

## Afterword: Towards New Reading

*non omnia possumus omnes*  
'Not all things can we all do'

*Bucolics* 8.63

I close with a Virgilian disclaimer that seems made for this place. Reviewing scholarship has left a vivid impression of accomplishments and strengths, but also idiosyncrasies, exclusions, gaps and mistakes. For all the learning and insight, energy in research and argument, no one gets it all, not even in terms of what we say we intend. To document what I mean, sorting out the merits and defects that strike me now, would require another book. Peopled with names like Alpers, Berg, Clausen, Della Corte, Martini, Putnam, Du Quesnay, Schmidt and Skutsch, it would alternate edifying instances with their contraries somewhat as in a bucolic match. After a quarter century absorbed by similar dialectics, something a bit broader may turn out to be more compelling.

Five projects come to mind. They seem feasible and timely thanks to recent studies that read Virgil and his tradition, before and after, in new ways. What they accomplish encourages. Where they clash or fall short, they open ways to more work.

The best account of pastoral after Virgil strikes me as broadly comprehensive and deeply analytical, yet Annabel Patterson, too, begins with the disclaimer quoted above: 'We cannot all do everything'. Patterson emphasizes that she is citing "Virgil (and one of his readers)" in self-reflexive use of what she tells us had become "a commonplace of humanistic scholarship."<sup>1</sup> In her view, she thereby reenacts a recurrent, indeed defining

<sup>1</sup> Annabel Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*. From *Virgil to Valéry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1987) 17, elegantly anatomized and set in a wider context of Virgilian studies by Craig Kallendorf, "Recent Trends in Virgilian Scholarship," *Helios* 18 (1991) 78-80. Mining Virgil for aphorisms and tags was a long industry: see the article, "Sententiae virgilianae," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4 (1988) 772-76.

feature of Virgilian tradition, since humanists and poets have long used Virgil's characters to reflect on their own situations; and they have taken license to do so from the ancient belief that Virgil himself reflected his own experience in his fictional personae.

Patterson argues that such identifications reveal much about their makers because of what she describes as "the dialectical structure that Virgil bequeathed to us, an ancient poetics no less elliptical than those of Plato and Aristotle" (p. 6). Thanks to this structure, she writes, "what people think of Virgil's *Eclogues* is a key to their own cultural assumptions, because the text was so structured as to provoke, consciously or unconsciously, an ideological response" (p. 7). She adds that readers often "repressed or suppressed half of what they found there or what others had found, in the interests of projects that could not afford a fully dialectical inspection" (p. 10).

Since Patterson ends with Valéry, one line of study might extend her ideological analysis to such strong readers of the *Bucolics* as Valéry's contemporary Paul Maury,<sup>2</sup> or a strong successor like Marie Desport.<sup>3</sup> One might, then, be tempted to go on to ferret out and unmask the ideologies — *maintes partis pris* — in the stronger among the readers mentioned in the *Foreword* above, so as to place them in the context of political and cultural vicissitudes after the two great wars.<sup>4</sup>

A second line of study might fill in a gap before Patterson really begins. Focusing on Renaissance and later tradition, she oversimplifies how Virgil's reputation first took root: (p. 1)

<sup>2</sup> "Le secret de Virgile et l'architecture des *Bucoliques*," *Lettres d'Humanité* 3 (1944) 71-147. Maury's memory still lingers in Alain Michel, "Catulle dans les *Bucoliques* de Virgile: histoire, philosophie, poétique," *REL* 67 (1989) 147, which manages to quite transcend the treatments of intertextuality cited in the *Foreword* above.

<sup>3</sup> *L'incantation virgilienne: Virgile et Orphée* (Bordeaux 1952), s.v. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 2 (1985) 32.

<sup>4</sup> Writing in 1991, it seems almost superfluous to remark that our disciplines and schools employ systems of ideas, values and beliefs, that constitute ideologies, even though one tradition pretends to be 'objective', sc. free of ideology: a tradition with which Patterson deliberately and pointedly breaks, as emphasized by Kallendorf (n. \*\*\*\*\* above) 79. My own assumptions about readership form one such system: so too the several scholars cite, each their own: *trahit sua quemque*.

More than two thousand years ago, certain privileged Roman readers unrolled a ‘book’ of poems and encountered the following greeting: *Tityre, tu... Nos patriam fugimus....* These lines have been echoing ever since; not, I would argue, because of their graceful memorability, but because those Roman readers faced, even in these first five lines, a challenge that has remained intensely audible.

Virgil’s text, we are told, survives through sheer dialectical and chiasmic force,<sup>5</sup> projecting itself miraculously across centuries from elite to elite reader in what she calls “the whole history of Virgilian interpretation” (p. 9).

Making it her business to bare the ideological bones of others, Patterson knows that words like “ever since” and “whole” provoke lists of exceptions. Her version of the impact of the *Bucolics* is bookish. She posits a leap in elite readership where the reality comprises many steps that took place little by little through a process of cultural construction in which readership only gradually acquired dominance. To retrace it all would make more than one new book. A few preliminary notes are in order here, since the fourth eclogue arguably was crucial to what must have taken place.

