THE HIERARCHY OF HERDSMEN, GOATHERDING, AND GENRE IN THEOCRITEAN BUCOLIC

DANIEL W. BERMAN

MODERN CRITICS OFTEN CREDIT THEOCRITUS with inventing a new poetic genre.[1] Still, Theocritean bucolic poetry, while clearly the beginning of something new and enduring, is as much the result of a reformulation and modification of precedents as it is an entirely new form.[2] I wish to re-examine here one feature of Theocritean bucolic, the supposed "hierarchy of herdsmen," with these observations in mind. In portraying the differing herding professions—namely cowherds, shepherds, and goatherds, which are strenuously distinguished from each other in the poems—Theocritus deftly uses existing literary structures of meaning, most notably from early epic, for programmatic purposes. Representation of herdsmen, especially the goatherds Lycidas and Comatas of *Idyll* 7 and Comatas of *Idyll* 5, becomes one way the poet creates, and broadcasts, his new bucolic poetics.

Whether a pastoral hierarchy—that cowherds or oxherds (βουκόλοι) are somehow superior to shepherds (ποιμένες), who are in turn superior to goatherds (αἰπόλοι)[3]—exists within the poems of Theocritus has been a debated question for some years.[4] Real-life economic concerns certainly could play a role in the perception of such a hierarchy, since cattle were more expensive to purchase and raise than sheep or goats (as they still are).[5] But a strict system of ordering within the bucolic poetry of Theocritus is difficult to trace without controversy. Thus

I wish to thank Gordon Williams for encouraging the ideas that formed the core of this paper some years ago. I am also grateful to Paul Harvey, Stephen Wheeler, and the readers for *Phoenix*, who all offered suggestions that sharpened my argument. Any infelicities that remain are, of course, my own.

[1] Halperin (1983: 2) offers a list of such commentators; see comments and notes also in Hunter 1999: 5–12 (an excellent short discussion of the nature of "bucolic" and "pastoral") and Hubbard 1998: 19–20.

[2] For a detailed examination of the problems associated with genre inception and its repercussions in Theocritean studies, see especially Gutzwiller 1991: 3–19 and Hubbard 1998: 1–44. Important work on the nature of Theocritean bucolic as a new genre has been done by Fantuzzi (1980), Gutzwiller (1991), and Thomas (1996), the last of whose comments are important for my own observations below.

[3] In what follows I shall use the term "cowherd" to translate βουκόλος or βούτης, though one could just as easily translate as "oxherd" or "neatherd." ποιμήν is the standard term for a herder of sheep; οἰοπόλος and similar formulations are not found in Theocritus.

[4] Gow (1952) mentions the possibility in a note on 1.86; the prospect is championed by Van Groningen (1958), who is followed more or less enthusiastically by Van Sickle (1970), Rossi (1971), and Halperin (1983: esp. 182–184 and 182, n. 94). There are opponents, as well, the most forceful of whom is Schmidt (1969 and 1987: 37–55; substantially the same as 1969, which I shall cite in notes *infra*), who traces the perceived hierarchy to the commentators of the fifth century.

[5] Witness our "cattleman," a term that retains some of the positive connotations of the Greek βουκόλος. This is due, most probably, to matters of economic value. Cattle are larger, and thus require more food and space, and can be used for plowing. All of these factors contribute to their higher

PHOENIX, VOL. 59 (2005) 3–4.

I shall begin by examining the claims made by critics that a strict hierarchy of herdsmen exists in Theocritean bucolic. Once we have sketched the outlines of this claim, I shall turn to Homer and the tragic poets to show that there exists in the earlier tradition an established system of markings of herdsmen (especially cowherds and goatherds) that must force a modification of our understanding of the hierarchy in Theocritus; in addition, the presence of this tradition belies the poet's role as the inventor of such a hierarchy. Instead, the legacy of Melantheus, the traitorous goatherd of the *Odyssey*, runs a parallel and contrary course with that of legendary cowherds such as Daphnis, sometimes credited with founding bucolic or pastoral poetry himself,[6] Anchises, and even Apollo. Theocritus elevates and embraces the role of the goatherd, with its traditionally negative marking, while not neglecting aspects of the original connotations of either that character or the noble cowherd. The poet's "bucolic" poetry (a term, of course, Theocritus himself uses)[7] thus exhibits a renovated representation of herdsmen when viewed in the light of the Greek tradition. It plays with existing categories rather than inventing, or for that matter adopting, any sort of strictly defined hierarchy. This literary process gives Theocritean bucolic poetry the feeling of being novel and unexpected, while also integrating it into the poetic tradition.

A HIERARCHY OF HERDSMEN IN THEOCRITUS?

Over the years some critics have seen evidence of an extensive hierarchy of herdsmen in the poetry of Theocritus.[8] Recognition of the presence of a hierarchy in bucolic poetry (though not necessarily in that of Theocritus) goes back at least as far as the commentator Donatus, in fact, who wrote in his *Vita Vergiliana*:[9]

---

economic status, relative to sheep and goats, which in ancient times were often tended together in single ("ovicaprine") herds. On ancient pastoral economies, see Hodkinson 1988, drawing economic distinctions between bovine and ovicaprine herds and commenting that bovine herds are more resistant to decimation due to disease or drought (60). See also Skydsgaard 1988, in the same volume, and Gabba and Pasquinucci 1979, especially 161–169 ("Gli animali e i prodotti"), on Roman Italy.

[6] This detail was, according to Aelian (*V.H.* 10.18), recounted by Stesichorus, and survives in many accounts of Daphnis, including those of Diodorus, Parthenius, and Servius. See Gow's (1952) introduction to the first *Idyll*, 1–2, and Hunter 1999: 63–68.

[7] On the term as a marker of genre, see the overview in Hunter 1999: 5–9. Of course, the very terms "bucolic" (βουκολικός) and βουκολιάσδεσθαι are implicated in the present discussion, since in early Greek the stem of both refers primarily to cowherds (*pace* Hunter 1999: 8, n. 26: if a woman can be called Andromache, why not a shepherd Boucolion?; on the mares of Erichthonius, see below, 233, n. 21; also Dover 1971: liv–lv, with useful comments, including one exception from Aristotle [*Hist. Anim.* 611a28] where βουκόλος must mean "herdsman," not "cowherd"). In Theocritus, both the verb and the adjective, when it is attached to poetic or musical terminology, clearly refer to a specific type of singing; note in this sense especially *Idyll* 7.49: ἀλλ' ἄγε βουκολικᾶς ταχέως ἀρξώμεθ' ἀοιδᾶς. While the verb βουκολιάσδεσθαι seems to carry this connotation consistently in Theocritus, other words of the βουκολ– stem refer most often to cowherds or cowherding, not singing.

[8] Van Groningen (1958: 313–317) makes the strongest case, and gives the best summary of the evidence on which it rests.

[9] Text in Wendel 1967: 17.

