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, Id. 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 Meliboëus: Ramus), which recalls Plato’s ambivalence toward certain kinds of dialogue: “ο ὄν κωμοδόν φορ’ ικόν πράγμα...ποιεῖν ἀν’ αποδίδον’ ἐ’ ἀλλήλω’, ἵνα μισθοφόρος (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: Ποίαν οε φῶμεν γαίαν ἐκλειπτο’α | πολυξενόθεαι, γη δὲ τ’ ἤ, πα’ ρα’ θ’ ὑρ’; (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

---

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 agelli
temptabant fructusque feros mansuescere terra
cernebant indulgendo blandaeque colendo.
inque dies magis in montem succedere siluas
(cogebant) infraque locum concedere cultis
(thence again and again care of the sweet little field
they attempted and saw earth tame wild fruits
with cosseting and soothing care.
And daily they drove the woods to proceed more
uphill and cede the space below to cared-for plots.)

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 demurrall (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; 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], ὁ δὲ άυτόν γλύκιον ἣ πα' θιδό’ (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 M eliboeus’ 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, φευγεῖν πα' θιδα, πρό εὖ, quod exulare est (flee the fatherland, for go into exile); and Guellius saw a tragic juxtaposition: Δι' αν δὲ λυποῦσαι χθόνα σύγχορον 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 M eliboeus 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’ ευπλοκάμου πολιή ἀλό' ἐν πελάγεσι | θεοσάμενοι γλυκερόν νόσσον (much amidst the stretches of fair-haired hoary sea praying for sweet homecoming: Archilochus 8 West), itself an epic juxtaposition, cf. 0 d. 1.14-5, πολλά...νόσσον.
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.”

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, to say nothing of shady groves in Homer, or valued shade in Theocritus, or in epigrams.

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, 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,” a usage that confers a colloquial tone.


99 ἐν νέμετι σκιερῷ (in a shady grove: Il. 11.480); ἄλογον ὑπὸ σκιερὸν ἑκα’ ἡμέρας Ἀπόλλωνος (beneath a shady grove of far-darting Apollo: Od. 20.278), cf. 8. 6.73, lucus...Apollo.

100 Id. 5.48-49, καὶ ὁ σκία οὐδὲν ὤμοιν | ἅ παρά ὑπ’; Id. 7.138, πο’ ὁ σκιαρὰ ὁροδαμνῖον; cf. Id. 12.8.

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

102 M ercari uius mihi sum formosam capram (I supposed I was trading a well-formed she-goat: Plautus, M erc. 229), ipse ecus, non formonsus, gradarius, optimus uector (itself the horse, not well formed, steady,

103 Clausen 1994.36.

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. “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 cauas 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.)

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: ‘Αχώ δ’ ἐν πέρι ημῶν ὄδυρε’ αι, ὡ” νι σωπ’ | κοὐκ’ ἵ μεμε’ αι ἀ ο α θείεα (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 A contius seated beneath oaks or elms and saying something that was reported by Aristanetus as εἶθε, ὁ δένδρα, καὶ νοῦ ὡ µίν γένοι †ο καὶ  
φωνή, ὅπω ἐν εἰτη’ ε 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.
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:

Τιτυρίον ἵππον ἑλάτων. Κωμάδω πο’ι ἀν Ἀμαρυλλίδα, οἱ δὲ μοι αἴγες βοσκον’ αἱ καὶ ὄροι, καὶ ο Τιτυρός αὐτά ἐλαιότει. Τιτυρίον ἐκ μίν ὁ καλὸν πεφυλημένε, βόσκε ἀ’ αἰγα, καὶ πο’ι ἀν κράναν ἅγε, Τιτυρίον καὶ ἄν ἐνορχάν, ὁν Λιβυκόν κνάκωνα, φυλάσσει μὴ οἱ κορύψη.

(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, 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). 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). 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.” In either case, the etymology would involve an animal, leaving Virgil to imply the etymology “reed” in

---

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).
metonymy for “pipe” should he choose. Hunter also raises the specter of double entendre, noting that “ἐλαύνει 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.” 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: ἄσεδομαι πο’ ἰ ἀν πτ’ ἐν ὅδ’ ἀποκλινθεί (here turned aside I shall sing by the pine: 3.38). 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.” An echo of the initial ambition marks the despairing close: οὐκέτ’ ἄετίδω (I’m not going to

114 Cf. Hunter 1999.111: “Among later explanations are that ἰ’υρο’ means κάλαμο ‘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 (Tityre...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’).” Raise the stylistic register and produce a more elaborate performance”: Hunter 1999.121; cf. Iliad. 1.1, ἀείδε. 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. ἔσοδομενοι, 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 (reclabans, 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.

116 Raise the stylistic register and produce a more elaborate performance”:

117 Idem 122.
sing any more, Id. 3.52).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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:\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{Meliboeus’} plot, marking a powerful dynamic of literary succession and démarche in literary position.

All together, the traits of \textit{Meliboeus} represent the cultural matrix from and against which Virgil approached his poetic career. In \textit{Meliboeus}, we have discovered him outlining, and in the process bidding to outdo, a far-ranging and complex literary ecosystem.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Meliboeus}, like \textit{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

\textsuperscript{118} Idem 128: “The present tense indicates, ‘no more singing for me’, but \textit{αἰεὶω} 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).