Not only readers formed Virgil’s first audiences. He issued the *Bucolics* with such success that they were presented frequently by actors on the stage, according to an ancient biographical notice that Patterson overlooks.<sup>6</sup> The notice invites renewed attention to the ways in which poetry made itself known in Virgil’s day and to the cultural reconstruction underway when he wrote: a subject that

<sup>5</sup> Chiasmus at every level, from phrase, to eclogue, to book, emerged as a structuring principle in my Rome lectures; an outline of the argument appears in the thematic labels, e. g. for chapter two, “L’impostazione (EG 1.1-10). 1. Da uno a più codici: le strutture di base. 2. Il rafforzamento mediante il chiasmo,” cited from *Poesia e potere. Il mito Virgilio* (Roma 1986) 45-58. Cf. from chapter seven, “Il rimpasto (EG VII). 1. Titiro: il ‘rialzo’ poetico e i motivi del ‘ribasso’. 2. Il potere del canto si risveglia. 3. La chiusa mediante chiasmo. 4. Lo sfondo poetico: le fonti.” pp. 119-136.

<sup>6</sup> “Bucolica eo successu edidit ut in scena quoque per cantores crebro pronuntiarentur,” *Vit. Donat.* 26-27, cf. 29, 32-33, with my discussions in *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 17: “L’epopea opinabile,” one Virgil’s earliest detractors. Ancestor to so many masques and court shows, even *A pastoral drama VIRGINIA on the birthday of an illustrious personage [George Washington] and the return of peace, February 11th, 1784*, [John Parke], Philadelphia 1786.

is undergoing important revisions in recent scholarship cited below.

Briefly, we may suppose the poet introducing his poems in recitations to privileged audiences,<sup>7</sup> as he was to do with the *Georgics* and certain books of the *Aeneid*, provoking conversation among the elite, not without reproach as well as praise.<sup>8</sup> Suppose the fourth eclogue recited in the context of celebrations for a political wedding, which was being honored by the themes of birth and political hope:<sup>9</sup> that must occasion gossip, sowing seeds of fame. More important, suppose the themes and topics of praise,<sup>10</sup> and the boldly drawn persona of prophetic authority, secured a favorable reception among those in the audience who had the power and controlled the means of production, who would arrange theatrical presentations, which would further enhance fame.<sup>11</sup> In the theater, the Roman public had long been fed on political allegory. Their take on the *Bucolics* as performed must have been what made Virgil a celebrity in his own day, applauded by theater crowds as if he were Augustus and mobbed in the streets.<sup>12</sup> Evidently his fictional version of a vatic utterance carried conviction and founded fame.<sup>13</sup> Against a rich Greek and Roman

<sup>7</sup> For the custom and obligations of recitation, see Nicholas Horsfall, "Poet and patron reconsidered," *Anc. Soc.* (Macquarie 1983) 1-3, linking the frequent performances of the *Bucolics* to their frequent presence in graffiti. Reciting and listening rather than individual reading were pervasive and invasive: see William Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge 1989) 226-27.

<sup>8</sup> The initially mixed reviews and formation of opinion are discussed in *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 12-24, under under the headings "L'epopea opinabile, Gli operatori culturali, Dal mimo al mito, La poetica del potere."

<sup>9</sup> Du Quesnay, "Vergil's Fourth Eclogue" (*Foreword*, n. 11) 34-38, argues that the occasion was the dynastic wedding of Octavia and Antony, yet he supposes only "readers," in this respect resembling Patterson.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. remarks by Du Quesnay on praise topics and vatic incidents in those times (op. cit. n. 9) 40-41, 43-67.

<sup>11</sup> See "Gli operatori culturali" *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 17-20.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Tacitus, *Dial.* 13: nothing else Virgil wrote could have gripped the crowds in the necessary mass medium.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. "Dal mimo al mito," *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 20-20-23, also the judicious remarks by Du Quesnay (op. cit. n. 9) 84. On the vatic persona Virgil creates see "The effect of of this pause [before 4.60-63] and change can best be

background,<sup>14</sup> Virgil unites diverse traditions of visionary speech,<sup>15</sup> Sibylline oracle and the *Parcae*,<sup>16</sup> into a semblance of new authority, reconstituting the role of *uates*.<sup>17</sup> He reinterpreted contemporary events into a new public mythology,<sup>18</sup> which he adumbrated in the first three eclogues and consolidated boldly in

---

appreciated if, after reading the poem once, we let the mind dwell on these and go over it once more. Then, to me at least, it becomes clear that the bulk of the poem is a prophetic *carmen* conceived as sung by a *vates fatidica*, with whom Virgil half identifies himself, *during the actual birth of a child*,” W. Warde Fowler, “The Child of the Poem,” in *Virgil’s Messianic Eclogue*, J. B. Mayor, ed. (London 1907) 69; “Bien avant l’Énéide, où il sera le prophète des destinées de Rome, tout concourt à montrer Virgile plongé dans une atmosphère mystique et se présentant come un *uates*,” Andrée Richter, *Virgile la huitième Bucolique* (Paris 1977) 41.

<sup>14</sup> Relations between prophecy and poetry in Greece receive a clear analysis from Gregory Nagy, “Ancient Greek Poetry, Prophecy and Concepts of Theory,” in *Poetry and Prophecy. The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*, J. L. Kugel, ed. (Ithaca 1990) 56-64; also Charles Segal, “Poetry, performance and society in early Greek literature,” *Lexis* 2 (1988) 123-144.