Tria genera pastorum sunt qui dignitatem in bucolicis habent, quorum minimi sunt qui αἰπόλοι *dicuntur a Graecis, a nobis caprarii; paulo honoratiores qui* μηλονόμοι ποιμένες, *id est opiliones, dicuntur; honoratissimi et maximi qui* βουκόλοι, *quos bubulcos dicimus.*

There are three types of herdsmen who gain status in bucolic poetry. The lowest of these are the ones we call goatherds, the Greeks αἰπόλοι; a bit more honored are the μηλονόμοι ποιμένες, that is shepherds; the most respected and greatest are the βουκόλοι, whom we call cowherds.[10]

Clearly, Donatus' observation is based at least in part on the differing value of the animals herded. But his remark provides clear evidence that at least by the fifth century commentators believed that a hierarchy, whether real or fictional, existed in the poetic pastoral world of Vergil. Since Theocritus' bucolic poetry is the unchallenged progenitor of Vergilian pastoral, many have concluded that the hierarchy in fact originated with the Alexandrian poet.

Indeed, the three types of herdsmen are clearly distinguished in the *Idylls*, with no one term (βουκόλος/βούτης, ποιμήν, αἰπόλος) interchangeable with any other in the system.[11] Beginning with this sound observation, proponents of the hierarchy go on to list numerous details that seem to support the claim that herdsmen are represented in the poems in a specific, and rigid, order of quality. The three professions, for example, are referred to in apparent hierarchical order (cowherds, then shepherds, then goatherds) in several poems.[12] In addition, the term αἰπόλος is used occasionally by the singing herdsmen in the poems as an insult, twice coupled with the term δύσερως.[13] Another factor is the generally unkempt appearance and unpleasant odor of goatherds.[14] Similarly, in *Idyll* 4, the cowherd Aegon tells the goatherd Battus to put on shoes—a seeming insult based on class (4.56). Interpersonal contact between herdsmen is also brought to bear here; critics have noted that conversation between two cowherds is polite (*Idyll* 6), but that between a shepherd and a goatherd vulgar and abusive

[10] All translations are my own.

[11] *Contra* Schmidt 1969: 189. This holds true except for Theocritean uses of βουκολικά, βουκολιάσδεσθαι, and βουκολιαστής, which can have meanings connected to poetic typology (i.e., meaning "bucolic"); see above, 229, n. 7.

[12] For example, 1.80: ἤνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ὠπόλοι ἦνθον; in fact, often throughout the bucolic poems, when more than one herdsman is mentioned, cowherds are spoken of first, followed by shepherds and goatherds. See also 20.34–36, where two loves of Aphrodite are listed, first the cowherd Anchises, and second Adonis, a shepherd. A similar list occurs at 1.105–110, when again Aphrodite's loves are recounted, with Paris and Anchises mentioned first, both cowherds, followed by the shepherd Adonis.

[13] At 1.86, where Priapus chastises Daphnis for acting more like a goatherd than a cowherd, and at 6.7, where Galatea uses the term αἰπόλος insultingly with reference to Polyphemus, a shepherd: δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῦσα. Both passages couple the word δύσερως with αἰπόλος, which can hardly be a compliment, whatever the specific connotations of the word.

[14] Theocritus includes details of their stench at 5.52 and probably 7.16. ταμίσοιο, "rennet," used in description of Lycidas' goatskin, most likely refers to the smell of sour milk or cheese. See Gow's (1952: 2.136) note on 7.16.

(*Idyll* 5). *Idyll* 1, which presents an exchange between the shepherd Thyrsis and an unnamed goatherd represents the shepherd consistently employing a more civilized level of discourse than the goatherd.[15]

Three of the *Idylls* depict singing contests between herdsmen (5, 6, and ps.-Theocritus 8),[16] but here, where we might expect to find conclusive evidence that one type of herdsman is perceived to be superior over another, the evidence is less definitive. The results of two of these contest poems do appear to reflect a hierarchical ordering: in poem 6, two cowherds, Daphnis and Damoetas,[17] sing to a draw, and in poem 8, Daphnis the cowherd is victorious over the shepherd Menalcas. But *Idyll* 5 is more ambiguous. In that poem, a goatherd named Comatas is victorious over Lacon, a shepherd. While there are features of the poem that point toward some hierarchical ordering (the two attempt to use a cowherd as their judge, for example), the outcome of the contest tells us either that the hierarchy is not as ironclad as it might be, or perhaps that the results of singing contests are not the best gauge of hierarchical relationships of this type. I will have more to say on this result below; in either case, there seems to be an anomaly here that demands explanation.

These pieces of evidence show that herdsmen as they appear in the bucolic poems of Theocritus—usually as interlocutors and singers, sometimes competitively abrasive with each other, sometimes not—are not all of equal stature and respect. But it is difficult to find solid evidence for a strict continuum of herdsmen, aside from the assertions of later commentators such as Donatus and a few later writers of pastoral or bucolic.[18] Instead, it seems quite clear that in the poems of Theocritus, one herdsman—the cowherd—is elevated above the rest, while another—the goatherd—is often, but not in all instances, denigrated. But even if we adopt this modified understanding of the hierarchy, we need to explain the

[15] On the differing registers of conversations between herdsmen, see especially Van Groningen 1958: 314.

[16] This argument will not rely on observations on *Idyll* 8, which is most probably written by a skilled imitator. Because this poem's treatment of herding professions seems to fit within the patterns I trace in *Idylls* 1, 5, 6, and 7, however, I include reference to it. On the poem's status in the Theocritean corpus, see Fantuzzi 1998: 62, n. 2 and 69–71; Hubbard 1998: 34–35; Rossi 1971.

[17] The identification of Damoetas as a cowherd is inferential. Though he is nowhere explicitly called a βουκόλος or βούτης, no grazing animals aside from cattle are mentioned in the poem, except for Polyphemus' sheep. Gow (1952: 2.120) makes the identification in his note on 6.1.

[18] This is the conclusion of Schmidt (1969), who traces the origin of the hierarchy to Donatus and the Vergilian commentators. The most interesting subsequent literary material on this question is Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* 1.16.1, where the cowherd Dorcon states ἐγώ, παρθένε, μείζων εἰμὶ Δάφνιδος, καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν βουκόλος, ὁ δὲ αἰπόλος· τοσοῦτον <οὖν ἐγὼ> κρείττων ὅσον αἰγῶν βόες ("Young lady, I am greater than Daphnis: I am a cowherd and he a goatherd, <thus> I am as much better than him as cattle are than goats." The text is that of Edmonds and Gaselee 1916, the insertion from Cobet; see also Morgan's commentary, 2004: 165). This appears to state outright that a hierarchy exists, based clearly on animal worth. In fact, the passage might best be read as an instance of thematic intertextuality (Dorcon reading Theocritus?), and at any rate supports even more strongly the system of markings I propose below.

mysterious victory of Comatas in *Idyll* 5, as well as the prominence of the goatherd Lycidas (and another goatherd Comatas, who appears in his song) in *Idyll* 7. To do this, and to understand how representations of herdsmen in the poems in fact come to carry programmatic meaning far beyond that of simple representation of the countryside and its colorful inhabitants, we must turn back to Homer and the earlier Greek tradition. We shall see that Theocritus adopts, and adapts, associations long present in Greek poetic discourse concerning herdsmen as a way of forging his own poetic terrain, both as a part of, and distinct from, the tradition of *epos*.