\textsuperscript{119} But cf. quisquis amores | aut metuet dulces aut experietur amaros (B. 3.109-10).

\textsuperscript{120} Cf. above, nn. 28 and 116.

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

\textsuperscript{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: ὁ χαρίεσσος 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. A M O R, A M A R E.

\(^{125}\) 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 Χαρί’ων ἀμαρύγμα” ἔχουσα (frr. 70.38, 196.6 M-W) gives special point to χαρίεσσος 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) γλυκερὸς βλέμματ’ ο’ ἀπ’ ἐροται, Arg. 3.288, 1018”; for sight in love, cf. above, n. 54.

\(^{126}\) Cf. the first meaning of χαρί’, “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 ὀστὶ ἄγριον παρκύποισα, 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. 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. It had also informed Meleager, other Theocritean contexts, 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 Φαίδρο (bright, beaming) overlaps the semantic field of Amaryllis. 

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 inmortalem et eundem beatum rutilandum esse uelint, quod ea forma neget esse pulchriorem Plato: at mihi uel cylindri uel quadrati uel coni 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).


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, 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.

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 Meliboeeus, 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 Meliboeeus: 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 αν'ρον, cf. ld. 7.149, 11.44; Epigr. 3.5 (Daphnis' shelter), 5.5. In ld. 8.72 a maiden does look out from her cave and call the herder “lovely, lovely”; LSJ call αν'ρον 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.\(^\text{134}\) In keeping with the portrait of M eliboës as a singer no longer able to sing,\(^\text{135}\) the name recalls with irony μελιβοα (sweet singer).\(^\text{136}\) Also, in keeping with the epic and tragic echoes just noted in M eliboës’ language, traces of both genres mark the name. According to Politian, the shepherd that found and nurtured O edipus was called M eliboës.\(^\text{137}\) 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.\(^\text{138}\) 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 A ntenor and A eneas. Thus a trace of Greek myth, as opposed to Trojan, attaches to M eliboës. The Trojan alternative, of course, includes the mythic linkage between A eneas, Romulus, Rome, and the Julian line. That mythology would help position the A eneas 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 M eliboës’ flight. The phrase haec otia (this repose) describes the new domain in language drawn from the domain lost. O tia dia (bright

\(^\text{134}\) The choice signals innovation, differentiation from Theocritus, writes Michelazzo 1987.460a, comparing M oeris (B. 9), as also not in Theocritus but like M eliboës 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.

\(^\text{135}\) Cf. above, nn. 116 and 118.

closing lament (Id. 3.52, 54).


\(^\text{138}\) A en. 3.401-02, ducis M eliboë...Philoctetae: Michelazzo 1987.460d.
repose, DRN 5.1387) had summed up Lucretius’ picture of the first rural culture,\(^\text{139}\) 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.\(^\text{140}\) 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).\(^\text{141}\) 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.\(^\text{142}\) In other epigrams, sacrifice, including a penned lamb, would be offered for erotic satisfaction not in dutiful gratitude for political

\(^{\text{139}}\) 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.

\(^{\text{140}}\) Cf. Benjamin Farrington, “Vergil and Lucretius,” Acta Classica 1 (1958) 45; cited as imitation, without underlining programmatic difference, by Wright 1983.120.

\(^{\text{141}}\) 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.

\(^{\text{142}}\) 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. As an emblem of Virgil’s bucolic domain, “tender lamb” may be more substantial than “tenuous oat” but it also is more taxed. 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. Thus “my cattle” relates Tityrus to Daphnis and Simichidas, confirming the other hints that Virgil intended to create a new foundational figure. Virgil also augments the space allotted Tityrus to more than the initial single beech. “Roaming” (errare) brings out what was already implicit in siluas: “not dense woods but partly open hillside with grazing among the trees.”

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. 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); 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. αρνα...οακτ’αν, 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{151} Since “first” and
“taught” are characteristic motifs in stories of poetic and cultural origin,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{154}

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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{151} Cf. above, n. 41.

\textsuperscript{152} Cf. above, n. 83, and primus at the etiological center of B. 1: 44.

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

\textsuperscript{154} For the importance of Pan for Virgil, see above n. 83.


\textsuperscript{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 Id. 1, 3, 5, 7) imply the difficulty of Virgil’s new venture. Motif of failed divination links this singer with defeated Mōris, 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. Id. 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.

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

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).

[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), 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 (l.d. 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.]

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.
162 Cf. Cicero, Pro Archia poeta 10.24: (Alexander the Great before the tomb of Achilles) ‘o fortunate,’ inquit,
‘adulescens, qui tuae uirtutis Homeri praecognes inueneris!’
163 Cf. above, n. 108.
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 (αν’ρον, Id. 3.6) but would likewise sing no more.]

79-83. Tityrus on conditional present of the two characters in repose (meicum 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: ὁ μακαριὸς ἔ Κομα (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, 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).

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 = πῆξά', cf. πάξαιμ, 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 monarchical 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.
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when he plants the oar; cf. the relationship of laurels to Apollo in B. 6.83.