<sup>15</sup> Virgil alludes to two kinds of prophetic authority: ‘Cumaean song’ points overtly, whatever its literary undertone, to the institution of the Sibylline books, which were administered by the Roman state and enjoyed a long, often controversial history; ‘Fates’ and *Parcae* have more private, literary and philosophical, resonance.

<sup>16</sup> On the Sibylline tradition at Rome and in later tradition, see the articles “Sibilla; Sibillini, Libri,” *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4 (1988) 825-31; also W. L. Kinter and J. R. Keller, *The Sibyl: Prophetess of Antiquity and Medieval Fay* (Philadelphia 1967) 38; and Arnaldo Momigliano, in *The Uses of Greek and Latin*, A. C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton, and Jill Kraye, edd. (London, 1988), reviewed in *JRS* LXXX (1990) 265.

<sup>17</sup> Cobbling together diverse traditions, Virgil gives new substance to the old *uates*: “Augustan romanticism in Virgil made it a poetic synonym of *poeta*...: the ancient *uates* combined the functions of prophet and poet,” Otto Skutsch, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford 1985) 372.

<sup>18</sup> On the background of infant heroes in Roman mythology, see Maurizio Bettini, Alberto Borghini, “Il bambino e l’eletto,” *Materiali e discussioni* 3 (1980) 121-153.

the fourth and fifth.<sup>19</sup> Nor need the message have been unequivocal to capture the general public or the elite patron. Around the time of the notional date of the fourth eclogue, the images of leaders of contending factions appear together on the two sides of some of the same coins.<sup>20</sup> The rhetoric of authority, contemporaneity and visionary praise might well impress, even if it reflected more than one heroic iconography, dynastic marriage and hope of offspring, but in a way so generic that the imagery could be assimilated to the ideology of the eventual victors.<sup>21</sup> That would confirm Virgil in his renown as *uates*. When the message became identified with an assured and ever more well-received state of affairs at Rome, the fame would be institutionalized with the ideology of the new state itself. Adroitly it blends return with innovation in quintessentially Augustan fashion.<sup>22</sup> Assimilation must grow as the fourth eclogue gets echoed in the great Augustan prophecies of the *Aeneid*:<sup>23</sup> when Virgil brings the source of ‘Cumaeen song’, the Sibyl, into

<sup>19</sup> On the whole matter of new mythology and cultural innovation in the Augustan age, see Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, “Rome’s Cultural Revolution,” *JRS* LXXIX (1989) 156-164. Exemplary in theory and practice, this piece, like the one on elegy that follows it, seems to represent a new scholarly discourse. Regrettably a piece on the *Bucolics* in the same issue reads like a throwback to something else (see critique in n. 42 below).

<sup>20</sup> W. H. Gross, “The Propaganda of an Unpopular Ideology,” in *The Age of Augustus*, R. Winkes, ed. (Louvain-la-Neuve 1985) 31; cf. J. Pollini, “Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate,” in *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, K. A. Raafaub and M. Toher, edd. (Berkeley 1990) 338-346.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. the arguments of Gordon Williams, *TORP* (Oxford 1968) 283. Virgil will imagine Augustus outstripping Hercules and Bacchus in Eastern exploits (*A.* 6.801-805), or, more subtly, assimilated to Hercules’ mythic traces (*A.* 8.362-69).

<sup>22</sup> The ideological profile of the eclogue, in style as in theme, with its deployment of traditional elements in a new way, lends itself to interpretation like that of another Augustan monument by B. A. Kellum, “The City Adorned: Programmatic Display at the *Aedes Concordiae Augustae*,” in Raafaub and Toher (above n. 20) 307; see also Wallace-Hadrill (above n. 19).

<sup>23</sup> *Aeneid* 1.286-91, 6.787-807. Integrated with the fourth eclogue in the ideological recollections of Calpurnius

his epic, applying the term *uates* to Apollo, the Sibyl and himself;<sup>24</sup> and when he purports, in the person of Jupiter, to unroll and read out the ‘fates’.<sup>25</sup>

A program of research, then, would investigate how the self-defined *uates* became a fixture in the cultural apparatus of imperial power.<sup>26</sup> Evidence for elite readership would come into play. Aside from the dissonance with Horace’s vatic utterance in the sixteenth epode, early another contemporary poet felt free to adapt motifs of the fourth eclogue to praise another noble patron.<sup>27</sup> A still younger contemporary read with more sensitivity to the turn matters would take: directing his praise to Augustus, he styled himself *uates* and echoed Virgil’s prayer in the fourth eclogue for long life: ‘These encampments will I follow; as bard singing of your camps will I be great: may the fates preserve that day for me!’<sup>28</sup> Propertius also recalled two motifs of the fourth eclogue when he hailed the project of the *Aeneid*: ‘something is being born greater than the *Iliad*’.<sup>29</sup> By the end of Augustus’ life, if a son of Pollio claimed identity with the miraculous ‘child’, that was misprision, ambitious and dangerous.<sup>30</sup> Restriction of the eclogue to imperial ideology produced ironies of a different sort, for instance insults to one of

---

Siculus: Jochem Küppers, “Tityrus in Rom..Bemerkungen zu einem vergilischen Thema und seiner Rezeptiongeschichte,” *IllCISt* 14 (1989) 38.