HERDSMEN IN HOMER AND BEYOND

Keeping the possible hierarchical system explored above in mind, it will be worthwhile to examine the portrayal of some important and influential herdsmen in the earlier Greek tradition, especially in Homer.[19] Certain professions of herdsmen, namely the highest in the supposed hierarchy, the cowherd, and the lowest, the goatherd, carry connotations that can, in fact, be traced to a system of markings established in the Homeric poems. Cowherds are positively marked through association of the trade with such noble and heroic figures as Anchises, Paris, and even Apollo, while goatherding obtains a thoroughly negative marking, primarily stemming from the portrayal of the goatherd Melantheus in the *Odyssey*. Shepherds seem to exist in a medial space in this early literature, able to be influenced in either direction. This system, then, of positive, neutral, and negative marking, reinforced by the continuing economic distinctions between animals, and of specific characteristics herdsmen sometimes display, becomes the literary tool Theocritus uses to help define his new bucolic poetry.

This system of marking has its origins in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[20] Perhaps the most influential instance of the elevation of cowherding in the Homeric poems occurs in the *Iliad* in a simple comment by Poseidon. In book 21 he goads Apollo (448–449): Φοῖβε, σὺ δ' εἰλίποδας ἕλικας βοῦς βουκολέεσκες / Ἴδης ἐν κνημοῖσι πολυπτύχου ὑληέσσης ("Phoebus, you were tending the shambling cattle on the slopes of many-folded woody Ida"). The lines are spoken as a reproach, since Poseidon has made the point that while Apollo was tending cattle he himself was aiding the Trojans. Poseidon's words, however, specifically associate the activity of herding cattle with Apollo, thus bringing significant respect to the practice. The legend of Apollo's time spent tending the cattle of Admetus, alluded to in this Iliadic passage, is also present in the later classical tradition; the most prominent example is to be found in Euripides' *Alcestis*, in

[19] Gutzwiller (1991: 23–79) offers a broader survey than I present here. I focus on Homer and on specific features of the representation of herdsmen relevant to the system I have traced above.

[20] On representations of herdsmen in the Homeric poems, see especially Bernsdorff (2001: 50–66), who begins with a useful survey of earlier scholarship. He gives the majority of his attention to the *Iliad*, however, while the groundwork for the markings I trace comes equally from the *Odyssey*.

which the god himself mentions his servitude as a cowherd in the prologue of the play.[21] Apollo's association with herding cattle is important for several reasons: first, the Homeric reference gives the profession the positive connotation of being associated with a god, and second, that god is none other than Apollo, divine bard and patron of poets. In the passage from the *Iliad* and the legend's echoes in later texts such as *Alcestis*, the cowherd is marked as a practitioner of a divine profession dear to Apollo, and thus as both noble and gifted in song. To be a cowherd is to play Apollo's role.[22]

The profession gains stature from another prominent cowherd in the Homeric poems, Anchises, father of Aeneas. At the moment when Aphrodite appears on the battlefield to spirit away Aeneas, who has been hit by a stone tossed by Diomedes, the narrator pauses to describe the goddess's relationship to her son (*Il.* 5.311–313):

> καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
> εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη
> μήτηρ, ἥ μιν ὑπ' Ἀγχίσῃ τέκε βουκολέοντι.
>
> Now the lord of men Aeneas would have died,
> If Aphrodite, daughter of Zeus, his mother, had not keenly noticed,
> Who bore him to Anchises while that one tended cattle.

Here the act of cowherding is again elevated through association. Anchises is identified both as a cowherd and as the lover of a goddess, the father of Aeneas by Aphrodite. The encounter is narrated in lavish detail in the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*, as well, where Anchises is also "herding cattle" while "looking in form like a god" (βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ἐοικώς, 55). The tradition of a liaison between the goddess and the cowherd Anchises is a strong one. Would a goatherd tempt her as much?

Cowherds in Homer, though practitioners of a divine profession, can also gain respect in more earthly ways. The finest example is Philoetius, Odysseus'

[21] *Alcestis* 8: ἐλθὼν δὲ γαῖαν τήνδ' ἐβουφόρβουν ξένῳ ("When I came to this land I tended cattle for my host"). Dale (1954, on *Alcestis* 8) cites the scholiast who asserts that the verb βουφορβέω can denote the pasturage of animals other than cattle. But there is no reason to see a dilution of the quite exact lexicon of herding here. Apollo is engaging in his normal, and Homeric, practice of tending cattle; cf. *Il.* 5.311–313, discussed below. *Iliad* 20.221–222 (also cited by Dale), where βουκολέω is used of horses (τοῦ τρισχίλιαι ἵπποι ἕλος κάτα βουκολέοντο / θήλειαι, πώλοισιν ἀγαλλόμεναι ἀταλῇσι) is the lone Homeric exception to the term's strict use for cattle. The verb is used in a genealogy of horses raised by Erichthonius, son of Dardanus, spoken in a boast by Aeneas to Achilles, and is appropriate here because the high value of horses associates the practice with cowherding. The verb's use might also serve to elevate the status of Erichthonius, who was presumably wealthy enough to "pasture mares as cattle."

[22] Apollo's status as a cowherd is taken for granted in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*, in which Apollo tends cattle that are raided by the infant Hermes (18: βοῦς ... Ἀπόλλωνος, etc.). The cattle of the Sun, i.e., Helios, also deserve mention here. It is natural for a divinity such as Helios to tend high-status cattle (*Odyssey* 12.299, 321–322, etc.). Though there are sheep in his flocks, as well, there are no goats.

trusty servant. He, along with the swineherd Eumaeus,[23] is among Odysseus' greatest allies when the hero arrives in Ithaca and seeks revenge on the suitors. Philoetius, called βουκόλος (20.227 and elsewhere) and βοῶν ἐπιβουκόλος ἀνήρ (20.235, a pleonastic compliment: "cowherding man of cattle") is a thoroughly positive character. He acts nobly and truthfully, even garnering the direct praise of Odysseus (20.227–228): βουκόλ', ἐπεὶ οὔτε κακῷ οὔτ' ἄφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας, / γιγνώσκω δὲ καὶ αὐτός, ὅ τοι πινυτὴ φρένας ἵκει ("Cowherd, since you seem like a man neither cowardly nor senseless, and I know myself what wisdom enters your mind"). The prominent position Odysseus gives to Philoetius' profession, mentioned in the first word of his salutation, underscores the association of positive qualities specifically with cowherding. Not only heroic figures gain stature from their practice of this Apolline profession.

