travels,

repose as a new myth of poetic foundation and cultural origin. In particular, the comparison of *Branchos* and *Apollo* with *Tityrus* and his god at Rome positions Virgil to establish identity as a Roman poetic founder against the Greek, putting into practice the idea recently retrieved by Varro that the old Latin word for poet was *uates* (seer, prophet, bard). Already here, in his first experiment with the vatic role, Virgil gives voice to the suffered contradictions of passage from the republic to a new version of Rome's original monarchic state. As *uates* he outlines new mythic foundations in both politics and poetics: his oracle, "as before, yet more," will prove prophetic, its program quintessentially Augustan.

John B. Van Sickle

Brooklyn College & the Graduate School

City University of New York

jvsickle@brooklyn.cuny.edu

when he plants the oar; cf. the relationship of laurels to *Apollo* in *B.* 6.83.