<sup>24</sup> *A.* 6.12 (“Delius inspirat uates”), 6.78 (“bacchatur uates”) etc., 7.41 (“tu uatem, tu, diua, mone”).

<sup>25</sup> *A.* 1.260-61: “fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet, / longius, et uoluens fatorum arcana mouebo.”

<sup>26</sup> The *Bucolics* will be interpreted alone lines sketched by Wallace-Hadrill, cited above (n. 19).

<sup>27</sup> Tibullus (2.5) to Messalla: see the discussion in G. Williams, “A Version of Pastoral: Virgil, *Eclogue* 4,” in *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, T. Woodman and David West, edd. (Cambridge 1974) 35.

<sup>28</sup> Propertius 2.10.19-20: “Haec ego castra sequar; uates tua castra canendo / magnus ero: seruent hunc mihi fata diem!” compared with *B.* 4.53-54, by Du Quesnay (op. cit, n. 9) 28; cf. other early homage to Virgil cited by G. D’Anna, D’Anna, “Gli inizi della fortuna di Virgilio,” *Sileno* 5-6 (1979-1980) 373-385.

<sup>29</sup> Propertius 2.34.66, “nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.”

<sup>30</sup> Pollio’s son, Asinius Gallus, had fatal ambitions of succeeding Augustus (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.13.2, cited by Du Quesnay (op. cit. n. 9) 88, n. 59.

Augustus' successors,, 'You have changed the golden centuries of Saturn, Caesar; for so long as you live they always will be iron',<sup>31</sup> or egregious flattery for another, 'cheap wool is changed for precious metal, golden centuries descend the pretty thread..., Of its own accord the work hastens, and with no toil soft threads descend the spun spindle'.<sup>32</sup> Ideological assimilation affected the way Virgil was remembered. Tacitus would imagine the poet Maternus, his own contemporary, mentioning Virgil in the same breath with Orpheus and Linus, who are described as legendary *uates* and the counselors and familiars of old kings in a golden age.<sup>33</sup> Texts of Virgil would be deposited among the books of divination.<sup>34</sup> The presence of imperial ideology, or nostalgia for its absence, undergirds the cultural reach of the *Bucolics*, inviting supplementary histories, up to the pagan recollection and Christian appropriation,<sup>35</sup> through Dante,<sup>36</sup> to Petrarch and the main focus of

<sup>31</sup> Tiberius: "Aurea mutasti Saturni saecula, Caesar;/ incolumi nam te ferrea semper erunt," (Suetonius, *Tiberius* 59): quoted by Du Quesnay (above n. 9) 60.

<sup>32</sup> Nero: Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 4, of the Fates singing, "mutatur uilis pretioso lana metallo, aurea formoso descendunt saecula filo /.../ Sponte sua festinat opus, nulloque labore / mollia contorto descendunt stamina fuso" (8-9, 12-13): cited by Egon Römisch, *Vergils vierte Ekloge im Unterricht* (Heidelberg 1970) 31-32. On the fourth eclogue in the Neronian panegyrics of Calpurnius Siculus, see Küppers, loc. cit. (n. 23).

<sup>33</sup> *Dial.* 12: Tacitus assimilates the figure of Virgil, as prophetic poet and friend of Augustus, to the mythic poets challenged in the fourth eclogue: discussed in "Il visionario e lo specchio eroico," *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 11.

<sup>34</sup> On oracular uses of Virgil, see "Scriptores historiae Augustae," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4 (1988) 734-37. The so-called *sortes Vergilianae* "were very probably a novelty in the 390's" according to Harris (above n. 7) 303.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. S. Benko, "Virgil's Fourth Eclogue in Christian Interpretation," *ANRW* II.31.1 (Berlin, 1980) 646-705; V. Bucheit, "Cicero ispiratus - Vergilius propheta? Zur Wertung paganer Autoren bei Lactanz," *Hermes* 118 (1990) 369-370; E. Heck, "*Vestrum est - poeta noster*: Von der Geringschätzung Vergils zu seiner Aneignung in der frühchristlichen lateinischen Apologetik," *MusHelv* 47 (1990) 104.

<sup>36</sup> See *Poesia e potere* (above, n. 5) 9-10, on Dante's Dante's reading and nostalgia for empire; cf. Maurizio Bettini, "Fonti letterarie e modelli semiologici: come Dante

Patterson's reading.

Beyond these supplements before and after Patterson's main focus, a third project would turn her methods on her reading of the *Bucolics*. Virgil himself surfaces, she says, and "elliptically suggests his reasons for writing pastoral" in the opening of the sixth eclogue (pp. 3-4), simultaneously identifying himself with the 'Tityrus' of the first poem, which has to be "recognized as one aspect of the *authorial ego*."<sup>37</sup> She adds that "The sign 'Menalcas' behaves in the same unsettling way... a name for Virgil to invest *momentarily* with his own cultural ambitions" (p. 5).