At the other end of the spectrum, the goatherd in Homer is a distinctly negative character, portrayed in many ways as exhibiting qualities antithetical to the cowherd's. Goatherds are less common in Homer than their nobler colleagues. The *Iliad* mentions them occasionally in similes, usually portraying them as going about their tasks without elaborating on their moral character. They appear simply as part of the pastoral background the similes provide to the poem of war.[24] The *Odyssey*, however, provides more opportunities to witness herdsmen in action, and it is here we meet the colorful character Melantheus, a goatherd of Odysseus' flock. His portrayal in the concluding portion of the *Odyssey* is important for understanding the nature and role of the goatherd in subsequent literature, since he exhibits negative qualities and behavior that become part of a standard marking that goatherds carry long subsequent to the Homeric poems in the Greek tradition.

Melantheus first appears in Book 17 of the *Odyssey*, when the disguised Odysseus and the swineherd Eumaeus encounter him on the road to the city. He is conspicuously described as αἶγας ἄγων ("leading goats," 213).[25] Immediately he hurls coarse rebukes at both the swineherd and Odysseus, whom he supposes a beggar (217–232), and follows his verbal assault with a physical one, kicking Odysseus in the hip (233–234). After a brief reprimand by Eumaeus, he insults Odysseus again, whom he still does not recognize, saying that he wishes Telemachus would be killed since Odysseus is surely not going to return (248–253). Our first meeting with the goatherd is important both for the general impression it communicates—he is a violent and disparaging man—and for the way it

[23] Eumaeus' portrayal in the *Odyssey* is also extremely positive. Though swineherding appears rarely in the poetic tradition after Homer, Eumaeus himself does surface occasionally in hellenistic and later poetry: see Theoc. *Id.* 16.54–55, and the second/first-century sepulchral epigram *GV* 1729 Peek; in the second of these his character is labeled φιλοδέσποτον. He is an acknowledged model of both hospitality and herdsmanship (on the former, see especially Odysseus' comment in *Od.* 14.53–54; on the latter, 14.523–533).

[24] For a more detailed discussion of representations of herdsmen in the *Iliad*, see Bernsdorff 2001: 52–62, though he draws less of a distinction between professions than I do here.

[25] On Melantheus, see especially the perceptive comments of Thalmann (1998: 83–84).

renders many of the specific features of his character. Melantheus engages in verbal abuse and speaks in vulgar, colorful, and often hyperbolic language.[26] These rhetorical traits, of course, are prominent in the portrayal of goatherds in Theocritus' poetry. In many of the *Idylls*, two interlocutors exchange compliments or insults before engaging in a singing contest, and colorful and sometimes unabashedly coarse language is common, even celebrated. We easily recognize Melantheus, upon his first appearance, as the literary ancestor of the verbally creative and combative herdsmen of Theocritean bucolic, especially Comatas in *Idyll* 5.

Melantheus is hardly heard from again until book 20, where he appears for the first time with his standard epithet αἰπόλος αἰγῶν ("goatherd of goats" [173], the pleonastic inverse of Philoetius' title), aids the suitors by bringing them goats for food (174–175), and later pours them wine (255). His most infamous action, however, occurs in book 22: he brings arms to the suitors from the inner store-rooms of Odysseus' palace during the great battle. The most prominent and effective traitor to Odysseus' home, he is suspected immediately of the treason by Telemachus (22.151–152) and is subsequently caught and bound by Eumaeus and tortured according to Odysseus' own commands. There is no question that Melantheus is portrayed in a thoroughly negative light here, in direct contrast with the cowherds we have examined, especially Philoetius, who appears fighting alongside his master Odysseus in the same section of the same poem. Melantheus' character is not redeemed, and though he combines general baseness with an amusing propensity for colorfully exaggerated language, his portrayal in the *Odyssey* must be considered an almost completely negative one. He is thus a perfect candidate for Theocritean reformulation.

This discussion of Homeric herdsmen cannot conclude without mention of one of the most prominent tenders of animals in the poems, the Cyclops Polyphemus. This formidable son of Poseidon is described in *Odyssey* 9 as herding sheep and goats (9.220, 239, etc.). Polyphemus is, of course, a model of incivility: he verbally abuses Odysseus from the moment he notices him and his men in the cave (a breach of *xenia*), and he devours many of Odysseus' companions raw.[27] I need only note the expected here: there are no cattle among Polyphemus' flocks.

[26] His speech is full of exaggeration and "strong and even excessive metaphors" (Russo *et al.* 1992: n. on 231–232), as, for instance, in the final two lines (231–232): πολλά οἱ ἀμφὶ κάρη σφέλα ἀνδρῶν ἐκ παλαμάων / πλευραὶ ἀποτρίψουσι δόμον κάτα βαλλομένοιο ("His ribs will wear out many a stool thrown from men's hands when he is popped in the head in the halls!"). Russo notes that these lines have been found lacking by some commentators, but they do, in any case, show strongly vivid imagery and hyperbole. See Thalmann 1998: 83–84 on the difference in linguistic register between Melantheus and the loyal Philoetius and Eumaeus.

[27] This episode of the *Odyssey* is often read, in part, as an object-lesson in what it means to be civilized; see in particular the perceptive reading by Mondi (1983), but also Heubeck's notes on 9.106–115 and 259–271 (Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989). Bernsdorff (2001: 63–64) discusses the contrast between Polyphemus' behavior towards his guests and his flocks.

Thus Homeric poetry lays the groundwork for two lasting markings for herdsmen, establishing a durable schism between the noble cowherd and the vile goatherd. Shepherds maintain a measure of neutrality, able to be marked by association with either group, as we shall see, while the swineherd, so noble and loyal a character in the *Odyssey*, has little literary life after the Homeric epics, garnering only a single brief and relatively inconsequential mention in the whole of the *Idylls* (16.54–55). If our goal is to trace influence from earlier Greek literature on a specific aspect of the poetry of Theocritus, there is little need to look beyond these markings into the intervening period. The influence of Homer is, of course, directly felt; simply by using the dactylic hexameter Theocritus acknowledges Homer as the central authority of the tradition in which he works.[28] This is not to say that intervening poetry is silent on the matter of herdsmen, however, and a brief look at a few particular places in which they play a prominent or significant role in fifth-century literature can sharpen the contours of the markings I wish to trace.[29]

Herdsmen populate the Greek tragic stage with some frequency. Perhaps predictably, however, it is difficult to discern any strict hierarchy among those found in the tragic corpus. The system of Homeric marking, at least, is not contradicted. Herdsmen often serve as deliverers of messenger-speeches, most notably in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Bacchae*, and *Rhesus*, or are bearers of important news in other ways (a good example is the messenger-herdsman who supplies the final piece of evidence against Oedipus in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*). They are invariably trustworthy and earnest, if occasionally a bit simple-minded. These herdsmen are never goatherds. The old messenger in *Oedipus Tyrannus* is a shepherd (1125), the messenger in *Iphigenia in Tauris* is a cowherd (255, 261), in *Bacchae*, the messenger identifies himself and his companions as βουκόλοι καὶ ποιμένες ("cowherds and shepherds," 714), and the messenger in *Rhesus* appears to be a shepherd.[30] In these plays, there seems to be little difference between herders of cattle or sheep, while goatherds—strikingly—are absent. In fact, the single mention of the practice of goatherding in the corpus of extant tragedies by the three main tragedians uses the verb αἰπολέω in reference to the Erinyes (*Eum.* 196): Apollo commands the Furies to leave his temple with the words χωρεῖτ' ἄνευ βοτῆρος αἰπολούμεναι (taken literally,

[28] Halperin (1983) has proposed most strongly that Theocritean bucolic should be understood as a subgenre of *epos*. His arguments go beyond form, though formal features are certainly significant factors in ancient delineations of the genres. See Halperin 1983: 217–257, but also Hubbard's comments on understanding the novelty of the bucolic genre as it relates to *epos* (1998: 19–20), and Hunter's comments on *epos* and Theocritean meter (1999: 17–21). On the relationship of the text of Homer to hellenistic poetic composition in general, see Rengakos 1993.

[29] Outside the world of literature, the distinctions between herdsmen are still strong in the classical period: a law from Chios attested on stone prohibits types of herding with specific language delineating shepherds, swineherds, and cowherds: Dittenberger *SIG*[4] 986.

[30] He is identified as a ποιμήν in at least one MS; even if his professional identity is not entirely secure, it is clear from the text that he does not herd goats.

something like "go, you goatherd's flock without a herdsman"). The putrid Furies are metaphorically equated with the charge of a goatherd. These examples are all concordant with the markings the three types of herdsmen carry in Homer. While in tragedy it appears that herdsmen have no special cultural superiority aside from their high level of integrity, only positively marked cowherds and unmarked shepherds can fulfill the role of messenger or good companion. There is no room for the boorish Melantheus or his reeking colleagues in the high register of Athenian tragedy.[31]

Bearing that observation in mind, we might expect satyr-drama to have an abundance of goatherds and goats, and we would be correct, at least in one sense; satyrs themselves can be portrayed as half-goat, and often carry, in the visual arts, goatskins.[32] The one complete satyr-drama extant, Euripides' *Cyclops*, however, is populated, aside from the satyrs themselves, with shepherds. Polyphemus and the satyr chorus both drive sheep, not goats, but their vulgar and often violent nature (and coarse language) seems to fit well with the paradigmatic goatherd. The play, along with its literary predecessor, the Cyclops-episode in the *Odyssey*, supplies perhaps the best example of shepherds influenced negatively by association with goatherds, here represented in the caprine qualities of the satyrs and father Silenus. Whereas in tragedy shepherds gain dignity by association with cowherds and are thus elevated to a high social position, here they are dragged to a lower register. The presence of goats and goatherds on the Athenian tragic or satyric stage may have been beyond an acceptable boundary, but *Cyclops*, and perhaps other satyr drama as well, also has neither cowherds nor cattle. The noblest of herdsmen are far from the Cyclops' uncivilized caves.

While there is no solid evidence for a strict hierarchy among herdsmen in this earlier literature, there does appear to be a tenacious system of markings that attaches specific associations to the different professions. Homeric epic, of course, is the source of the original markers, both in positively marking cowherds through association with noble and respected heroes, and in negatively marking goatherds, primarily through the portrayal of Melantheus and the Cyclops Polyphemus in the *Odyssey*. This set of connotations is not ignored in later pre-hellenistic literature, though it is not in the foreground. Tragedy portrays the various herdsmen at least without disrupting the system—a goatherd is never elevated to a position of social prominence nor is a cowherd demoted to one of inferiority. Shepherds appear to

[31] This pattern is supported, perhaps, by (admittedly late) evidence attesting to followers of Dionysus known as βουκόλοι: see Merkelbach 1988: 61–62. Merkelbach's thorough study of herding imagery and Dionysus-cult uncovers only a single reference to goatherding: *Idyll* 7.

[32] Satyrs depicted on archaic and classical vases usually have horses' tails. But see Lawall 1967: 81 and especially n. 14 on their caprine qualities. The satyrs' and Silenus' association with Pan, in general, also connects them directly to goats and goatherds. For examples, see Boardman 1974: 232–233 (black-figure vases depicting Pan, satyrs, and silenoi) with plates; Boardman 1975: 226 (Pan), 233 (satyrs) on early red-figure with plates; and Boardman 1989: 227 (Pan), 230 (satyrs and silenoi) on classical red-figure. On satyrs, Boardman (1989: 230) makes the important observation that by the fourth century "there is a tendency for their form to become more goatish than equine."

be susceptible to guilt or glory through association as, for example, in *Cyclops* and *Bacchae*, respectively. I return now to the *Idylls* of Theocritus to examine how the poet uses this literary system in both old and new ways.[33]

AEPOLIC AND BUCOLIC

The prominent position herdsmen inhabit in the *Idylls*, especially in the first eleven poems (often called the pastoral *Idylls*) provides ample opportunity to examine how Theocritus makes use of the system of markings I have traced. Donatus, speaking of Vergil, makes observations that are only partially true for Theocritus. The hellenistic poet's representation of herdsmen shows not a hierarchy but an adaptation, and at times inversion, of the system of markings. The question of whether Theocritus himself invented the system, and if so, if it is based on actual herding practice, becomes secondary when the influence of Homer is recognized. Economic factors played a role, but after the Homeric poems, there is little need for the system to mirror concrete reality directly. Many herds in ancient times (as today) mixed sheep and goats,[34] and this certainly helped support the continuing distinction between cattle and the lower animals that the marking system reflects. But the Homeric poems establish a literary model that can operate on its own. It is reinforced by the details of economic value, not dependent upon them. Theocritus uses this system and, we shall see, in typically hellenistic fashion, inverts and even glorifies what was previously lowly and ignoble, to help achieve his own programmatic goals.

Much of the Theocritean material adduced by critics to prove the existence of the Donatan hierarchy shows even more clearly how Theocritus adopts a system of markings that was part of the poetic tradition he inherited. Enumeration of herdsmen in order at 1.80 (ἦνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ᾠπόλοι ἦνθον, "the cowherds came; the shepherds and goatherds came") and the lists of the loves of Aphrodite in 1.105–110 and 20.34–36 (in both cases, a cowherd or cowherds are followed by the shepherd Adonis) remain important, but now even more because they place cowherds first and goatherds last. The two lists of Aphrodite's loves would presumably also have included goatherds last, if she had ever deigned to fall for one. Of course, use of the term αἰπόλος as an insult (1.86 and 6.7), and the coupling of the term with δύσερως in each of these instances, also fits well with the profession's negative marking. In fact, with Melantheus clearly in mind, the reproach "goatherd" seems somewhat more potent than it would be if viewed merely as a gibe based on class or wealth—put another way, literary tradition may be more powerful here than economic reality.