Again, as with her exclusive focus on readers, Patterson has reduced a complex reality. Taking 'Tityrus' and 'Menalcas', she rounds up usual suspects. They traditionally have been seen as masks for the dissembling author. Had she pressed the logic of her own approach to get beyond the traditional lineup, she would have found a further identification with yet another bucolic character, one with at least as good a claim to represent an "aspect of the *authorial ego*."

Patterson does not remark that the recall of 'Tityrus' in eclogue six has an immediate sequel. Virgil goes on in eclogue seven to recall and identify himself with the other figure from eclogue one, 'Meliboeus'. This recycled 'Meliboeus', like the returned 'Tityrus' in eclogue six, has been recast as a narrator. Both figures are portrayed, too, as having interests beyond the notional present and serving as mere conveyors of songs that originate with others. The kinds of singing reported differ enormously. Nothing supports the inference, however, that in one more than the other Virgil meant to reveal "his reasons for writing pastoral" and "his own cultural ambitions."<sup>38</sup> If anything, from the

---

utilizz  alcuni autori latini," *Studi Danteschi* LII (1979-1980) 189-211.

<sup>37</sup> Relating her argument to contemporary critical theory, she infers that Virgil here provides "one of the earliest analyses we have of the problematic author-function defined by Michel Foucault" (p. 4).

<sup>38</sup> In privileging the sixth eclogue over others as a bearer of poetics, Patterson has been misled by recent critics, who themselves overreacted to the discovery of a papyrus containing a precise source for part of the eclogue's opening program. The scholarly bandwagon erred in two respects: it ignored poetics in the other eclogues, each of which contributes a distinct facet of Virgil's overall response to literary tradition; and it ignored other signs of poetics in the sixth eclogue, notably the hints of Callimachus and Varro

standpoint of bucolic genre, the seventh eclogue might seem *prima facie* the more ambitious: here Arcadians first come upon the scene and sing, foreshadowing Virgil's repossession only in the final eclogue of the mythic place of bucolic origin.<sup>39</sup>

If both scenarios in their different ways are crucial, with equal claims to represent "*authorial* ego," suppressing one is just the kind of fault Patterson reproves in traditional readers, namely failure to read dialectically (p. 6). The corrective would be a supplement, returning to retrace and assay the vicissitudes not only of 'Tityrus' but of 'Meliboeus', each treated equally, or better, considered together, dialectically, as a significant pair which is a dual "sign" or "aspect" (Patterson's terms) of the elusive "*authorial* ego" disseminated in Virgil's book.<sup>40</sup>

The first steps in such a further project would focus on the neglected member of dialectic, unsung facet of "*authorial* ego." Virgil's scenario in the first eclogue showed a 'Meliboeus' unhappy to arrive on the bucolic scene. The scenario depicted a figure forced to come to 'Tityrus' from a wider, fuller background, where his normal activities as citizen, farmer, and singer have been interrupted under the same historical circumstances that left the erstwhile slave 'Tityrus' sitting pretty.<sup>41</sup>

In the seventh eclogue Virgil stages a new scenario. Following his identification with 'Tityrus' in the sixth, the poet identifies himself as 'Meliboeus', imagined as again arriving on the bucolic scene from elsewhere, no longer forced, merely led by a straying goat and held by a big bucolic contest, which he narrates in its entirety. The contest is billed as a match between Arcadians and is in fact the first in the book and in all bucolic tradition, a circumstance less remarked by exegetical tradition than such a

---

Atacinus at the close: see J. Van Sickle, *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics* (Roma, 1978) 148-58, 235.

<sup>39</sup> See *Foreword*, nn. 23, 24, 25, and p. 155 below.

<sup>40</sup> "Virgil's own vision subsumes and transcends the visions of both Meliboeus and Tityrus," writes C. Perkell, "Eclogues," in "Vergilian Scholarship in the Ninties," W. W. Briggs, Jr. ed., *Vergilius* 36 (1990) 52; with specific comments on the import of 'Meliboeus' in my own "Response to a Bemused Reader" (above, *Foreword*, n. 6) 58-59.

<sup>41</sup> Apt what Patterson says of the weighted motifs associated with Meliboeus, e.g. 'fatherland' (p. 2); cf. "Titiro: i motivi dell'andata e ritorno. Melibeo: i motivi dell'andare lontano," *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 59-66.

departure would seem to warrant.<sup>42</sup> Exegetes aside, Virgil stages the scenario with such elaborate art, advertising the skill of the singers and the presence of an authoritative figure, Daphnis, that no one can doubt the seriousness of his investment, its implication of a poetics,<sup>43</sup> or its punctilious variation on the poetics suggested through the ‘Tityrus’ of eclogue six.<sup>44</sup>

A fuller dialectical reading would not only come to terms with this renewed pairing of ‘Tityrus’ and ‘Meliboeus’, but would look ahead to the next eclogue, where Virgil invents yet another narratorial figure. This is the third narrator in the series begun with ‘Tityrus’ and ‘Meliboeus’. Arguably then it represents yet a further facet of the “*authorial ego*.” Like its two predecessors, this narrator is portrayed in an imaginary scenario as coming from other concerns. It is represented like them as aware of other horizons. With respect to the bucolic foreground, then, all three narrators are conceived as secondary figures: onlooking, overhearing, and conveying the poetic product of others. As the scenario in the eighth eclogue unfolds, the new narrator is characterized, too, as fascinated by bucolic contrast, but unlike