[33] On representations of herdsmen in non-bucolic hellenistic poetry, see Bernsdorff 2001. He dismisses the classic "Hirtenhierarchie" in Apollonius, Theocritus, and Vergil (83) but is receptive especially to Homeric influence on these and other authors.

[34] Hodkinson 1988: 60.

Interaction among herdsmen offers the best attestation of Theocritus' adoption of the marking system. I stated earlier that the register of conversation among differing levels of herdsmen varies distinctly, especially in *Idylls* 1, 5, and 6.[35] *Idyll* 6, a conversation between the two cowherds Daphnis and Damoetas is remarkable for its civility, as was noted above, but *Idyll* 5 provides an example of the other extreme in the conversation between Lacon, a shepherd, and Comatas, a goatherd. The vulgar and abusive nature of their exchange can be understood as a feature of Theocritus' adoption of goatherding's negative marking. A shepherd, without the positive presence of a cowherd or cattle, is capable of descending to the "aepolic" level. In fact, Homeric influence is more than latent in the poem. In 149–150, the poem's final lines, the goatherd Comatas, talking to a billy-goat, states: ἀλλὰ γενοίμαν, / αἰ μή τυ φλάσσαιμι, Μελάνθιος ἀντὶ Κομάτα ("if I don't crush you, may I become Melantheus instead of Comatas!"). Comatas here swears an oath on the name of his predecessor, something like "stick a needle in my eye." With this line, the poet brings to the foreground the goatherd's literary pedigree. Theocritus implicitly states how far he is from inventing the rough behavior and language of Comatas at the beginning of this *Idyll*—it is, so to speak, in character.

Two of the three contest-poems conclude exactly as we would expect. *Idyll* 6, a contest between two cowherds, ends in a draw, and in *Idyll* 8, a contest between a cowherd and a shepherd, the cowherd is victorious. *Idyll* 5, however—the salty contest between Comatas and Lacon—presents an anomaly, since the goatherd Comatas takes the prize. I have already examined the nature of their exchange, and shown how it supports the negative marking of the goatherd and a neutral one of the shepherd. How, then, can we explain Comatas' victory? The answer lies in Theocritus' use of the existing system precisely in order to subvert it in certain ways. Through this victory, the poet is making a programmatic statement. What were negative characteristics in Homer are here treated in a more detached, even ironic, fashion. Comatas' success is an elevation of the true vulgarity and abusiveness of Melantheus (specifically named in the song's final lines) to a sophisticated literary vulgarity—that is, to something acceptable in the register of hellenistic poetic discourse. This is a particularly effective way in which Theocritus both attaches his new poetry to the genre of epic and carves out new territory for his bucolic songs. Simultaneously he underscores one of the most prominent features of Melantheus, literary progenitor, and Comatas, literary descendant: linguistic vibrancy. Comatas' significance in this respect is underscored in *Idyll* 7 as well, where another goatherd with the same name appears as the subject of Lycidas' song as a symbol of poetic inspiration.[36] This suggests that the goatherd's victory in *Idyll* 5 is not a random event, or an isolated instance of this type of

[35] Noted above, 230–231, as traced by Van Groningen 1958: 314.

[36] On this doubling of Comatas, see Fantuzzi (1998: 64–65), who sees Comatas of *Idyll* 7, along with Daphnis of *Idyll* 1, as represented more mythically than the "everyday" herdsmen who otherwise populate the poems (65).

representation, but a deliberate device on the poet's part.[37] In fact, the two poems in the collection that are most often associated with Theocritean programmatic statements, *Idylls* 1 and 7, show similar strategies.

Callimachus, in describing a figure clearly similar to himself, writes in his *Aetia* καὶ γὰρ ὁ θρηικίην μὲν ἀπέστυγε χανδὸν ἄμυστιν / οἰνοποτεῖν, ὀλίγῳ δ' ἥδετο κισσυβίῳ ("he hates drinking the long Thracian drought with mouth agape, but takes pleasure in the small peasant's cup").[38] The elevation of the inferior object, here specifically a κισσύβιον, a peasant's ivy-wood cup, is a significant expression of Callimachus' poetic identity. We cannot, of course, equate Callimachean poetics in their specifics with those of Theocritus, but this typically hellenistic stance can also be paralleled in the *Idylls*. Theocritus, in fact, takes up the image in his own ecphrastic description of a cup, also called a κισσύβιον, in *Idyll* 1, the song that initiates his collection of bucolic poems.[39] The three scenes on the cup described by the unnamed goatherd all can be understood to contain programmatic statements concerning Theocritus' new bucolic poetry.[40] Without diminishing the importance of these scenes, we can identify here another programmatic angle: that of the presence of the cup as an object. It is called an αἰπολικὸν θάημα (a "goatherd's wonder," 56). The lowly cup, with its beautiful carvings, and its function as inspiration for bucolic song, is itself explicitly related by this phrase to the negatively marked herdsman. This is not a situation where the terminology of herdsmen becomes generalized (that is, the term "aepolic" simply denotes that the cup is in the possession of a herdsman, or creates in it a symbol of intensified or strengthened bucolicism),[41] but rather a significant example of the way Theocritus creates a distinctive identity for his new genre. This aepolic olive-wood cup is not the shield of a great Achaean warrior, nor a temple façade at Delphi,[42] but a humble possession of the lowliest of herdsmen. In addition, it is the nameless goatherd who describes the cup to the shepherd Thyrsis, further underscoring its aepolic nature. This is Theocritean inversion at

[37] Callimachus' epigram 22 (Pf), on the goatherd Astacides, lends additional support here, since the poem can be read as a comment on the elevation of the goatherd in the *Idylls* (as well as on other Theocritean poetic mannerisms); see Bing (1995: 129–130), who labels the epigram "a case of goatherd-boosterism run riot" (130).

[38] Call. *Aet.* 178.11–12 (Pf).

[39] On the position of the first *Idyll* in the manuscript tradition, see Gow 1952: 1.lxvi–lxix.

[40] See Hunter 1999: 60–63 and note on 27–61 for discussion of the κισσύβιον and the three scenes depicted upon it. Hunter collects more extensive bibliography on the passage (76). Halperin 1983: 161–189 also offers a useful discussion.

[41] The position of Van Groningen 1958: 316, followed in part by Halperin 1983: 184. It is an oversimplification to conclude, with the scholiast on this passage, that this terminology is a type of metonymy. More can be gained by understanding the terms for herdsmen as distinguishing among professions in all their uses (aside from the exceptions in the nomenclature of sung poetry noted above).

[42] Two examples, of course, of objects of high-style ecphrastic description in the Greek tradition, from the *Iliad* and Euripides' *Ion*.

its finest, and sets the stage for the portrayal of Comatas in *Idyll* 5, discussed above (239), and that of Comatas and Lycidas in *Idyll* 7.

Perhaps the most telling instance of Theocritus' employment of the system of markings to define his new poetic product comes in *Idyll* 7, the other poem in the corpus with clear programmatic goals.[43] The narrator and a few companions meet a goatherd named Lycidas on the road to a festival of Demeter. He is introduced in lines 11–19:

> ... καί τιν' ὁδίταν
> ἐσθλὸν σὺν Μοίσαισι Κυδωνικὸν εὕρομες ἄνδρα,
> οὔνομα μὲν Λυκίδαν, ἦς δ' αἰπόλος, οὐδέ κέ τίς νιν
> ἠγνοίησεν ἰδών, ἐπεὶ αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐφκει.
> ἐκ μὲν γὰρ λασίοιο δασύτριχος εἶχε τράγοιο
> κνακὸν δέρμ' ὤμοισι νέας ταμίσοιο ποτόσδον,
> ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ στήθεσσι γέρων ἐσφίγγετο πέπλος
> ζωστῆρι πλακερῷ, ῥοικὰν δ' ἔχεν ἀγριελαίῳ
> δεξιτερᾷ κορύναν.

We came upon a certain Cydonian traveler, by the grace of the Muses, a good man. His name was Lycidas, and he was a goatherd, nor would anyone have mistaken him once they saw him, since he looked very much like a goatherd. For he had a yellow fleece from a thick-haired shaggy goat on his shoulders, stinking of fresh cheese, and around his chest an old cloak was bound with a wide belt, and he carried in his right hand a crooked staff of wild olive.

Lycidas is described as looking conspicuously like a goatherd, to the point that no one could possibly mistake his identity (13–14). Precisely because of the emphatic nature of the description, many critics have proposed that Lycidas represents a god or poet in disguise; suggested identifications range from Apollo and Pan on the one hand to Callimachus, Philetas, or other contemporary poets on the other.[44] But identification is not a crucial point.[45] Lycidas figuratively represents many of the standard tenets of poetry of the period as practiced by both Callimachus and Theocritus, and his song touches on the very nature of poetic inspiration, especially in the image of another goatherd being shut in a chest and fed by bees (78–89). That goatherd's name, of course, is Comatas

[43] The bibliography on *Idyll* 7 is extensive; see Hunter 1999: 151 for an overview of recent work. This poem is often considered one of Theocritus' primary programmatic statements. On this point, see in particular Hubbard 1998: 22–28 (with further bibliography in n. 11); Lawall 1967: 74–117; Segal 1981: 110–112; Berger 1984; Goldhill 1991: 225–240 (with bibliography in n. 1).

[44] The concept of the poem as a "mascarade bucolique" is mentioned by Gow (1952: 2.129–130), but the idea is not new with him (see Hubbard 1998: 31). For a good survey of the suggestions made by readers over the years, see Hubbard 1998: 24 with nn. 15 and 16. Hubbard himself argues that Lycidas seems a "caricature of Philetas" (24). Philetas was from Cos, the setting of the poem. Bowie (1985: 77) suggests that Lycidas should be recognized as a character from Philetas' poetry.

[45] On the interpretative problems that attempts at identification produce, see especially Goldhill 1991: 230.

(83).[46] By portraying a goatherd singing about a goatherd who is ultimately a symbol of poetic inspiration (and homonymous with a rough-edged singing goatherd in another *Idyll*), Theocritus creates a programmatic statement that is simultaneously subversive and traditional. It reaches across poems in creating a sense of the aepolic that incorporates both divinely-inspired goatherd-singers (Lycidas and the Comatas of this *Idyll*) and their combative and rustic fellow tradesman (Comatas of *Idyll* 5).

The companions' encounter with Lycidas on the road also evokes Odysseus' and Eumaeus' meeting with Melantheus in *Odyssey* 17.[47] This clear reminiscence of Homeric poetry in general, and Melantheus in particular, intensifies the connection between Lycidas and his literary ancestor. A similar filiation is made explicit in the final lines of *Idyll* 5, where Comatas invokes Melantheus, as I have noted; thus the two *Idylls* together serve to associate Lycidas and Comatas both with the Homeric precedent. This doubling helps the poet retain features of Lycidas' aepolic identity, as is clear from the lines introducing him (remember the Homeric epithet of Melantheus, αἰπόλος αἰγῶν). But Lycidas is the negative goatherd we know from Homer and earlier literature only in certain mannered characteristics, just as formal features of the verse, such as its meter, are the closest connections between the Homeric poems and those of Theocritus. Thus in form, content, and even setting, Theocritus selectively embellishes features of his poetry's epic ancestry—in the case of Lycidas, especially by retaining the Melanthean traits of rusticity and capacity for linguistic creativity.

By using these eloquent goatherds as vehicles for his programmatic message, Theocritus simultaneously acknowledges and distances himself from the tradition of Homer and the "cyclic poems" that Callimachus roundly despises.[48] He does not subvert the traditional marking of the goatherd; he instead uses it to make a new poetic statement. If subversion were the goal, cowherds in the *Idylls* would not retain their traditional dignity, which is in fact also underscored in *Idyll* 7, since Simichidas, the poem's narrator and a figure sometimes identified as a stand-in for Theocritus, appears to fancy himself a cowherd.[49] In fact, Theocritus' name for his new poetry, βουκολικά, also asserts the continuing preeminence

[46] At least, if there is only one goatherd in question in lines 78–89. Hunter (1999: 176, citing Radt 1971: 254–255) argues that there are two, and Comatas is "likened to, not identified with" the unnamed goatherd of 78–83.

[47] On the Homeric resonance of the encounter in *Idyll* 7, see especially Halperin 1983: 225–227; Goldhill 1991: 226–228; Hunter 1999: 147–148.

[48] For criticism of the ποίημα κυκλικόν, see Callim. fr. 28.1 (Pf).

[49] Consensus is that Simichidas is a city dweller out for a country stroll with friends; there is little reason to assume the "I" of the poem represents the poet himself. As for cowherding, at 91–93 he states: Λυκίδα φίλε, πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα / Νύμφαι κἠμὲ δίδαξαν ἀν' ὥρεα βουκολέοντα / ἐσθλά ("Dear Lycidas, the nymphs taught me many noble things when I tended cattle on the slopes"). Simichidas here presents himself in the role of the cowherd familiar from earlier literature (especially that of Anchises in *Il.* 5.311–313), and of the Hesiodic rustic poetic initiand (see Kambylis 1965: 17–68); in doing so he elevates his own status (*contra* Segal 1981: 172, n. 21).

of cowherding. It is certainly a more elevated name than αἰπολικά would have been, though the latter term can be used effectively to describe the ivy-wood cup in *Idyll* 1. The new and different aspect of Theocritus' poetry is expressed instead by his representation of the goatherd as the ultimate symbol of poetic inspiration (in parallel with the κισσύβιον of the first poem), embodied in Lycidas, his subject Comatas, and the Comatas of *Idyll* 5. In the *Odyssey*, Melantheus shows a knack for quick-witted abuse, and these Theocritean goatherds still retain the trait of linguistic acumen inherited from their literary progenitor. Theocritus' goal, however, is not to sing of the glorious deeds of men on the battlefield, but rather to produce a new song of the countryside for a sophisticated audience. His work will thus have rough language and rustic but witty interlocutors, while still remaining, formally speaking, a strand of epic. Lycidas and the two versions of Comatas, reeking of fresh cheese and looking very much like goatherds but capable of true poetic brilliance, become symbols of the essence of Theocritean bucolic song.