<sup>42</sup> One obstacle to understanding Arcadia in the *Bucolics* has been the notion that it pervades, a notion energetically deconstructed by Richard Jenkyns, “Virgil and Arcadia,” *JRS* LXXIX (1989) 26-39. Analytic impetus carries Jenkyns so that the *Bucolics* are left in bits and pieces, like Orpheus after the mothers. Nowhere does any sense peep through of the poetics of the poems, painstaking synthesis and remediation (‘weaving’ a self-reflexive metaphor in the text). Methodologically this seems of a time and culture alien to what produced the theoretically sophisticated studies of Augustan culture and poetics cited above from the same place. Mistakenly, Jenkyns’ title led me to expect some larger address to the structural importance of Arcadian motifs through Virgil’s works: see my *Design*, pp. 227-231; also “Snell’s view wrong,” pp. 72, 168, 190, which anticipate Jenkyns without throwing the baby out.

<sup>43</sup> So E. E. Beyers, “Vergil: Eclogue 7..A Theory of Poetry,” *Acta Classica* 5 (1962) 38-47; cf. *Poesia e potere* (n. 5 above) 137-148: “Il gioco dello accertamento. 1. La commistione delle poetiche. 2. Melibeo: i motivi del ritorno ‘da vicino’. 3. La contesa: rilettura e scelta.”

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *Poesia e potere* (n. 5 above) 119-136: “Il rimpasto. 1. Titiro: il ‘rialzo’ poetico e i motivi del ‘ribasso’ a metà. 2. Il potere del canto si risveglia. 3. La chiusa mediante chiasmo. 4. Lo sfondo poetico: dal Permesso alle fonti arcadi.”

‘Meliboeus’ not conveying both sides. Virgil makes this latest intermediary report ‘Maenalian, sc. Arcadian, verses’ that tell of failure in love, but then refuse to relate the opposite, which consists of ‘songs’ with magical power in love.<sup>45</sup> The latter are left by the narrator to the Muses.<sup>46</sup> The excuse alleged, ‘Not all things can we all do’, is the disclaimer with which Patterson and the present essay begin.

The disclaimer, we are now in a position to remark, comes late in a multiplex development of “*authorial ego*.” Virgil uses it to characterize and set apart the third in his series, after the successive citings of ‘Meliboeus’ and ‘Tityrus’. All three narrators are conceived as retrospective, each presented as returning, looking in from another perspective, outside or above, and each making a disclaimer of some sort.

What these successive disclaimers imply in terms of “*authorial ego*” will have to be left to the supplement.<sup>47</sup> In closing, we can only cite further hints that they point backwards, into the eclogue book and forwards into Virgil’s subsequent career.<sup>48</sup> The trail takes up where Virgil makes his narrator in eclogue eight look beyond while spurning a particular strain in bucolic; for he adapts language to express both the higher ambitions and the disclaimer from eclogue four.<sup>49</sup> In making the disclaimer, he modulates into the minor key a dominant note from four.<sup>50</sup> There the motif itself

<sup>45</sup> Arcadian song gets reported by the narrator, who eschews a more closely Sicilian (Theocritean) song: see *Poesia e potere* (n. 5) 144, “Verso arcade e canto di potere.” *potere.*”

<sup>46</sup> Yet the same Muses aided ‘Tityrus’ to narrate the singing in eclogue six: *B.* 6.13, “Pergite, Pierides,” cf. *B.* 8.63, “Dicite, Pierides: non omnia possumus omnes.” A further development in “*authorial ego*” appears to be signalled by the changes.

<sup>47</sup> The poetics of song are at issue, see *Poesia e potere* and my “Response to a Bemused Reader” (above, *Foreword*, n. 4) 63, n. 30.

<sup>48</sup> On its exemplary role for later poets, see L. Lipking, *The Life of the Poet. Beginning and Ending Poetic Careers* (Chicago 1984).

<sup>49</sup> “tua dicere facta” (8.8), cf. 4.54. On the programmatic nature of these horizons, see my “*Commentaria in Maronem Commenticia: A Case History of Bucolics Misread*,” in *Virgil: 2000 Years = Arethusa* 14 (1981) 17-34.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. “omnis feret omnia tellus,” *B.* 4.39. Other reductions or inversions of motifs from *B.* 4 also occur in *B.* 8, and progressively throughout the last half of the eclogue

embodied traces of earlier texts, echoing material from the book,<sup>51</sup> also transposing a theme from Lucretius.<sup>52</sup>

The scenario of the ambitious and discriminating narrator likewise points ahead. In the ninth eclogue, Virgil breaks the narratorial progression and reverts to dramatic dialogue, which turns on the absence of the powerful and unifying singer, ‘Menalcas’.<sup>53</sup> The narrative form returns in eclogue ten, where the versatile “*authorial ego*” creates a scenario that brings the narrator to an unprecedented notional place and time: Arcadia imagined as pre-mythic, certainly pre-bucolic, which is to say, before the nymph Arethusa leaves for Sicily where she is known to Theocritus. The scene is peopled with recapitulative characters from the eclogue book, among them ‘Menalcas’ and Pan.<sup>54</sup>