Understanding Theocritus' use of this system of herdsmen thus helps us define both the foundation and the substance of bucolic poetry. While Theocritus has often been credited with creating the genre, it is questionable whether such an accomplishment is possible at all. Creating a genre is not generally the work of a single mind, and Theocritean bucolic is sometimes, perhaps correctly, considered a subgenre of epic.[50] Surely our own conception of the genre owes much to Vergil, who greatly modified it, perhaps simplifying the types of poetry called by the name "bucolic." But there is little question that both Theocritus' pastoral and non-pastoral poetry, which may have all been referred to by the same name,[51] was new in many ways. Some modern theories of genre are based more on generic relationships, both synchronic and diachronic, than on actual beginnings, and this may shed some light on the question of the true origins of bucolic song.[52] According to this conception, to credit Theocritus with "founding" anything would be too strong, but recognizing and charting his conservation, subversion, or even destruction, of existing literary conventions, allows us to place him at the vanguard of a line of poets that stretches through Vergil to pastoral poetry of the present day. His adaptation of both Homeric and economically based markings for various herdsmen is only one way he contributes to the creation of what later generations identified as the new genre of bucolic poetry. But it is an important one, and it helps explain how new forms of discourse are born from the old. Theocritus combines wit and inventiveness with respect for tradition, all three tools that greatly contribute to the quality and durability of his new bucolic

[50] See again Halperin 1983, especially 217–248.

[51] Thomas (1996) makes the case that Theocritus' non-pastoral poetry was still "bucolic"; see especially 238.

[52] Gutzwiller (1991: 9) stresses this point, as does as Hubbard (1998: 19–20), who would credit the poet of *Idylls* 8 and 9, whom he distinguishes from Theocritus as more a founder of the genre than Theocritus himself.

poetry. His innovation spurred on further modifications of the genre, from the political pastorals of Vergil to the songs of modern cowboy poets, heirs of the cowherd Daphnis.

Department of Classics and Ancient
Mediterranean Studies
Pennsylvania State University
108 Weaver Building
University Park, PA 16802
U.S.A. dwb11@psu.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berger, H. 1984. "The Origins of Bucolic Representation: Disenchantment and Revision in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*," *CA* 3: 1–39.

Bernsdorff, H. 2001. *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*. Stuttgart.

Bing, P. 1995. "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus," *A&A* 41: 115–131.

Boardman, J. 1974. *Athenian Black Figure Vases*. Oxford.

—— 1975. *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period*. London.

—— 1989. *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Classical Period*. London.

Bowie, E. L. 1985. "Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, Philetas and Longus," *CQ* N.S. 35: 67–91.

Dale, A. M. ed. 1954. *Euripides:* Alcestis. Oxford.

Dittenberger, W. 1960. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*[4]. 4 vols. Hildesheim = *SIG*[4].

Dover, K. J. ed. 1971. *Theocritus: Select Poems*. Basingstoke and London.

Edmonds, J. M. and S. Gaselee (eds.). 1916. *Daphnis and Chloe and Parthenius*. Cambridge, MA.

Fantuzzi, M. 1980. "La contaminazione dei generi letterari nella letteratura greca ellenistica: rifiuto del sistema o evoluzione di un sistema?," *Lingua e stile* 15: 433–450.

—— 1998. "Textual Misadventures of Daphnis: The Pseudo-Theocritean *Id.* 8 and the Origins of the Bucolic 'Manner'," in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Hellenistica Groningana 3. Groningen. 61–79.

Gabba, E. and M. Pasquinucci. 1979. *Strutture agrarie e allevamento transumante nell'Italia romana (III–I Sec. a.C.)*. Pisa.

Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

Gow, A. S. F. ed. 1952. *Theocritus*[2]. 2 vols. Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, K. J. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison.

Halperin, D. M. 1983. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven.

Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey 2: *Books IX–XVI*. Oxford.

Hodkinson, S. 1988. "Animal Husbandry in the Greek Polis," in C. R. Whittaker (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge. 35–74.

Hubbard, T. K. 1998. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor.

Hunter, R. L. ed. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge.

Kambylis, A. 1965. *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*. Heidelberg.

Kock, T. 1880. *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta* 1. Leipzig.
Lawall, G. 1967. *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book.* Cambridge, MA.
Merkelbach, R. 1988. *Die Hirten des Dionysos.* Stuttgart.
Mondi, R. 1983. "The Homeric Cyclopes: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme," *TAPA* 113: 17–38.
Morgan, J. R. ed. 2004. *Longus,* Daphnis and Chloe. Oxford.
Peek, W. 1955. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* 1: *Grab-Epigramme.* Berlin = *GV.*
Pfeiffer, R. 1949. *Callimachus.* 2 vols. Oxford.
Radt, S. L. 1971. "Theocritea," *Mnemosyne* 24: 251–259.
Rengakos, A. 1993. *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter.* Stuttgart.
Rossi, L. R. 1971. "Mondo pastorale e poesia bucolica di maniera: l'idillio ottavo del *corpus* Teocriteo," *SIFC* 43: 5–25.
Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey 3: *Books XVII–XXIV.* Oxford.
Schmidt, E. A. 1969. "Hirtenhierarchie in der antiken Bukolik?," *Philologus* 113: 183–200.
—— 1987. *Bukolische Leidenshaft oder über antike Hirtenpoesie. Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 22. Frankfurt am Main.
Segal, C. 1981. *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral.* Princeton.
Skydsgaard, J. E. 1988. "Transhumance in Ancient Greece," in C. R. Whittaker (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity.* Cambridge. 75–86.
Thalmann, W. 1998. *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the* Odyssey. Ithaca.
Thomas, R. F. 1996. "Genre Through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius," in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Theocritus.* Hellenistica Groningana 2. Groningen. 227–246.
Van Groningen, B. A. 1958. "Quelques problèmes de la poésie bucolique grecque," *Mnemosyne* 11: 293–317.
Van Sickle, J. 1970. "Poetica teocritea," *QUCC* 9: 67–83.
Wendel, C. ed. 1967. *Scholia in Theocritum vetera.* Stuttgart.