Beyond the eclogue book, the scenario of the observer looking if not down recurs at a later turning point. Looking back from the end of the *Georgics* to the beginning of the *Bucolics*,

---

book: see Andrée Richter, *Virgile la huitième Bucolique* (Paris 1977) 54-61, and my chapter, “La Rassegna: Verso arcade e canto di potere,” *Poesia e potere. Il mito Virgilio* (Roma 1986) 149-59.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *B.* 3.60-61: “ab Ioue principium Musae, Iouis omnia plena,/ ille colit terras, illi mea carmina curae.” The fourth eclogue augments and caps material from pieces that precede: e.g. Charles P. Segal, “Pastoral Realism and the Golden Age: Correspondence and Contrast Between Virgil’s Third and Fourth Eclogues,” *Philologus* 121 (1977) 158-163, reprinted in *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral* (Princeton 1981) 265-70; also now in *Poesia e potere* (n. 50), “Il compimento e il progetto dei ritorni (EG III): 1. Il canto ricupera il registro alto; 2. Si compie una struttura; 3. La riconquista della rete intertestuale; 4. Rifondare la tradizione epica,” pp. 91-106.

<sup>52</sup> See Alpers (cited in *Foreword*, n. 8) and Chapter three.

<sup>53</sup> For the nexus of *Bucolics* 8 and 9, see *Poesia e potere* (n. 5 above) 149-166, “La rassegna (EG VIII + VIII). VIII). 1. Il potere della lettura strutturale. 2. Verso arcade e canto di potere (EG viii). 3. Il canto ridotto e differito (EG VIII).”

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *Poesia e potere* (n. 5 above) 167-188: “Ritorno “Ritorno compiuto alle fonti (EG X). 1. Il commiato dai motivi: il potere di Amore. 2. Breve rassegna dei codici di lettura. 3. Ritorni e chiose strutturali. 4. Le fonti riconquistate: il mito arcade. 5. La rivisitazione dei motivi.”

Virgil identifies himself *in propria persona* with the perspective of ‘Meliboeus’. He recalls and revises the opening of the first eclogue, saying ‘You, Tityrus, I sang under cover of beech’.<sup>55</sup> The final echo implies that, among the facets of “*authorial ego*,” ‘Tityrus’ typified the bucolic valence, while ‘Meliboeus’ figured a wider background and higher ambition.

Turning the full force of Patterson’s approach on the *Bucolics*, one would integrate the usual suspects and move dialectically to include what had been left out. One would sniff out the traces of dissembled “*authorial ego*,” that knit up the eclogue book and people it with representative personae in emblematic scenarios. In the resultant revision, ‘Tityrus’ might seem to found and frame a newly vatic and Roman strain in the old bucolic genre. ‘Menalcas’ somehow would herd this new enterprise from Theocritean bucolic origins to a new pastoral foundation on Arcadian grounds. The singer ‘Meliboeus’ would figure the more epical past and future compass within these local adjustments took place.<sup>56</sup>

The dialectical and integrative bent of Virgil’s mind has hardly been the forte of the elucidators Patterson trusted for her view of the meaning and structure of the eclogue book (p. 6). The text awaits further study with tools like hers. Beyond may lie a fourth project. Where the first two supplemented after and before her main concerns, the third would complicate her reading of the founding text, thus providing reason to look again the practice of humanists and poets, some of whom may turn out to have read Virgil in a more integrative manner than we could have recognized before.

A dialectical and integrative reading of the *Bucolics* might spark yet a fifth project. The concept of dialectical integration invites comparison with the concept of analogy that informs a strong reading of Theocritus by Kathryn Gutzwiller.<sup>57</sup> She studies Theocritus, and the ideology of bucolic genre before and after, in ways that invite comparison with Patterson and suggest a new

<sup>55</sup> *G.* 4.566, “Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi”; cf. *B.* 1.1, “Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi.” In retrospect, both ‘Tityrus’ and the singer are set beneath the beech, within the bucolic confines, which is a far cry from the motif attributed to the singer in the eclogue: *B.* 1.77, ‘No songs will I sing,’ “*carmina nulla canam.*”

<sup>56</sup> On the poetics of song in the eclogue book, see *Foreword*, n. 3.

<sup>57</sup> Kathryn J. Gutzwiller, *Theocritus’ Pastoral Analogies. The Formation of a Genre* (Madison 1991).

estimate of relations between Theocritus and Virgil. To such an undertaking, however, Gutzwiller herself contributes virtually nothing. The implications of her new Theocritus for Virgil remain to be worked out.

Closing with reproach for the complacency of recent academic pastoralism, Patterson decries its conception of a mind and genre that are stable, abstracted from underlying and surrounding realities, which for these platitudinous moderns consist of cushioning institutional support. More aware of contingency, she ends:

Virgil himself both regretted and denied the inefficacy of song (for which read humanist writing) in the hard times, *tela inter Martia*, doves among eagles; yet the ninth eclogue taught us the necessary conclusion:

Desine plura... et quod nunc instat agamus.<sup>58</sup>

Urgent and enigmatic, her close invites her readers to make once more the metaphorical leap of identifying a project of our own with a moment in Virgil.<sup>59</sup> Given the scenario of the ninth eclogue, if we identify with the figure she cites, we are compelled to think of leaving our familiar and productive place. Everything we stood for and that stood for us has come to nothing. In the course of flight, shade is being stripped from the trees. Only too easily the picture of displacement and defoliated landscape brings to mind the destruction of nature in our own time, our foreboding more absolute and universal than any Virgil could envisage, nature itself no longer natural anywhere. In the eclogue at least, old husbandmen can be replaced by new. Nature will be there for someone. The possibility of new order remains.

To make her closing allegory, Patterson omits a word, “puer,” which was addressed to an interlocutor, one characterized in the scenario as younger, still eager for ‘song’, having to be put off by the present need to go. The word takes us for a moment back, out of the grim route, for it echoes more confident moments in the book, before the series of disclaimers, when the project for ‘still greater song’ held the stage and a “puer” was imagined being

<sup>58</sup> B. 9. 66: ‘Cease speaking further... and what now presses let us do’.

<sup>59</sup> ‘For we, too, have lived to hear that harsh word spoken to us, *These are mine, old inhabitants go away*’, “*Viui enim et nos peruenimus quibus dicatur durum illud, Haec mea sunt, ueteres migrate coloni*”: thus Aldus Manutius identifies his own exile with that of the fleeing herdsman in the ninth eclogue: preface to *Pindarus* (Venice 1513).

born. The echo reminds us that in the economy of the eclogue book, the despair of the ninth eclogue is local and instrumental, carrying off particular elements that have no role but to get out of the way at this late moment in the whole plan. The routed figures are traces of particular strains, facets in an evolving and multiplex poetics, song as magic, residues of historicity, of ‘Tityrus’ and the powerful vatic strain itself. All must clear out, giving way for the final accomplishment of the last eclogue, which at last recovers the bucolic homeland, placing song on Arcadian ground, where the master absent from eclogue nine, ‘Menalcas’, will appear at home. Patterson’s motto, then, is a local function, not a general operator, and as such resembles the disclaimers from the preceding eclogues.<sup>60</sup> The local utterances of loss and limitation serve the progress of larger plans. Through the art of integrative dialectic ‘Virgil’ seems organized to get it all, both the immediate Arcadian gratification and the more far-reaching song.

These intimations of wider dialectic, more deeply integrated, might justify our fourth project, with a new look at Patterson’s material, to sort out those that truly flattened the dialectic from any, few, that recaptured something like its scope. Yet all such projects, if I read Patterson well, risk luxuriousness in a sense articulated by Valéry. And “projects” in this connection must mean equally the openness to fine allusion or closure to its presence, all scholastic ardors, all the tissue of remeditations, intimacies of the echo-chamber, all of what Patterson calls “pleasures of the text and allure of perpetual revision”: all tainted with academic security and narcissistic marginality like that which Valéry evokes:<sup>61</sup>

This is the way *ladies* used to be treated. They were showered with attention, they governed manners, but their gallant privileges stopped there, and their authority vanished at the smallest piece of serious business.

Casting the opprobrium back on academic pastoralists, rather gently if one considers how they cling to certain habits of thought,<sup>62</sup> Patterson moves to her resolute close. Prophetic and

<sup>60</sup> The disclaimer undergoes further reduction in the ninth eclogue, from “non omnia possumus omnes” (8.63) to “omnia fert aetas” (9. ), ‘Time takes everything away’.

<sup>61</sup> Quoted by Patterson (op. cit.) 331, from “Is the Mind a Luxury,” *History and Politics*, in *Collected Works* 10 (New York 1963) 366-67.

<sup>62</sup> My own latest strictures on certain conceptions of pastoral appear in “Response to a Bemused Reader,” (above, *Foreword* n. 4) 61. The seriousness of Virgil’s business in poetry, and its dialectical art, are treated by Katharine Toll,

parainetic, somewhat in the style of a *uates* herself,<sup>63</sup> her motto urges doing what can be done in a crisis. What she intends she does not add, but thinking it over a reader fresh from her book may understand that here again a Virgilian motto is self-reflexive, now looking back to the deconstruction of ideology already carried out in her book. Her envoi earned, she has done what she sees to do.

Virgilian maxims dictated by particular scenarios yield supplementary sense as traces of the protean “*authorial* ego.” A *puer* suppressed and a broken *uates* emulated to make an envoi that affirms an agenda, both act as traces that return our minds to eclogue four — confident engagement with history and culture — redoubling the rebuke to academic fuss. The integrating play gets home, dialectic reopens, minds get new reasons to begin.

---

“The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam Laeto Socii Clamore Salutant*,” *Helios* 18 (1991) 3-14.

<sup>63</sup> The old ‘Moeris’ Patterson quotes is represented obliquely as a *uates* or friend of one at *B.* 9.33-34. In the scenario, a more youthful and optimistic ‘Lycidas’ speaks, seeking to elicit song from ‘Moeris’: ‘Me, too, [sc. like you, Moeris, or your erstwhile protector, the absent Menalcas] herdsmen call / bard, but I do not believe them’, “Me quoque dicunt / uatem pastores, sed non ego credulus illis.”